112TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
112–78

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1540

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

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

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

66–252 WASHINGTON : 2011

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

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

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

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

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the Legislation	1
Rationale for the Committee Bill	2
Hearings	5
Committee Position	5
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	5
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	5
Summary of Discretionary Authorizations in the Bill	6
Budget Authority Implication	17
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	21
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	21
OVERVIEW	21
Aircraft Procurement, Army	21
Overview	21
Items of Special Interest	21
Aerial Common Sensor	21
Airborne Reconnaissance Low	21
Air filters for National Guard helicopters	22
CH–47F Chinook helicopter	22
UH–72A Lakota helicopter aircraft survivability equipment	22
Missile Procurement, Army	22
Overview	22
Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	23
Overview	23
Items of Special Interest	23
Abrams tank program National Guard modernization	23
Bradley fighting vehicle program	24
M4 carbine product improvement program	24
Stryker vehicles	25
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	25
Overview	25
Other Procurement, Army	25
Overview	25
Items of Special Interest	25
Body armor investment strategy	25
Body armor requirements generation and weight reduction initiatives	26
Information management system for the National Guard	27
Joint Tactical Radio System	27
Light tactical vehicle investment strategy	28
M915 line haul tractor trailer acquisition strategy	29
Tactical wheeled vehicle acquisition strategy	29
Weapon light upgrades	29
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	30
Overview	30
Items of Special Interest	30
Efforts to mitigate the improvised explosive device threat to dismounted operations	30
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization	30
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	31
Overview	31
Items of Special Interest	31
V–22	31
Weapons Procurement, Navy	32

Page

Overview 32
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps 32
Overview 32
Items of Special Interest 32
Laser guided air-launched rockets 32
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 32
Overview 32
Items of Special Interest 33
Amphibious Assault Ship 33
Navy Shipbuilding Program 33
Other Procurement, Navy 34
Overview 34
Procurement, Marine Corps 34
Overview 34
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 34
Overview 34
Items of Special Interest 35
B–1 bomber aircraft force structure 35
Common vertical lift support platform 35
Global Hawk 35
Intra-theater and inter-theater airlift programs 36
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force 37
Overview 37
Missile Procurement, Air Force 37
Overview 37
Other Procurement, Air Force 38
Overview 38
Procurement, Defense-Wide 38
Overview 38
Items of Special Interest 38
Innovative titanium manufacturing processes 38
Non-Standard Aviation and Aviation Foreign Internal Defense 38
Special operations combatant craft systems 39
Special operations communications equipment and tactical radio systems 39
Standard missile-3 interceptors 39
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense 40
Transition of non-lethal weapons 41
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 42
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 42
Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations 42
Subtitle B—Army Programs 42
Section 111—Limitation on Retirement of C–23 Aircraft 42
Section 112—Limitation on Procurement of Stryker Combat Vehicles 42
Section 113—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Airframes for Army UH–60M/HH–60M Helicopters and Navy MH–60R/MH–60S Helicopters 42
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 42
Section 121—Multiyear Funding for Detail Design and Construction of LHA Replacement Ship Designated LHA–7 42
Section 122—Multiyear Funding for Procurement of Arleigh Burke-Class Destroyers 43
Section 123—Multiyear Procurement Authority for Mission Avionics and Common Cockpits for Navy MH–60R/S Helicopters 43
Section 124—Separate Procurement Line Item for Certain Littoral Combat Ship Mission Modules 43
Section 125—Life-Cycle Cost-Benefit Analysis on Alternative Maintenance and Sustainability Plans for the Littoral Combat Ship Program 43
Section 126—Limitation on Availability of Funds for F/A–18 Service Life Extension Program 44
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 44
Section 131—B–1 Bomber Force Structure 44
Section 132—Procurement of Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellites 44
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters 45
Section 141—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 45

Page

Section 142—Contracts for Commercial Imaging Satellite Capacities 45
Section 143—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Acquisition of Joint Tactical Radio System 45
Section 144—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program 45
Section 145—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Commercial Satellite Procurement 46
Section 146—Separate Procurement Line Item for Non-Lethal Weapons Funding 46
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 46
OVERVIEW 46
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army 46
Overview 46
Items of Special Interest 46
Active protection systems technology development 46
Armed Deployable Helicopter 47
Army science and technology management 47
Bioinformatics initiative 48
Development of personnel protection equipment for female soldiers 48
Ground Combat Vehicle 49
Improved Turbine Engine Program 50
Joint Light Tactical Vehicle 50
Medium Extended Air Defense System 51
Nett Warrior 52
Precision artillery munitions acquisition strategy 52
Status of Future Combat Systems contract actions 53
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy 53
Overview 53
Items of Special Interest 53
Defense University Research Instrumentation Program 53
Expeditionary Fire Support System Precision Extended Range Munition 54
Joint Expeditionary Fires Analysis of Alternatives 54
Naval gunfire support 54
Navy remotely piloted demonstration and strike aircraft programs 55
Over-the-horizon vessel tracking 56
Study on LHD Class steam plants and propulsion systems 56
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force 57
Overview 57
Items of Special Interest 57
Air Force advanced materials research 57
Air Force missile field monitoring technology 57
Army and Air Force test, evaluation, range, and facility support 58
Common propulsion technology development 58
Deep Space Climate Observatory Launch Service 59
Electronic, Scheduling and Dissemination Upgrade 59
F–35 aircraft 60
F–35 alternative ejection seat 62
Hosted payloads 63
KC–46A aerial refueling aircraft program 63
Lead-free electronic components 64
Military satellite communications technology development 64
Next generation long-range strike bomber program 65
Operationally responsive space 66
Space-Based Infrared System 66
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide 67
Overview 67
Items of Special Interest 67
3–D advanced integrated circuit capabilities 67
Airborne Infrared 68
Basic research international cooperation 68
Capabilities to support humanitarian assistance and disaster relief 69
Composite technology for use in missile defense interceptors 69
Conventional prompt global strike 69
Cyber test and evaluation 70
Defense laboratory survey 71
Directed energy research 71

Page

Engineer and Scientist Exchange Program 72
Fabrication of micro-air vehicles 73
Ground-based midcourse defense 73
High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System 75
Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions 75
Industrial research and development activities 76
Israeli cooperative missile defense 76
Medical Countermeasures Initiative and the Chemical and Biological Defense Program 77
Meeting airspace needs for defense-related Unmanned Aerial Systems research 78
Missile defense adjunct sensor capabilities 78
Mitochondrial disease research 78
Mobile applications development 78
Multidisciplinary research in cyber-related fields 79
Nanotechnology research 79
National Research and Education Center for Corrosion 80
Phased, adaptive approach 80
Precision Tracking Space System 81
Project Pelican 82
Scientific and engineering fellowships 83
Semiconductor development 83
Social media tools for collaboration 83
Standard Missile-3 Block IIA interceptor 84
Study on possible establishment of a power and energy University Affiliated Research Center 84
Technology transition and insertion 85
University Affiliated Research Centers 86
Vertical lift consortium 86
Weaponization of rail-launched Unmanned Aerial Systems 86
Weapons of Mass Destruction defeat technologies and capabilities 87
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense 87
Overview 87
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 87
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 87
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations 87
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 88
Section 211—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Ground Combat Vehicle Program 88
Section 212—Limitation on the Individual Carbine Program 88
Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Ohio-class Ballistic Missile Submarine Replacement Program 89
Section 214—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Amphibious Assault Vehicles of the Marine Corps 90
Section 215—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for the Propulsion System for the F–35 Lightning II Aircraft Program 91
Section 216—Limitation on Obligation of Funds for Joint Replacement Fuze Program 91
Section 217—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Joint Space Operations Center Management System 92
Section 218—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Wireless Innovation Fund 92
Section 219—Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research and Development 92
Section 220—Designation of Main Propulsion System of the Next-Generation Long-Range Strike Bomber Aircraft as Major Subprogram 92
Section 221—Designation of Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System Development and Procurement Program as Major Subprogram 93
Section 222—Prohibition on Delegation of Budgeting Authority for Certain Research and Educational Programs 93
Section 223—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Future Unmanned Carrier-based Strike System 93
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs 93
Section 231—Acquisition Accountability Reports on the Ballistic Missile Defense System 93
Section 232—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Medium Extended Air Defense System 94

Page

Section 233—Homeland Defense Hedging Policy and Strategy 95
Section 234—Ground-based Midcourse Defense System 96
Section 235—Study on Space-based Interceptor Technology 96
Subtitle D—Reports 97
Section 241—Annual Comptroller General Report on the KC–46A Aircraft Acquisition Program 97
Section 242—Independent Review and Assessment of Cryptographic Modernization Program 97
Section 243—Report on Feasibility of Electromagnetic Rail Gun System 97
Subtitle E—Other Matters 97
Section 251—Repeal of Requirement for Technology Transition Initiative 97
Section 252—Preservation and Storage of Certain Property Related to F136 Propulsion System 97
Section 253—Extension of Authority for Mechanism to Provide Funds for Defense Laboratories for Research and Development of Technologies for Military Missions 98
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 98
OVERVIEW 98
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 100
Budget Request Adjustments 100
Flight Simulator Training Hour Restoration 100
Marine Corps Expeditionary Forward Operating Base 100
Operational Energy Capability Improvement 101
Strategic Environmental Research Program 101
Energy Issues 101
Energy-Efficient Tires 101
Navy Green Fleet Initiative Including Harbor Tugs 101
Support of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Operational Energy Plans and Programs 101
Logistics and Sustainment Issues 102
Aircraft Landing Gear Systems Sustainment 102
Department-Wide Depot Workforce Development 102
Improved Corrosion Prevention and Control Practices 102
Increased Competition for the Operation and Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems 103
Laser Peening Technologies 104
Long-Term Corrosion Strategies of the Military Departments 104
Parts Supply Recapitalization 105
Study on Reducing Navy Small Boat Maintenance Costs 105
Sustainment Planning 106
Readiness Issues 107
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Operational Considerations and Force Structure 107
Army Unit Manning Effects on Readiness 107
Distribution and Use of Bottled Water in Contingency Operations 108
Federal Fire Protection 109
Installation Emergency Management Programs 109
Marine Corps Air Station Miramar Instrument Landing System Replacement 109
Material Readiness of the Navy's Amphibious and Surface Combatant Ships 110
Modified Tables of Equipment 111
Naval Air Station North Island 111
Review of Department of Defense's Mix of Live and Simulated Training 111
Security Force Assistance 112
U.S. Army Full Spectrum Training Mile 112
Other Matters 113
Air Force Environmental Cleanup 113
Briefing on the Use of the Overseas Contingency Operations Budget for Military Equipment Reset 113
Department of Defense Personnel Security Clearance Program 113
Department of Defense Unexploded Ordnance Cleanup Report 114
Disposal of Surplus Property 114
Expedited Security Clearance Processing for Wounded Warriors 115

Page

Federal Facility Agreement for Environmental Cleanup at Tyndall Air Force Base ... 116
Joint Space Operations Center ... 116
Key Enabler Explosive Ordnance Disposal Requirements ... 116
Satellite Operations Efficiencies ... 117
Wounded Warrior Service Dog Programs ... 117
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 118
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ... 118
Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding ... 118
Subtitle B—Energy and Environmental Provisions ... 118
Section 311—Designation of Senior Official of Joint Chiefs of Staff for Operational Energy Plans and Programs and Operational Energy Budget Certification ... 118
Section 312—Military Installation Implementation of Land Management Plans and Sustainability Studies ... 118
Section 313—Improved Sikes Act Coverage of State-Owned Facilities Used for the National Defense ... 118
Section 314—Discharge of Wastes at Sea Generated by Vessels of the Armed Forces ... 118
Section 315—Designation of Department of Defense Executive Agent for Alternative Fuel Development ... 118
Section 316—Favorable Consideration of Energy-Efficient Technologies in Contracts for Logistics Support of Contingency Operations ... 119
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment ... 119
Section 321—Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair ... 119
Section 322—Core Logistics Capabilities ... 119
Section 323—Designation of Military Industrial Facilities as Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence ... 120
Section 324—Redesignation of Core Competencies as Core Logistics Capabilities for Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence ... 120
Section 325—Permanent and Expanded Authority for Army Industrial Facilities To Enter into Certain Cooperative Arrangements with Non-Army Entities ... 121
Section 326—Amendment to Requirement Relating to Consideration of Competition Throughout Operation and Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems ... 121
Section 327—Implementation of Corrective Actions Resulting from Corrosion Study of the F–22 and F–35 Aircraft ... 121
Subtitle D—Readiness ... 121
Section 331—Modification of Department of Defense Authority To Accept Voluntary Contributions of Funds ... 121
Section 332—Review of Proposed Structures Affecting Navigable Airspace ... 122
Section 333—Sense of Congress Regarding Integration of Ballistic Missile Defense Training Across and Between Combatant Commands and Military Services ... 122
Subtitle E—Reports ... 122
Section 341—Annual Certification and Modifications of Annual Report on Prepositioned Materiel and Equipment ... 122
Section 342—Modification of Report on Maintenance and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards ... 122
Section 343—Additional Requirements for Annual Report on Military Working Dogs ... 122
Section 344—Assessment and Reporting Requirements Regarding the Status of Compliance with Joint Military Training and Force Allocations ... 123
Section 345—Study of United States Pacific Command Training Readiness ... 123
Subtitle F—Limitations and Extensions of Authority ... 123
Section 351—Adoption of Military Working Dog by Family of Deceased or Seriously Wounded Member of the Armed Forces Who Was the Dog's Handler ... 123
Section 352—Prohibition on Expansion of the Air Force Food Transformation Initiative ... 123
Section 353—Limitation on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for the Migration of Army Enterprise Email Services ... 124

Page

Section 354—One-Year Extension of Pilot Program for Availability of Working-Capital Funds to Army for Certain Product Improvements .. 124
Subtitle G—Other Matters ... 124
Section 361—Consideration of Foreclosure Circumstances in Adjudication of Security Clearances ... 124
Section 362—Authority To Provide Information for Maritime Safety of Forces and Hydrographic Support ... 124
Section 363—Deposit of Reimbursed Funds under Reciprocal Fire Protection Agreements ... 125
Section 364—Reduction in Amounts Otherwise Authorized To Be Appropriated to the Department of Defense for Printing and Reproduction ... 125
Section 365—Reduction in Amounts Otherwise Authorized To Be Appropriated to the Department of Defense for Studies, Analysis and Evaluations ... 125
Section 366—Clarification of the Airlift Service Definitions Relative to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet ... 125
Section 367—Ratemaking Procedures for Civil Reserve Air Fleet Contracts ... 126
Section 368—Sense of Congress on Proposed Federal Aviation Administration Changes to Flight Crew Member Duty and Rest Requirements ... 126
Section 369—Policy on Active Shooter Training for Certain Law Enforcement Personnel ... 126
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS ... 126
OVERVIEW ... 126
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 128
Subtitle A—Active Forces ... 128
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces ... 128
Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels ... 128
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces ... 128
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve ... 128
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves ... 129
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) ... 129
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2012 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians ... 129
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support ... 130
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations ... 130
Section 421—Military Personnel ... 130
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY ... 130
OVERVIEW ... 130
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 131
Community College of the Air Force ... 131
Critical Language Training at Reserve Officer Training Programs and Senior Military Colleges ... 131
Expanding the Use of On-Line Education in the Department of Defense Educational Activity ... 132
Review for Hispanic American Service Cross Recipients ... 132
Use of Electronic Media for Family Support Programs ... 132
Wounded Warrior Implementation ... 133
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 133
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally ... 133
Section 501—Increase in Authorized Strengths for Marine Corps Officers on Active Duty in Grades of Major, Lieutenant Colonel, and Colonel ... 133
Section 502—General Officer and Flag Officer Reform ... 133
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management ... 134
Section 511—Leadership of National Guard Bureau ... 134
Section 512—Preseparation Counseling for Members of the Reserve Components ... 135
Section 513—Clarification of Applicability of Authority for Deferral of Mandatory Separation of Military Technicians (Dual Status) until Age 60 ... 135

Page

Section 514—Modification of Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion for Reserve Officers Employed as Military Technicians (Dual Status) . 135
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities 135
Section 521—Findings regarding Unique Nature, Demands, and Hardships of Military Service 135
Section 522—Policy Addressing Dwell Time and Measurement and Data Collection regarding Unit Operating Tempo and Personnel Tempo 136
Section 523—Authorized Leave Available for Members of the Armed Forces Upon Birth or Adoption of a Child 136
Section 524—Extension of Authority To Conduct Programs on Career Flexibility To Enhance Retention of Members of the Armed Forces 136
Section 525—Policy on Military Recruitment and Enlistment of Graduates of Secondary Schools 136
Section 526—Navy Recruiting and Advertising 137
Subtitle D—Military Justice and Legal Matters 137
Section 531—Procedures for Judicial Review of Military Personnel Decisions Relating To Correction of Military Records 137
Section 532—Clarification of Application and Extent of Direct Acceptance of Gifts Authority 137
Section 533—Additional Condition on Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell Policy 138
Section 534—Military Regulations Regarding Marriage 138
Section 535—Use of Military Installations as Site for Marriage Ceremonies and Participation of Chaplains and Other Military and Civilian Personnel in Their Official Capacity 138
Subtitle E—Member Education and Training Opportunities and Administration 138
Section 541—Improved Access to Apprenticeship Programs for Members of the Armed Forces Who Are Being Separated from Active Duty or Retired 138
Section 542—Expansion of Reserve Health Professionals Stipend Program To Include Students in Mental Health Degree Programs in Critical Wartime Specialties 138
Section 543—Administration of United States Air Force Institute of Technology 139
Section 544—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by the Governor of Puerto Rico 139
Section 545—Temporary Authority To Wave Maximum Age Limitation on Admission to United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Air Force Academy 139
Section 546—Education and Employment Advocacy Program for Wounded Members of the Armed Forces 139
Subtitle F—Army National Military Cemeteries 140
Section 551—Army National Military Cemeteries 140
Section 552—Inspector General of the Department of Defense Inspection of Military Cemeteries 140
Subtitle G—Armed Forces Retirement Home 141
Section 561—Control and Administration by Secretary of Defense 141
Section 562—Senior Medical Advisor Oversight of Health Care Provided to Residents of Armed Forces Retirement Home 141
Section 563—Establishment of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Advisory Council and Resident Advisory Committees 141
Section 564—Administrators, Ombudsmen, and Staff of Facilities 142
Section 565—Revision of Fee Requirements 142
Section 566—Revision of Inspection Requirements 142
Section 567—Repeal of Obsolete Transitional Provisions and Technical, Conforming, and Clerical Amendments 142
Subtitle H—Military Family Readiness Matters 142
Section 571—Revision to Membership of Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council 142
Section 572—Continuation of Authority To Assist Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 143
Section 573—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces 143
Section 574—Center for Military Family and Community Outreach 143

Page

Section 575—Mental Health Support for Military Personnel and Families ... 143
Section 576—Report on Department of Defense Autism Pilot Projects ... 143
Subtitle I—Improved Sexual Assault Prevention and Response in the Armed Forces ... 144
Section 581—Director of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office ... 144
Section 582—Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates ... 144
Section 583—Sexual Assault Victims Access to Legal Counsel and Services of Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates ... 144
Section 584—Privilege in Cases Arising Under Uniform Code of Military Justice Against Disclosure of Communications Between Sexual Assault Victims and Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, Victim Advocates and Certain Other Persons ... 144
Section 585—Maintenance of Records Prepared in Connection with Sexual Assaults Involving Members of the Armed Forces or Dependents of Members ... 145
Section 586—Expedited Consideration and Priority for Application for Consideration of a Permanent Change of Station or Unit Transfer Based on Humanitarian Conditions for Victim of Sexual Assault ... 145
Section 587—Training and Education Programs for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program ... 145
Subtitle J—Other Matters ... 145
Section 591—Limitations on Authority To Provide Support and Services for Certain Organizations and Activities Outside Department of Defense ... 145
Section 592—Display of State, District of Columbia, and Territorial Flags by Armed Forces ... 145
Section 593—Military Adaptive Sports Program ... 146
Section 594—Wounded Warrior Careers Program ... 146
Section 595—Comptroller General Study of Military Necessity of Selective Service System and Alternatives ... 146
Section 596—Sense of Congress Regarding Playing of Bugle Call Commonly Known as "Taps" at Military Funerals, Memorial Services and Wreath Laying Ceremonies ... 146
Section 597—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Yellow Ribbon Day ... 146
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS ... 147
OVERVIEW ... 147
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 147
Commissary and Exchange Privileges for Non-Department of Defense Federal Employees Overseas ... 147
Consolidation of Disability Evaluation System ... 147
Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act ... 148
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 149
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances ... 149
Section 601—Fiscal Year 2012 Increase in Military Basic Pay ... 149
Section 602—Resumption of Authority To Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing under Certain Circumstances ... 149
Section 603—Lodging Accommodations for Members Assigned to Duty in Connection with Commissioning or Fitting Out of a Ship ... 149
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays ... 149
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces ... 149
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals ... 149
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers ... 150
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities ... 150
Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays ... 150
Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses ... 150

Page

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances Generally 150
Section 621—One-Year Extension of Authority To Reimburse Travel Expenses for Inactive-Duty Training outside of Normal Commuting Distance 150
Section 622—Mandatory Provision of Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants for Seriously Ill and Wounded Members of the Armed Forces 151
Subtitle D—Consolidation and Reform of Travel and Transportation Authorities 151
Section 631—Purpose 151
Section 632—Consolidation and Reform of Travel and Transportation Authorities of the Uniformed Services 151
Section 633—Old-Law Travel and Transportation Authorities Transition Expiration Date and Transfer of Current Sections 151
Section 634—Addition of Sunset Provision to Old-Law Travel and Transportation Authorities 151
Section 635—Technical and Clerical Amendments 152
Section 636—Transition Provisions 152
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations 152
Section 641—Expansion of Use of Uniform Funding Authority To Include Permanent Change of Station and Temporary Duty Lodging Programs Operated through Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities 152
Section 642—Contracting Authority for Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities To Provide and Obtain Goods and Services 152
Section 643—Designation of Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base as a Fisher House 153
Section 644—Discretion of the Secretary of the Navy To Select Categories of Merchandise To Be Sold by Ship Stores Afloat 153
Section 645—Access of Military Exchange Stores System to Credit Available Through Federal Financing Bank 153
Section 646—Enhanced Commissary Stores Pilot Program 153
Subtitle F—Disability, Retired Pay and Survivor Benefits 153
Section 651—Monthly Amount and Duration of Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance for Widows and Widowers of Deceased Members of the Armed Forces Affected by Required Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity Offset for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation 153
Subtitle G—Other Matters 154
Section 661—Reimbursement of American National Red Cross for Humanitarian Support and Other Services Provided to Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents 154
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 154
OVERVIEW 154
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 155
Automated Patient Management System for Air Evacuation 155
Clarification on Competition for Medical Research Consultation and Education 156
Clinical Social Workers 156
Cost Share for Acute Care Prescriptions under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program 156
Expansion of Spinal Cord Injury Research Program 157
Mental Health and Traumatic Brain Injury 157
Orthopedic Research for Extremity Injury 157
Physical Rehabilitation of Wounded Warriors 158
Recommendations for Cost Savings Under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program 158
Use of Simulation Technology in Medical Training 158
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 159
Subtitle A—Improvements to Health Benefits 159
Section 701—Annual Enrollment Fees for Certain Retirees and Dependents 159
Section 702—Provision of Food to Certain Members and Dependents Not Receiving Inpatient Care in Military Medical Treatment Facilities 159

Page

Section 703—Behavioral Health Support for Members of the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces 160
Section 704—Transition Enrollment of Uniformed Services Family Health Plan Medicare-Eligible Retirees to TRICARE for Life 160
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration 160
Section 711—Unified Medical Command 160
Section 712—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Future Electronic Health Records Program 160
Subtitle C—Other Matters 160
Section 721—Review of Women-Specific Health Services and Treatment for Female Members of the Armed Forces 160
Section 722—Comptroller General Reviews of Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Project 161
Section 723—Comptroller General Report on Contracted Health Care Staffing for Military Medical Treatment Facilities 161
Section 724—Treatment of Wounded Warriors 161
Section 725—Cooperative Health Care Agreements 161
Section 726—Prostate Cancer Imaging Research Initiative 161
Section 727—Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury 161
Section 728—Collaborative Military-Civilian Trauma Training Programs 161
Section 729—Traumatic Brain Injury 161
Section 730—Competitive Programs for Alcohol and Substance Abuse Disorders 162
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 162
OVERVIEW 162
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 162
Acquisition Involving Federal Prison Industries 162
Aircraft Specialty Metal Content 162
Army Contract Bundling 163
Beryllium Stockpile Modernization 163
Common Database for Tracking Contracts and Contractor Personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan 164
Competition in Construction Acquisition Programs 165
Cost Escalators in Major Weapons Systems Life Cycle Cost Estimations 166
Defense Contract Audit Agency Improvements 166
Nunn-McCurdy Breach due to a Quantity Reduction 167
Pilot Programs for Rapid Acquisition of Information Technology 168
Small Business Subcontracting Goals 168
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 169
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management 169
Section 801—Requirements Relating to Core Logistics Capabilities for Milestone A and Milestone B and Elimination of References to Key Decision Points A and B 169
Section 802—Revision to Law Relating to Disclosures to Litigation Support Contractors 169
Section 803—Extension of Applicability of the Senior Executive Benchmark Compensation Amount for Purposes of Allowable Cost Limitations under Defense Contracts 170
Section 804—Supplier Risk Management 170
Section 805—Extension of Availability of Funds in the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund 170
Section 806—Defense Contract Audit Agency Annual Report 171
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 171
Section 811—Calculation of Time Period Relating to Report on Critical Changes in Major Automated Information Systems 171
Section 812—Change in Deadline for Submission of Selected Acquisition Reports from 60 to 45 days 171
Section 813—Extension of Sunset Date for Certain Protests of Task and Deliver Order Contracts 171
Section 814—Clarification of Department of Defense Authority To Purchase Right-Hand Drive Passenger Sedans 172

Page

Section 815—Amendment Relating to Buying Tents, Tarpaulins, or Covers from American Sources 172
Section 816—Para-Aramid Fibers and Yarns 172
Section 817—Repeal of Sunset of Authority to Procure Fire Resistant Rayon Fiber from Foreign Sources for the Production of Uniforms 172
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan 172
Section 821—Restrictions on Awarding Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan to Adverse Entities 172
Section 822—Authority To Use Higher Thresholds for Procurements in Support of Contingency Operations 173
Section 823—Authority To Examine Records of Foreign Contractors Performing Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan 173
Section 824—Definitions 173
Subtitle D—Defense Industrial Base Matters 173
Section 831—Assessment of the Defense Industrial Base Pilot Program 173
Section 832—Department of Defense Assessment of Industrial Base for Potential Shortfalls 173
Section 833—Comptroller General Assessment of Government Competition in the Department of Defense Industrial Base 174
Section 834—Report on Impact of Foreign Boycotts on the Defense Industrial Base 174
Section 835—Rare Earth Material Inventory Plan 174
Subtitle E—Other Matters 175
Section 841—Miscellaneous Amendments to Public Law 111–383 Relating to Acquisition 175
Section 842—Procurement of Photovoltaic Devices 175
Section 843—Clarification of Jurisdiction of the United States District Courts To Hear Bid Protest Disputes Involving Maritime Contracts ... 175
Section 844—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement 175
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 176
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 176
Conduct of the Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review 176
Influence of Budget on Quadrennial Defense Review 176
Information Operations and Strategic Communications 177
Management of Information Technology 177
NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence 178
Office of Cyberthreat Analysis 178
Protection of Sensitive Information 179
Report on Contractors at the Defense Intelligence Agency 179
Report on Increasing Competition for Space Launch 179
Research and Development Assessments in Quadrennial Defense Review and the Responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff 180
Total Force Management 180
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 182
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 182
Section 901—Revision of Defense Business System Requirements 182
Section 902—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 182
Subtitle B—Space Activities 182
Section 911—Notification Requirement for Harmful Interference to Department of Defense Global Positioning System 182
Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related Matters 184
Section 921—Report on Implementation of Recommendations by Comptroller General on Intelligence Information Sharing 184
Section 922—Insider Threat Detection 184
Subtitle D—Total Force Management 185
Section 931—General Policy for Total Force Management 185
Section 932—Revisions to Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Management Constraints 186
Section 933—Additional Amendments Relating to Total Force Management 186

Page

Section 934—Amendments to Annual Defense Manpower Requirements Report ... 186
Section 935—Revisions to Strategic Workforce Plan ... 187
Section 936—Technical Amendments to Requirement for Inventory of Contracts for Services ... 187
Section 937—Modification of Temporary Suspension of Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Contractor Performance ... 187
Section 938—Preliminary Planning for Department of Defense Public-Private Competitions ... 188
Section 939—Conversion of Certain Functions from Contractor Performance to Performance by Department of Defense Civilian Employees ... 188
Section 940—Assessment of Appropriate Department of Defense and Contractor Personnel for the Defense Medical Readiness Training Institute ... 189
Subtitle E—Quadrennial Roles and Missions and Related Matters ... 189
Section 951—Transfer of Provisions Relating to Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review ... 189
Section 952—Revisions to Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review ... 189
Section 953—Amendment to Presentation of Future-Years Budget and Comptroller General Report on Budget Justification Material ... 189
Section 954—Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Assessment of Contingency Plans ... 190
Section 955—Quadrennial Defense Review ... 190
Subtitle F—Other Matters ... 190
Section 961—Deadline Revision for Report on Foreign Language Proficiency ... 190
Section 962—Military Activities in Cyberspace ... 191
Section 963—Activities to Improve Multilateral, Bilateral, and Regional Cooperation regarding Cybersecurity ... 191
Section 964—Report on U.S. Special Operations Command Structure ... 191
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS ... 192
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 192
Counter-Drug Activities ... 192
Interagency Coordination ... 192
Whole-of-Government Approaches and the National Security Strategy ... 192
Other Matters ... 193
Analysis of Nuclear Force Structure Alternatives ... 193
Annual Report on Missile Proliferation ... 193
Audit Readiness of the Department of Defense ... 194
Comptroller General Review of Security Requirements for Special Nuclear Material ... 195
Countering Adversarial Narratives ... 195
Countering Network-Based Threats ... 196
Counterproliferation Improvements and Efficiencies ... 197
Cyber Activity of the People's Republic of China ... 198
Cyber Threats to Critical Infrastructure ... 199
Economic Warfare ... 199
Evaluation of the Alternative Methods for Titanium Production ... 200
Global Posture Review Report ... 200
Government Accountability Office Assessment of Reporting Cost Data Collection ... 200
Management and Security of Nuclear Weapons ... 201
Nuclear Command, Control and Communications ... 201
Planning for Electromagnetic Pulse Events ... 202
Reduction in Reporting Requirements ... 203
Secure Telecommuting Centers ... 203
Special Operations Aviation and Rotary Wing Support ... 204
State Partnership Program ... 204
The Role of Military Information Support Operations ... 205
U.S. Special Operations Command Undersea Mobility Strategy ... 206
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 207
Subtitle A—Financial Matters ... 207
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority ... 207
Section 1002—Budgetary Effects of This Act ... 207
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities ... 207

Page

Section 1011—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces to Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counterterrorism Activities 207
Section 1012—Extension of Authority of Department of Defense To Provide Additional Support for Counterdrug Activities of Other Governmental Agencies 207
Section 1013—One-Year Extension of Authority To Provide Additional Support for Counter-Drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments 207
Section 1014—Extension of Authority To Support Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia 207
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 208
Section 1021—Budgeting for Construction of Naval Vessels 208
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 208
Section 1031—Definition of Individual Detained at Guantanamo 208
Section 1032—Extension of Authority for Making Rewards for Combating Terrorism 208
Section 1033—Clarification of Right To Plead Guilty in Trial of Capital Offense by Military Commission 208
Section 1034—Affirmation of Armed Conflict with Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and Associated Forces 209
Section 1035—Requirement for National Security Protocols Governing Detainee Communications 209
Section 1036—Process for the Review of Necessity for Continued Detention of Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 209
Section 1037—Prohibition on Use of Funds To Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States To House Detainees Transferred from Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 210
Section 1038—Prohibition on Family Member Visitation of Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 210
Section 1039—Prohibition on the Transfer or Release of Certain Detainees to or within the United States 210
Section 1040—Prohibitions Relating to the Transfer or Release of Certain Detainees to or within Foreign Countries 210
Section 1041—Counterterrorism Operational Briefing Requirement 211
Section 1042—Requirement for Department of Justice Consultation Regarding Prosecution of Terrorists 211
Subtitle E—Nuclear Forces 212
Section 1051—Annual Assessment and Report on the Delivery Platforms for Nuclear Weapons and the Nuclear Command and Control System 212
Section 1052—Plan on Implementation of the New START Treaty 212
Section 1053—Annual Report on the Plan for the Modernization of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile, Nuclear Weapons Complex, and Delivery Platforms 213
Section 1054—Sense of Congress on Nuclear Force Reductions 213
Section 1055—Limitation on Nuclear Force Reductions 213
Section 1056—Nuclear Employment Strategy 214
Section 1057—Comptroller General Report on Nuclear Weapon Capabilities and Force Structure Requirements 214
Subtitle F—Financial Management 215
Section 1061—Amendments Relating to Financial Management Workforce 215
Section 1062—Reliability of Department of Defense Financial Statements 215
Section 1063—Financial Management Personnel Competency Assessment 215
Section 1064—Tracking Implementation of Department of Defense Efficiencies 216
Section 1065—Business Case Analysis for Department of Defense Efficiencies 216
Section 1066—Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan 217
Section 1067—Corrective Action Plan Relating to Execution of Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan 217
Subtitle G—Studies and Reports 217
Section 1071—Repeal of Certain Report Requirements 217
Section 1072—Biennial Review of Required Reports 217

Page
Section 1073—Transmission of Reports in Electronic Format 218
Section 1074—Modifications to Annual Aircraft Procurement Plan 218
Section 1075—Change of Deadline for Annual Report to Congress on National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment 218
Section 1076—Report on Homeland Defense Activities 218
Section 1077—Report on Nuclear Aspirations of Non-State Entities, Nuclear Weapons, and Related Programs in Non-Nuclear Weapons States and Countries Not Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and Certain Foreign Persons 218
Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 219
Section 1081—Exemption from Freedom of Information Act for Data Files of the Military Flight Operations Quality Assurance Systems of the Military Departments 219
Section 1082—Limitation on Procurement and Fielding of Light Attack Armed Reconnaissance Aircraft 219
Section 1083—Use of State Partnership Program Funds for Civilians and Non-Defense Agency Personnel 220
Section 1084—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for Manufacturing Beyond Low Rate Initial Production at Certain Prototype Integration Facilities 220
Subtitle I—Other Matters 220
Section 1091—Treatment under Freedom of Information Act of Certain Department of Defense Critical Infrastructure Information 220
Section 1092—Expansion of Scope of Humanitarian Demining Assistance Program to Include Stockpiled Conventional Munitions Assistance 220
Section 1093—Mandatory Implementation of the Standing Advisory Panel on Improving Coordination Among the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development on Matters of National Security 220
Section 1094—Number of Navy Carrier Air-Wings and Carrier Air-Wing Headquarters 221
Section 1095—Display of Annual Budget Requirements for Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment 221
Section 1096—National Rocket Propulsion Strategy 221
Section 1097—Inclusion of Religious Symbols as Part of Military Memorials 222
Section 1098—Unmanned Aerial Systems and National Airspace 222
Section 1099—Sense of Congress Regarding the Killing of Osama Bin Laden 222
Section 1099A—Grants to Certain Regulated Companies for Specified Energy Property Not Subject to Normalization Rules 222
Section 1099B—Submittal of Information Regarding Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 222
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS 222
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 222
Department of Defense Hiring Processes 222
Pay Parity for Department of Defense Federal Wage System Employees Employed at Joint Military Institutions 224
Performance Management Authorities for the Department of Defense ... 224
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 225
Section 1101—Amendments to Department of Defense Personnel Authorities 225
Section 1102—Provisions Related to the Department of Defense Performance Management System 225
Section 1103—Repeal of Sunset Provision Relating to Direct Hire Authority at Demonstration Laboratories 226
Section 1104—Denial of Certain Pay Adjustments for Unacceptable Performance 226
Section 1105—Revisions to Beneficiary Designation Provisions for Death Gratuity Payable Upon Death of a Government Employee 226
Section 1106—Extension of Authority to Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas 227
Section 1107—Waiver of Certain Pay Limitations 227
Section 1108—Services of Post-Combat Case Coordinators 227

Page

Section 1109—Authority to Waive Recovery of Certain Payments Made under Civilian Employees Voluntary Separation Incentive Program ... 228
Section 1110—Extension of Continued Health Benefits ... 228
Section 1111—Authority to Waive Maximum Age Limit for Certain Appointments ... 229
Section 1112—Sense of Congress Relating to Pay Parity for Federal Employees Serving at Certain Remote Military Installations ... 229
Section 1113—Reports by Office of Special Counsel ... 229
Section 1114—Disclosure of Senior Mentors ... 229
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS ... 230
OVERVIEW ... 230
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 231
African Security Sector Reform ... 231
Closure of United States Military Installations and Alteration of Basing Arrangements in European Command Theater of Operations ... 232
Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program ... 232
Joint Military Exercises with Iraq ... 233
Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China ... 234
Military Power of Iran ... 234
NATO Special Operations Headquarters ... 234
Report on Deployment of Assets and Personnel to Libya ... 235
Taxing Foreign Assistance in Afghanistan ... 235
Transparency in NATO Arms Sales ... 236
Unfunded Requirements of the Department of Defense ... 236
United States Missile Defense Cooperation with Russia ... 237
U.S. Africa Command and the Lord's Resistance Army ... 238
Village Stability Operations and the Afghan Local Police Program in Afghanistan ... 238
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 239
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training ... 239
Section 1201—Expansion of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism ... 239
Section 1202—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program To Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces ... 239
Section 1203—Five-Year Extension of Authorization for Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities ... 240
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan ... 240
Section 1211—Authority To Establish a Program To Develop and Carry Out Infrastructure Projects in Afghanistan ... 240
Section 1212—Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan ... 240
Section 1213—Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations ... 241
Section 1214—Extension and Modification of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund ... 241
Section 1215—Report on Extension of United States-Iraq Status of Forces Agreement ... 242
Section 1216—Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq ... 242
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters ... 243
Section 1221—Review and Report on Iran's and China's Conventional and Anti-Access Capabilities ... 243
Section 1222—Report and Consultation on Energy Security of NATO Alliance ... 243
Section 1223—Extension of Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan ... 243
Section 1224—Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea ... 244
Section 1225—National Security Risk Assessment of the United States Federal Debt Owned by the People's Republic of China ... 244
Section 1226—Congressional Notification Requirement before Permanent Relocation of Any United States Military Unit Stationed Outside the United States ... 244
Section 1227—Annual Report on Military Power of the People's Republic of China ... 245

Page

Section 1228—Limitation on Funds to Provide the Russian Federation with Access to United States Missile Defense Technology 245
Section 1229—International Agreements Relating to Missile Defense 245
Section 1230—Non-strategic Nuclear Weapon Reductions and Extended Deterrence Policy 246
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION 247
OVERVIEW 247
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 248
Cooperative Threat Reduction Biological Surveillance Network 248
Cooperative Threat Reduction of Biological Weapons 249
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 250
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds 250
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 250
Section 1303—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cooperative Biological Engagement Program 250
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 250
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 250
Subtitle A—Military Programs 250
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds 250
Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund 251
Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense 251
Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 251
Section 1405—Defense Inspector General 251
Section 1406—Defense Health Program 251
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile 251
Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds 251
Section 1412—Revision to Required Receipt Objectives for Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile 251
Subtitle C—Chemical Demilitarization Matters 252
Section 1421—Changes to Management Organization to the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative Program 252
Subtitle D—Other Matters 252
Section 1431—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home 252
Section 1432—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois 252
Section 1433—Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund 252
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS 253
OVERVIEW 253
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 253
CV–22 Combat Loss Replacement Funding 253
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund 253
MH–60 Combat Loss Replacement Funding 254
National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Fund 255
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 255
Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations 255
Section 1501—Purpose 255
Section 1502—Procurement 255
Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 255
Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance 256
Section 1505—Military Personnel 256
Section 1506—Working Capital Funds 256
Section 1507—Defense Health Program 256
Section 1508—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide 256
Section 1509—Defense Inspector General 256
Subtitle B—Financial Matters 256
Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations 256
Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority 256
Subtitle C—Limitations and Other Matters 256
Section 1531—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund 256

Page

Section 1532—Continuation of Prohibition on Use of United States Funds for Certain Facilities Projects in Iraq 257
Section 1533—One-Year Extension of Project Authority and Related Requirements of Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan 257
TITLE XVI—ADDITIONAL BUDGET ITEMS 258
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 258
Subtitle A—Procurement 258
Section 1601—Budget Item Relating to Modification of Torpedoes and Related Equipment 258
Section 1602—Budget Item Relating to Anti-Submarine Warfare Electronic Equipment 258
Section 1603—Budget Item Relating to Shallow Water Mine Counter Measures 258
Section 1604—Budget Item Relating to LHA–7 Ship Program 258
Section 1605—Budget Item Relating to Mobility Aircraft Simulators 258
Section 1606—Budget Item Relating to Modifications to Aircraft 258
Section 1607—Budget Item Relating to SH–60 Crew and Passenger Survivability Upgrades 258
Section 1608—Budget Item Relating to Modification of In-Service A–10 Aircraft 259
Section 1609—Budget Item Relating to Radar Support 259
Section 1610—Budget Item Relating to Electronic Equipment-Automation 259
Section 1611—Budget Item Relating to Base Defense Systems 259
Section 1612—Budget Item Relating to Sniper Rifle Modifications 259
Section 1613—Budget Item Relating to Generators and Associated Equipment 259
Section 1614—Budget Item Relating to National Guard and Reserve Equipment 259
Subtitle B—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 260
Section 1616—Budget Item Relating to New Design SSN 260
Section 1617—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Submarine System Development 260
Section 1618—Budget Item Relating to Surface Anti-Submarine Warfare 260
Section 1619—Budget Item Relating to Ship Preliminary Design and Feasibility Studies 260
Section 1620—Budget Item Relating to Industrial Preparedness 260
Section 1621—Budget Item Relating to Mixed Conventional Load Capability for Bomber Aircraft 260
Section 1622—Budget Item Relating to TACAIR-launched UAS Capability Development 260
Section 1623—Budget Item Relating to Electro-photonic Component Capability Development 261
Section 1624—Budget Item Relating to Airborne Reconnaissance Systems 261
Section 1625—Budget Item Relating to Small Business Innovative Research 261
Section 1626—Budget Item Relating to Defense Research Sciences 261
Section 1627—Budget Item Relating to Defense Research Sciences 261
Section 1628—Budget Item Relating to Communications Advanced Technology 261
Section 1629—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Technology 261
Section 1630—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Technology 262
Section 1631—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology 262
Section 1632—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology 262
Section 1633—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology 262
Section 1634—Budget Item Relating to Rotary Wing Surfaces 262
Section 1635—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Technology 262
Section 1636—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology 262

Page

Section 1637—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology 263
Section 1638—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology 263
Section 1639—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology 263
Section 1640—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology 263
Section 1641—Budget Item Relating to Lightweight Body Armor 263
Section 1642—Budget Item Relating to Industrial Preparedness Manufacturing Technology 263
Section 1643—Budget Item Relating to Secure Microelectronics 263
Section 1644—Budget Item Relating to Army Tactical Command and Control Hardware and Software 264
Section 1645—Budget Item Relating to Battlespace Knowledge Development and Demonstration 264
Section 1646—Budget Item Relating to Technology Transfer 264
Section 1647—Budget Item Relating to University Research Initiatives 264
Section 1648—Budget Item Relating to University Research Initiatives 264
Section 1649—Budget Item Relating to Clinical Care and Research 264
Section 1650—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology 265
Section 1651—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology 265
Section 1652—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology 265
Section 1653—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology 265
Section 1654—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology .. 265
Section 1655—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology .. 265
Section 1656—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology .. 265
Section 1657—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology .. 266
Section 1658—Budget Item Relating to Chemical and Biological Defense Program 266
Section 1659—Budget Item Relating to Special Operations Advanced Technology Development 266
Section 1660—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support 266
Section 1661—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support 266
Section 1662—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support 266
Section 1663—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support 266
Section 1664—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology 267
Section 1665—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology 267
Section 1666—Budget Item Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction Defeat Technologies 267
Section 1667—Budget Item Relating to Countermine Systems 267
Section 1668—Budget Item Relating to Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research 267
Section 1669—Budget Item Relating to Special Applications for Contingencies 267
Section 1670—Budget Item Relating to Microelectronics Technology Development and Support 268
Section 1671—Budget Item Relating to Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research 268
Section 1672—Budget Item Relating to Marine Corps Landing Force Technology 268
Section 1673—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Concepts and Simulation 268
Section 1674—Budget Item Relating to Human Effectiveness Applied Research 268
Section 1675—Budget Item Relating to Aerospace Propulsion 268
Section 1676—Budget Item Relating to End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities 268
Section 1677—Budget Item Relating to Sensors and Electronic Survivability 269
Section 1678—Budget Item Relating to Military Engineering Advanced Technology 269
Section 1679—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology . 269

Page

Section 1680—Budget Item Relating to Establishment of Protocols for Joint Strike Fighter Lead-Free Electronics Components 269
Section 1681—Budget Item Relating to Portable Helicopter Oxygen Delivery Systems 269
Section 1682—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research 269
Section 1683—Budget Item Relating to Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology 270
Section 1684—Budget Item Relating to Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology 270
Section 1685—Budget Item Relating to Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs 270
Section 1686—Budget Item Relating to Warfighter Advanced Technology 270
Section 1687—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology . 271
Section 1688—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology . 271
Section 1689—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology . 271
Section 1690—Budget Item Relating to Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness, and Safety 271
Section 1691—Budget Item Relating to Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense . 271
Section 1692—Budget Item Relating to Operationally Responsive Space 271
Section 1693—Budget Item Relating to Space Technology 271
Section 1694—Budget Item Relating to Army Net Zero Programs 272
Section 1695—Budget Item Relating to Offshore Range Environmental Baseline Assessment 272
Section 1696—Budget Item Relating to Department of Defense Corrosion Protection Projects 272
Section 1697—Budget Item Relating to Study of Renewable and Alternative Energy Applications in the Pacific Region 272
Section 1698—Budget Item Relating to Alternative Energy for Mobile Power Applications 272
Section 1699—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Battery Technologies 272
Section 1699A—Budget Item Relating to Operational Energy Improvement Pilot Project 272
Section 1699B—Budget Item Relating to Microgrid Pilot Program 273
Section 1699C—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Surface Machinery Systems 273
Section 1699D—Budget Item Relating to Base Camp Fuel Cells 273
Section 1699E—Budget Item Relating to Defense Alternative Energy 273
Section 1699F—Budget Item Relating to Radiological Contamination Research 273
Subtitle C—Operation and Maintenance 273
Section 1699G—Budget Item Relating to Department of Defense Corrosion Prevention Program 273
Section 1699H—Budget Item Relating to Navy Emergency Management and Preparedness 273
Section 1699I—Budget Item Relating to Army Simulation Training Systems 274
Section 1699J—Budget Item Relating to Army Industrial Facility Energy Monitoring 274
Section 1699K—Budget Item Relating to Army National Guard Simulation Training Systems 274
Section 1699L—Budget Item Relating to Army Arsenals 274
Section 1699M—Budget Item Relating to Cold Weather Protective Equipment 274
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 274
PURPOSE 274
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW 275
Section 2001—Short Title 275
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to Be Specified by Law 275
Section 2003—Limitation on Implementation of Projects Designated as Various Locations 275
Section 2004—Effective Date 275
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 275
SUMMARY 275

Page
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 275
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 275
Section 2102—Family Housing 276
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 276
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 276
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project 276
Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects 276
Section 2107—Additional Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project Using Prior-Year Unobligated Army Military Construction Funds 276
Section 2108—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects 276
Section 2109—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects 276
Section 2110—Technical Amendments to Correct Certain Project Specifications 277
Section 2111—Additional Budget Items Relating to Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 277
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 277
SUMMARY 277
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 277
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 277
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 278
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 278
Section 2202—Family Housing 278
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 278
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy 278
Section 2205—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project 278
Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects 278
Section 2207—Additional Budget Items Relating to Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 278
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 279
SUMMARY 279
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 279
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 279
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 279
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 279
Section 2302—Family Housing 280
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 280
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force 280
Section 2305—Modification of Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project 280
Section 2306—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project 280
Section 2307—Limitation on Implementation of Consolidation of Air and Space Operations Center of the Air Force 280
Section 2308—Additional Budget Items Relating to Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 280
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 281
SUMMARY 281
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 281
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 281
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 282
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations 282
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 282
Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects 282
Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies 282
Section 2404—Additional Budget Items Relating to Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 282

Page
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations ... 282
Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide ... 282
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM ... 282
SUMMARY ... 282
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 283
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 283
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO ... 283
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ... 283
SUMMARY ... 283
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 283
Explanation of Funding Adjustment ... 283
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 284
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations ... 284
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 284
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 284
Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 284
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 284
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 284
Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve ... 284
Subtitle B—Additional Budget Items ... 285
Section 2611—Additional Budget Items Relating to Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 285
Section 2612—Additional Budget Items Relating to Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 285
Section 2613—Additional Budget Item Relating to Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 285
Subtitle C—Other Matters ... 285
Section 2621—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project ... 285
Section 2622—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects ... 285
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES ... 285
SUMMARY ... 285
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 286
Base Realignment and Closure Community Recovery ... 286
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 286
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 ... 286
Section 2702—Authorized Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 ... 286
Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005 ... 286
Section 2704—Authority to Extend Deadline for Completion of Limited Number of Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations ... 287
Section 2705—Increased Emphasis on Evaluation of Costs and Benefits in Consideration and Selection of Military Installations for Closure or Realignment ... 287
Section 2706—Special Considerations Related to Transportation Infrastructure in Consideration and Selection of Military Installations for Closure or Realignment ... 287
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS ... 287
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 287
Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Homeporting in Europe ... 287
Africa Command Basing Alternatives ... 288
Army Housing Shortfall at Growth Installations ... 288

Page

Assessment of Improvements in Construction Techniques to Achieve Life-Cycle Cost-Effective Facilities 288
Castner Range Complex 289
Collateral Support for Infrastructure and Real Property Programs 289
Comptroller General Report Regarding Third-Party Financing for Renewable Energy Projects on Military Installations 290
Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense's Report on the Arctic and Northwest Passage 291
Construction Unit Costs 291
Cooperative Agreements to Facilitate Defense Posture Review Initiatives 292
Corrosion Evaluation for Facilities and Infrastructure 293
Department of Defense Microgrid Activities 293
Elementary and Secondary Schools on Military Installations 294
Energy and Water Utilities Privatization 294
Fort Bragg Parking Assessment 295
Homeowners Assistance Program 295
Leasing of Military Museums 296
Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet Range 296
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 297
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 297
Section 2801—Prohibition on Use of Any Cost-Plus System of Contracting for Military Construction and Military Family Housing Projects 297
Section 2802—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction Projects 297
Section 2803—Condition on Rental of Family Housing in Foreign Countries for General and Flag Officers 298
Section 2804—Protections for Suppliers of Labor and Materials under Contracts for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects 298
Section 2805—One-Year Extension of Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects inside United States Central Command Area of Responsibility and Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa Areas of Responsibility and Interest 298
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 298
Section 2811—Clarification of Authority to Use Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund for Minor Construction and Alteration Activities at Pentagon Reservation 298
Section 2812—Removal of Discretion of Secretaries of the Military Departments Regarding Purposes for which Easements for Rights-of-Way May Be Granted 298
Section 2813—Limitations on Use or Development of Property in Clear Zone Areas 299
Section 2814—Defense Access Road Program Enhancements to Address Transportation Infrastructure in Vicinity of Military Installations 299
Subtitle C—Energy Security 299
Section 2821—Consolidation of Definitions Used in Energy Security Chapter 299
Section 2822—Consideration of Energy Security in Developing Energy Projects on Military Installations Using Renewable Energy Sources 299
Section 2823—Establishment of Interim Objective for Department of Defense 2025 Renewable Energy Goal 299
Section 2824—Use of Centralized Purchasing Agents for Renewable Energy Certificates to Reduce Cost of Facility Energy Projects Using Renewable Energy Sources and Improve Efficiencies 299
Section 2825—Identification of Energy-Efficient Products for Use in Construction, Repair, or Renovation of Department of Defense Facilities 300
Section 2826—Core Curriculum and Certification Standards for Department of Defense Energy Managers 300
Section 2827—Submission of Annual Department of Defense Energy Management Reports 301
Section 2828—Continuous Commissioning of Department of Defense Facilities to Resolve Operating Problems, Improve Comfort, Optimize Energy Use, and Identify Retrofits 301

Page

Section 2829—Requirement for Department of Defense to Capture and Track Data Generated in Metering Department Facilities 301
Section 2830—Metering of Navy Piers to Accurately Measure Energy Consumption 301
Section 2831—Report on Energy-Efficiency Standards and Prohibition on Use of Funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Gold or Platinum Certification 301
Subtitle D—Provisions Related to Guam Realignment 302
Section 2841—Use of Operation and Maintenance Funding to Support Community Adjustments Related to Realignment of Military Installations and Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam 302
Section 2842—Medical Care Coverage for H–2B Temporary Workforce on Military Construction Projects on Guam 302
Section 2843—Certification of Military Readiness Need for Firing Range on Guam as Condition on Establishment of Range 302
Section 2844—Repeal of Condition on Use of Specific Utility Conveyance Authority regarding Guam Integrated Water and Wastewater Treatment System 302
Subtitle E—Land Conveyances 302
Section 2851—Land Exchange, Fort Bliss, Texas 302
Subtitle F—Other Matters 303
Section 2861—Change in Name of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces to the Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy 303
Section 2862—Limitation on Reduction in Number of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Permanent Duty at a Military Installation to Effectuate Realignment of Installation 303
Section 2863—Prohibition on Naming Department of Defense Real Property after a Member of Congress 303
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 303
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 303
OVERVIEW 303
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 304
National Nuclear Security Administration 304
Overview 304
Nuclear Modernization 304
Weapons Activities 306
Stockpile Stewardship 307
Stockpile Management 307
Directed Stockpile Work 308
B61 Phase 6.3 Life Extension Program 308
Science Campaign 309
Engineering Campaign 309
Readiness Campaign 309
Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign 310
Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign 311
Exa-scale computing at the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration National Laboratories 311
Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities 311
Report on project management for large-scale construction programs 312
Secure Transportation Asset 313
Comptroller General Evaluation of Study on Options for Nuclear Weapon Transportation 313
Work for Others at the National Nuclear Laboratories 314
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation 314
Nuclear Centers of Excellence 314
Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention 315
Naval Reactors 315
Office of the Administrator 316
Environmental and Other Defense Activities 316
Overview 316
Defense Environmental Cleanup 316
Other Defense Activities 317
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal 317

Page
Report on Mixed Oxide Fuel 317
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 318
Subtitle A—National Security Program Authorizations 318
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration 318
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup 318
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities 318
Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance 318
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 318
Section 3111—Consolidated Reporting Requirements relating to Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship, Management, and Infrastructure 318
Section 3112—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security 319
Section 3113—Use of Savings from Pension Reimbursements for Budgetary Shortfalls 319
Subtitle C—Reports 320
Section 3121—Repeal of Certain Report Requirements 320
Section 3122—Progress on Nuclear Nonproliferation 320
Section 3123—Reports on Role of Nuclear Sites and Efficiencies 321
Section 3124—Net Assessment of High-Performance Computing Capabilities of Foreign Countries 322
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD 322
OVERVIEW 322
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 322
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 322
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 323
Section 3201—Authorization 323
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES 323
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 323
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations 323
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION 323
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 323
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2012 323
Section 3502—Use of National Defense Reserve Fleet and Ready Reserve Force Vessels 324
Section 3503—Recruitment Authority 324
Section 3504—Ship Scrapping Reporting Requirement 324
DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES 324
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 324
Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables 324
TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT 325
Section 4101—Procurement 325
Section 4102—Procurement for Overseas Contingency Operations 373
TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 388
Section 4201—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 388
Section 4202—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for Overseas Contingency Operations 427
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 430
Section 4301—Operation and Maintenance 430
Section 4302—Operation and Maintenance for Overseas Contingency Operations 448
TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL 458
Section 4401—Military Personnel 458
Section 4402—Military Personnel for Overseas Contingency Operations 459
TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 460
Section 4501—Other Authorizations 460
Section 4502—Other Authorizations for Overseas Contingency Operations 464
TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 466
Section 4601—Military Construction 466
TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 492
Section 4701—Department of Energy National Security Programs 492
DEPARTMENTAL DATA 503
Department of Defense Authorization Request 503

Page
Communications from Other Committees 507
Fiscal Data 522
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 522
Statement Required by the Congressional Budget Act 523
Committee Cost Estimate 523
Advisory of Earmarks 523
Oversight Findings 524
General Performance Goals and Objectives 524
Statement of Federal Mandates 525
Federal Advisory Committee Statement 525
Applicability to the Legislative Branch 525
Committee Votes 525
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 538
Additional Views
  Additional Views of Representative Robert J. Wittman 539
  Additional Views of Representative Mike Coffman 540
  Additional Views of Representative Chris Gibson 541

112TH CONGRESS 1st Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT 112–78

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012

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

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1540]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

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

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would, (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2012: (a) the personnel strength for

each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and Reserve Components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for the Maritime Administration.

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Resources for Warfighters and Families

Recognizing that the service and sacrifice of our military men and women is a down payment on future health care benefits, the committee bill takes a sensible approach to TRICARE. The bill includes a provision that would allow for a modest fee increase, while protecting military families from steep fee increases in the future. The bill also provides a 1.6 percent increase in military basic pay.

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

The committee bill provides additional services and protections for service members who have been the victim of sexual assault. The committee bill also includes language that would make mental health assessments available for members of the reserve compo-

nents at the location of their unit during unit training and assemblies.

Capabilities and Force Structure for Current and Future Threats

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

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

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

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

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

Fiscal Responsibility, Transparency, and Accountability

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

standards for DOD financial management, including standards for financial management personnel, reporting, and budgeting for financial auditing.

Incentivizing Competition

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

HEARINGS

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

COMMITTEE POSITION

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

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

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

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

The bill does not generally provide budget authority. This bill authorizes appropriations; subsequent appropriation acts will provide

budget authority. However, the committee strives to adhere to the recommendations as issued by the Committee on the Budget as it relates to the jurisdiction of this committee.

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

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

SUMMARY OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE BILL

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

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

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2012

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	553,033,469	-1,671	553,031,798
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	18,084,980		18,084,980
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050) -- BASE BILL	571,118,449	-1,671	571,116,778
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	117,842,993	1,096,700	118,939,693
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	**688,961,442**	**1,095,029**	**690,056,471**
Base National Defense Discretionary Programs that are Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Do Not Require Additional Authorization			
Defense Production Act Purchases	19,964		19,964
Indefinite Account: National Science Center, Army	25		25
Indefinite Account: Overseas Military Facility Investment Recovery	1,000		1,000
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	9,000		9,000
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	22,000		22,000
SCN - Reappropriation (unspecified transfers to SCN: in annual DoD approps bill).	20,000		20,000
SCN - Use of expired funds for reimbursements to the Claims and Judgment Fund (in annual appr	8,000		8,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**79,989**		**79,989**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	109,000		109,000
Assumed Rescission (DOE Weapons Activities)	-40,000		-40,000
Assumed Rescission (Nuclear Non-Proliferation)	-30,000		-30,000

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(Dollars in Thousands)

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

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

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

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

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

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Aerial Common Sensor

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

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

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

Airborne Reconnaissance Low

The Airborne Reconnaissance Low (ARL) is a multifunction, day/night, all weather DHC–7 fixed-wing reconnaissance aircraft. The Army is evaluating options to modernize the ARL fleet. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on the current state of the ARL fleet, including reliability and maintainability within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The report should also include a review of the options currently under consideration for major ARL modernization programs.

Air filters for National Guard helicopters

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

CH–47F Chinook helicopter

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

UH–72A Lakota helicopter aircraft survivability equipment

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

The committee remains supportive of the UH–72A helicopter program. The committee notes that with over 150 aircraft now delivered to the Army on cost and within schedule, the UH–72A has proven to be a robust and efficient multirole platform. The committee understands that the UH–72A has a documented requirement for 210 helicopters to support domestic missions in "permissive" environments. The committee believes that there may be opportunities to leverage this aircraft to meet additional operational needs for the warfighter. However, before this happens, the committee needs to understand how the Army defines "permissive" versus "non-permissive" environments. In addition the committee needs to understand what the associated survivability modifications would be required and if such modifications would be feasible, given size, weight, and power limitations, if the mission envelope of the UH–72A was expanded beyond "permissive" environments.

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

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

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

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

WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Abrams tank program National Guard modernization

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

The committee notes that the National Guard currently has six Heavy Brigade Combat Teams (HBCT) that consist of the Abrams M1A1 tank which is an analog based system and active duty HBCTs operate the more modern M1A2 tank which uses a digital system. The committee also notes that there are significant differences in capability, particularly for growth and survivability between the M1A1 and M1A2 SEP (version 2) that now is being produced under the current Multi-Year Procurement contract. The committee understands that under the original Future Combat Systems (FCS) strategy, the Army planned to cascade the M1A2 tanks to the National Guard. However, as a result of the termination of the FCS program, the Army has yet to develop a plan to modernize the National Guard HBCT in the near term. Given the Army's top development project is currently the tactical "network," which requires a digital capability, the committee believes the National Guard needs the M1A2 tank in order to stay aligned with the Army's tactical network strategy.

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

fleet" the National Guard with the most modern version of Abrams tanks.

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

Bradley fighting vehicle program

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

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

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

M4 carbine product improvement program

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

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

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

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

Stryker vehicles

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

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Overview

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

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

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Body armor investment strategy

The committee notes that section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Defense to establish procurement line items and research and development program elements for body armor

programs. The committee notes the Secretary of Defense has failed to establish procurement line items and as a result, the committee is concerned about the long term investment strategy for body armor. The committee understands that under the Department's existing budgetary policy, funding to procure body armor, clothing, and other personal protective gear is typically included in the Operation and Maintenance appropriations account and is categorized as an "expendable" item. The committee is aware that the O&M appropriation accounts allow for greater flexibility in funding based on dynamic annual program requirements. The committee also notes that establishing a separate, procurement line item would not prevent the Department from continuing to use the O&M appropriation for sustainment purposes or limit the military departments' ability to use rapid acquisition authorities to ensure the fastest possible exploitation of body armor material improvements, production, or fielding.

The committee believes that establishing an individual procurement line item would generate better accountability and transparency in long term planning, programming, and investment by the military services for the acquisition of body armor. Further, a long term investment strategy based on future requirement estimates could better position the body armor industrial base to rapidly respond to new threats or requirements as well as accelerate the amount of industry investment to further advancements in survivability and weight reduction.

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

Body armor requirements generation and weight reduction initiatives

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

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

Information management system for the National Guard

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

Joint Tactical Radio System

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

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

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

The committee understands that the Army is likely to lower its current basis of issue of GMR radios for Brigade Combat Teams (BCT). In addition, when factoring in the fiscal year 2011 and 2012 requests the Army has requested procurement of almost 10 brigade sets of GMR radios. Therefore, elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would restrict the use of fiscal year

2012 procurement funds until the Secretary of the Army submits to the congressional defense committees written certification that the acquisition strategy for full-rate production includes full and open competition. In addition, the committee recommends a reduction in funds for GMR procurement due to a lack of clarity regarding the Army's overall requirements for GMR radios.

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

Light tactical vehicle investment strategy

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

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

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

Further, the committee is aware of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency's (DARPA) recent initiatives, in partnership with the Army and the Marine Corps, aimed at enhancing HMMWV survivability for the warfighter through the integration of "structural blast chimney" technology on original equipment manufacturer-produced HMMWVs. The committee understands DARPA is conducting ballistic, mobility, and reliability tests and that initial ballistic test results have indicated improvements to vehicle and warfighter survivability without increasing overall vehi-

cle weight. The committee supports this effort and expects this technology would be considered, pending favorable test results, as part of the UAH competitive recapitalization program and would encourage the acceleration of this program.

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

M915 line haul tractor trailer acquisition strategy

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

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

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

Tactical wheeled vehicle acquisition strategy

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

Weapon light upgrades

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

The committee notes that the current Army inventory of approximately 100,000 MU series weapon lights incurs substantial cost to the Army due to battery replacement rates. The committee understands that retrofitting these weapon lights using the V-series KM4 upgrade kit, or other upgrade kits, may significantly reduce battery replacement demand, resulting in substantial annual savings to the Government. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to review options for weapon light upgrade kits in order to determine if any meet requirements and could produce the substantial savings due to lower battery usage.

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

JOINT IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICE DEFEAT FUND

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Efforts to mitigate the improvised explosive device threat to dismounted operations

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

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

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization

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

The committee understands JIEDDO was established in February 2006 to "lead, advocate, and coordinate all DOD actions . . . to defeat IEDs as weapons of strategic influence." The committee expects improvised explosive devices (IEDs) to remain an enduring threat to U.S. forces. The committee notes that Congress has provided approximately $19.7 billion to JIEDDO to counter the IED threat and that JIEDDO has reported significant progress in the

counter-IED (C–IED) fight in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and in the Republic of Iraq. For instance, the committee understands enemy IED efficacy in Afghanistan has decreased since October 2010. The committee commends JIEDDO's efforts to rapidly develop, procure, and field programs to mitigate the IED threat in response to urgent operational needs. To build on the considerable progress made, the committee, in collaboration with the Government Accountability Office, will continue to conduct oversight of JIEDDO's capability to effectively manage and evaluate C–IED programs.

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

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

V–22

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

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

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

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

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

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

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

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Laser guided air-launched rockets

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

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

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

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Amphibious Assault Ship

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

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

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

Navy Shipbuilding Program

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

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

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

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

Perhaps the most worrisome aspect of the shipbuilding program is that it will be difficult to fund and maintain the current plan once the Navy begins to acquire replacements for the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine fleet. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, Navy officials suggested that there may be options to fund these boats outside of the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy account. The committee be-

lieves that the industrial teaming arrangement has been successful on the *Virginia*-class submarine program and would encourage the Secretary of the Navy to use the capabilities of both submarine shipbuilders in crafting an affordable acquisition strategy for the *Ohio*-class Replacement Program.

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

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

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

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

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

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

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

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

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

B–1 bomber aircraft force structure

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

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

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

Common vertical lift support platform

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

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

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

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

Global Hawk

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

The committee is aware this platform is a critical high-demand, low-density intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) asset that is being used extensively and effectively to perform crit-

ical missions in Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee also notes that this platform is being used effectively in global humanitarian and recovery operations. The committee supports the Global Hawk UAS program and should the Secretary of Defense determine that additional Global Hawk UAS are required, then the committee encourages using funds contained within this Act for the purposes of addressing those requirements.

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

Intra-theater and inter-theater airlift programs

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

The committee notes in regards to inter-theater airlift aircraft programs, the Secretary of the Air Force requested to repeal section 8062(g) of title 10, United States Code, which provides that the Secretary of the Air Force maintain a minimum inventory of 316 strategic inter-theater airlift aircraft. The committee does not support repeal and believes that a minimum inventory of 316 airlift aircraft provides a prudent balance of operational risk, affordability and sufficient organic capabilities in meeting the ever-increasing mobility requirements in support of the National Military Strategy and combat operations. The committee's rationale stems from concerns regarding the future viability of the Civil Reserve Airlift Fleet, the reliance of transporting oversize and outsize cargo using foreign aircraft leasing arrangements, the unforeseen over-utilization rates of the current fleet of inter-theater airlift aircraft, the consistent under-estimation of deploying units Time-Phased Force and Deployment Data regarding the amount of equipment to support combat operations, and the Mobility Capability and Requirements Study does not address or characterize the operational risk in meeting combatant commander warfighting requirements or timelines.

The committee notes in regards to intra-theater airlift aircraft programs, that the Department of Defense continues to struggle with sufficiently, and comprehensively, analyzing and defining intra-theater airlift mobility requirements for active and reserve components, as well as National Guard units supporting both title 10 and title 32, United States Code, airlift mobility operations. The committee continues to believe that a reduction in the C–130H/J inventory from 395 to 335 aircraft, a reduction in the inventory of C–27J aircraft from 78 to 38, and a wholesale inventory reduction by the Army of 42 C–23 aircraft is unjustified, premature and based on insufficient analytics, and moreover, executed for budgetary reasons. Furthermore, the committee understands that neither the 2006 Mobility Capability Study or the 2010 Mobility Capability and Requirements Study did not comprehensively analyze all aspects of intra-theater airlift requirements in the mission areas of time sensitive-direct support, homeland security, Air Force and Army National Guard domestic airlift operations in support of contingencies resulting from natural disasters, humanitarian crises, emergencies, and combatant commander warfighting requirements.

Unless the Department has analysis that indicates the original requirement for 78 C–27J aircraft is no longer valid, the committee supports the procurement of 9 C–27J aircraft in fiscal year 2012 and the acquisition of C–27Js in fiscal year 2013 and beyond to meet the requirements of the National Guard. Without a comprehensive analysis of the aforementioned mission areas, it is impossible to justify such a decrease in intra-theater airlift capabilities.

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

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from retiring C–23 aircraft until one year after the Director of the National Guard, in consultation with the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Commander, U.S. Northern Command, Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, and the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency submits an intra-theater airlift study to the congressional defense committees that incorporates a comprehensive review of intra-theater airlift requirements for both title 10, United States Code, and title 32, United States Code operations. Lastly, if the intra-theater airlift requirements of the study are not sufficiently supported by the currently planned intra-theater airlift force structure of the Department of Defense, the committee encourages the Department to procure the most cost-effective and mission-effective airlift aircraft to meet requirements.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Overview

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

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

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

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

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

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

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

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

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Innovative titanium manufacturing processes

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

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

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

Non-Standard Aviation and Aviation Foreign Internal Defense

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

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

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

Special operations combatant craft systems

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

The committee notes that U.S. Special Operation Command's fleet of Naval Special Warfare Rigid Inflatable Boats (NSW RIB) will be drawn down through fiscal year 2017. The committee also notes that the Mk V platform will leave service beginning in fiscal year 2012, and that the Combatant Craft Medium Mk1 (CCM Mk1) platform is projected to fill this important capability requirement for maritime special operations forces. However, the committee understands that delays in the CCM Mk1 program have created a capability gap in combatant craft that would potentially result in the number of available combatant craft falling below operational requirements, thus requiring a bridging strategy until the CCM Mk1 is fully fielded by fiscal year 2020. The committee believes this potential gap represents a serious national security concern as special operations forces are increasingly called upon to operate in a maritime environment.

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

Special operations communications equipment and tactical radio systems

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

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

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

Standard missile–3 interceptors

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

The request would support the production of 46 standard missile–3 (SM–3) Block IB interceptors for delivery in fiscal year 2014.

The fiscal year 2011 budget request included plans by MDA to procure 66 SM–3 Block IB interceptors in fiscal year 2012. However, the budget request procures 20 less SM–3 Block IB interceptors than previously planned.

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

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

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

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

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

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense

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

The budget request would support the procurement of 68 interceptors, a fifth THAAD battery consisting of 6 launchers, and one Tactical Station Group. The fiscal year 2011 budget request of $858.9 million included plans by MDA to procure 67 THAAD interceptors, a fourth THAAD battery consisting of 6 launchers, and additional launchers for batteries 1–3. However, technical issues associated with a safety component in the interceptor resulted in a production stop and delayed contract award. As a result, the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) decreased THAAD procurement by $272.0 million, and only 22 of the planned 67 interceptors were

procured. Additionally, MDA expects to procure fewer launchers in fiscal year 2011 than initially planned.

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

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

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

Transition of non-lethal weapons

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

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

Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military departments to clearly identify a procurement account for NLW line items in their future year budget submissions. The committee's oversight of the Department's NLW investments is limited due to the lack of clear data on NLW budgets and pro-

grams, as programs are often grouped in multiple categories and are often contained in multiple service line items.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations

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

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Limitation on Retirement of C–23 Aircraft

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

Section 112—Limitation on Procurement of Stryker Combat Vehicles

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

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

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

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

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

This section would amend section 111 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) by adding a third year of multiyear authority to fully

fund the LHA–7. Instead of just fiscal years 2011–12, this section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to also fund the ship in fiscal year 2013.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—B–1 Bomber Force Structure

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

Section 132—Procurement of Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellites

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

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

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

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

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

SUBTITLE E—JOINT AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 141—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

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

Section 142—Contracts for Commercial Imaging Satellite Capacities

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

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

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

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

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

This section would require a report outlining U.S. Special Operations Non-Standard Aviation and Aviation Foreign Internal De-

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

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

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

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

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a dedicated procurement line item in future defense budget submissions for non-lethal weapons (NLW). The committee expects that each line item description will identify the specific programs for which funds are being requested; provide summary justification for the program; identify whether the program is a joint or service-specific initiative; and the amount of funding provided during the past fiscal year. The committee also expects the Department to provide similar information for all budget requests for research, development, test and evaluation for NLWs.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

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

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

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Active protection systems technology development

The committee continues to believe that active protection systems (APS) will be a critical component of all future Army and Marine Corps combat vehicles including both tracked and wheeled platforms, due to the anticipated advances in threats, such as mis-

siles, mines, improvised explosive devices, and rocket-propelled grenades. The committee notes that section 216 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), required the Department of Defense to conduct a series of tests of available APS systems, to inform future APS research or procurement decisions. The committee understands that the last of these systems will complete testing in the summer of 2011. The committee notes that several of the systems tested were developed, in part, using Department of Defense research and development funds from the Future Combat Systems program. The other systems tested were foreign or commercially-developed.

The committee believes that the investments in sensor and interception APS technologies to-date should not be wasted. The committee notes that future upgrades of Abrams tanks, Bradley Fighting Vehicles, Amphibious Assault Vehicles, as well as new vehicles such as the Ground Combat Vehicle, will likely require the incorporation of APS technology in order to achieve future survivability requirements. For those and other vehicles, the committee encourages the leveraging of effective APS technologies that were developed with past Department of Defense funding, if they meet requirements and are affordable. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2012, that describes the results of the APS testing conducted under section 216 of Public Law 110–181. The report should also identify government-developed APS technologies that could be used to equip combat vehicles and all funds that have been allocated in fiscal year 2013 and beyond to further develop and field these technologies.

Armed Deployable Helicopter

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

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

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

Army science and technology management

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

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

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to deliver a report to the congressional defense committee within 150 days after enactment of this Act. This report should include an analysis of the efficiencies to be gained through the disestablishment of RDECOM compared to the status quo, as well as a description of how the new management structure will maintain oversight, coordination and integration of Army S&T planning and execution.

Bioinformatics initiative

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

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

Development of personnel protection equipment for female soldiers

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

The committee understands that the Army is comprised of 14 percent women. The committee has heard concerns from a number of service women who are deployed in Operation New Dawn (OND) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) that due to the physical differences between service men and women the current interceptor body armor system's design may not be as ergonomically effective for the female body type. The female soldiers in communication with the committee noted issues of restriction and discomfort and

suggested this could impact their operational effectiveness. The committee notes that the current counter-insurgency and dismounted operations in OND and OEF place service women in direct combat action with the enemy. The committee believes there is merit in conducting an evaluation as to whether there is an operational need to tailor interceptor body armor (IBA) systems fielded to service women specifically for the physical requirements of women.

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

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

Ground Combat Vehicle

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

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

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

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

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

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

Improved Turbine Engine Program

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

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

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

Joint Light Tactical Vehicle

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

The committee understands the JLTV program is expected to replace at least one-third of the Army and Marine Corps light tactical

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

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

Medium Extended Air Defense System

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

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

The committee notes that the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) provides the program with the full fiscal year 2011 budget request of $467.1 million. The committee would support the use of these funds, in addition to any funds made available in fiscal year 2012, for costs associated with multilateral termination of the MEADS contract. Should the Secretary further restructure the MEADS program, the committee encourages the Secretary to immediately identify and harvest promising MEADS technologies, whether U.S. or partner-developed, transition those technologies into a Patriot air and missile defense system upgrade effort or other viable program of record, and adequately resource that approach.

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

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

Nett Warrior

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

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

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

Precision artillery munitions acquisition strategy

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

The committee is aware the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army conducted a Capability Portfolio Review (CPR) for Precision Fires in 2010 which resulted in a significant decrease in the quantity of Excalibur rounds in favor of investment in the PGK program. The committee recognizes that the Excalibur 1B round, scheduled to begin procurement in fiscal year 2012, is more expensive than the projected cost of the PGK. However, the committee notes that there appears to be significant differences in the accuracy performance between the precision Excalibur round and the near-precision PGK system in that the Excalibur system significantly outperforms the PGK system.

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

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

Status of Future Combat Systems contract actions

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

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Defense University Research Instrumentation Program

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

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

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

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

Expeditionary Fire Support System Precision Extended Range Munition

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

The committee understands the EFSS PERM program is part of the EFSS mortar system program. The EFSS PERM was originally intended as a sole source development effort, but is now being transitioned to full and open competition for demonstration, qualification and production and that a request for proposals is expected to be released in fiscal year 2012. The committee notes that the EFSS 120mm mortar system could be capable of firing the Army Accelerated Precision Mortar Initiative (APMI) round, which would offer dismounted infantrymen and Marines similar performance to the proposed EFSS PERM round. The committee also notes that the PERM round will not achieve low-rate initial production until fiscal year 2015 and that the Army APMI round has already begun fielding. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Marine Corps conduct a comprehensive Cost and Operational Effectiveness Analysis prior to beginning a new development program for the EFSS PERM round.

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

Joint Expeditionary Fires Analysis of Alternatives

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

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

Naval gunfire support

The committee is concerned about the Department of the Navy's lack of progress in developing Naval Surface Fires in support of Marine Corps operating forces. While the committee is aware of the Navy's earlier efforts in this area that ended in terminated programs, the requirement still exists and the Navy's own Fire Support Analysis of Alternatives recommends the development of a 5-inch guided projectile. The committee expects the establishment of

a program to develop this capability. In testimony before the committee in recent years, the Marine Corps has repeated the immediate need to fill the requirement for Naval Surface Fires. The current security environment, the truncation of the DDG–1000 program to three ships, and the proposed termination of the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle program add urgency to the need for this capability. The committee encourages the Navy to address this long neglected capability deficit by assessing, through a competitive demonstration, the capabilities of existing technology to meet the Navy and Marine Corps requirements in the fiscal year 2013 timeframe.

Navy remotely piloted demonstration and strike aircraft programs

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

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

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

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

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would limit obligation of fiscal year 2012 FUCSS funds to no more than 15 percent until 60 days after the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition submit certain certifications regarding the acquisition of FUCSS to the congressional defense committees. This provision would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide the con-

gressional defense committees a briefing, subsequent to a review of the Navy's FUCSS acquisition strategy, not later than 90 days after the date on which the aforementioned Department of Defense officials submit the certain certifications to the congressional defense committees.

Over-the-horizon vessel tracking

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

Study on LHD Class steam plants and propulsion systems

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

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

(1) Providing plant operators early warning or prognostic recognition of impending failures and recommended remedial actions;

(2) Providing real-time recommended operator actions to improve plant efficiency;

(3) Reducing fuel consumption;

(4) Minimizing component and sensor wear to enable LHD 1–7 to meet full design service life; and

(5) Enabling more efficient maintenance planning by automatic generation of maintenance work orders, and immediate delivery of equipment health information to both shipboard crews and shore-side support staff.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

Air Force advanced materials research

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

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

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

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

Air Force missile field monitoring technology

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

The committee therefore directs the commander of Air Force Global Strike Command to provide a briefing by September 6, 2011, to the congressional defense committees on the current capabilities to monitor the status of Air Force ICBMs; a summary of potential technologies to improve the status monitoring of ICBMs; the benefits, risks, technical maturity costs, and schedules to imple-

ment such technologies; and any recommendations for specific technologies the Air Force plans to pursue.

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

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

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

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

Common propulsion technology development

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

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

The committee believes the sustainment of the SRM industrial base is a national challenge that spans multiple departments and agencies of the U.S. Government. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that recommends the President develop a national rocket propulsion strategy.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee stated that "the Department should invest in a substantive defense-wide research and development (R&D) activity" for SRMs that could be leveraged for future strategic strike, missile defense, and space launch systems. In a March 2011 report to Congress on the SRM industrial base sustainment and implementation plan, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics stated that the Department will consider "expanding current research and development (R&D) programs" whose intent would be for "the Air Force and Navy to pursue development and maturation of common technologies for future strategic missile sys-

tem designs . . . [and] maintaining design and engineering expertise in the large-SRM industry." The report further states that the Department would recommend starting such a program no later than 2014. The committee supports such an expanded SRM research and development program. The committee is concerned about further erosion of the SRM industrial base and encourages the Department to immediately start a competitive R&D program rather than wait until 2014.

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

Deep Space Climate Observatory Launch Service

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

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

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

Electronic, Scheduling and Dissemination Upgrade

The committee is aware that the current electronic, scheduling and dissemination (ESD) system for the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN) faces several sustainment challenges. The ESD system allows satellite operators at 40 geographically separated locations to request contact time on 16 shared AFSCN antennas and allows schedulers to de-conflict overlapping requests to create and publish a schedule. The ESD system must accommodate some 1,300 different vehicle configurations for over 160 supported satellites to manage an average 410 satellite contacts per day, to include up to 120 real-time mission changes per day. The ESD hardware is largely commercial-off-the-shelf technology based on 1980's era technology including the disk operating system and 286-equivalent computers. For example, a majority of these items are not available through either government supply systems or commercial vendors, as the components and software are technologically obsolete. The committee understands, based on information provided by the Air Force, that the current ESD system will only be fully sustainable through 2014. The committee has learned from the Air Force that sufficient funding is available to continue development of the ESD upgrade through fiscal year 2011 and that the Air Force will seek approval of a $20.7 million reprogramming request in fiscal year 2011 to continue development though fiscal year 2012.

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

F–35 aircraft

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

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

On February 23, 2010, the Deputy Secretary of Defense submitted to the committee an update of the 2007 Department of Defense report, "Joint Strike Fighter Alternate Engine Acquisition and Independent Cost Analysis" for the competitive engine program, which noted that an investment of $2.9 billion over 6 years in additional cost would be required to finish F136 engine development and to conduct directed buys to prepare the F136 for competitive procurement of F–35 engines in 2017. This report also projected that long-term costs for either a one-engine or two-engine competitive acquisition strategy would be the same, on a net present value basis. Last September, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that this estimate was based on two key assumptions made by the Department of Defense in developing the $2.9 billion funding projection that have significant impact on the estimated amount of upfront investment needed. These assumptions were: (1) four years of noncompetitive procurements of both engines would be needed to allow the alternate engine contractor sufficient time to gain production experience and complete developmental qualification of the engine, and (2) the Government would need to fund quality and reliability improvements for engine components. GAO notes that past studies and historical data it examined indicate that it may take less than 4 years of noncompetitive procurements and that competition may obviate the need for the Government to fund component improvement programs. GAO

concludes that if these conditions hold true for the alternate engine, the funding projection for the alternate engine could be lower than DOD's projection.

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

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

The committee also notes that section 3, titled "Scope of Work", of the 2006 memorandum of understanding (MOU) signed by all JSF partner nation senior defense officials regarding the production, sustainment, and follow-on development of the Joint Strike Fighter states that "the production work will include, but will not be limited to, the following: Production of the JSF air vehicle, including propulsion systems, both F135 and F136." The committee understands that this MOU is still current.

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

The committee believes that the F–35 competitive engine program has its roots in the F–16 alternate engine program which began in the early 1980s. Often called, "The Great Engine War" the committee notes that Robert Drewes, in his 1987 book, "The Air

Force and The Great Engine War," wrote: "Competition is the only sure way to get the best effort. Competition did yield . . . some substantial initial benefits to the Air Force . . . engine improvements [were offered] to the Air Force earlier than the Air Force had been led to expect without the competition. Furthermore, unit prices were lower than . . . had previously been offer[ed]. Since the initial split buy in February 1984, competition further induced [the contractor] to grant even more concessions to the Air Force. Warranty prices have been reduced significantly and arrangements with the European Participating Governments have improved."

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

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

(2) Annual completion for procurement is kept in place over an extended period;

(3) Contractors produce more reliable engine, resulting in lower maintenance costs; and

(4) Contractors invest additional corporate money to remain competitive.

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

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

F–35 alternative ejection seat

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

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has benefited from a common family of ejection seats in its tactical aircraft fleet since the late 1970s. The committee understands that preliminary internal Air Force studies have determined that the potential exists for significant cost savings and increased pilot safety with an alternative ejection seat system for the F–35A. The com-

mittee also notes that the Department of Commerce has expressed concern about risks to national security if the United States becomes totally reliant on foreign sources for ejection seat technology. Accordingly, the committee believes the Department of Defense should be particularly mindful of these issues in evaluating competitive options for F–35A ejection seat program.

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

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

Hosted payloads

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

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

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

KC–46A aerial refueling aircraft program

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

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

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

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

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

Lead-free electronic components

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

Military satellite communications technology development

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

The budget request for Evolved AEHF MILSATCOM reflected the cost savings the Air Force expects to achieve in fiscal year 2012 as a result of its new Evolutionary Acquisition for Space Efficiency (EASE) approach to space acquisition. The EASE approach reinvests cost savings from satellite block buys into a steady research and development program called the "capability and affordability insertion program" (CAIP). Such an approach is envisioned to lower the cost and risk of follow-on systems, by placing the risk of new technology development and capability improvements outside of the critical path for satellite procurement until such technologies and capabilities are sufficiently mature for insertion into future satellite block upgrades.

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

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

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

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

Next generation long-range strike bomber program

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

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

The committee remains concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has not performed a comprehensive life-cycle cost analysis comparing the development of one bomber platform, integrating all long-range strike capabilities, to a "family of long-range strike systems" to determine the affordability of the Department of Defense's long-range strike portfolio strategy.

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

Operationally responsive space

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

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

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

Space-Based Infrared System

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

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

The committee is concerned that the Air Force has not provided funds for the exploitation of SBIRS data, particularly the staring

sensor, and notes previous congressional efforts to include funds for such purpose.

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

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

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

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

Overview

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

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

Items of Special Interest

3–D advanced integrated circuit capabilities

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

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

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

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

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

Airborne Infrared

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

According to MDA budget materials, ABIR is planned to provide early precision tracking of ballistic missiles, discrimination, and fire control quality data to enable early intercepts. ABIR is also expected to increase the missile raid handling capacity of the ballistic missile defense system. The committee understands that ABIR technical feasibility has been demonstrated in several recent flight tests and experiments.

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

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

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

Basic research international cooperation

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

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

Armed Forces, as well as boosting the capacity of our foreign partners.

Capabilities to support humanitarian assistance and disaster relief

The committee recognizes the value that Department of Defense science and technology (S&T) efforts provide in addressing the full range of military missions. S&T investments are critical in providing technological options to address known requirements, as well as hedge against uncertainty. The committee notes that the preponderance of S&T investments are in traditional areas like weapons systems, platforms, and sensors. The committee is concerned that the current investment strategy leaves gaps in areas of unconventional or irregular threats.

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

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

Composite technology for use in missile defense interceptors

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

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

Conventional prompt global strike

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

The committee notes that the first hypersonic technology vehicle (HTV–2) flight test in April 2010 was unsuccessful. According to the Department of Defense, a second HTV–2 flight test is planned for August 2011 and the first flight test of an alternative design, the advanced hypersonic weapon (AHW), is planned for fiscal year 2012. The committee understands that hypersonic technology is cutting-edge. The committee further recognizes that designing a vehicle to glide through the Earth's atmosphere at Mach 20, and developing the associated thermal management and guidance and control technology, is a significant scientific and engineering challenge.

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

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

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

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

Cyber test and evaluation

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

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to conduct an analysis of

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

(1) Whether the Department of Defense is sufficiently funding T&E at the level necessary to address cyber and IT capability needs over the Future Years Defense Program;

(2) Whether the Department of Defense has sufficient numbers of technical personnel with the expertise in IT disciplines to conduct T&E for cyber and IT systems over the Future Years Defense Program; and

(3) Whether the Department of Defense has adequate infrastructure to conduct T&E for cyber and IT systems over the Future Years Defense Program.

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

Defense laboratory survey

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

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

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

Directed energy research

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

The budget request supports the maintenance of the Airborne Laser Test Bed (ALTB) as a science and technology test bed, addi-

tional beam propagation and lethality testing, and further maturation of Diode Pumped Alkaline-gas Laser System technology.

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

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

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

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

Engineer and Scientist Exchange Program

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

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

(2) Form a cadre of professionals with international experience to enhance research and development programs;

(3) Gain insight into foreign research and development methods, organizational structures, procedures, production, logistics, testing, and management systems;

(4) Cultivate future international cooperative endeavors; and

(5) Avoid duplication of research efforts among allied nations.

The committee supports the goals of this program and encourages the Department to make greater use of this program to facili-

tate cooperation and collaboration with our foreign allies and partners in the area of computer network operations. The committee believes that this could help our foreign partners build their own cyber operations capabilities, as well as boost U.S. capacity in this area.

Fabrication of micro-air vehicles

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

Ground-based midcourse defense

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

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

The last two intercept flight tests of the GMD system, FTG–06 in January 2010 and FTG–06a in December 2010, failed to achieve intercept. The committee understands that the FTG–06 failure was principally due to a quality control issue associated with a component in the exo-atmospheric kill vehicle (EKV). The FTG–06a failure is still under investigation but is also centered on technical issues involving the EKV.

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

cluding the schedule and additional resources necessary to implement the plan.

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

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

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

Additionally, in testimony before the committee in March 2011, the Director, Missile Defense Agency acknowledged that procurement of additional GBIs will be necessary in light of recent flight-test results and that the Department should reassess the number of GBIs it should procure.

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

velopment and sustainment contract for the GMD system in June 2011, and urges MDA to closely manage any contractor transition to minimize mission impact during this critical period in the GMD program.

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

High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System

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

Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions

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

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

(1) Enhancing research programs and capabilities in scientific and engineering disciplines critical to the national security functions of the Department;

(2) Encouraging greater participation in DOD programs and activities;

(3) Increasing the number of graduates, including underrepresented minorities in science, technical engineering and mathematics fields; and

(4) Encouraging research and educational collaboration with other colleges and universities.

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

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

Industrial research and development activities

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

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

Israeli cooperative missile defense

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

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

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

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

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

steady progress continues to be made in meeting the agreed Arrow-3 knowledge points.

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

Medical Countermeasures Initiative and the Chemical and Biological Defense Program

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

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

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

Meeting airspace needs for defense-related Unmanned Aerial Systems research

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

Missile defense adjunct sensor capabilities

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

Mitochondrial disease research

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

Mobile applications development

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

The committee is also aware that some defense organizations, such as the Army, the Defense Information Systems Agency, and

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

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

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

Multidisciplinary research in cyber-related fields

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

Nanotechnology research

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

However, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense lacks sufficient expertise in some emerging research disciplines related to nanotechnology to support a long-term research investment strategy. The committee is aware that a dedicated federally funded research and development center (FFRDC) could support the Department in this effort, but that no such broad-based nanotechnology FFRDC exists.

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

National Research and Education Center for Corrosion

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

Phased, adaptive approach

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

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

The committee notes that NATO formally endorsed territorial missile defense at its November 2010 Lisbon Summit and in its

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

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

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

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

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

Precision Tracking Space System

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

The request would support trade studies and alternative analyses, preliminary subsystem designs, and risk reduction activities. According to MDA budget materials, PTSS is planned to provide

tracking, discrimination, and fire control quality data to enable earlier intercept opportunities. PTSS is also expected to increase the missile raid handling capacity of the ballistic missile defense system. The program was a new start in fiscal year 2011.

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

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

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

Project Pelican

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

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

for addressing operational and logistical constraints of using large airships, such as basing, airspace management, and environmental issues.

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

Scientific and engineering fellowships

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

Semiconductor development

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

Social media tools for collaboration

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

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

Standard Missile–3 Block IIA interceptor

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Establishing a University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) is one potential method for providing the Department of Defense with long-term continuity for essential research, development, and engineering capability enhancements in specific mission areas. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to assess the cost and feasibility of establishing a UARC that researches and develops power and energy technologies to reduce energy demand, improve energy-efficiency, and help achieve the overall mission requirements of the Department of Defense and

military services. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 29, 2012. The report should include recommendations regarding the potential establishment of this UARC, the proposed funding required to establish the UARC, and an analysis of potential locations.

Technology transition and insertion

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

The committee notes that technology transition is essential to fulfilling the mandate of section 202 of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23), which requires acquisition strategies to ensure competition throughout the lifecycle of major defense acquisition programs. The committee believes that program managers are risk averse and are not incentivized to pull new technologies into programs of record in order to foster competition and reduce program cost. Consequently, there is a need for mechanisms external to a program of record to identify promising new technologies and to reduce the risk of technology transition for major defense acquisition programs. However, both the committee and the Government Accountability Office have observed that the Department's approach to funding transition is flawed and that multiple, small funding sources for specific transition activities offer a piecemeal solution to a more systemic problem.

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

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

University Affiliated Research Centers

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

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

Vertical lift consortium

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

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

Weaponization of rail-launched Unmanned Aerial Systems

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's interest in weaponizing rail-launched Unmanned Aerial Systems

(UAS) to respond to urgent requirements to protect U.S. and coalition forces. The committee further understands there is an urgent needs statement being staffed to meet requirements in U.S. Central Command's area of responsibility.

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

Weapons of Mass Destruction defeat technologies and capabilities

The committee notes that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA) continues a strong partnership with each of the services and U.S. Special Operations Command to develop and field innovative weapons of mass destruction (WMD) defeat technologies and solutions that reduce, eliminate and counter the threat of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and high-yield explosive materials (CBRNE). In particular, the committee supports DTRA's ongoing activities to develop and demonstrate innovative munitions that incinerate and destroy chemical and biological agents without incidental target agent dispersal and area contamination. These technical capabilities remain an area of particular interest to the committee since the national intelligence community continues to assess credible threats posed by terrorist groups, states, and state-sponsored entities to acquire and weaponize CBRNE materials for use against the United States and its allies. The committee therefore encourages DTRA to continue development and demonstration of innovative and emerging agent and functional defeat technologies to ensure prompt transition of validated capabilities to address national security requirements.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Overview

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

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

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

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

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

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

Section 212—Limitation on the Individual Carbine Program

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

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

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

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

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

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

This section would express a sense of Congress that:

(1) The long-term ability of the United States to maintain a nuclear force sufficient to address the range of mission requirements necessary to deter, dissuade, and defeat potential adversaries and assure allies and partners must not be comprised solely on the basis of the promise of potential cost savings resulting from the Department's decision to reduce the planned number of missile tubes per Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine from 24 to 16; and

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

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

Over the course of the last year, the committee has received inconsistent information on the number of missile tubes per hull planned for the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine replacement. In a May 13, 2010, report to Congress, required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the President outlined his SSBN force structure plans: "The Secretary of Defense, based on recommendations from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has established a baseline nuclear force structure that fully supports U.S. security requirements and conforms to the New START limits. . . . The United States will reduce

the number of SLBM launchers (launch tubes) from 24 to 20 per SSBN, and deploy no more than 240 SLBMs at any time." These plans for 20 missile tubes per SSBN were reaffirmed in the joint Department of Energy and Department of Defense February 16, 2011, update to the report required by section 1251. However, on January 10, 2011, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics issued an acquisition decision memorandum for the Ohio-class submarine replacement program whereby the Navy received milestone A approval to proceed with a design based on 16 missile tubes.

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

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

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

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

The Department briefed the committee on its rationale for termination of the EFV program on April 7, 2011. The committee remains concerned that the Department failed to conduct the proper analysis prior to making the decision to terminate the EFV program. The committee has yet to see the detailed analysis that would show one way or the other whether or not other alternatives may have been a more efficient solution rather than terminating the EFV program. The committee questions the Department's assumptions behind the decision to change the deployment distance from 25 nautical miles to 12 nautical miles. In addition, the committee believes that the Marine's combat effectiveness will be nega-

tively impacted as a result of potential motion sickness stemming from riding in an amphibious assault vehicle that is not up on plane for long periods of time. The current AAV is launched from approximately 2 nautical miles and can travel up to 6 knots in ideal sea state conditions. During the April 7 briefing, the committee was told that an upgraded AAV might be able to reach 10 knots and that the speed requirement for the follow-on effort to the EFV, the Amphibious Combat Vehicle (ACV), would be somewhere in the vicinity of 14 knots. The committee notes that a replacement vehicle to the EFV would have to go 16 or 17 knots in order to accelerate until the vehicle moves along the top of the water. The committee is concerned that although no analysis has yet to be completed, the Department has determined that it does not have a high-speed water requirement as validated by the JROC in 2007.

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

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

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

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

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2012 for the Air Force for the joint/common replacement fuze program for Air Force and Navy nuclear warheads to not more than 75 percent until the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the congressional defense committees on the feasibility of the program. The committee notes that an ongoing Air Force effort to modernize fuzes on the Mk21 reentry vehicle through a depot re-

furbishment program experienced significant schedule delays. A review of this refurbishment program indicates that the Air Force failed to conduct a feasibility study to determine whether the depot had the expertise and capability to perform the refurbishment.

The committee understands that the Air Force and Navy are pursuing a joint/common replacement fuze program for both intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missile reentry vehicles. The committee applauds their efforts to seek efficiencies and share lessons learned through such a program. However, the committee seeks to ensure that all stakeholders have developed a full understanding of the feasibility of the proposed replacement program before full development proceeds, and avoid the pitfalls experienced in the Air Force refurbishment program.

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

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

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

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

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

Section 219—Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research and Development

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

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

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate the main propulsion system of the next-generation long-range strike bomber aircraft as a major subprogram and would require

the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a competitive acquisition strategy for the propulsion system.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUBTITLE C—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

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

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

gram enters engineering and manufacturing development, and production and deployment.

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

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

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

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

In a Department of Defense MEADS fact sheet, dated February 14, 2011, and subsequent Medium Extended Air Defense System Report to Congress, dated March 18, 2011, the Department concluded that the completion of MEADS design and development (D&D) would require an additional $2.0 billion, of which the U.S. Government's share would be $1.2 billion, and extend the schedule by 30 months at a minimum. The Department of Defense estimated that an additional $800.0 million would be required to complete U.S.-unique certification, test, and evaluation requirements, and integration. Therefore, the Department of Defense concluded that, "The U.S. cannot afford to purchase MEADS and make required upgrades to Patriot concurrently over the next two decades," and decided to complete a proof of concept effort, which is scheduled to be completed by 2014, using the remaining D&D funds agreed to in a 2004 memorandum of understanding. The Department argues that this effort would put the D&D program on stable footing should the Italian Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany wish to continue MEADS development and production, although the U.S. has decided not to pursue MEADS procurement and pro-

duction. The budget request contained $804.0 million across fiscal years 2012–13 for the U.S. share of the proof of concept effort.

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

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

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

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

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

Lastly, the committee wants to make clear its support for international missile defense cooperation, and encourages the Department to continue to pursue cooperative missile defense activities that are affordable and benefit the security of all parties.

Section 233—Homeland Defense Hedging Policy and Strategy

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

(1) If the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) threat from the Middle East materializes earlier than 2020, or technical challenges or schedule delays affect the availability of the Standard Missile-3 Block IIB interceptor planned for fielding in Europe by 2020 to protect the United States as part of phase 4 of the President's phased, adaptive approach;

(2) If the ICBM threat from East Asia materializes more rapidly than expected;

(3) That improves or enhances the protection of the United States beyond the ground-based midcourse defense capabilities currently deployed for the defense of the United States; and

(4) That includes plans for ensuring that hedging capabilities are suitable to perform the assigned mission, operationally effective, and use technologies that are sufficiently matured and tested prior to fielding.

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

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

Section 234—Ground-based Midcourse Defense System

This section contains five findings concerning the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system, including recent intercept flight test failures, its role in protecting the U.S. homeland, reductions in the President's budget request for GMD, schedule delays resulting from the flight-test failures and Missile Defense Agency operations before the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) was enacted, and additional ground-based interceptors (GBI).

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

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

Section 235—Study on Space-based Interceptor Technology

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study examining the technical and operational considerations associated with developing and operating a limited space-based interceptor (SBI) capability and submit a report on such study to the

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

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

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

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

Section 242—Independent Review and Assessment of Cryptographic Modernization Program

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

Section 243—Report on Feasibility of Electromagnetic Rail Gun System

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

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 251—Repeal of Requirement for Technology Transition Initiative

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

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

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and carry out a plan for the preservation and storage of property owned by the Federal Government that was acquired under the

F136 propulsion system development contract that would: ensure that the Secretary preserves and stores such property in a manner that would allow the development of the F136 propulsion system to be restarted after a period of idleness, provide for the long-term sustainment and repair of such property, and allow for such preservation and storage to be conducted at either the facilities of the Federal Government or a contractor under such contract; identify supplier base costs of restarting development; ensure that the Secretary, at no cost to the Federal Government, provides support and allows for the use of such property by the contractor under such contract to conduct research, development, test, and evaluation of the F136 engine, if such activities are self-funded by the contractor; and identify any contract modifications, additional facilities or funding that the Secretary determines necessary to carry out the plan. This section would also prohibit the obligation or expenditure of amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise make available for fiscal year 2012 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy, or research, development, test and evaluation, Air Force, for the F–35 Lightning II program for activities related to destroying or disposing of the property acquired under the F136 propulsion system development contract. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committee, not later than 45 days after the enactment of the Act, on the Secretary's plan for the preservation and storage of such property.

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

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

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

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

While deployed Army forces have, in most cases, the equipment, personnel, and training they require for their missions, this deployed readiness has come at the continued expense of non-deployed Army units. The committee remains concerned about the number of non-deployed units reporting that they are not ready for combat operations, or would need additional time and equipment to prepare for deployment. Restoring equipment readiness is a key

element of the Army reset process. The fiscal year 2012 budget request moves an increasing share of the enduring depot maintenance requirements back to the base budget, providing funds for the restoration of equipment, damaged or worn out by nearly 10 years of constant operations, back to a level of combat readiness. The Army has increased funding for home-station full spectrum training, reflecting anticipated increases in training tempo as the Army commits fewer units to combat operations. However, the Army has transitioned its methodology for identifying training requirements and resource allocations and is using the term "Full Spectrum Training Mile" as a metric. The committee is concerned that this metric may not be the best tool for gauging operations tempo and content of training.

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

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

The Marine Corps recently concluded a Force Posture Review that emphasized "rebalancing" the Marine Corps to better "focus on

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

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

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

Flight Simulator Training Hour Restoration

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

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

Marine Corps Expeditionary Forward Operating Base

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

Operational Energy Capability Improvement

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

Strategic Environmental Research Program

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

ENERGY ISSUES

Energy-Efficient Tires

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

Navy Green Fleet Initiative Including Harbor Tugs

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

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

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

LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT ISSUES

Aircraft Landing Gear Systems Sustainment

The committee is aware that aircraft landing gear systems are one of the more critical and complex subsystems on an aircraft. The system consists of complex structures, actuators, wheels, brakes, tires, steering, and anti-skid systems. The structural components are non-redundant flight safety critical items designed for the absolute minimum weight and size necessary to perform their critical functions. The committee notes that it is not unusual to have critical crack sizes that are below the threshold necessary for detection and mitigation techniques used for other aircraft structures. As a result of these unique and challenging design constraints, aircraft landing gear systems are typically leading drivers of aircraft accidents and mishaps. The committee recognizes that many landing gear technical issues are common for heavyweight or lightweight aircraft, and the U.S. Air Force Landing Gear Engineering Group has excellent engineering insight into festering problems before they result in catastrophic mishaps. The committee encourages the U.S. Air Force to ensure that best practices are in place, including any recommendations from the Landing Gear Engineering Group, and that the service is proactive, not reactive, in the prevention of catastrophic failures.

Department-Wide Depot Workforce Development

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

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

Improved Corrosion Prevention and Control Practices

In its report, "Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars and Enhance Revenue" (GAO–11–318SP) the Government Accountability Office (GAO) stated that, "The Department of Defense estimates that corrosion costs the department over $23 billion each year." To target funding toward corrosion prevention and control, the Department established a separate program element and line item in the budget request. The Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight uses much of the funds for projects designed by the military departments to develop and test new technologies, currently

costing up to $0.5 million per project. During the 6 years that the Department of Defense Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight has been funding corrosion projects, the average estimated return on investment for those projects has been 50-to-1. GAO reported that the Department of Defense is currently asking the military departments to validate the actual return on investment for the projects funded in fiscal year 2005 compared to the original estimates. To date, validations have been completed for 10 of the 28 corrosion projects funded in fiscal year 2005.

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

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

Increased Competition for the Operation and Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems

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

Furthermore, the committee has repeatedly called for fostering competition in life-cycle sustainment to include competition for new parts, repair parts, and touch labor associated with overhauls and maintenance. Section 805 of the National Defense Authorization

Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) requires the Secretary of Defense to implement product support strategies for major weapon systems and to leverage both industry and Department of Defense Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence to achieve competition, performance, and cost savings. Section 805 further stipulates that product support managers should maximize competition at the system, subsystem, and component levels. Despite this guidance, the committee is aware that the military departments continue sole-source relationships with original equipment manufacturers even when other qualified suppliers exist, foregoing potential savings that could total in the billions of dollars.

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

Laser Peening Technologies

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

Long-Term Corrosion Strategies of the Military Departments

The committee is concerned that the military departments, by not aligning their corrosion control and prevention efforts with the Department of Defense Corrosion Prevention and Mitigation Stra-

tegic Plan, are incurring higher-than-necessary life-cycle costs for military equipment sustainment. Therefore, the committee directs the corrosion control and prevention executive (CCPE) of each military department to develop a long-term strategy for addressing corrosion prevention and control within the military departments by April 1, 2012. The military department's strategy should support the existing Department of Defense-level strategy published by the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight.

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

Parts Supply Recapitalization

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

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

(1) Surge capacity and the flexibility to respond quickly to increased demand;

(2) Increased speed to market and cost savings in the procurement of machined parts;

(3) Rapid adaptability to changing machine and production environments; and

(4) Cyber capabilities that mitigate overproduction and counterfeiting.

Study on Reducing Navy Small Boat Maintenance Costs

The committee is concerned that the Department of the Navy is not taking advantage of the prospective return on investment and reduced life-cycle sustainment costs that could be achieved through greater investment in corrosion control and prevention measures for the Navy's small boats. Therefore, the committee directs the

Secretary of the Navy to conduct a study on strategies to reduce maintenance and repair costs associated with small boat storage and harboring and submit a report on the results to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 31, 2011. At a minimum, the study shall investigate the potential for reduced maintenance and repair costs of the Navy's small boat fleet through the use of advanced boat lift as well as storage and harboring equipment, including an evaluation and business case analysis of the impact of these strategies for potential improvements to small boat acquisition costs and life-cycle sustainment. In the report to the committee, the Secretary should include recommendations regarding the potential establishment of improved boat corrosion control and prevention as:

(1) A key performance parameter for the selection of boat maintenance and storage equipment;

(2) A key performance parameter for sustainment;

(3) A requirement for the Naval Sea Systems Command to incorporate into its acquisition strategies prior to issuing a solicitation for procurement contracts.

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

Sustainment Planning

The committee is aware of the Department of the Navy's successful use of modeling and cost-benefit analysis to support efficient logistics and sustainment and manage total life-cycle product support costs of the Navy's T–6, T–34, and T–45 training aircraft. The committee notes that these efforts are in keeping with the goals of section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) regarding life-cycle management and product support strategies for major weapon systems. Such tools apply a strategic decision analysis approach to the evaluation of multiple alternatives and quantitatively assess the impact of uncertainty to provide relevant insight into decision-making. The committee is particularly interested in the application of these predictive analytical tools to assist the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter program office in sustainment planning.

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

READINESS ISSUES

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Operational Considerations and Force Structure

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

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

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by December 5, 2011, that assesses how operational requirements and considerations, such as force protection, other mission requirements, geographic trade-offs, and readiness and availability, affect the Aegis BMD concept of operations and the implications of such operational requirements and considerations on force structure required to support combatant commanders' missile defense missions. Similarly, such assessment should also address how the Navy balances its various mission requirements and the impact of missile defense requirements on its force structure demands and operational tempo. The assessment should also describe any recent Aegis BMD deployments, for example, to support the July 2009 Democratic People's Republic of Korea missile launches, and how operational requirements and considerations influenced the Aegis BMD force structure and concepts of operation to address the combatant commanders' mission requirements.

Army Unit Manning Effects on Readiness

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

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

(1) A list of Army units that are reporting degraded readiness;

(2) An analysis of the extent to which the personnel component of readiness is affecting overall readiness;

(3) Army personnel strengths and how they are matched to requirements;

(4) Army policies and established business rules for calculating personnel readiness;

(5) The Army's processes for meeting manning goals throughout the Army's force generation cycle; and

(6) The extent to which the Army has developed plans to address actual or projected unit manning shortages for specific occupational specialties or pay grades.

Distribution and Use of Bottled Water in Contingency Operations

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

(1) The total quantity of bottled water that is distributed by convoys in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and the associated cost with the purchase and distribution of bottled water;

(2) An assessment of the current water filtration technologies including reverse osmosis systems available, as well as those systems being developed to support clean, filtered water with the necessary minerals for forward operating bases;

(3) An assessment of how the Department of Defense will reduce its demand for bottled water while ensuring access to clean, safe water for service members in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;

(4) An assessment of how plastic waste is being minimized and discarded, and what precautions are being taken to prevent exposure to toxic fumes on forward operating bases in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan as a result of the destruction of plastic waste;

(5) A cost assessment of the Fully Burdened Cost of Water in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; and

(6) An assessment of water purification plants available for use by the United States military in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan

Federal Fire Protection

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

Installation Emergency Management Programs

The committee is aware that Department of Defense Instruction 6055.17 establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and prescribes procedures for developing, implementing, and sustaining Installation Emergency Management (IEM) programs at Department of Defense installations worldwide. The committee understands that the intent of the IEM program is to provide a fully integrated emergency management capability to address "all hazards" including manmade or natural disasters, as well as the ability to interoperate with regional civilian emergency responders but is concerned that funding in the budget request for fiscal year 2012 is fragmented distributed in multiple budget elements. To prevent a funding approach that is potentially inadequate, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the respective Secretaries of the military departments to consider centrally funding Installation Emergency Management under a single defense-wide funding line in future years.

Marine Corps Air Station Miramar Instrument Landing System Replacement

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

mitigate the impacts to future air operations and to ensure aircrew safety.

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

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

Based on the results of all these reports, the Navy launched a number of initiatives designed to better maintain the material conditions of its surface ships. Given the cost of new ships, and size of the current fleet relative to current and projected requirements, it is critical that the Navy's efforts to maintain its ships succeed and help its ships to meet or exceed their expected lifespan. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Navy's initiatives to improve the material condition of its surface ship fleet and report the results to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This review should focus on the Navy's amphibious ships, cruisers, destroyers, and frigates. For each of these types/classes of ships, the Comptroller General should compare data on the actual material condition compared to the projected condition, considering information such as the following:

(1) The projected service life when the first ship of the class was designed or delivered;

(2) The current age of the class;

(3) The age at which any ships of the class were decommissioned;

(4) Any changes in maintenance policy for the class; and

(5) Any deferments of major availabilities.

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

Modified Tables of Equipment

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

At a minimum, the review should examine:

(1) What equipment used in operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and Operation New Dawn should be added to MTOEs;

(2) The process by which equipment is nominated for inclusion in MTOEs;

(3) Items that should be removed from MTOEs; and

(4) The military services' respective strategies for future sustainment of MTOEs outside of Overseas Contingency Operations funds.

Naval Air Station North Island

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

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

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

In order to better understand the potential benefits of the military services' efforts, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the status of military services' programs, including factors that were considered in determining

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

Security Force Assistance

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

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

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

(1) The extent to which the Department has defined and differentiated intended roles, missions, and required capabilities for security force assistance for both general purpose forces and special operations forces;

(2) The extent to which the Department has incorporated lessons learned from current operations; and

(3) The extent to which the Army has developed its concept for regionally aligned brigades and has identified costs associated with implementing the concept.

U.S. Army Full Spectrum Training Mile

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

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

(1) The methodology behind the new metric, to include vehicles covered;

(2) Cost estimates and assumptions; and

(3) The model suitability for budgeting, forecasting, and training.

OTHER MATTERS

Air Force Environmental Cleanup

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

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

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

(1) Operational equipment shortfalls attributable to current policy;

(2) Degradation in equipment readiness attributable to current policy; and

(3) Production inefficiencies caused by current policy.

Department of Defense Personnel Security Clearance Program

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

Therefore, in 2011 the Department's security clearance program was removed from the GAO's high-risk list.

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

Department of Defense Unexploded Ordnance Cleanup Report

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

(1) What new technologies the Department of Defense is developing for unexploded ordnance identification and cleanup;

(2) How those technologies may accelerate cleanup timelines for all installations, and specifically those in Hawaii;

(3) Estimated timeline for adopting new technologies; and

(4) Estimated savings anticipated as a result of these new technologies.

Disposal of Surplus Property

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

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

sonable to allow the State and local governments' representatives to screen property in a forward location such as the State of Kuwait, thereby improving visibility and access to available surplus property and reducing overseas transportation charges for undesirable equipment,

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

Expedited Security Clearance Processing for Wounded Warriors

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

The committee is concerned that the Federal Government's internal human resources processes may not allow for timely consideration of the qualifications of an individual who has submitted an application but is awaiting processing of a security clearance in order to be considered for a Federal Government position. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy for Department of Defense hiring actions that ensures employment applications for these individuals are not disqualified in the initial human resources screening process on the basis of a lack of a clearance. Such policy should ensure that appropriate human resources offices proactively contact the eligible candidates to ensure that the expedited security clearance processing moves forward, even if there is no guarantee of ultimate employment. In addition, the policy should ensure that if the eligible candidate is not offered employment under that particular hiring action, that the expedited clearance review is completed, which would facilitate the ability of the individual to apply for future Federal Government positions. The Secretary of Defense shall provide a copy of the policy to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 15, 2011.

Federal Facility Agreement for Environmental Cleanup at Tyndall Air Force Base

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

Joint Space Operations Center

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

Key Enabler Explosive Ordnance Disposal Requirements

The committee recognizes that the services have taken extraordinary efforts to revitalize the capability and increase the capacity of the Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) force. The committee recognizes that the EOD force is a key enabler for combatant commanders and will continue to be vital for the foreseeable future. However, the committee remains concerned that the services have not adequately rebalanced EOD force structure and maintained full-spectrum capabilities to ensure success in a wide range of contingencies, as directed by the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review.

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

(1) Procurement;
(2) Operation and Maintenance; and
(3) Research, development, testing and evaluation.

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

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

Satellite Operations Efficiencies

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

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

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees by February 6, 2012, to include: an assessment of the Department's efforts to modernize its satellite operations capabilities, a comparison of the Department's satellite operations concepts with those in other Government entities and commercial industry, and an identification of practices that the Department could adopt to improve its satellite operations, consistent with Department of Defense mission requirements.

Wounded Warrior Service Dog Programs

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

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

SUBTITLE B—ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This section would require the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Operational Energy Plans and Programs (OEPP) to recommend and the Secretary of Defense to designate a service secretary as the

executive agent for alternative fuel development. The Assistant Secretary of Defense OEPP would direct the policy, and the executive agent would collaborate with the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Research and Engineering as well as the Department of Energy.

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

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

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to give favorable consideration to defense logistics support contract proposals in support of contingency operations that include energy efficient or energy reduction technologies or processes. The committee continues to be concerned about the high demand for fossil fuel in contingency operations and the security challenges it creates for logistics convoys.

SUBTITLE C—LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT

Section 321—Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair

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

Section 322—Core Logistics Capabilities

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

This section also would amend section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, to require an annual report on the core logistics capability requirements; the depot maintenance workload requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, this section would amend the reporting requirement mandated in section 328 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to assess the effective use of the authorities provided under section 4544, title 10, United States Code, and to make recommendations for improvement to each category of Army industrial facility to compete for contracts.

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

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

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

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

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

SUBTITLE D—READINESS

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

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

Section 332—Review of Proposed Structures Affecting Navigable Airspace

This section would modify section 44718 of title 49, United States Code, to permit the Federal Aviation Administration to develop procedures for the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security to review and comment on aeronautical studies.

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

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

SUBTITLE E—REPORTS

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

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

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

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

This section would modify section 7310(c) of title 10, United States Code, to include vessels that are operated pursuant to a contract entered into by the Military Sealift Command, the Maritime Administration, or the U.S. Transportation Command.

Section 343—Additional Requirements for Annual Report on Military Working Dogs

This section would amend section 358 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to require the Secretary of Defense to provide additional information on the use of military working dogs on a contracted basis, the status of the Department's breeding programs, and the future military working dog force structure.

The committee remains concerned that the Department may rely too heavily on contracted military working dogs and may not be

fully utilizing the Department's domestic breeding programs leading to increased costs to the taxpayer.

Section 344—Assessment and Reporting Requirements Regarding the Status of Compliance with Joint Military Training and Force Allocations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a biennial assessment of the military departments compliance with the joint training, doctrine, and resource allocation recommendations that are promulgated by the Joint Staff. The assessment also would include the effectiveness of the Joint Staff in carrying out the missions of planning and experimentation formerly accomplished by U.S. Joint Forces Command. The results of the first assessment would be provided to the congressional defense committees by March 31 of 2012, and every even-numbered year thereafter.

Section 345—Study of United States Pacific Command Training Readiness

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM), to complete a study by February 28, 2013, on current and future training requirements for the Armed Forces assigned to USPACOM's area of responsibility.

SUBTITLE F—LIMITATIONS AND EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY

Section 351—Adoption of Military Working Dog by Family of Deceased or Seriously Wounded Member of the Armed Forces Who Was the Dog's Handler

This section would amend section 2583(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the adoption of a military working dog by the family of a deceased or seriously wounded member of the Armed Forces who was the handler of the dog.

Section 352—Prohibition on Expansion of the Air Force Food Transformation Initiative

This section would prohibit the Air Force from expanding its Food Transformation Initiative beyond the initial six bases in the pilot program until 270 days after the Secretary of the Air Force provides a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services. This report would include a description on the impact of the initiative on non-appropriated funded employees; a detailed information technology plan, including funding for implementation; and a description of performance metrics for measuring the initiative. In addition, the report would include an estimate of cost savings; an explanation of the tracking of appropriated and non-appropriated funds; an explanation of any barriers encountered and recommended remedies; and a plan for addressing recommendations expected to be made by the Government Accountability Office following its review of the initiative.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the com-

mittee expressed its initial concern regarding the Air Force's Food Transformation Initiative. As a result, the committee required a review of the initiative by the Comptroller General of the United States, which is due in July 2011. While the Air Force was prohibited from moving forward with expansion of the initiative until 90 days after that review, the committee is concerned that the Air Force intends to continue expanding this initiative without fully assessing the full impact at the six initial bases, and addressing any problems encountered at these bases.

Section 353—Limitation on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for the Migration of Army Enterprise Email Services

This section would prohibit the Army from obligating more than 2 percent of the funds available for fiscal year 2012 in procurement and operations and maintenance accounts for the migration of enterprise email services until the Secretary of the Army provides a business case analysis comparing the relative merits and cost-benefit analysis of transitioning to Defense Information Systems Agency enterprise email services.

Section 354—One-Year Extension of Pilot Program for Availability of Working-Capital Funds to Army for Certain Product Improvements

This section would extend the Department of the Army Product Improvement Pilot Program authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), to October 1, 2014.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 361—Consideration of Foreclosure Circumstances in Adjudication of Security Clearances

This section would allow special consideration during security clearance adjudications to be given to members of the Armed Forces who may have a housing foreclosure on his or her credit report. The committee notes that the recent housing crisis and resulting foreclosures are a potential problem for members of the Armed Forces since a foreclosure could jeopardize their ability to apply for or renew a security clearance.

Section 362—Authority To Provide Information for Maritime Safety of Forces and Hydrographic Support

This section would amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, by inserting after chapter 667 a new chapter authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to maximize the safety and effectiveness of Navy, Joint, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and coalition forces by collecting marine weather and ocean data, modeling of that data, and forecasting potentially hazardous meteorological and oceanographic conditions.

Section 363—Deposit of Reimbursed Funds under Reciprocal Fire Protection Agreements

This section would amend section 1856d(b) of title 42, United States Code, which allows the Department of Defense to allocate reimbursements for fire protection services to the appropriation fund or account from which the expenses were paid subject to the same provisions and restrictions as the original funding. This section would add flexibility to the reimbursement process beginning in fiscal year 2012 by permitting the Department to allocate reimbursements to the fund or account currently available for fire protection activities should the period of availability for obligation under which services were originally provided have expired.

Section 364—Reduction in Amounts Otherwise Authorized To Be Appropriated to the Department of Defense for Printing and Reproduction

This section would reduce by 10 percent the printing and reproduction budgets for each of the military departments and the defense agencies.

The committee notes that the budget request contained $357.0 million for printing and reproduction services, Department-wide. While the committee recognizes that paper copies often are necessary to facilitate mission accomplishment, the committee believes that the Department should reduce spending on high-quality, glossy color prints (such as the ones accompanying the fiscal year 2012 budget rollout, and other reports and briefings to Congress). Utilizing double-sided, plain, black-and-white copies still accomplishes the goal, while achieving considerable savings. In addition, the committee urges the Department to consider technologies, such as electronic documentation and transmission, to process information without the use of paper printing and reproduction. This section would generate $35.7 million in savings in fiscal year 2012.

Section 365—Reduction in Amounts Otherwise Authorized To Be Appropriated to the Department of Defense for Studies, Analysis and Evaluations

This section would reduce by 10 percent the budget request for studies, analyses, and evaluations performed by each military department and the defense agencies. The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense has emphasized the need to fund the core mission of the Department of Defense, realigning funds from non-essential cost areas to areas of direct mission support. The Secretary of Defense has implemented an initiative to eliminate unnecessary Department of Defense boards and study groups, and this section would support the Secretary's efforts to reduce unnecessary costs. This section would generate a savings of $24.0 million in fiscal year 2012.

Section 366—Clarification of the Airlift Service Definitions Relative to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet

This section would amend section 41106 of title 49, United States Code, to clarify that the application of current law is limited to contracts for airlift services using aircraft of a type the Department of

Defense has determined are eligible for participation in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program.

Section 367—Ratemaking Procedures for Civil Reserve Air Fleet Contracts

This section would amend section 9511a of title 10, United States Code, to codify the authority of the Department of Defense to offer scheduled and expansion contract airlift business to Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) carriers according to the amount of airlift capability they commit for CRAF activation. Commercial air carriers in the CRAF program commit airlift capability to be activated for the Department's use during wartime. In exchange for such a commitment, the Department contracts with the participating carriers for its peacetime or routine airlift requirements. The committee is aware that competitive contracts for this activity are generally not feasible because oftentimes none of the air carriers have commercial operations in the needed locations and therefore have no basis for providing a reasonable offer. The committee notes that this type of entitlement-based contract is done in conjunction with statutorily mandated ratemaking procedures that have served as an effective means of determining fair and reasonable rates while furthering the objectives of the CRAF program.

Section 368—Sense of Congress on Proposed Federal Aviation Administration Changes to Flight Crew Member Duty and Rest Requirements

This section would express a sense of Congress that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) should make every effort to ensure that any changes to guidelines, regulations, and rules of the FAA, including changes to flight crew member duty and rest requirements, fully consider the impact of such changes on the Civil Reserve Air Fleet carriers, U.S. Transportation Command and the Department of Defense.

Section 369—Policy on Active Shooter Training for Certain Law Enforcement Personnel

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and promulgate guidelines to ensure civilian and military law enforcement responsible for force protection at U.S. military installations receive Active Shooter Training. The committee recognizes this training was a recommendation of the Department of Defense Independent Review Related to Fort Hood entitled "Protecting the Force: Lessons from Fort Hood."

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee supports the budget request for the authorized end strengths for the Armed Forces in fiscal year 2012. The budget request reduces the end strength of the Active Duty Army by 7,400 personnel to 562,000, which is a planned reduction of the temporary end strength increase authorized in the Ike Skelton Na-

tional Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). Notwithstanding support for the Army's reduction, the committee remains concerned with the continued impact of the high number of non-deployable soldiers on Army readiness, individual dwell time, and the Army's ability to ensure deploying units are fully manned. Based on data provided to the committee by the Army during briefings, 17 percent, which is approximately 20,000 personnel, of soldiers in the Army's deploying combat units are not deployable, and this figure is growing at an unsustainable rate. In addition, there are approximately 9,000 soldiers processing through the Permanent Disability Evaluation System after being found medically unfit for service. The Army could potentially face a deployable inventory deficit of 30,000 soldiers for its mission requirements by fiscal year 2017 if these challenges are not addressed. While the Army could take measures to partially reduce the number of non-deployable personnel in its combat units, the committee believes that more dramatic measures will be required to reform the Permanent Disability Evaluation System, which still requires disabled soldiers to remain on Active Duty for 1 year or more as they are processed through the system.

The committee is also concerned with the Navy's request of a reduction in the active authorized end strength by 3,000 sailors. The Navy has been challenged over the past several years as sailors deployed as individual augmentees to overseas contingency operations to execute non-traditional Navy missions, which has drained needed manpower from the fleet. The Navy has undertaken an efficiency task to increase readiness in the fleet by eliminating approximately 7,200 shore billets and assigning those personnel to sea billets. The committee will closely monitor this process as well as the Navy's reduction of manpower and the impact on operations and requirements.

The Secretary of Defense, as part of an additional $78–billion efficiencies reduction in the Department budget top line, has proposed to significantly reduce the size of the active Army by 27,000 soldiers and the active Marine Corps by 15,300 Marines beginning in fiscal year 2015 through fiscal year 2016. The committee is concerned the impact this force reduction will have on individual dwell time on both services, especially for the Army since this reduction of 27,000 soldiers is in addition to a planned reduction of 22,000 temporary end strength by fiscal year 2013. The committee has heard repeatedly in hearings and briefings over the past several years that achieving an individual dwell time ratio of 1 to 3 is critical to maintaining the health of the Active Component Army and Marine Corps and their families. In his statement for the record submitted to the committee during the fiscal year 2012 Department of Defense posture hearing, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated that, "For our Army combat units, we do not expect to begin to reach our interim goal of 1:2 deploy-to-dwell ratios until 2012." This appears to be the best ratio that can be obtained for the foreseeable future; and the new standard. The projected force reductions are based on an assumption that the combat commitment in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan would be significantly reduced by the end of 2014. It remains unclear to the committee what the level of forces in Afghanistan would need to be reduced in order to allow the force reduction to begin without an adverse

impact on troops and their families. More importantly, the manpower reductions appear to have no relationship to the requirements of overall national military strategy or to future war fighting requirements.

The committee is committed to working with the Department to ensure that the proper analysis of end strength requirements is completed prior to the proposed reductions beginning. It is imperative the military maintain sufficient manpower to support current and future requirements that have been generated by a Nation at war for almost 10 years.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Active Duty personnel of the Armed Forces as of September 30, 2012:

Service	FY 2011 Authorized	FY 2012		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2012 Request	FY 2011 Authorized
Army	569,400	562,000	562,000	0	−7,400
Navy	328,700	325,700	325,739	39	−2,961
USMC	202,100	202,100	202,100	0	0
Air Force	332,200	332,800	332,800	0	600
DOD	1,432,400	1,422,600	1,422,639	39	−9,761

Section 402—Revision in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum Active Duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as of September 30, 2012. The committee recommends 562,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Army, 325,739 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Navy, 202,100 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 332,800 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Air Force.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Selected Reserve personnel, including the end strength for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves, as of September 30, 2012:

Service	FY 2011 Authorized	FY 2012		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2012 Request	FY 2011 Authorized
Army National Guard	358,200	358,200	358,200	0	0

Service	FY 2011 Authorized	FY 2012		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2012 Request	FY 2011 Authorized
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	65,500	66,200	66,200	0	700
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	106,700	106,700	106,700	0	0
Air Force Reserve	71,200	71,400	71,400	0	200
DOD Total	846,200	847,100	847,100	0	900
Coast Guard Reserve	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves as of September 30, 2012:

Service	FY 2011 Authorized	FY 2012		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2012 Request	FY 2011 Authorized
Army National Guard	32,060	32,060	32,060	0	0
Army Reserve	16,261	16,261	16,261	0	0
Naval Reserve	10,688	10,337	10,337	0	−351
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	14,584	14,833	14,833	0	249
Air Force Reserve	2,992	2,662	2,662	0	−330
DOD Total	78,846	78,414	78,414	0	−432

Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2012:

Service	FY 2011 Authorized	FY 2012		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2012 Request	FY 2011 Authorized
Army Reserve	8,395	8,395	8,395	0	0
Army National Guard	27,210	27,210	27,210	0	0
Air Force Reserve	10,720	10,777	10,777	0	57
Air National Guard	22,394	22,509	22,509	0	115
DOD Total	68,719	68,891	68,891	0	172

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2012 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish the maximum end strengths for the Reserve Components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status technicians as of September 30, 2012:

Service	FY 2011 Authorized	FY 2012		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2012 Request	FY 2011 Authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of Reserve Component personnel who may be on Active Duty or full-time National Guard duty during fiscal year 2012 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by section 401 or section 412 of this Act unless the duration on Active Duty exceeds the limitations in section 115(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

Service	FY 2011 Authorized	FY 2012		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2012 Request	FY 2011 Authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Naval Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in the funding table in section 4401 of division D of this Act.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

OVERVIEW

The committee recognizes that after almost 10 years of war, the Department of Defense must remain flexible and continue to adapt its policies to maintain a viable All-Volunteer Force. The committee continues its efforts to provide needed flexibility to the Department in order to manage the total force. For example, the committee has included several provisions which enhance the management of the Reserve Component and increase the flexibility of the Marine Corps to manage its field grade officers. The committee also supports the need to provide flexibility for individuals during their military career and has extended authorities for service members

to pause their active service in order to meet personal or professional needs and then return to active service.

In addition, the committee has proposed reductions to the statutory authorizations in the numbers of general and flag officers on active duty, complementing the efforts of the Secretary of Defense to reduce such officers across the Department. Further, the committee has provided funds to support local educational agencies heavily impacted by military dependent enrollments.

The committee also recognizes the selfless sacrifices that our military men and women and their families are making on behalf of the Nation and has included provisions that would improve the overall well being and readiness of the force. Just as important as those still serving, the committee believes its commitment to our service members does not end once they are out of the military. The committee has included several provisions to improve the oversight and function of Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, and the Armed Forces Retirement Home. The Department of Defense and the military services have a history of partnering with local communities through community service projects, mentorship programs, and education programs to enhance the community and maintain a civic relationship with communities that support its installations. The committee commends the military services and the Department of Defense for their efforts and encourages the Department to continue to seek ways to expand these partnerships.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Community College of the Air Force

The Community College of the Air Force provides enlisted members of the U.S. Air Force the opportunity to earn their associate degree in a variety of areas. The committee believes that program and funding efficiencies may be gained by allowing enlisted members from the other services to participate in this program. The committee requests the Secretary of Defense to review the feasibility and cost of allowing enlisted members from the other services, including the U.S. Coast Guard, to participate in the Community College of the Air Force's associate degree program, and to provide a briefing on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Critical Language Training at Reserve Officer Training Programs and Senior Military Colleges

The committee believes foreign language skills are critical to national security and has provided the Department of Defense the flexibility to establish programs to ensure a viable pool of foreign language speaking service members and national security personnel. Section 529 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) authorized the Secretary of Defense to establish language training centers of excellence at universities, senior military colleges, and other institutions of higher learning to develop a foundation of expertise in critical and strategic languages and regional studies. The military is increasingly placed in roles where language skills are critical in day-to-day op-

erations. Therefore, the committee recommends the Secretary of Defense to develop a program to establish language training centers, and also encourage the Secretary of Defense to include the Reserve Officer Training Corps and senior military college programs within the National Security Education Program.

Expanding the Use of On-Line Education in the Department of Defense Educational Activity

The Department of Defense Education Activity (DODEA) educates eligible Department of Defense military and civilian dependents from pre-kindergarten through 12th grade in schools located overseas and in the U.S. and its territories and possessions. The committee recognizes that the technology to support successful online education exists in the civilian education sector and is concerned that DODEA may not be taking full advantage of online school programs that already exist and are successfully serving current military families. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the potential cost-savings and achievement benefits of introducing a K–12 online learning environment into the DODEA school system, and to report his findings to the committee by April 1, 2012. The report shall identify existing online educational opportunities for DODEA students, alternative online school opportunities currently used by military families, and recommendations, as appropriate, for enhancing and funding DODEA's expansion of the use of online education.

Review for Hispanic American Service Cross Recipients

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee noted that it believes that the statutory authority to conduct a review for Hispanic American service cross recipients from World War I exists in underlying law, section 552 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). In H. Rept. 111–491, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services and House Committee on Armed Services notification of the reviews conducted within 180 days of the date of enactment of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). The committee anticipates receiving notification on this subject in June and looks forward to a full report on the actions that they have taken to ensure that the service of Hispanic American World War I veterans is properly recognized.

Use of Electronic Media for Family Support Programs

The committee continues to encourage the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the military departments to provide service members and their families a balance between work and family life and to promote quality of life programs. Given the high operations tempo experienced by many service members during the past nearly 10 years of war, the committee believes it is critical that widely dispersed military families far removed from military installations, particularly families of Reserve Component service members, have access to the tools necessary to effectively manage their lives dur-

ing times of stress. Assistance in personal finance, stress management, grief counseling, and general morale and wellbeing management is a critical component of family support initiatives. The committee understands that these types of support services can be provided through a variety of cost-effective media options, to include audio books, compact disks, digital video disks, and other electronic media delivered through the Internet. Further, the committee believes that programs using such media options offer a flexible capability to target needed services to specific families on demand over a wide geographic area in a cost-effective manner. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report, by March 31, 2012, on the current use of electronic media for delivering family support programs within the Department of Defense, the potential for greater use of commercially procured electronic media to support family programs, a survey of vendors capable of providing such services who are already sanctioned by the General Services Administration, and the Secretary's view of the propriety and cost-effectiveness of increasing the use of electronic media to support family programs.

Wounded Warrior Implementation

Section 511 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–181) provided the authority enabling military technicians (dual status) to continue to be employed as technicians when the loss of their military membership in the Selected Reserve is the result of a combat-related disability. The National Guard Bureau issued implementing instruction in June 2009 to the state-level National Guard Headquarters. Unfortunately, the implementation guidance may not have been distributed to all pertinent levels of personnel and dual-status technicians may not have been informed of this program. Therefore, the committee directs the National Guard Bureau to reissue the implementing instructions to the state and territory headquarters with additional guidance to ensure the information is disseminated to the lowest level possible.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY GENERALLY

Section 501—Increase in Authorized Strengths for Marine Corps Officers on Active Duty in Grades of Major, Lieutenant Colonel, and Colonel

This section would increase the grade table allowance for Marine Corps officers serving on active duty in grades major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel. For example, with an officer strength of 17,500, the Marine Corps could promote 485 additional officers to the grade of major, 286 additional officers to the grade of lieutenant colonel, and 37 additional officers to the grade of colonel.

Section 502—General Officer and Flag Officer Reform

This section would eliminate 14 authorizations for general and flag officers in joint duty assignments and add up to 7 officers serving in intelligence positions to count against the joint duty assign-

ment limit. This section would also eliminate 11 Air Force general officer authorizations and would require that the superintendents of the service academies be counted against their respective service's general and flag officer limits. This section would require that the directed changes take place between January 1, 2012, and October 1, 2013. The committee applauds the efforts of the Secretary of Defense to reduce the number of general and flag officers on active duty, which numbered 967 as of July 2010, by 102 over the next 2 years. However, the committee was disappointed that the Secretary made no substantial proposal in the budget request to reduce the statutory limits imposed not only on the number of general and flag officers on active duty, but also on the statutory limits on the number of general and flag officers serving in each grade. For example, at present, the military services are statutorily authorized to have as many as 658 general and flag officers on active duty to meet in-service requirements, as well as up to another 324 general and flag officers for joint duty assignments. In addition, the numbers of general and flag officers actually on active duty are increased because several are excluded from counting against the statutory limits. Such exemptions include the superintendents of the military service academies, the general and flag officers assigned to the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, and the Attending Physician to Congress. The effect of allowing the statutory limits and exemptions to remain in place would be to create what the committee believes is excessive room for the military services and the joint commands to generate future increases in the number of general and flag officers on active duty, notwithstanding the policy controls that the Secretary of Defense intends to impose to limit future growth.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Leadership of National Guard Bureau

This section would establish the position of and criteria for the Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau, with the officer holding that position, following appointment by the President and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve in the grade of lieutenant general. This section would require that both the Chief and Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau be designated by the Secretary of Defense as general officers to be counted against the pool of general and flag officers in joint duty assignments established by section 526(b) of title 10, United States Code. This section would also establish a chain of succession for both the Chief and Vice Chief of the National Guard Bureau should either or both be absent or disabled. Finally, this section would authorize the incumbent holding the position of Director of the Joint Staff of the National Guard Bureau to continue to serve in the current grade of major general as the acting vice chief until the appointment of an officer to be the vice chief.

Section 512—Preseparation Counseling for Members of the Reserve Components

This section would amend section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, to require individual preseparation counseling be made available to members of the Reserve Component. This service is currently available for service members whose discharge from active duty is anticipated as of a specific date. This section would also clarify the 90-day requirement for preseparation counseling for Reserve Component members who have less than 90-days before release from active duty due to operational requirements. This allows preseparation counseling to begin as soon as possible within the remaining period of service.

Section 513—Clarification of Applicability of Authority for Deferral of Mandatory Separation of Military Technicians (Dual Status) until Age 60

This section would amend section 10216(f) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force may each implement policies to allow military technicians (dual status) who reach their mandatory separation date before age 60 the ability to apply for continued service. This section would also amend section 10218(a)(3)(A)(i) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that if a military technician (dual status) is given the opportunity to apply for continued service and is found to be qualified, the Secretary concerned may appoint the technician to another position as a military technician (dual status).

Section 514—Modification of Eligibility for Consideration for Promotion for Reserve Officers Employed as Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would remove from promotion eligibility those Reserve officers of the Army and Air Force employed as dual status military technicians who had been retained on the Reserve Active-status list beyond the mandatory removal date normally required after reaching their maximum number of years of service.

SUBTITLE C—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

Section 521—Findings regarding Unique Nature, Demands, and Hardships of Military Service

This section would state the findings of Congress with regard to the nature, demands, and hardships of military service. This section would state that there is no constitutional right to serve in the military; military operations often require extraordinary sacrifices, to include the ultimate sacrifice; successful units are characterized by high morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion; military living and working conditions are often Spartan and primitive characterized by forced intimacy and little privacy; and the Armed Forces must maintain policies that allow for recruiting of persons who can be expected to maintain the high standards for morale, good order and discipline, and unit cohesion.

Section 522—Policy Addressing Dwell Time and Measurement and Data Collection regarding Unit Operating Tempo and Personnel Tempo

This section would amend section 991 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy that addresses dwell time for members of the Armed Forces. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish a system for tracking and recording the number of days each member of the Armed Forces is deployed, prescribe policies and procedures for measuring operating tempo and personnel tempo, and maintain a central data collection repository to provide information for research, analysis, interagency reporting, and evaluation of programs and policies. This section would define the term "dwell time".

Section 523—Authorized Leave Available for Members of the Armed Forces Upon Birth or Adoption of a Child

This section would increase the number of days of non-chargeable leave from 21 to 42 that a service member may be granted following adoption of a child, if the service member is the primary caregiver of the child. The section would also provide that the other service member of a dual military couple may also be awarded 10 days of non-chargeable leave that may be taken at the same time as the primary caregiver is on adoption leave. This section would bring the adoption leave authority in line with the non-chargeable leave provided to service members who delivered a newborn child and dual military couples who were able to conceive a child naturally.

Section 524—Extension of Authority To Conduct Programs on Career Flexibility To Enhance Retention of Members of the Armed Forces

This section would extend from December 31, 2012, to December 31, 2015, the authority for the Secretaries of the military departments to inactivate service members from active duty in order to allow them to meet personal or professional needs and return them to active duty following the period of inactivation.

Section 525—Policy on Military Recruitment and Enlistment of Graduates of Secondary Schools

This section would require a secretary of the military department to treat persons who receive a diploma from a legally operating secondary school or otherwise completes a program of secondary education in compliance with the education laws of the State in which the person resides the same as a person who receives a diploma from a secondary school, as defined by section 7801 of title 20, United States Code. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy on recruitment and enlistment that incorporates following: (1) Means for identifying qualified persons to enlist; (2) Means for assessing how qualified persons fulfill their enlistment obligation; and (3) Means for maintaining data by each diploma source which can be used to analyze attrition rates. As a part of the policy, this section would require the Secretary of each military department to develop a recruitment plan that includes a

marketing strategy for potential recruits with all types of secondary educations credentials, and to develop a communication plan to ensure the policy and recruitment plan are understood by military recruiters.

The committee understands the Department of Defense's current recruiting policy is based on attrition data rather than secondary education diploma source. The committee believes the current policy needs to be revised to account for both the increasing numbers and the quality of alternative delivery methods of secondary education content, such as charter schools, online high schools, homeschooling, and hybrid schools. The committee also recognizes and encourages the Department of Defense, as well as the military services to continue to develop assessments and tools to better predict performance, behaviors, and attitudes in order to minimize attrition.

Section 526—Navy Recruiting and Advertising

This section would add $983,000 to Operations and Maintenance, Navy, Line 440 for Recruiting and Advertising for the professional development of youths, ages 11 to 17, to promote interest and skill in seamanship and aviation while instilling qualities that mold strong moral character.

SUBTITLE D—MILITARY JUSTICE AND LEGAL MATTERS

Section 531—Procedures for Judicial Review of Military Personnel Decisions Relating To Correction of Military Records

This section would establish guidelines for judicial review of decisions by the boards for correction of military records operated by the Secretaries of the military departments. The guidelines would ensure that boards for correction of military records issue concise written statements that consist of the factual and legal basis for decisions that deny requested actions, along with a statement of the procedures and timing associated with seeking a judicial review. Further, the guidelines would require that judicial review be pursued within 1 year of a final decision by a board for correction of military records. The guidelines would also ensure that service members seek review of their issues in the most efficient manner possible that reduces costs for both the individual and the Government.

Section 532—Clarification of Application and Extent of Direct Acceptance of Gifts Authority

This section would expand the eligibility of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense to receive gifts from nonprofit organizations, private parties, and other sources outside the Department of Defense. The expansion would make eligible all members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat operation or a combat zone designated by the Secretary of Defense. Under current law, only those persons with a combat-related injury are eligible. This section would also require that the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense would apply retroactively to injuries and illnesses incurred on or after September 11, 2001.

Section 533—Additional Condition on Repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell Policy

This section would amend the Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–321) to require the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees their written certification that repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell law specified in section 654 of title 10, United States Code, will not degrade the readiness, effectiveness, cohesion, and morale of combat arms units and personnel of their respective armed force that are engaged in combat, deployed to a combat theater, or preparing for deployment to a combat theater.

Section 534—Military Regulations Regarding Marriage

This section would affirm the policy of section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (1 U.S.C. 7) that the word "marriage" included in any ruling, regulation, or interpretation of the Department of Defense applicable to a service member or civilian employee of the Department of Defense shall mean only a legal union between one man and one woman.

Section 535—Use of Military Installations as Site for Marriage Ceremonies and Participation of Chaplains and Other Military and Civilian Personnel in Their Official Capacity

This section would establish that marriages performed on DOD installations or marriages involving the participation of DOD military or civilian personnel in an official capacity, to include chaplains, must comply with the Defense of Marriage Act (1 U.S.C. 7), which defines marriage as only the legal union between one man and one woman.

SUBTITLE E—MEMBER EDUCATION AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES AND ADMINISTRATION

Section 541—Improved Access to Apprenticeship Programs for Members of the Armed Forces who Are Being Separated from Active Duty or Retired

This section would amend section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the secretary concerned to permit a member of the Armed Forces to participate in an apprenticeship program that provides employment skills training and assists them in transitioning into new careers in civilian life.

Section 542—Expansion of Reserve Health Professionals Stipend Program To Include Students in Mental Health Degree Programs in Critical Wartime Specialties

This section would expand the categories of health professional students eligible to receive a stipend to include students enrolled in an institution in a course of study that results in a degree in clinical psychology or social work.

Section 543—Administration of United States Air Force Institute of Technology

This section would amend chapter 901 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section establishing a position of commandant of the United States Air Force Institute of Technology who is either an active duty officer of the Air Force in a grade not below the grade of colonel or a civilian who was retired from the Air Force in the grade not below the grade of brigadier general. This section would also establish a position of Provost and Academic Dean at the United States Air Force Institute of Technology.

Section 544—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by the Governor of Puerto Rico

This section would amend section 4342(a)(7) of title 10, United States Code, to increase the number of nominations to the military service academies by the Governor of Puerto Rico from 1 to 3.

Section 545—Temporary Authority To Wave Maximum Age Limitation on Admission to United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, and United States Air Force Academy

This section would authorize the secretary of a military department to waive the maximum age limitation for admission to a military service academy from 23 to 26 for an otherwise qualified candidate. The candidate must be either (a) an enlisted member of the Armed Forces who was prevented from being admitted to a military service academy before they reached the maximum age as a result of service in a theater of operation for Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, or Operation New Dawn; or (b) a candidate who possess an exceptional record that sets them apart from other candidates, as determined by the secretary concerned. This section would limit the number of candidates admitted to each academy under this waiver authority to five per academic year. The Secretary of each military department shall track the number of graduates using this waiver authority who remain in the Armed Forces beyond the active duty service obligation. This section would require the secretary concerned is required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2016, that displays the number of applications for waivers, the number of waivers granted by the secretary, the number admitted to the academy utilizing the waiver, and the number of graduates who were enlisted prior to admission to an academy that have remained in the service past their active duty service obligation, beginning with the class of 2009.

Section 546—Education and Employment Advocacy Program for Wounded Members of the Armed Forces

This section would add $15,000,000 to Operations and Maintenance, Defense Wide, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Line 260 for the purpose of an Education and Employment Advocacy pilot program to engage Wounded Warriors early in their recovery.

SUBTITLE F—ARMY NATIONAL MILITARY CEMETERIES

Section 551—Army National Military Cemeteries

This section would establish the general authority of the Secretary of the Army to develop, operate, manage, administer, oversee, and fund the Army National Military Cemeteries, consisting of Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia, and the U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home National Cemetery, District of Columbia, in a manner and to standards that fully honor the service and sacrifices of the deceased members of the Armed Forces whose last resting places are in the respective cemeteries. This section would require the Secretary to promulgate regulations and policies for the Army National Military Cemeteries, to include eligibility for interment and inurnment, and mandate that annual budget requests for the cemeteries be provided to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. In promulgating eligibility regulations for interments and inurnments, the Secretary should ensure that they are consistent with the relevant provisions of title 38, United States Code. This section would place the cemeteries under the direct jurisdiction of Headquarters, Department of the Army, and authorize the position and set forth the responsibilities of the Executive Director of the cemeteries, who would report directly to the Secretary of the Army. This section would also require that by 1 June 2012 there be an operational electronic database at Arlington National Cemetery for recordkeeping and full accounting of all records of each specific gravesite and niche location at that cemetery and the identification of the individual interred or inurned at each specific gravesite and niche location. This section would also specify the qualifications, duties, and supervisory chain for the superintendents of the respective cemeteries. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of the Army to appoint an Advisory Committee on Arlington National Cemetery to provide periodic consultation and advice on the administration of Arlington National Cemetery, as well as on the erection of memorials and master planning for the cemetery. The committee urges the Secretary to include a representative from the National Cemetery Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, as a member of the Advisory Committee to facilitate consistency and enable best practices to be interchanged. Finally, this section would require not only the Secretary of the Army to periodically inspect the cemeteries, but would also direct the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to inspect the cemeteries during fiscal years 2012 and 2014. The Secretary would be required to provide the congressional defense committees a plan for corrective actions not later than 120 days following any inspection directed by the Secretary or conducted by the Inspector General.

Section 552—Inspector General of the Department of Defense Inspection of Military Cemeteries

This section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to inspect the cemeteries at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, and the United States Air Force Academy to determine: the adequacy of

and adherence to the statutes, policies, and regulations governing those cemeteries; the adequacy of the system employed to fully account for and accurately identify the remains interred or inurned in each; the history and adequacy of the oversight efforts of the Secretaries of the military departments who have jurisdiction for these cemeteries; and other matters. This section would also require the Inspector General to follow-up on that part of the 2010 report of the special inspection of Arlington National Cemetery pertaining to the Soldiers' and Airmen's National Cemetery. The follow-up inspection would be to determine whether the Secretary of the Army has fully and completely addressed the issues raised and the recommendations made in the 2010 report. This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2012, on the findings and recommendations of the inspection of their respective cemeteries, together with a plan for corrective action. Finally, this section would require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to inspect a statistically valid sample of the other cemeteries, both inside and outside the United States, that are under the jurisdiction of the Secretaries of the military departments. The purpose would be to assess the adequacy of and adherence to the statutes, policies, and regulations governing the management, oversight, operations, and interments and inurnments by those cemeteries. This section would also require the Inspector General to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2012, on the findings of these inspections, and then the Secretaries of the military services would be required to submit a plan for corrective actions to the same committees by April 1, 2013.

SUBTITLE G—ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

Section 561—Control and Administration by Secretary of Defense

This section would establish that the administration of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, to include the provision of health care and medical care for the residents, is a responsibility of the Secretary of Defense.

Section 562—Senior Medical Advisor Oversight of Health Care Provided to Residents of Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would clarify the oversight responsibilities and reporting requirements of the Senior Medical Advisor with regard to the health care provided to the residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Section 563—Establishment of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Advisory Council and Resident Advisory Committees

This section would establish one Armed Forces Retirement Home Advisory Council, replacing the local boards established for each of the two facilities of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. This section would specify the required expertise of the members of the advisory council and require the Secretary of Defense to designate a member to be the chairperson of the advisory council, who would

be responsible for the operation of the council. This section also would require resident advisory committees at each facility of the Armed Forces Retirement Home. These committees, consisting of residents elected by the residents of each facility, would serve as a forum for ideas, recommendations, and issues to be discussed with the management of each facility.

Section 564—Administrators, Ombudsmen, and Staff of Facilities

This section would eliminate the positions of deputy director and associate director in each facility and establish the position of ombudsman. The ombudsman of each facility would have the authority to communicate with the administrator of the facility, the Chief Operating Officer of the Retirement Home, the Senior Medical Advisor, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. This section also would make a technical change in the title of the person responsible for the operations of each facility of the Armed Forces Retirement Home from "Director" to "Administrator".

Section 565—Revision of Fee Requirements

This section would repeal the obsolete transitional fee requirements for the Armed Forces Retirement Home and establish permanent fee requirements.

Section 566—Revision of Inspection Requirements

This section would revise the interval of inspections that the Inspector General of the Department of Defense would be required to make of each facility of the Armed Forces Retirement Home from annually to not less often than every 3 years. This section also would clarify requirements for reporting and corrective actions.

Section 567—Repeal of Obsolete Transitional Provisions and Technical, Conforming, and Clerical Amendments

This section would clarify that former members of the Coast Guard are eligible to be residents of the Armed Forces Retirement Home and that senior personnel officer and senior enlisted members of the Coast Guard are eligible to serve on the Armed Forces Retirement Home Advisory Council. This section also would repeal obsolete transitional provisions enacted as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), and make technical, conforming and clerical amendments.

SUBTITLE H—MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS

Section 571—Revision to Membership of Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council

This section would clarify the appointment options for family member representatives serving on the Department of Defense Military Family Readiness Council to include parents of members of the military services and would further designate Reserve Component representation on the council.

Section 572—Continuation of Authority To Assist Local Educational Agencies that Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would provide $30.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that have military dependent students comprising at least 20 percent of the students in average daily attendance per year. The section would also provide $10.0 million for assistance to local educational agencies that experience significant increases and decreases in the average daily attendance of military dependent students due to the military force structure changes, the relocation of military forces from one base to another, and from base closures and realignments.

Section 573—Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents who Are Members of the Armed Forces

This section would amend title 2 of the Service Members Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. app. 521) to require a court that issued a temporary custody order based solely on a service member being deployed or anticipating deployment to reinstate the custody order that was in effect immediately preceding the temporary order unless the court finds reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child. This section would also prohibit courts from using deployment or the possibility of deployment against a service member when determining the best interest of a child.

Section 574—Center for Military Family and Community Outreach

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a Center for Military Family and Community Outreach in cooperation with an historically black university to train social work students, social work faculty members and social workers to understand military life and enhance their competencies in providing services to military families.

This section would also add $1,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Army to establish a Center for Military Family and Community Outreach.

Section 575—Mental Health Support for Military Personnel and Families

This section would add $3,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps for a collaborative program to train active duty military personnel to recognize combat stress disorder, suicide risk, substance addiction, risk-taking behaviors and family violence.

Section 576—Report on Department of Defense Autism Pilot Projects

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on any pilot projects that the Department of Defense is conducting on autism services to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

SUBTITLE I—IMPROVED SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION AND RESPONSE IN THE ARMED FORCES

Section 581—Director of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office

This section would require that the director of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office be a general or flag officer or an employee of the Department of Defense in a comparable senior executive service position.

Section 582—Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates

This section would require a full time Sexual Assault Response Coordinator and a full time Sexual Assault Victim Advocate be assigned to each brigade or equivalent unit level of the armed forces. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish a training and certification program for Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates.

This section would also add $45,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance for Defense Wide Activities for Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates and sexual assault prevention training and education, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 583—Sexual Assault Victims Access to Legal Counsel and Services of Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates

This section would entitle a member of the Armed Forces who is the victim of a sexual assault to legal assistance provided by a military legal assistance counsel who is certified as competent to provide such duties and assistance provided by a qualified Sexual Assault Victim Advocate. This section would also entitle a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces who is the victim of a sexual assault and resides on or in the vicinity of a military installation, to the extent practicable, legal assistance provided by a military legal assistance counsel who is certified as competent to provide such duties as well as assistance provided by a qualified Sexual Assault Victim Advocate. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to implement a Sexual Assault Response Coordinator-led process by which a member or dependent who is the victim of a sexual assault may decline to participate in the investigation of the sexual assault.

Section 584—Privilege in Cases Arising Under Uniform Code of Military Justice Against Disclosure of Communications Between Sexual Assault Victims and Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, Victim Advocates and Certain Other Persons

This section would create a confidentiality privilege in military tribunals for communication between sexual assault victims and Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, Sexual Assault Victims Advocates, and DOD SAFE Help line personnel.

Section 585—Maintenance of Records Prepared in Connection with Sexual Assaults Involving Members of the Armed Forces or Dependents of Members

This section would require the Department of Defense to maintain records relating to sexual assault involving members of the Armed Forces or their dependents for not less than 100 years and provide the victim permanent access to the records maintained by the Department. In addition, this section would require that the victim be provided a copy of the court-martial proceedings in certain circumstances.

Section 586—Expedited Consideration and Priority for Application for Consideration of a Permanent Change of Station or Unit Transfer Based on Humanitarian Conditions for Victim of Sexual Assault

This section would require the secretary concerned to expedite the consideration and approval of an application for a permanent change of station or unit transfer submitted by a member of the Armed Forces who is a victim of sexual assault.

Section 587—Training and Education Programs for Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program

This section would require the Secretary of each military department to provide sexual assault training and education for members of the armed forces at each level of professional military education. This section would also require sexual assault training and education for civilian employees.

This section would also add $45,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance for Defense Wide Activities for Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Sexual Assault Victim Advocates and sexual assault prevention training and education, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

SUBTITLE J—OTHER MATTERS

Section 591—Limitations on Authority To Provide Support and Services for Certain Organizations and Activities Outside Department of Defense

This section would amend section 2012 of title 10, United States Code, to require the service secretary concerned to request funds for projects under this authority in the annual budget submission to Congress. This section also would limit the annual obligation of funds to $10.0 million, beginning in fiscal year 2012. The heavy reliance on the Reserve Component over the past 10 years has reduced the need for sustainment training requirements of the Reserve Component.

Section 592—Display of State, District of Columbia, and Territorial Flags by Armed Forces

This section would amend section 2249b of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new subsection requiring the Secretary of Defense to ensure that whenever the official flags of all 50 states are

displayed by the armed forces, the flags of the District of Columbia and the territories of the United States shall also be displayed.

Section 593—Military Adaptive Sports Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a military adaptive sports program to provide adaptive sports programs to eligible wounded and injured members of the Armed Forces.

Section 594—Wounded Warrior Careers Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a career-development program with the Education and Employment Initiative for severely wounded warriors of the armed forces and their spouses. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees plans for a cost-benefit analysis of the results of the services provided to severely wounded warriors and their families.

This section would add $1,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide to carry out a career program for severely wounded warriors and their families.

Section 595—Comptroller General Study of Military Necessity of Selective Service System and Alternatives

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to study the criticality of the Selective Service System to the Department of Defense in meeting future manpower needs of the Armed Forces that are in excess of the ability of an all-volunteer force to provide and to determine the fiscal and national security impacts of disestablishing the Selective Service System. In addition, the section would require the study to assess alternatives to disestablishing the Selective Service System, as well as alternatives to registration for Selective Service. The Comptroller General's report of the study would be due not later than March 31, 2012, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

Section 596—Sense of Congress Regarding Playing of Bugle Call Commonly Known as "Taps" at Military Funerals, Memorial Services and Wreath Laying Ceremonies

This section expresses the sense of Congress that the bulge call known as Taps should be sounded by a live solo bugler at a military funeral, memorial service or wreath laying ceremonies.

Section 597—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Yellow Ribbon Day

This section would provide a sense of Congress supporting the goals and ideals of Yellow Ribbon Day in honor of members of the Armed Forces who are serving overseas apart from their families and loved ones.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to believe that robust and flexible compensation programs are central to maintaining a high quality, combat ready force. Accordingly, the committee recommends an across-the-board pay raise of 1.6 percent to ensure that military pay rates keep pace with pay raise levels in the private sector, as measured by the Employment Cost Index. The committee recommends that the authorities for a wide array of bonuses, special and incentive pays, and other compensation benefits set to expire on December 31, 2011, be extended for an additional year.

The committee also recommends a series of provisions that would consolidate and simplify travel and transportation authorities to enhance the utility, flexibility, efficiency, and relevancy of the law in response to a complex and changing travel and transportation environment.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Commissary and Exchange Privileges for Non-Department of Defense Federal Employees Overseas

The committee is aware of interest in extending shopping privileges at military commissaries and exchanges to non-Department of Defense (DOD) government agency employees serving at locations outside the United States, and particularly those serving in U.S. territories and possessions (the territory of Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, the territory of American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands). The committee recognizes that current policies generally restrict the access of non-DOD employees serving outside the United States. The committee understands that the limited exceptions to the rule are confined to employees serving at the location outside the United States on transportation agreements as defined in 41 CFR 302–2.12. The committee believes that it may be cost efficient and in the best interests of U.S. missions outside the United States for all Federal employees to have access to available military commissaries and exchanges when the employee's agency reimburses the cost of extending such privileges to the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2012, on the feasibility, propriety, and cost of a proposal for non-DOD Federal agencies to reimburse the Department of Defense for the cost of extending commissary and exchange privileges to employees of the agency serving outside the United States on transportation agreements.

Consolidation of Disability Evaluation System

The committee is encouraged by the initial feedback that the Department of Defense Integrated Disability Evaluation System has reduced the time required to deliver benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs to wounded warriors. However, the committee

remains concerned that service members with similar disabilities are receiving disparate disability ratings because of different standards, policies, and procedures used by the Physical Evaluation Boards operated by the military departments. The committee believes that achieving consistent disability ratings regardless of service is an important objective that will ensure service members are treated equitably. The committee believes that one method for ensuring such consistent outcomes is to operate a consolidated disability evaluation system within the Department of Defense. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2012, on the feasibility, propriety, cost, and recommended legislation to implement such a consolidated disability evaluation system, if the Secretary determines that recommended legislation is appropriate and necessary.

Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act

The committee recognizes that the members of the Armed Forces and their families endure many financial hardships as a result of the intense operations tempo required to support ongoing military operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee believes that one of the most important benefits military families receive is the savings provided by the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA), the military exchanges, and other nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces. The committee notes that the implementation of the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–222) requires a 3-percent withholding tax to be collected from contractors doing business with the Government. The committee understands that one of the major consequences of the implementation of the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 will be higher prices that manufacturers will charge for goods sold to all nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces to help offset the 3-percent withholding tax.

The committee remains convinced that the Secretary of the Treasury, through the resources of the Internal Revenue Service, has the ability to certify that the limited number of manufacturers that customarily contract with nonappropriated fund instrumentalities are not delinquent in paying taxes. The committee believes that the judicious use of the Internal Revenue Service's capability to determine the tax status of manufacturers can be used to exempt DeCA, the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, the Navy Exchange Service Command, the Marine Corps Exchange, the Veterans Canteen Service, the Coast Guard Exchange Service, and all morale, welfare, and recreation nonappropriated fund instrumentalities from the requirement to implement the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 without a loss of revenue to the U.S. Government.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Fiscal Year 2012 Increase in Military Basic Pay

This section would increase basic pay for members of the uniform services by 1.6 percent, effective January 1, 2012. This raise would match the pay raise rate in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index.

Section 602—Resumption of Authority To Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances

This section would extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the basic allowance for housing rates in an area where the housing market has been disrupted by one or more bases experiencing significant growth in assigned military personnel or a major disaster until December 31, 2012.

Section 603—Lodging Accommodations for Members Assigned to Duty in Connection with Commissioning or Fitting Out of a Ship

This section would expand the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to provide lodging or compensation for housing to enlisted service members when such members are deprived of their quarters onboard ships that are under construction or repair. This section would provide the Secretary special authority for compensation of service members deprived of their quarters onboard a ship under construction at shipyards affected by the Base Realignment and Closure 2005 activities, specifying the shipyard at Pascagoula, Mississippi, and Bath, Maine.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority for the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, and income replacement payments for Reserve Component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service until December 31, 2012.

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, the accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, the incentive special pay for nurse an-

esthetists, the special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties until December 31, 2012.

Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending a period of active service, nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until December 31, 2012.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend the authority for the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, the special bonus and incentive pay authority for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities, the special health professions incentive pay and bonus authorities, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high-priority units until December 31, 2012.

Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between Armed Forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates until December 31, 2012.

Section 616—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Referral Bonuses

This section would extend the authority for the health professions referral bonus and the Army referral bonus until December 31, 2012.

SUBTITLE C—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES GENERALLY

Section 621—One-Year Extension of Authority To Reimburse Travel Expenses for Inactive-Duty Training outside of Normal Commuting Distance

This section would extend the authority for the secretary concerned to reimburse members of the Selected Reserve for travel expenses resulting from inactive-duty training when the location of

the training is outside normal commuting distance from the member's permanent residence until December 31, 2012.

Section 622—Mandatory Provision of Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants for Seriously Ill and Wounded Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretaries concerned to provide non-medical attendants a per diem allowance or reimbursement for the actual and necessary expenses of the travel, or a combination of the two, to support their travel when performing non-medical attendant duties. This section would result in the addition of a new budget item to section 4401 of division D relating to military personnel accounts for non-medical attendant per diem in the amount of $20,000,000.

SUBTITLE D—CONSOLIDATION AND REFORM OF TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITIES

Section 631—Purpose

This section would define the purpose of this subtitle is to consolidate and reform travel and transportation authorities in chapter 8 of title 37, United States Code, as required to address the complexities and changing nature of travel. This section would state that this initiative would meet mission needs and the needs of the members of the uniformed services by providing the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries concerned the authority to prescribe and implement travel and transportation policy that is simple, efficient, relevant, and flexible.

Section 632—Consolidation and Reform of Travel and Transportation Authorities of the Uniformed Services

This section would provide the definitions, the general authorities, and, where required, more specific authorities that would be the guidelines used by the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries concerned to prescribe travel and transportation programs. This section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct pilot programs to test alternative methods for performing and reimbursing travel, for limiting the need for travel, and for reducing the environmental impact of travel. This section would also provide administrative guidelines for implementing the reform initiative, to include the need to issue regulations.

Section 633—Old-Law Travel and Transportation Authorities Transition Expiration Date and Transfer of Current Sections

This section would transfer 32 existing travel and transportation authorities from chapter 7 of Title 37, United States Code, to chapter 8 of title 37, and redesignate each section with a new number.

Section 634—Addition of Sunset Provision to Old-Law Travel and Transportation Authorities

This section would amend each of the redesignated sections that would be installed in chapter 8 of title 37, United States Code, to reflect the existence of a transition expiration date by which the

Secretary of Defense would be required to terminate use of the authorities provided within those sections.

Section 635—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make the technical and clerical amendments necessary to facilitate the transfer of the redesignated sections from chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code to chapter 8 of title 37.

Section 636—Transition Provisions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to transition all travel and transportation programs to operate under the authorities provided in the consolidation and reform authorities provided in subchapter I and subchapter II of chapter 8 of title 37, United States Code. This section would also provide the Secretary of Defense and the secretaries concerned the authority to modify current law to facilitate the transition process. Finally, this section would establish a transition period termination date as the end of a 10-year period beginning on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE E—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

Section 641—Expansion of Use of Uniform Funding Authority To Include Permanent Change of Station and Temporary Duty Lodging Programs Operated Through Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities

This section would expand the use of the uniform funding authority authorized for morale, welfare, and recreation programs operated through nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to include permanent change of station and temporary duty lodging programs. This would allow the lodging facilities to consolidate and simplify their business practices and accounting systems by managing appropriated funds in accordance with the procedures, policy, and laws applicable to the expenditure of nonappropriated funds.

Section 642—Contracting Authority for Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities To Provide and Obtain Goods and Services

This section would clarify that nonappropriated fund instrumentalities may enter into single-year or multi-year contracts with another element of the Department of Defense, another Federal agency, or a private-sector agency to provide or obtain goods and services beneficial to the military community and the effective management of such instrumentalities. This section also would authorize nonappropriated fund instrumentalities to participate in partnerships with private entities to provide programs at no cost to the Government on military installations using Government facilities and other Government support resources.

Section 643—Designation of Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base as a Fisher House

This section would deem that the Fisher House for the Families of the Fallen and Meditation Pavilion at Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, shall be considered a Fisher House for all other purposes established in law with regard to Fisher Houses and Fisher Suites.

Section 644—Discretion of the Secretary of the Navy To Select Categories of Merchandise To Be Sold by Ship Stores Afloat

This section would grant the Secretary of the Navy the authority to use his discretion in determining what products will be sold by Navy ship stores.

Section 645—Access of Military Exchange Stores System to Credit Available Through Federal Financing Bank

This section would authorize the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, Navy Exchange Service Command, and Marine Corps exchanges to borrow funding for business operations from the Federal Financing Bank.

Section 646—Enhanced Commissary Stores Pilot Program

This section would authorize the Defense Commissary Service to operate an enhanced commissary store at a military installation designated for closure or adverse realignment under a base closure law. Such stores would be empowered to sell alcoholic beverages, tobacco products, and other products to be determined at prices at least 10 percent below the local community prices. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to retain profits from the sale of such goods to offset the cost of operating the enhanced commissary store. Such enhanced commissary stores would be authorized to operate between October 1, 2011 and December 31, 2013. This section would result in the addition of a new budget item to section 4501 of division D relating to Working Capital Fund for Defense Commissary Agency to support the operation of an enhanced commissary store in the amount of $2,000,000.

SUBTITLE F—DISABILITY, RETIRED PAY AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Section 651—Monthly Amount and Duration of Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance for Widows and Widowers of Deceased Members of the Armed Forces Affected by Required Survivor Benefit Plan Annuity Offset for Dependency and Indemnity Compensation

This section would increase existing monthly amounts and establish additional monthly amounts paid under the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance to surviving spouses or former spouses of deceased service members who are denied the full amount of their annuity under the Survivor Benefit Program (SBP) due to the offset required by the receipt of Dependency and Indemnity Compensation (DIC) from the Department of Veterans Affairs. The section would also extend the termination date for the Special Survivor

Annuity Allowance authority from October 1, 2017 to October 1, 2021.

This "widows' tax" has long denied surviving family members the payment of their SBP benefits earned by the service of their spouses and paid for through premium reductions to retired pay. This section would provide an incremental step in the continuing effort to eliminate the DIC offset against SBP annuities. This section would provide the following monthly amounts for the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance, to include increases through fiscal year 2017 and newly established amounts for fiscal years 2018–2021:

Fiscal year 2013 from $90 to $163;
Fiscal year 2014 from $150 to $200;
Fiscal year 2015 from $200 to $215;
Fiscal year 2016 from $275 to $282;
Fiscal year 2017 from $310 to $314;
Fiscal year 2018 set at $9;
Fiscal year 2019 set at $15;
Fiscal year 2020 set at $20; and
Fiscal year 2021 set at $27.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 661—Reimbursement of American National Red Cross for Humanitarian Support and Other Services Provided to Members of the Armed Forces and Their Dependents

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to reimburse the American National Red Cross for humanitarian support or other services approved by the Secretary that are provided to members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps and their dependents. This section would result in the addition of a new budget item to section 4301 of division D relating to operation and maintenance for Defense–wide activities for reimbursement of the American

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains committed to ensuring that members of the Armed Forces, retirees, survivors, and their families have access to quality health care. The committee understands the challenge facing the Department of Defense as the cost of health care continues to grow. The committee recognizes that there are several factors that contribute to the cost growth of the Defense Health Program including the increased cost of health care in general, the increased number of wounded and injured service members as a result of the unprecedented survival rate from wounds on the battlefield, and the congressionally mandated expansion of health care benefits that are commensurate with the service of all components of the military services. However, the committee believes that even in the face of the growing cost of military health care, the military health system must provide for medical readiness and force health protection for our men and women in uniform and ensure that all other beneficiaries receive health care services. It is imperative

that as the Nation continues to fight the global war on terrorism, the Department of Defense provides world-class health care for our wounded service members regardless of whether their wounds are physical or emotional.

Sadly, the committee notes that members of the Armed Forces, particularly in the Reserve Components, continue to struggle with mental health issues that can ultimately result in suicide. Members of the Reserve Components often reside in rural communities and may not have access to mental health care. The committee recommends legislation to expand the capacity of the military health system to provide mental health care to members of the Reserve Components at the location of the unit during scheduled unit training and to provide training on suicide prevention and response. In addition, the committee recommends that the Department undertake several projects that would further advance the knowledge and understanding of traumatic brain injury and combat related mental health issues to enhance the care provided to members of the Armed Forces.

The committee is concerned that when the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs pursue joint or combined health care operations, an insufficient amount of joint strategic analysis and planning is done. The committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress addressing architecture to guide the transition for future projects among other information regarding the Department of Defense process before funds may be expended for future electronic health records.

Finally, for the past few years, Congress has encouraged the Department of Defense to improve the health status of the beneficiary population and improve the cost-effectiveness of the care provided to beneficiaries by adopting proven practices. The committee notes that the designated providers, a series of health plans that have been part of the Military Health System for 30 years, have a proven record of excellence in disease management and prevention initiatives that improve health outcomes and satisfaction for military beneficiaries. The committee urges the Department to use this program as a model for strengthening and improving the heath status of military beneficiaries.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Automated Patient Management System for Air Evacuation

The Committee remains committed to military medical research to further enhance the survivability of wounded and injured servicemembers during transport from a combat theater to definitive medical care. The Committee is aware that the Department of Defense has gained enormous experience in providing a seamless continuum of critical care to injured warfighters, creating a model used worldwide for damage control and intensive care. This care may begin on the battlefield, extend through air transport to intermediate care centers such as Landstuhl Army Medical Center in Germany, and culminate in the continental United States. The Committee understands the challenges encountered while ensuring optimal resuscitation are numerous, particularly in regard to curtailing the progression of shock and providing timely counter-

measures to minimize further complications. The Committee urges the Department of Defense to continue efforts to develop an automated feedback loop resuscitation platform with the end goal of providing automated, optimal resuscitation during medical air evacuation.

Clarification on Competition for Medical Research Consultation and Education

The committee is aware of concern regarding section 178 of title 10, United States Code, which provides a special status relationship between a non-profit organization and the Department of Defense. The committee understands that this special status only applies to cooperative agreements with the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. Other military health system medical research, consultation, and education activities should be conducted under competitive procedures. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the current processes and procedures of the various military health systems to ensure that fair and open competition for medical research, consultation, and education are being conducted, and submit a report on the results of the review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2012.

Clinical Social Workers

The committee remains concerned about the increasing number of service members and their families who require mental health services. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense and the military services employ several methods to recruit, retain, and train mental health professionals to provide the necessary mental health care. In particular, the committee understands that clinically-trained social workers are uniquely qualified to address the mental health needs of individuals and families. The committee encourages the Department and the military services to continue to explore strategies to rapidly increase the number of mental health professionals, including clinically-trained social workers. The committee further encourages the Department and the military services to explore the possibility of collaborative programs with educational institutions to train mental health professionals.

Cost Share for Acute Care Prescriptions under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program

The Committee is concerned that the Department of Defense proposal to increase the cost share for prescriptions at retail pharmacies will affect the ability of TRICARE beneficiaries, particularly those who live in areas distant from a military treatment facility, to receive prescriptions needed for acute medical conditions in the medically necessary timeframe. The Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of maintaining the same cost share for the initial dispensing of acute care medications filled outside of a military treatment facility as if it were dispensed through the TRICARE Mail Order Pharmacy. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the findings and recommendations by March 30, 2012.

Expansion of Spinal Cord Injury Research Program

The committee recognizes spinal cord injuries are a serious combat-related condition affecting our servicemembers in Iraq and Afghanistan. Congress established the Spinal Cord Injury Research Program in 2009 (Public Law 110–329) to support research into regenerating and repairing damaged spinal cords and improving rehabilitation therapies. Much of this research has focused on the acute-phase of spinal cord injuries, but more work must be done on the regeneration of chronic spinal cord injuries.

The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to foster research relating to developing treatments that could be applied during the chronic post-injury period of a spinal cord injury event, in addition to research currently being conducted on acute injuries.

Mental Health and Traumatic Brain Injury

The committee continues to support the national effort to identify and treat post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury occurring in members of the Armed Forces as a result of combat. The committee is aware of the challenges the Department of Defense continues to face in providing mental health care to service members and their families, as well as diagnosing and treating traumatic brain injury. The committee notes the diverse range of evolving concepts and technologies from the Nation's academic, scientific, and public health base that directly relate to mental health and traumatic brain injury. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to complete within 6 years after the date of enactment of this Act the following:

(1) A 5-year pilot program under which the Secretary of Defense should establish a process to provide payment for any treatments demonstrated to be effective, including diagnostic testing of traumatic brain injury or post-traumatic stress disorder received by members of the Armed Forces in health care facilities other than military treatment facilities.

(2) A neurophotonics program to develop tools for understanding, diagnosing, and treating traumatic brain injury and chronic traumatic encephalopathy.

(3) A program to use mindfulness-based cognitive skills training to help service members cope with stress and provide greater cognitive resources to improve adaptive functioning during deployment.

(4) A program to train behavioral health professionals within the military health system to use biofeedback and other exposure therapies to treat service members with post-traumatic stress disorder and related anxiety disorders.

Orthopedic Research for Extremity Injury

The committee is aware of the increasing number and constantly evolving nature of blast injuries as a result of current military operations. The committee understands that technologies for treating blast-related battle injuries affecting the extremities continue to advance the care of these injuries. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to invest in orthopedic research to provide military medical providers with the cutting-edge tools and technologies needed to treat injured service members.

Physical Rehabilitation of Wounded Warriors

The committee commends the Department of Defense for continuing to advance the treatment and rehabilitation of wounded warriors. The committee notes that the Department has been a leader in identifying innovative devices and technologies that assist in rehabilitating wounded and injured service members and ultimately help improve their lives and the well being of the troops. Further, the committee is aware that treating wounded and injured service members with physical therapy is a critical component of a comprehensive medical treatment plan. As such, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to investigate new and emerging medical physical therapy devices and technologies that could be used to improve the rehabilitation of wounded warriors.

Recommendations for Cost Savings Under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program

The committee is committed to partnering with the Department of Defense to reduce the cost of prescription drugs under the TRICARE Pharmacy Program. The committee understands that increasing use of generic drugs will reduce cost due to the substantial difference in price between brand and generic drugs. For the same drug product, generic drugs on average cost 20 percent less than the price of brand drugs. Additionally, the committee notes that a number of high-use drugs are coming off patent in the next 2 years, increasing the opportunity for more cost-savings. Therefore, the committee urges the Department to raise its generic drug dispensing rate.

Use of Simulation Technology in Medical Training

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense currently supplements combat trauma training with the use of live animals, known as "live tissue training", when no suitable simulation technology or alternative exists. The committee notes that this advanced training has contributed directly to the high survival rate for combat wounded service members, which has increased significantly compared to survival rates in past conflicts. According to the Department, simulators currently lack sufficient realism and the ability to replicate combat wounds and the associated emotional stressors combat medics face on the battlefield. In addition, simulators require rigorous verification and validation, which can only be achieved through empirical data collection. The committee also notes that the Department's use of live tissue training is strictly regulated by a number of Federal laws and policies, and is accredited by the Association for the Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, an international non-profit organization that promotes the humane use of animals in science.

On September 5, 2008, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics established the Use of Live Animals in Medical Education and Training Joint Analysis Team (ULAMET JAT) to address the use of live animals for DOD medical readiness training. ULAMET JAT, in its final report, found that several critical, high stakes medical procedures cannot be taught at present using simulation, including the treatment of certain penetrating chest wounds, amputation, and hemostasis. ULAMET JAT

further noted in its final report that "live animal training is the singular opportunity to experience management of injuries in a living system prior to deployment to a combat zone. The next opportunity to use these skills very likely will be treating combat wounded." ULAMET JAT's final report also made nine recommendations related to the Department's policies on the use of animals in combat trauma training and plans to validate and adopt alternatives as they become viable, including simulation technologies.

The committee believes that the use of animals in combat trauma training remains appropriate for critical, high-risk medical procedures, until such time that alternatives are developed, to provide combat medics an equal or better training experience that more closely replicates the combat wounds and emotional stressors encountered on the battlefield. However, the committee believes that the Department should continue to aggressively pursue alternatives to the use of live animals in combat trauma training.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to finalize and implement a strategy for the development of future technology to further refine, reduce, and replace the use of live animals in medical education and training. This implementation strategy should leverage the Department's science and technology and research, development, testing, and evaluation organizations, as well as private industry, to develop additional advanced training simulators and training aids, including animal-alternative training, to offer the most realistic, practical, transferable, and cost-effective training to all medical personnel. The Secretary is further directed to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on this implementation strategy and the status of the recommendations contained within ULAMET JAT's final report.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—IMPROVEMENTS TO HEALTH BENEFITS

Section 701—Annual Enrollment Fees for Certain Retirees and Dependents

This section would express the sense of Congress that career members of the uniformed services and their families make extraordinary sacrifices to protect freedom for all Americans and that those sacrifices constitute pre-payment for health care during retirement. This section would also limit any annual increase in TRICARE Prime enrollment fees to the amount equal to the percentage by which retiree pay is increased beginning October 1, 2012.

Section 702—Provision of Food to Certain Members and Dependents Not Receiving Inpatient Care in Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide food and beverages at no cost to certain individuals receiving outpatient medical care at a military treatment facility, or is a family member providing care to an infant receiving inpatient medical care at a military treatment facility.

Section 703—Behavioral Health Support for Members of the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide access to mental health assessments to members of the Reserve Components during scheduled unit training and assemblies. In addition, the Secretary would be required to provide psychological health programs and training on suicide prevention and post-suicide response.

Section 704—Transition Enrollment of Uniformed Services Family Health Plan Medicare-Eligible Retirees to TRICARE for Life

This section would prohibit a Medicare eligible military retiree from enrolling in the managed care program of a designated provider after September 30, 2012.

SUBTITLE B—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

Section 711—Unified Medical Command

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a unified medical command to provide medical services to the Armed Forces and other health care beneficiaries of the Department of Defense as defined in chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code. This section would also require the Secretary to develop a comprehensive plan to establish a unified medical command.

Section 712—Limitation on Availability of Funds for the Future Electronic Health Records Program

This section would limit the amount of funds the Secretary of Defense may obligate or expend for future electronic health programs until 30 days after the date that the Secretary submits a report to the congressional defense committees that addresses: the architecture to guide the transition of the electronic health records of the Department of Defense to a future state that is cost-effective and interoperable; a process for selecting investments in information technology; the report required by section 715 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383); and the effectiveness of the Interagency Program Office.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 721—Review of Women-Specific Health Services and Treatment for Female Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review on the availability, efficacy, and adequacy of health care services for female members of the Armed Forces. The results of the review shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2012.

Section 722—Comptroller General Reviews of Department of Defense–Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Project

This section would reduce the frequency of reviews conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States as required by section 1701 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 723—Comptroller General Report on Contracted Health Care Staffing for Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the contracting practices used by the military departments to provide health care professional services to members of the Armed Forces, dependents, and retirees. The Comptroller General is required to submit the findings of this review to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2013.

Section 724—Treatment of Wounded Warriors

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, for rapid clinical evaluation and deployment of novel treatment strategies for wounded service members with an emphasis on musculo-skeletal injuries.

Section 725—Cooperative Health Care Agreements

This section would add $500,000 to the Defense Health Program for cooperative health care agreements between military installations and local or regional health care systems.

Section 726—Prostate Cancer Imaging Research Initiative

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense Health Program for prostate cancer imaging research.

Section 727—Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury

This section would add $2,000,000 to the Defense Health Program for the Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury to enhance efforts to disseminate post-deployment mental health information.

Section 728—Collaborative Military-Civilian Trauma Training Programs

This section would add $3,000,000 to the Defense Health Program for collaborative military-civilian trauma training programs between military installations and local or regional health care systems.

Section 729—Traumatic Brain Injury

This section would add $1,000,000 to the Defense Health Program to develop national medical guidelines regarding the post-acute rehabilitation of individuals with traumatic brain injury.

Section 730—Competitive Programs for Alcohol and Substance Abuse Disorders

This section would add $5,000,000 to the Defense Health Program to support a competitive program for translational research centers tasked with addressing alcohol and substance abuse issues.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues its robust oversight of the acquisition system of the Department of Defense and closely monitors implementation of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) and the Improve Acquisition Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–383)). The committee recommends several authorities to assist the DOD in managing contracts in support of contingency operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. The committee also includes a provision to require sustainment planning earlier in the development of a weapon system with the intent to reduce total-ownership costs and improve system performance. The committee addresses a variety of other matters of acquisition policy, to include matters related to the industrial base and strategic materials.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Acquisition Involving Federal Prison Industries

The committee continues to be concerned that in implementing section 827 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) the Department of Defense (DOD) is not complying with the intent of the law. The committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 required the Secretary of Defense to: review the list of product categories used in complying with section 827 of Public Law 110–181 to ensure that these categories contain similar market participants and are consistent with the need to protect the Department's access to the commercial market; to establish consistent dates for the publication of an updated list; and to notify industry of such dates. In the same report, the committee also directed the Secretary to conduct a comprehensive review of contract awards made to Federal Prison Industries (FPI) to ensure that non-competitive awards are not being made to FPI inappropriately. The committee directs the Secretary to brief the congressional defense committee on the progress of the review and any changes made to DOD policy, regulation or processes determined to be necessary as a result of the review by July 30, 2011.

Aircraft Specialty Metal Content

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, for each military unique aircraft and engine procured by the Department of Defense in fiscal year 2012, to assess the extent to which such aircraft or engine includes specialty metal not melted or produced in the United States. The Secretary of Defense should submit a report of

the findings of the assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by October 30, 2012. The assessment should include a description by aircraft or engine type of the average amount of specialty metal contained in such aircraft or engine that was not melted or produced in the United States, expressed as a percentage of the total specialty metal content of the aircraft or engine, and an itemized description of the use of specialty metal not melted or produced in the United States for each aircraft or engine type, including specific references to the exceptions provided by section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, per component or subsystem containing specialty metal not melted or produced in the United States.

Army Contract Bundling

The committee is concerned that Army contracting officers are consolidating contracts, particularly for base support functions, which have traditionally been provided by small businesses. The committee believes that providing business opportunities to small businesses, including those owned by veterans and service-disabled veterans, is critical to our national economy and to the local communities in which Army installations are located. The committee is concerned that consolidation of contracts currently awarded to small and disadvantaged businesses may be a result of a shortfall of Army contracting personnel and may result in negative effects in the long-term. The committee is aware that section 313 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–240) states that "the head of a federal agency may not carry out an acquisition strategy that includes a consolidation of contract requirements of the federal agency with a total value of more than $2,000,000, unless the senior procurement executive or Chief Acquisition Officer for the federal agency, before carrying out the acquisition strategy (A) conducts market research; (B) identifies any alternative contracting approaches that would involve a lesser degree of consolidation of contract requirements; (C) makes a written determination that the consolidation of contract requirements is necessary and justified; (D) identifies any negative impact by the acquisition strategy on contracting with small business concerns; and (E) certifies to the head of the federal agency that steps will be taken to include small business concerns in the acquisition strategy."

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review Department of the Army contracting actions to ensure compliance with the provisions of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010, and to brief the congressional defense committees on the findings of the review by December 1, 2011. The review shall include an assessment of the Army's processes to allow opportunities for small businesses to provide goods and services in response to Army requirements, and shall identify challenges facing the Army acquisition workforce, including any shortage of trained personnel to administer contracts.

Beryllium Stockpile Modernization

Since 2005, the Department of Defense has supported a public-private partnership for the construction of a modern high purity beryllium refinery under title 3 of the Defense Production Act of

1950 (Public Law 81–774). High purity beryllium has been identified as "both a strategic and critical material" by the Department of Defense Strategic Materials Protection Board.

With the beryllium refinery currently starting production, the committee encourages the Department to reevaluate and modernize its beryllium inventory in the National Defense Stockpile. Much of the beryllium currently in the stockpile is either obsolete or in a non-economic form. The committee encourages the Department to consider upgrading its beryllium inventory, in accordance with the recommendation of the former National Materials Advisory Board, to a rotating buffer stockpile which will enable the forms of beryllium in the stockpile to be updated on a continual basis. Such an approach would ensure that the stockpile always contains the grades of beryllium needed to meet critical defense needs and does not become obsolete.

Common Database for Tracking Contracts and Contractor Personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan

Section 861 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to enter into a memorandum of understanding regarding matters relating to contracts in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Among the matters to be addressed in this memorandum, section 861 of Public Law 110–181 required the agencies to identify and implement a common database for tracking contracts and contractor personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan across the three agencies. In response, the agencies agreed through a series of memoranda of understanding to use the Department of Defense's Synchronized Predeployment Operational Tracker (SPOT) system as the common database.

The committee is concerned that, while progress has been made, the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID have still not fully implemented the requirements of section 861 of Public Law 110–181. The committee is pleased to note that the SPOT database has been modified to accept aggregate-level data on the number of personnel employed by nongovernmental organizations (NGO), alleviating the concerns of the NGOs that providing the U.S. Government detailed personal information for their Iraqi and Afghan employees puts the neutrality of the NGOs at risk and endangers the safety and security of these local national employees. The committee emphasizes that the statute only requires an accounting of total numbers of personnel, unless those personnel are performing private security functions. However, the committee remains concerned that 4 years after enactment of section 861 the SPOT database still does not include all of the information required, including basic financial information on contracts in Iraq and Afghanistan and the number of personnel killed or wounded while working on such contracts. The committee encourages the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID to work together to quickly resolve these outstanding statutory requirements.

The Government Accountability Office and the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction have stressed to the committee that a complete and fully functional common database would not only improve interagency coordination and management of contracts, but also improve transparency, oversight, and audits of Government spending. The committee agrees, and emphasizes that an accurate and complete common database is not only required by section 861 of Public Law 110–181, but is also in the best interest of the agencies, Congress, and the public.

Competition in Construction Acquisition Programs

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has inappropriately advocated a construction acquisition program that values speed in execution over savings. The committee notes that the Naval Facilities Engineering Command has awarded a global Multiple Award Task Order Contract, which may serve to expedite construction processes but also creates barriers to competition, increases the overall cost to construction, and may aggregate the overall risk to the project. While this contracting approach is appropriate in some emergency situations that require speed in execution, the committee believes that this approach is inappropriate for routine construction requirements.

The committee is concerned that construction contracts such as the Navy's global Multiple Award Task Order Contract impede the Department in receiving the best construction contract pricing because it does not allow consideration of locally based, task order type construction contracts. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the Department is not complying with congressional intent to foster the participation of small business concerns as prime contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers, and may not be in compliance with Federal Acquisition Regulations regarding small business concerns and contract bundling determination and justification.

The committee believes that the Department should minimize barriers to competition and ensure the widest participation of construction contractors to the military construction programs in order to ensure best value for the taxpayer. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of this issue and provide a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2011. The review shall include, as a minimum:

(1) A cost benefit analysis of the regional task order construction contracts compared with a locally based, task order contract or a single construction project acquisition process. Such an assessment should include a review of potential construction contractors that are eliminated from competition and the potential savings that would be expected by an expanded contractor field participating in the construction acquisition process;

(2) An assessment of the programs or policies to determine if there are statutory or regulatory barriers in providing a locally based construction contract;

(3) An assessment of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command's Multiple Award Task Order Contract to determine

compliance with Federal Acquisition Regulations related to contract bundling and small business considerations; and

(4) An assessment on the construction contract bundling definitions to determine whether an expansion of the definition is appropriate to ensure small business equities are adequately protected.

Cost Escalators in Major Weapons Systems Life Cycle Cost Estimations

The committee is aware that cost escalators such as inflation, geopolitical risk, and market influences affect long-term cost considerations for major weapons systems. The committee believes that accurate appraisals of life cycle cost escalations, based on current and reliable economic indicators, are critical to effective programmatic evaluation and overall efficiency. The committee is concerned that methods currently employed by the Department of Defense to assess the costs of acquiring, developing, producing, operating, sustaining, and disposing of major weapons systems, their subsystems, and components are insufficient to produce realistic life cycle cost assessments. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the Department's methods for estimating the life cycle costs of major weapons programs, including its standards and procedures for assessing and maintaining currency of cost escalators, and to brief the congressional defense committees on the findings of that review on, or before, September 30, 2011.

Defense Contract Audit Agency Improvements

The committee is concerned over the continuing staffing shortages and audit backlogs experienced by the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), which have resulted in significant delays in conducting audits and could negatively impact the acquisition process. Not only do delays hinder the Federal Government's ability to recoup any monies owed to it, the delays also potentially limit competition by limiting the ability of companies to participate in the Federal Government contracting process. The committee has heard from small, medium, and large contractors regarding the lack of timeliness of audits and the decreasing quality of those audits. In particular, contractors have voiced concern over the elimination of "inadequate-in-part" findings in favor of the use of "pass-fail" audits which do not distinguish between minor and major violations. The committee is aware that unintended consequences may result from such actions. Contractors have informed the committee that it may take several months, or years, for DCAA to revalidate the corrections a contractor has taken to fix any inadequacies found in a contractor's business system; such delays affect the ability of contractors to receive payment on current contracts or to submit bids on future contracts, as they may be deemed non-responsive if their systems have not been approved.

The committee believes that improved communication is one step to addressing the problems that contractors have raised and commends DCAA for publishing a revised "rules of engagement" which encourages timely and meaningful communication with contractors regarding scope and any initial findings. In addition, the committee

is aware that DCAA has undertaken other efforts aimed at improving the collaboration between DCAA and the Defense Contract Management Agency and to better realign the resources between the two agencies. While the committee commends DCAA for taking these steps to improve its audit capabilities, the committee is concerned that as part of the Secretary of Defense's efficiencies initiative, DCAA has been tasked to reduce administrative support staff and revalidate its requirement for additional auditors over the next 5 years. The committee cautions the Secretary that although short-term savings may be generated by a reduction in staff support, it may result in hampering efforts to improve DCAA performance and may actually result in an increase of costs to the Department.

The committee directs the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency to review the decision to eliminate the use of inadequate-in-part findings in favor of instituting a pass-fail standard, and to make recommendations for improvements in the timeliness of the evaluation and the re-evaluation of contractor business systems. In addition, the Director should provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by December 15, 2011 on the results of the evaluation as well as the recommendations to improve timeliness, reduce backlog, and improve audit quality.

Nunn-McCurdy Breach Due to a Quantity Reduction

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense submitted a legislative proposal to Congress for fiscal year 2012 that would amend section 2433a of title 10, United States Code, to reduce some of the requirements the Department must perform in the event it is determined that a critical cost threshold breach (referred to as a Nunn-McCurdy breach) was caused primarily by changes in the quantity of items to be procured. The proposal would eliminate the requirement for written certification by the Secretary of Defense to Congress that, among other things, continuation of the program is essential to national security, there are no lower cost alternatives to the program which will provide acceptable capability to meet the requirement, and the new cost estimates for the program have been deemed reasonable by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE).

The committee is aware that in order to make the determination that the breach was caused primarily by changes in quantity of the items to be procured, the Director of Performance Assessments and Root Cause Analyses would still be required to conduct a root cause analysis. Additionally, the Director of CAPE would still be required to quantify the cost impact of the causal effects. Therefore, the committee believes that little efficiency would be gained by the Department's proposal and that the Secretary's certification and delivery of the root cause analysis and supporting reassessment documentation to Congress is not unduly burdensome and is necessary for congressional oversight. Moreover, in the event that a program's cost increases enough to trigger a Nunn-McCurdy breach, the committee believes that the Secretary is obligated to determine whether there are lower cost alternatives to the program which would provide acceptable capability, regardless of the underlying reason for the cost increase. Therefore, the committee has not included this proposed provision in this Act.

Pilot Programs for Rapid Acquisition of Information Technology

The committee is encouraged by Department of Defense efforts to develop a rapid acquisition process for information technology (IT) as required by section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). The committee understands that creating and implementing the processes and structures to manage complex IT systems is a deliberate process, but should nonetheless allow for the flexibility to experiment with various options before codifying the result. The committee is concerned that the current development process has limited the ability to conduct pilot projects that would provide real-world experience with different management options and has unnecessarily slowed down IT acquisition reform.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to expand the number and types of pilot projects it conducts to inform the current acquisition reform process. For example, pilot projects should be expanded beyond business systems to include other existing programs, such as the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System or the Navy's Next Generation Enterprise Network. The committee believes that this could provide information to show how rapid IT acquisition could function for command and control systems or enterprise data services.

Small Business Subcontracting Goals

The committee notes that while current statutes and regulations require set-asides for small business subcontracts, prime contractors are prohibited from accounting for the total dollar amount flowing to small businesses. Currently, if a contractor that is not a small business is identified as the primary first-tier subcontractor, a prime contractor is prevented from reporting any of the other subcontract dollars that may flow to small businesses; this occurs regardless of whether small business subcontractors comprise either the remainder of the first tier or all other subcontracting tiers. The committee believes that allowing prime contractors to report small business subcontracting at all tiers would demonstrate the full extent of small business participation on Department of Defense contracts. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop procedures for fully accounting for small business participation at all tiers on a Department of Defense contract, and to publish such procedures in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation if the Secretary determines that to be necessary to fully implement such procedures. The Department shall ensure that the procedures fully account for small business participation, but do not permit duplicate reporting of small business participation. The Department shall provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a copy of the subcontracting accounting procedures and any proposed regulation by March 30, 2012.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Section 801—Requirements Relating to Core Logistics Capabilities for Milestone A and Milestone B and Elimination of References to Key Decision Points A and B

This section would amend section 2366a and 2366b of title 10, United States Code, to require the Milestone Decision Authority to certify that a preliminary analysis of core logistics capabilities for each major weapons system has been performed as entrance criteria for entering the technology development phase of a major defense acquisition program (milestone A) and that the core logistics requirements and associated sustaining workloads for the weapons system have been determined as entrance criteria for entering the engineering and manufacturing development phase (milestone B). This section also would require certification that relevant sustainment criteria and alternatives were sufficiently evaluated and addressed in the initial capabilities document to support an analysis of alternatives and the development of key performance parameters for sustainment of the program throughout its projected life cycle. Furthermore, this section would require certification that life-cycle sustainment planning has identified and evaluated relevant sustainment costs through development, production, operation, sustainment, and disposal of the program, and any alternatives, and that such costs are reasonable and have been accurately estimated.

The committee is aware that the Secretary issued formal guidance on the operation of the defense acquisition system on October 18, 2010, which directed space systems to be subject to milestone A and milestone B requirements. Therefore, this section also would strike references to "key decisions points" in section 2366a and 2366b of title 10, United States Code.

Section 802—Revision to Law Relating to Disclosures to Litigation Support Contractors

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to include a new section relating to the disclosure of confidential commercial, financial or proprietary information, technical data, or other privileged information to a litigation support contractor for the sole purpose of providing litigation support. This section would require the litigation support contractor to execute a contract with the Government agreeing to or acknowledging that any information furnished will be used only for the purpose stated in the contract, that the litigation support contractor will take all precautions necessary to protect the sensitive information, that the sensitive information will not be used by the litigation support contractor to compete against the third party for contracts, and that a violation of any of the above would be basis for the Government to terminate the contract. This section would also repeal a superseded provision in section 2320 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 803—Extension of Applicability of the Senior Executive Benchmark Compensation Amount for Purposes of Allowable Cost Limitations under Defense Contracts

This section would amend section 2324 of title 10, United States Code, by expanding the existing executive compensation cap to apply to any individual performing on a contract rather than certain management employees. The committee is aware that the Defense Contract Audit Agency has shown that there are lower-level executives not subject to the cap and non-executive employees who receive compensation in excess of the benchmark compensation amount. The committee believes that this section would reduce the risk of excessive individual compensation charged to defense contracts.

Section 804—Supplier Risk Management

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to manage supplier risk by directing contracting personnel to use a business credit reporting bureau, or other objective sources of business information, to evaluate supplier risk on all Department of Defense (DOD) contract actions. This section also would require the use of automated, off-the-shelf products to identify suppliers by location and to monitor suppliers for events that may affect their performance, such as a merger or acquisition, or bankruptcy filing.

The committee notes that while the Federal Acquisition Regulation requires that Federal contracting officials determine contractor responsibility prior to contract award, adherence within the Department to this requirement has been inconsistent, often varying both among, and within, individual contracting offices. In addition, the evaluation of supplier risk traditionally has been treated as a one-time event, rather than an ongoing responsibility. As a result, DOD contracting personnel frequently have limited or belated visibility into changes occurring after contract award that could impact a supplier's ability to meet their requirements.

The committee notes that commercial firms increasingly have sought solutions to manage supplier risk throughout the contract lifecycle. In addition, the committee is aware that the Department of Veterans Affairs has employed a business credit reporting system to assist its acquisition personnel with contractor responsibility determinations. The committee believes that such a supplier risk management initiative would benefit the Department of Defense through cost avoidance (by reducing its exposure to high-risk suppliers), increased efficiency, and a greater return on investment.

The committee also believes that such a tool could be implemented in a manner that focuses on those suppliers that are most likely to be a risk, and could also allow the Department of Defense to evaluate supplier risk with lower-tier suppliers.

Section 805—Extension of Availability of Funds in the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund

This section would make technical amendments to section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (DAWDF). The committee notes that this section would enable all funds credited, transferred, appropriated, or

deposited to the DAWDF to remain available for expenditure in the fiscal year for which it is credited and the 2 succeeding fiscal years.

Section 806—Defense Contract Audit Agency Annual Report

This section would require the Director of the Defense Contract Audit Agency to submit an annual report that summarizes its audit activities during the previous fiscal year, including significant problems, abuses, and deficiencies, a statistical table showing the total number of audit reports, the length of time taken for each audit, and the questioned dollar value, as well as recommendations for corrective actions. The report also would include a summary of any backlog of pending contractor audits and a rationale for the cause of the backlog. This section would require the annual report to be provided to the congressional defense committees by March 30 of each year and be made available on a public website within 60 days after receipt of the report by Congress. The committee believes that this section would increase transparency and accountability, and facilitate congressional oversight of the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

SUBTITLE B—AMENDEMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 811—Calculation of Time Period Relating to Report on Critical Changes in Major Automated Information Systems

This section would amend the requirement for when a critical change report would be needed for a Major Automated Information System (MAIS). Currently, a report is required when a MAIS investment has failed to achieve a full deployment decision within 5 years after funds were first obligated for the program. This section would amend that to require a critical change report within 5 years after contract award. This section would also specify that any time under which the contract award is under protest would not be counted against this 5-year limit.

Section 812—Change in Deadline for Submission of Selected Acquisition Reports from 60 to 45 days

This section would amend section 2432(f) of title10, United States Code, to require the comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Reports to be delivered to Congress not later than 45 days after the end of the first quarter of the fiscal year. The committee believes that this will enhance congressional oversight.

Section 813—Extension of Sunset Date for Certain Protests of Task and Deliver Order Contracts

This section would amend section 4106(f) of title 41, United States Code, to extend the sunset date to September 20, 2016. The committee is aware that section 843 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) temporarily expanded the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) jurisdiction to hear bid protests by authorizing it to hear protests on task and delivery orders valued in excess of $10.0 million. The authority was provided with a sunset in 2011 in order to allow Congress to evaluate the effectiveness of the expanded jurisdiction and

gauge the impact of increased workload on GAO. Section 825 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) extended the sunset date for bid protests on task and delivery orders for defense acquisitions until September 30, 2016. However, section 825 did not address civilian agency acquisitions.

Section 814—Clarification of Department of Defense Authority To Purchase Right-Hand Drive Passenger Sedans

This section would amend section 2253 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the cost threshold of $30,000 per vehicle applies specifically to right-hand drive passenger sedans and does not apply to right-hand drive vehicles such as ambulances, fire trucks, or buses.

Section 815—Amendment Relating to Buying Tents, Tarpaulins, or Covers from American Sources

This section would amend section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the domestic source requirement for tents, tarpaulins, or covers includes the materials and components of tents, tarpaulins, or covers.

Section 816—Para-Aramid Fibers and Yarns

This section would eliminate the authority of the Secretary of Defense to procure articles containing para-aramid fibers and yarns manufactured in certain foreign countries, by repealing section 807 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 1999 (Public Law 105–261). This section also would prohibit the Department of Defense from issuing a solicitation requiring proposals submitted pursuant to such solicitation to include the use of para-aramid fibers and yarns.

Section 817—Repeal of Sunset of Authority to Procure Fire Resistant Rayon Fiber from Foreign Sources for the Production of Uniforms

This section would make permanent the authority to procure fire resistant rayon fiber for the production of uniforms from foreign sources by striking subsection (f) of section 829 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 821 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATING TO CONTRACTS IN SUPPORT OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ OR AFGHANISTAN

Section 821—Restrictions on Awarding Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan to Adverse Entities

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to void a contract, or require the prime contractor to void a subcontract under a contract, in support of contingency operations in the Republic of Iraq or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, if the Secretary determines that a foreign entity or foreign individual performing on the contract, or a task or delivery order, is directly engaged in hos-

tilities or is substantially supporting forces that are engaged in hostilities against the U.S. or its coalition partners.

Section 822—Authority To Use Higher Thresholds for Procurements in Support of Contingency Operations

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to apply a simplified acquisition threshold of $1.0 million and micro-purchase threshold of $25,000 for contracting activities supporting contingency operations in the Republic of Iraq or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, regardless of the location of the contracting activity.

Section 823—Authority To Examine Records of Foreign Contractors Performing Contracts in Support of Contingency Operations in Iraq or Afghanistan

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to examine the records of a foreign contractor, or a foreign subcontractor, performing a contract in support of contingency operations in the Republic of Iraq or the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This authority would not apply if the contract was being performed by a contractor or a subcontractor that is a foreign government, or agency of a foreign government, or if precluded by applicable laws. This section also would require the Secretary to issue guidance, not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to implement this section.

Section 824—Definitions

This section would define certain terms used in this subtitle.

SUBTITLE D—DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS

Section 831—Assessment of the Defense Industrial Base Pilot Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees assessing the defense industrial base pilot program of the Department of Defense by March 1, 2012.

Section 832—Department of Defense Assessment of Industrial Base for Potential Shortfalls

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the U.S. industrial base to identify potential gaps that might affect military readiness. Such assessment would be required within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. In addition, the Comptroller General of the United States would be required to review the Secretary of Defense's assessment, including completeness of the report and the reasonableness of the methodology and recommendations.

The Department of Defense relies on thousands of suppliers to ensure that it has the weapons, supporting equipment, and raw materials it needs to support current and future conflicts against conventional opponents. However, the committee is concerned that increasing globalization in the defense industry presents uncertainty in the ability of the United States to maintain a reliable and

sufficient supplier base in the event of such conflicts. In addition, defense industry prime contractors are relying more on subcontractors, including commercial suppliers, which can limit the visibility into the lower tiers of the supplier base. The committee notes that studies by the Government Accountability Office have found that the Department lacks a framework and consistent approach for managing supplier base concerns such as counterfeit parts in the supply chain, and reliance on rare earth materials from the People's Republic of China in military equipment and systems. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the Department has not taken steps to identify supplier-base availability for defense needs beyond a 5-year time frame. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to address these deficiencies in the required report and to provide a specific assessment of the vulnerabilities posed to defense systems as a result of potential counterfeiting of sub-components manufactured in China.

Section 833—Comptroller General Assessment of Government Competition in the Department of Defense Industrial Base

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of government mandated and supported competition in the Department of Defense industrial base. This section also would require the Comptroller General to submit a report on the findings and recommendations of the assessment to the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2012.

Section 834—Report on Impact of Foreign Boycotts on the Defense Industrial Base

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, not later than February 1, 2012, a report setting forth an assessment of the impact of foreign boycotts on the defense industrial base. The report shall include a summary of foreign boycotts that posed a material risk to the defense industrial base from January 2008 to the date of enactment of this Act; the apparent objectives of each such boycott; an assessment of the harm to the defense industrial base as a result of each such boycott; an assessment of the sufficiency of the efforts of the Department of Defense and Department of State to mitigate the material risks of each such foreign boycott on the defense industrial base; and recommendations to reduce the material risks of foreign boycotts. This section also would prohibit the Comptroller General from publicly disclosing the names of any person, organization, or entity involved in, or affected by, such boycotts without express written permission.

Section 835—Rare Earth Material Inventory Plan

This section would require the Administrator, Defense Logistics Agency Strategic Materials to develop a plan to establish an inventory of rare earth materials needed to ensure the long-term availability of such materials. Among other matters, the Administrator

would be required to identify and describe the steps necessary to create an inventory of rare earth materials to support national defense requirements and ensure reliable sources, provide a detailed cost-benefit analysis of creating such an inventory, provide an analysis of the potential market effects associated with creating such an inventory, and identify and describe the steps necessary to develop and maintain a competitive multi-source supply chain for rare earth materials. This section would require the Administrator to submit the plan to the Secretary of Defense within 180 days following the date of enactment of this Act, and require the Secretary to determine whether to execute the plan. The Secretary would be required to submit that determination, along with the plan, to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of receiving the plan from the Administrator.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 841—Miscellaneous Amendments to Public Law 111–383 Relating to Acquisition

This section would make three amendments to the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) relating to acquisition. This section would strike the requirement in section 804 that the acquisition process for rapid fielding of capabilities in response to urgent operational needs may only be applied for capabilities that can appropriately be acquired under fixed price contracts. This section also would strike the requirement in section 812 for the Secretary of Defense to issue guidance requiring the use of manufacturing readiness levels as a basis for measuring, assessing, reporting, and communicating manufacturing readiness and risk. This section also would amend section 1073 by allowing, rather than directing, the Secretary of Defense to establish a defense research and development rapid innovation program.

Section 842—Procurement of Photovoltaic Devices

This section would amend section 846 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to clarify that, for the purposes of that section, the Department of Defense is deemed to own a photovoltaic device if the device is installed on Department of Defense property or in a facility owned or leased by or for the Department of Defense. This section also would clarify the definition of photovoltaic devices.

Section 843—Clarification of Jurisdiction of the United States District Courts To Hear Bid Protest Disputes Involving Maritime Contracts

This section would amend section 1491(b) of title 28, United States Code, by establishing the U. S. Court of Federal Claims as the exclusive Federal court forum for bid protests.

Section 844—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement

This section would amend section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (42 U.S.C. 17142) to exempt the Department

of Defense from the requirements related to contracts for alternative or synthetic fuel in that section.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Conduct of the Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review

The committee found the completeness of the 2008 Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review (QRMR) lacking. In addition, the accompanying report delivered to Congress in January 2009 failed to comply with the requirements of section 118b of title 10, United States Code. Rather than using the QRMR as an opportunity to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the roles and missions of the Armed Forces with the intent to identify capability gaps and areas of unnecessary duplication, the 2008 review appeared to simply endorse the status quo. Furthermore, rather than conducting a complete review, the Secretary of Defense chose to only examine select areas of interest. The review only focused on the Department's planned investments to meet asymmetric challenges and did little to evaluate the conventional force structure or need for legacy hardware programs. The committee notes that many of the conclusions of the review have proven faulty, such as the determination that assigning the C–27J to both the Air Force and the Army provided the "most value to the joint force." The committee also notes that the Department has not complied with the requirement in section 222 of title 10, United States Code, to present the future-years budget by core mission areas. The committee includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would require the inclusion of budget justification materials associated with the core competencies of the military services, and would further require the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the sufficiency of the Department's budget justification materials.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to take a more comprehensive approach to the 2011 QRMR and to comply with congressional intent in conducting the review. The committee believes the QRMR, if conducted as intended, would provide a solid basis for reducing waste while also improving the joint warfighting capability of the Department.

Influence of Budget on Quadrennial Defense Review

The committee has previously expressed concern regarding the influence of defense budgets on the "Quadrennial Defense Review" (QDR), conducted pursuant to section 118 of title 10, United States Code. Section 118 requires this comprehensive examination of the national defense strategy, force structure, force modernization plans, infrastructure, budget plans, and other elements of the defense program and policies be conducted every four years. Paragraph (b)(3) of section 118 requires that that the QDR identify the budget plan that would be "required to provide sufficient resources to execute successfully the full range of missions called for in that national defense strategy at a low-to-moderate level of risk." Likewise, paragraph (b)(4) of section 118 requires that the QDR's rec-

ommendations, "are not constrained to comply with the budget submitted to Congress by the President . . .".

The committee notes that in the past representatives of the Department of Defense have indicated that the QDR is not budget constrained; rather, it is budget informed. While the committee acknowledges that ultimately resources must shape any strategy, the committee believes that the QDR should be based upon a process unconstrained by budgetary influences so that such influences do not determine or limit its outcome. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to brief the committee no later than September 30, 2012 on the steps the Department will take during conduct of the QDR in fiscal year 2013 to ensure that the next QDR fulfills all statutory requirements, including those related to budget plans, and in particular the steps that the Department will take to ensure the QDR is not constrained to comply with the budget submitted by the President pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

Information Operations and Strategic Communications

The committee continues to support information operations (IO) and strategic communications (SC) as important tools for countering enemy narratives, as well as engaging with the global community. The committee is aware that the January 2011 Secretary of Defense memo on IO and SC has contributed significantly to improving the management structure and budgeting process for IO and SC functions within the Department of Defense.

The committee believes that the realignment of IO and SC responsibilities to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy is critical for breaking down the traditional organizational stovepipes of IO and bridging those elements with the emerging instruments of influence under SC. The committee also recognizes the improvement of the budget justification material related to IO and SC, which greatly improves the oversight and management of those activities.

The committee also encourages the Department of Defense to continue to pursue workforce development opportunities that bring together diverse skill sets and career specialties. For example, the Department should do more to integrate social science skills, cultural intelligence, and human terrain understanding to the IO and SC field. The committee also believes that as the Joint Chiefs of Staff evaluate joint SC and IO training and education curricula, it ensures that it maintains and sustains existing centers of excellence.

Management of Information Technology

The committee recognizes that the acquisition and management of information technology (IT) systems and services is highly complex. The budget request contained $38.4 billion for IT alone, and included funds to develop items ranging from avionics to logistics to command and control to desktop computing. Managing such a complex enterprise has traditionally been a challenge for the Department.

The committee is concerned that recent organizational changes within the Department that are a part of the Secretary of Defense's efficiency initiatives may in fact hamper management of Depart-

ment of Defense IT. For example, the committee believes that the decision to eliminate core management and oversight functions within the office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration and the Business Transformation Office appears to have been made without adequate planning, or justification. Furthermore, the rationale for eliminating these functions at a time when IT reform and consolidation is being contemplated to generate cost savings is counterintuitive to the committee.

The committee believes that the Department must maintain responsibility and oversight of its IT programs as well as sufficient numbers of experienced and trained acquisition professionals if they are to succeed.

NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence

The committee is aware that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has accredited a Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence (CCD COE) to enhance the capability, cooperation, and information sharing among NATO member nations and partners in cyber defense through education, research and development, lessons learned, and consultation. The Center represents the main source of expertise in the field of cooperative cyber defense within NATO and the committee recognizes the importance of this organization in linking U.S. and European initiatives to improve cyber defense capabilities. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to provide more support to the Center by increasing the number of personnel exchanges, and supporting additional cooperative workshops and other initiatives. The committee believes that this could help support our foreign partners build their own cyber operations capabilities, as well as boost U.S. capacity in this area.

Office of Cyberthreat Analysis

The committee is aware that the Defense Intelligence Agency has established the Office of Cyberthreat Analysis to provide an all-source analysis capability focused on threats in cyberspace. The office provides a range of support functions to the entire defense community, including: all-source defense analysis of cyberthreats to the Nation; target development; exercise planning; battle damage assessment; and counterintelligence investigations and operations, including supply chain risk management.

The committee is concerned that this office has not been sufficiently staffed to complete the tasks assigned. For instance, the growing importance of conducting supply chain risk assessments and vulnerability assessments on specific acquisition programs are likely to drive the needs for the limited numbers of personnel, making it difficult to carry out other missions. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Commander, U.S. Cyber Command to assess the sufficiency of the workforce assigned to the Office of Cyberthreat Analysis compared to the missions assigned to it. The Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence shall submit a report on this assessment to the Senate Committee on Armed Services

and the House Committee on Armed Services by 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

Protection of Sensitive Information

The committee understands that numerous directives, memoranda, and other instructions guide the policy and processes of properly safeguarding information. The committee believes one very important source of guidance is the June 2006 Office of Management and Budget (OMB) memorandum titled, "Protection of Sensitive Agency Information" (OMB Memorandum M–06–16) as the memorandum directs government agencies to emplace specific safeguards that conform with National Institute of Standards and Technology procedures for the protection of remote information.

The committee is concerned that the safeguards directed to be emplaced have not been fully implemented or incorporated into existing Department of Defense procedures. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department to review the guidance directed in the OMB memorandum and ensure that those safeguards are instituted within the Department of Defense.

Report on Contractors at the Defense Intelligence Agency

In subtitle D of title IX of this Act, the committee recommends several provisions on total force management within the Department of Defense, including section 934 which would amend an annual reporting requirement by the Secretary of Defense contained in section 115a of title 10, United States Code, on defense manpower requirements, to include an estimate for contractor requirements for support services. This provision would facilitate an improved awareness of the Department of Defense requirements being performed by contractors.

The committee is particularly interested in understanding the use of contractors by the defense intelligence community, starting with the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the manpower mix criteria used to determine which defense intelligence functions should be performed by contractors and which functions should be performed by military members or Government civilians.

The committee, therefore, directs the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on how the Defense Intelligence Agency plans to implement subtitle D of title IX of this Act by December 9, 2011. The report also shall include an identification of the current contractor workforce, current and planned use of contractors by the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the manpower mix criteria used to determine which defense intelligence functions are performed by contractors and which functions are performed by military members or Government civilians. The report shall be provided in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if descriptions of the use of contractors or criteria are classified.

Report on Increasing Competition for Space Launch

The committee is pleased that highly reliable space launch vehicles in the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program have resulted in over 30 successful launches since 2002. However, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should pro-

vide expanded opportunities for competition in support of its space launch requirements, including competition in the EELV program. The committee further believes that the Department of Defense should establish clear criteria that new providers of space launch capabilities would be expected to meet in order to become qualified competitors for launching defense payloads.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a report detailing how it intends to incorporate new providers of space launch capabilities into its space launch acquisition plans while preserving mission assurance, identify potential cost savings, and identify the criteria required for new entrants wishing to bid on opportunities to provide launch services for defense payloads.

Research and Development Assessments in Quadrennial Defense Review and the Responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense is required every 4 years to conduct a Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), pursuant to section 118 of title 10, United States Code. The QDR is intended to provide a strategic review of force modernization plans and to define sufficient force modernization plans necessary to execute successfully the full range of missions called for in the national defense strategy. The committee believes an essential element of any force modernization plan is the research and development plan necessary to deliver future capabilities. As well, while the exact military capabilities required in 20 years may be difficult to predict, adequate research and development in the near-term creates options for decision makers in the long-term. The committee believes the QDR was intended to identify such prudent hedges against future, ill-defined threats. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to identify the assumptions used in future QDRs related to research and development and the core capabilities relating to research, development, test, and evaluation required to support the national defense.

The committee also notes that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has a key role in advising the Secretary on requirements, programs, and budgets, and the committee believes this role should include advice on research and development. Specifically, paragraph (a)(4) of section 153 of title 10, United States Code, requires the Chairman to advise the Secretary on the priorities of the requirements identified by the combatant commanders. The committee is aware that the combatant commanders often include science and technology priorities in their respective integrated priority lists. As a result, the committee believes it is important for the Chairman to include in his advice to the Secretary the research and development needs of the combatant commanders and to maintain situational awareness of technological innovations that could pose challenges to U.S. national security.

Total Force Management

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense's recent focus on efficiencies without a thorough business case analysis and risk assessment potentially undermines the Department's abil-

ity to appropriately plan and budget for its total manpower requirements. The committee believes that the Department of Defense (DOD) should aggressively undertake a more holistic approach to its requirements in order to achieve the appropriate balance in its total workforce, rather than managing simply to an arbitrary civilian authorization level.

Total force management would improve personnel requirements determination and planning to facilitate decisions on which sector is most appropriate to perform that requirement with consideration of the distinct value of each component of the plan, whether military (Active and Reserve Components), civilian, or contractor personnel. For example, the military provides an expeditionary capability with specialized training in combat, combat support, and combat service support capabilities; civilian personnel provide needed oversight and direction, continuity of operations, and specialized enduring skills that do not require expeditionary, combat, or combat-related competencies; and contractor personnel provide specialized skills and surge capabilities that do not require the command and control or transparency to the public required by military and civilian personnel.

The committee notes that several tools are available to facilitate total force management decisions. These include the strategic civilian human capital plan (10 U.S.C. 115b), service contracting inventory (10 U.S.C. 2330a), inclusion of contractor services support work in the annual budget displays (10 U.S.C. 235), and the list of commercial activities required by the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act (Public Law 105–270). In addition, section 129, title 10, United State Code, requires that the Department of Defense civilian workforce be managed on the basis of workload rather than any arbitrary constraints or limitations. Furthermore, the committee notes that sections 2461 and 2463 of title 10, United States Code, outline the procedures for the conversion of functions to performance by either DOD civilian personnel or contractor personnel; these procedures are tools that allow the Department to "right size" its workforce where appropriate. The committee notes that these tools should be used only in response to changes in the Department's mission or if insufficient strategic human capital planning was done prior to workforce decisions being made initially.

Therefore, elsewhere in this title the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a total force management plan that would provide the means to establish the appropriate mix of manpower, military, civilian, and contractor personnel, to perform the mission of the Department of Defense. Risk mitigation should take precedence over cost when necessary to maintain appropriate manpower to support the Department's operations and readiness to perform the core missions of the Armed Forces.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

Section 901—Revision of Defense Business System Requirements

This section would update the structure and process of the defense business systems investment review boards, including clarifying responsibilities based on recent reorganization within the Department of Defense. This section would also consolidate reporting by the Department of Defense Deputy chief management officers and the reports required by the Chief Management Officer of the military departments required by section 908 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

Section 902—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would re-designate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps and change the title of its secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

SUBTITLE B—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Section 911—Notification Requirement for Harmful Interference to Department of Defense Global Positioning System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a notification to Congress upon such a determination that a space-based or terrestrial-based commercial communications service will cause or is causing widespread harmful interference with Global Positioning System (GPS) receivers of the Department of Defense (DOD). The notification would include a summary of the reasons for such harmful interference, the entity causing the interference, and the magnitude and duration of the interference.

The committee is aware that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) issued a conditional order to a commercial communications company on January 26, 2011, authorizing it to provide broadband voice and data communications services that potentially interfere with GPS. The committee recognizes that the Armed Forces are highly dependent on GPS capabilities and services. The committee believes that any space-based or terrestrial-based commercial communications service that has the potential to interfere with GPS should not receive final authorization to provide service within the United States by the FCC unless and until the potential interference with GPS is resolved.

Such commercial services are planned to be transmitted from 40,000 land-based towers across the United States. The committee understands, based on information received from the Air Force, that the signal strength of such service is estimated to be one billion times more powerful than the GPS signal. Though the commercial service would broadcast on a frequency adjacent to GPS, it

may still overwhelm GPS receivers, potentially causing a denial of service for millions of users in the United States relying on GPS navigation and timing services. Such users included the military, emergency responders, maritime and aeronautical emergency communication systems, banking transactions, air traffic and ground transportation systems, and myriad commercial applications.

The committee understands that the Deputy Secretary of Defense sent a letter to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission on January 12, 2011, highlighting the "strong potential for interference to . . . critical national security systems," and "strongly recommend[ing] deferral of final action on [the FCC order and authorization] until the proper interference analysis and mitigation studies can be conducted."

The committee is aware of several other letters of concern regarding potential GPS interference, including: a December 28, 2010, multi-agency memorandum to the Chairman of the Interdepartment Radio Advisory Committee (IRAC) signed by officials from the military departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Commerce, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of the Interior, and Department of Homeland Security; a January 12, 2011, letter to the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information; and a March 25, 2011, letter cosigned by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Transportation.

The committee understands that the authorization of commercial communications service is conditional "upon the completion of the process for addressing interference concerns relating to GPS" undertaken by a technical working group whose analysis of potential interference with GPS devices and recommendations to mitigate such interference is due to be submitted to the FCC no later than June 15, 2011.

The committee is concerned about the impact on U.S. national security resulting from potential harmful interference with GPS. The committee recognizes the extent to which the military is reliant on GPS and notes the military's current inventory of nearly one million GPS receivers. Thousands of GPS receivers are integrated into weapons systems, aircraft, ships, and vehicles. GPS is crucial in such areas as blue force tracking, precision munitions employment, combat search and rescue, close air support, logistics, and communications.

The committee understands that the FCC did not conduct a study on potential interference prior to the January 26, 2011, order and authorization. The committee is disappointed that the FCC proceeded with the order and authorization prior to any study and resolution of the GPS interference issue. Furthermore, the committee understands that the Department of Defense has not determined whether it can mitigate the interference and questions whether sufficient analysis and mitigating measures can be identified and implemented by June 15, 2011. The committee believes the burden of proof for non-interference should be placed on the commercial communications company and believes the FCC should indefinitely postpone final decision until the harmful interference

issue has been resolved, with the full coordination and approval of the Department of Defense.

The committee reminds the Secretary of Defense of the authority in section 2281 of title 10, United States Code, which states that the Secretary "may not agree to any restriction on the Global Positioning System . . . that would adversely affect the military potential of the Global Positioning System." The committee intends to work with the Secretary of Defense to mitigate the effects of any harmful interference with GPS on the military.

SUBTITLE C—INTELLIGENCE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 921—Report on Implementation of Recommendations by Comptroller General on Intelligence Information Sharing

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on actions taken to implement the recommendation of the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, "Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance: Establishing Guidance, Timelines, and Accountability for Integrating Intelligence Data Would Improve Information Sharing" (GAO–10–265NI). GAO recommends that the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretaries of the military services, develop intelligence information sharing guidance, such as a concept of operations, and to provide such direction and prioritization to improve intelligence community information sharing. In addition, this section directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Under Secretary's report to determine whether it is consistent with and adequate to address its recommendation.

The committee is concerned about the extent to which Department of Defense intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance efforts are managed in accordance with overarching direction and priorities for sharing intelligence information across the defense intelligence community. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to implement the recommendation. The committee also requests that GAO provide it with an update regarding its conclusions from this review as soon as practicable.

Section 922—Insider Threat Detection

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a program for enhanced information sharing protection and insider threat mitigation for the information systems of the Department of Defense in order to detect unauthorized access to, use of, or transmission of, classified or controlled unclassified information.

The committee is concerned with the acute damage to national security of recent unauthorized releases of classified information from the Department of Defense and other Government information systems. The committee notes that the impact of these releases will continue for many years, to the detriment of existing operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, as well as the rep-

utation and credibility of the United States in international affairs now and in the future.

The committee recognizes that the Department is responding seriously to this event and is implementing safeguards to prevent such a breach again. While the Department should continue to pursue technical security measures, the committee is concerned that the human dimension is not receiving sufficient attention. The committee therefore encourages the Department to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the means by which to detect, respond and mitigate the threat posed by trusted persons inside the organization who would purposely compromise the security of the network (otherwise known as the "insider threat").

Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the technological and procedural responses may be having a negative impact on the productivity and effectiveness of forces supporting ongoing operations in areas of hostility. The committee cautions the Department to pay special consideration in how technological or procedural fixes are implemented in operational areas of hostility to ensure that these concerns do not become a significant problem.

SUBTITLE D—TOTAL FORCE MANAGEMENT

Section 931—General Policy for Total Force Management

This section would amend section 129a of title 10, United States Code to require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a total force management plan that would determine the appropriate manpower mix of military (Active and Reserve Components), civilian and contractor personnel necessary to accomplish the mission of the Department of Defense (DOD). Overall responsibility for establishing the policies and procedures to implement such a plan would be given to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, with responsibility for requirements determination, planning and programming being given to the manpower and force structure authorities for each DOD component.

The committee is aware that DOD Instruction 1100.2 requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to obtain a written statement from each requiring official regarding decisions to contract for support. This section would codify that requirement and also would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to ensure that the policies and procedures governing the acquisition process are consistent with those developed to implement the total force management plan. Furthermore, to ensure that budget decisions are developed in line with these policies, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) would be required to justify in the annual budget submission any budget decision that may inhibit implementation of the total force management plan.

The committee notes that manpower and force structure personnel should have a greater role in requirements determination, planning, programming, and budgeting. This is intended to ensure that all aspects of the Department of Defense workforce (military, civilian and contractor personnel) are utilized in a balanced and rational fashion.

Section 932—Revisions to Department of Defense Civilian Personnel Management Constraints

This section would amend section 129 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the civilian personnel of the Department of Defense (DOD) are managed on the basis of workload and in support of the total force management plan developed in accordance with section 129a, as would be amended by this Act. This change would reinforce the committee's position that manpower requirements should be based on mission requirements and not arbitrary cost savings that ignore the workload needs of the DOD components.

Section 933—Additional Amendments Relating to Total Force Management

This section would amend section 113 of title 10, United States Code, to include an accounting for contractors in the Secretary of Defense annual report to Congress on expenditures, work, and accomplishments of the Department of Defense. The inclusion of contractors in this report would facilitate improved awareness of the role of contractors in accomplishing the mission of the Department. In addition, this section would amend section 1597 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the guidelines put in place related to civilian personnel reductions comply with the total force management plan required by section 129a, title 10, United States Code, as would be amended by this act.

This section also would amend section 863 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), to include considerations relating to policy for total force management required by section 129a of title 10, United States Code, in the implementation plan required for establishment of requirements processes for the acquisition of services. The committee believes that this is necessary in order to align the processes for the acquisition of services with the manpower requirements determination process required by section 129a.

Section 934—Amendments to Annual Defense Manpower Requirements Report

This section would amend section 115a of title 10, United States Code, to revise the annual defense manpower requirements report to include a projection of the annual Department of Defense (DOD) civilian personnel requirements for the next fiscal year, and the strength levels of the previous year. This change reflects the recognition that DOD civilian personnel should be managed by workload requirements, which may fluctuate during a given year and should be accommodated as necessary. In addition, this section would require the inclusion of an estimate for contractor requirements for support services, as outlined in each military department's service contractor inventory as required by section 2330a of title 10, United States Code. The inclusion of contractors in this report would facilitate an improved awareness of the Department of Defense requirements being performance by contractors.

Section 935—Revisions to Strategic Workforce Plan

This section would amend section 115b of title 10, United States Code to achieve the following outcomes in Department of Defense (DOD) civilian workforce planning requirements:

(1) Reduce costs associated with planning and allow the Department to improve its implementation efforts by moving from an annual to a biennial report;

(2) Align the workforce planning assessment period to correspond with existing DOD budget and manpower planning cycles upon which workforce requirements, authorizations, and forecasts are based; and

(3) Require that the assessment of the appropriate mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel is aligned with the total force management plan developed in accordance with section 129a, title 10, United States Code, as would be amended by this Act.

While the committee recommends these changes in order to align the Department's strategic civilian workforce plans with existing budget and manpower planning structures and provide time to implement planned strategies, it remains concerned that the Department has not fully complied with the requirements outlined in section 115b of title 10, United States Code. According to a September 2010 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO–10–814R), this could result in the Department relying on "incomplete information concerning the size, composition and needs of the civilian workforce. In particular, the Department may not be able to determine whether its investment in strategies to improve the civilian workforce is effective and efficient." Therefore, the committee urges the Department to develop performance measures to assess its progress and guide its civilian workforce planning.

Section 936—Technical Amendments to Requirement for Inventory of Contracts for Services

This section would amend section 2330a(c) of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional clarity regarding the types of contracted services to be inventoried and the manner in which contractor full-time equivalents are captured. In addition, this section would more clearly delineate the statutory responsibilities and roles in developing guidance and implementing particular aspects of the statute. This section also would direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to develop and promulgate guidance specific to the review requirements outlined in paragraph (e) of 2330a of title 10, United States Code. This clarification is intended to ensure that the Department of Defense's total force manpower management equities are fully represented.

Section 937—Modification of Temporary Suspension of Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Contractor Performance

This section would lift the temporary suspension of Department of Defense public-private competitions that was included in section 325 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Section 325 temporarily suspended the au-

thority to initiate public-private competitions until the Secretary of Defense provided a report to Congress on the conduct of such competitions and certified compliance with certain statutory requirements. This section would eliminate the compliance certification and lift the suspension 30 days after receipt by Congress of the Secretary of Defense report, and after an assessment of the report is conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States.

The committee notes that the moratorium already could have been lifted if the Department had complied with the requirements of Section 325 under the time frame outlined in that section. However, the committee is taking this action to ensure that the report is delivered promptly so that the Department can reinstate the public-private competition process once the reporting requirements are complied with.

Section 938—Preliminary Planning for Department of Defense Public-Private Competitions

This section would amend section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, to place the responsibility to issue and maintain guidance and procedures for preliminary planning for public-private competitions with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. Currently all elements of public-private competitions are the responsibility of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. However, the committee believes that preliminary planning for public-private competitions should include an increased and more active role for the manpower and personnel communities, which have greater expertise in determining manpower requirements, whether military, civilian, or contractor personnel. While the committee believes that the manpower and personnel communities should remain actively engaged throughout the entirety of the process, the conduct of the acquisition component of the competition remains the responsibility of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, which has the requisite acquisition expertise. However, the committee recommends the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics realign responsibility for public-private competitions from the Deputy Under Secretary for Installations and Environment to the Director for Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy.

Section 939—Conversion of Certain Functions from Contractor Performance to Performance by Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would amend section 2463 of title 10, United States Code, to require the conversion of any inherently governmental function to performance by Department of Defense (DOD) civilian employees. The committee notes that this requirement was not specifically included in section 2463 when it was enacted originally because it was presumed that such functions were not being performed by contractors. However, the committee is aware that was a false presumption. For example, according to a report by the Government Accountability Office, "Defense Acquisitions: Further Action Needed to Better Implement Requirements for Conducting Inventory of Service Contract Activities, January 2011", within the

Department of the Army, more than 2,000 contractor full-time equivalents are performing work that is inherently governmental, and an additional 45,934 Army contractors are performing activities deemed closely associated with inherently governmental functions. The committee finds this troubling and urges the military services, particularly the Army, to convert such functions immediately to performance by DOD civilian employees.

In addition, this section would require a cost analysis and a savings differential before converting certain commercial functions to performance by DOD civilian employees. This requirement would be applied for the conversion of functions that are not inherently governmental. This section also would require procedures to be developed to notify a contractor of the intent to insource a contract on which the contractor is currently performing; a copy of the notification would be provided to the congressional defense committees. The intent of the notification is to provide fair notice to affected contractors but not to delay or stop an insourcing initiative.

Section 940—Assessment of Appropriate Department of Defense and Contractor Personnel for the Defense Medical Readiness Training Institute

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the appropriate mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to carry out mission and functions of the Defense Medical Readiness Training Institute. This assessment would be carried out in accordance with sections 129 and 129a of title 10, United States Code, as would be amended by this Act.

SUBTITLE E—QUADRENNIAL ROLES AND MISSIONS AND RELATED MATTERS

Section 951—Transfer of Provisions Relating to Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to transfer the requirement for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct an assessment of roles and missions of the Armed Forces from section 118b to section 153, and to enhance the Chairman's role in advising the Secretary of Defense on the assignment of functions of the Armed Forces in order to obtain maximum efficiency and effectiveness of the Armed Forces.

Section 952—Revisions to Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review

This section would amend section 118b of title 10, United States Code, to enhance the requirements of the Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review by requiring the review to include an assessment of the functions and capabilities of the Department of Defense and its major components to achieve the objectives of the national defense strategy and the national military strategy.

Section 953—Amendment to Presentation of Future-Years Budget and Comptroller General Report on Budget Justification Material

This section would amend section 944 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to include the functions of each of the armed forces as identified under

the most recent Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review pursuant to section 118b of title 10, United States Code. This section also would require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the sufficiency of Department of Defense regulations, policies, and guidance governing the construction of budget exhibits and to provide recommendations to improve the consistency, clarity, accuracy, and completeness of the Department of Defense's budget justification material.

Section 954—Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Assessment of Contingency Plans

This section would amend paragraph (b)(1) of section 153 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to submit to Congress, as part of the Chairman's assessment of risks under the National Military Strategy submitted pursuant to paragraph (b)(2) of such section, an assessment of the critical deficiencies and strengths in force capabilities (including manpower, logistics, intelligence, and mobility support) identified during the preparation and review of contingency plans of each geographic combatant commander, and assess the effect of such deficiencies and strengths on meeting national security objectives, policy, and strategic plans. The committee notes that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is already required to advise the Secretary of Defense on such information, in accordance with Department of Defense Directive 5100.01. This section would further amend paragraph (b)(2) of section 153 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a plan for mitigating a critical deficiency in force capability for a contingency plan, as identified by the Chairman in paragraph (b)(1) of such section, as amended.

Section 955—Quadrennial Defense Review

This section would express the sense of Congress that the quadrennial defense review is a critical strategic document and should be based upon a process unconstrained by budgetary influences so that such influences do not determine or limit its outcome. This section would also amend paragraph (4) of section 118(b) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that each quadrennial defense review shall be conducted so as to make recommendations that are not constrained to comply with and are fully independent of the budget submitted to Congress by the President, pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, in order to allow Congress to determine the level of acceptable risk to execute the missions associated with the national defense strategy within appropriated funds.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 961—Deadline Revision for Report on Foreign Language Proficiency

This section would amend section 958 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by striking "annually thereafter" in subsection (a) and inserting "by June 30 each year thereafter;" and by striking "December 31, 2013" in subsection (d) and inserting "June 30, 2013".

Section 962—Military Activities in Cyberspace

This section would affirm that the Secretary of Defense has the authority to conduct military activities in cyberspace. The committee recognizes that because of the evolving nature of cyber warfare, there is a lack of historical precedent for what constitutes traditional military activities in cyberspace.

In particular, this section would clarify that the Secretary of Defense has the authority to conduct clandestine cyberspace activities in support of military operations pursuant to the Authorization for the Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) outside of the United States or to defend against a cyber attack on an asset of the Department of Defense.

The committee notes that al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces are increasingly using the internet to exercise command and control as well as to spread technical information enabling attacks on U.S. and coalition forces in areas of ongoing hostilities.

While these terrorist actions often lead to increased danger for U.S. and coalition forces in areas of ongoing hostilities, terrorists often rely on the global reach of the internet to communicate and plan from distributed sanctuaries throughout the world. As a result, military activities may not be confined to a physical battlefield, and the use of military cyber activities has become a critical part of the effort to protect U.S. and coalition forces and combat terrorism globally.

In certain instances, the most effective way to neutralize threats and protect U.S. and coalition forces is to undertake military cyber activities in a clandestine manner. While this section is not meant to identify all or in any way limit other possible military activities in cyberspace, the Secretary of Defense's authority includes the authority to conduct clandestine military activities in cyberspace in support of military operations pursuant to an armed conflict for which Congress has authorized the use of all necessary and appropriate force or to defend against a cyber attack on a Department of Defense asset.

Because of the sensitivities associated with such military activities and the need for more rigorous oversight, this section would require quarterly briefings to the congressional defense committees on covered military activities in cyberspace.

Section 963—Activities to Improve Multilateral, Bilateral, and Regional Cooperation regarding Cybersecurity

This section would establish a cybersecurity fellowship program within the Department of Defense that would allow for the temporary assignment of a member of the military forces of a foreign country to a Department of Defense organization for the purpose of assisting the member to obtain education and training to improve the member's ability to understand and respond to information security threats, vulnerabilities of information security systems, and the consequences of information security incidents.

Section 964—Report on U.S. Special Operations Command Structure

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2012, a report on

U.S. Special Operations Command structure and make recommendations to better support development and deployment of joint forces.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

The budget request contained $1.15 billion for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, in addition to $486.5 million, for Overseas Contingency Operations, which is contained within the operating budgets of the military services. The budget is organized in fiscal year 2012 to address four broad national priorities: (1) international support; (2) domestic support; (3) intelligence and technology support; and (4) demand reduction.

The committee recommends an authorization for fiscal year 2012 Department of Defense counter-drug activities as follows (in millions of U.S. dollars):

FY12 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request	$1,156.3
International Support	$553.8
Domestic Support	$238.8
Intelligence and Technology Support	$212.1
Demand Reduction	$151.6
FY12 Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Request Recommendation	$1,156.3

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

Whole-of-Government Approaches and the National Security Strategy

In its July 2010 report, the Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel emphasized a call for interagency reform, writing that "the Panel notes with extreme concern that our federal government structures—both executive and legislative, and in particular those related to security—were fashioned in the 1940s and, at best, they work imperfectly today . . . a new approach is needed." The Panel continued, "the Panel finds that the Executive branch lacks an effective 'whole of government' capacity that integrates the planning and execution capabilities of the many federal departments and agencies that have national security responsibilities." The committee agrees, and believes that the current agency-centric structures, processes, and cultures within the national security system prevent full and effective whole-of-government integration.

The President's 2010 "National Security Strategy" stated that there is a need to "update, balance, and integrate all tools of American power and work with our allies and partners to do the same," and laid out various aspects of a broad vision to strengthen whole-of-government integration. The committee believes that success in implementing this vision can best be assured by the preparation and oversight of an implementation plan containing concrete actions to be taken toward achieving the broad whole-of-government vision articulated in the "National Security Strategy." Therefore, the committee recommends that the President develop and submit

to Congress an implementation plan for the whole-of-government vision prescribed in the "National Security Strategy."

OTHER MATTERS

Analysis of Nuclear Force Structure Alternatives

The committee is aware that the President is considering further nuclear force reductions and changes in nuclear targeting guidance. The committee believes any decisions about the size and composition of the Nation's nuclear forces must be informed by robust quantitative analysis, to include war gaming and simulations, force-on-force analysis, scenario-based exchange calculations, and examination of alternative employment policies.

While this type of analysis was done extensively during the cold war, recent reports, including a September 2008 Defense Science Board report on "Nuclear Deterrence Skills" and the December 2008 "Report of the Secretary of Defense Task Force on Department of Defense Nuclear Weapons Management," reveal that the skills needed to conduct this type of nuclear analysis are in danger of atrophying. Furthermore, the assumptions and scope of cold war-era nuclear analyses are vastly different than what is needed today. Today's geopolitical environment presents a diverse range of new threats and opportunities that the committee believes must be examined using the same robust quantitative analysis that was done in previous decades as well as new analytical methods appropriate to address emerging challenges.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on current, proposed, and several alternative nuclear force structures of the United States and brief the congressional defense committees on the methodology, findings, and recommendations of the study by March 1, 2012. In conducting the study, the Secretary of Defense should coordinate, as appropriate, with the Secretary of State, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration.

The study should include an analysis of the effects of various U.S. nuclear force structures and policies on the forces and policies of other nations, as well as the linkages to and effects on nuclear terrorism, nonproliferation, missile defense, and strategic conventional capabilities. The study should examine various scenarios, a broad spectrum of assumptions, and include rigorous quantitative analysis of the potential vulnerability, survivability, and effectiveness of various U.S. nuclear force structures under these scenarios. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to use common metrics to examine and compare the implications of different force structures, and encourages the use of red-teams or competitive analysis to ensure a comprehensive assessment of the options. The committee believes this study will provide the President and Congress with important information needed to inform future decisions regarding U.S. nuclear force structure and policies.

Annual Report on Missile Proliferation

The committee notes that section 1308(f)(1)(A) of the Security Assistance Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–228) requires the President to deliver an annual report to several congressional committees, in-

cluding the House Committee on Armed Services, on the proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, chemical, and radiological weapons. Section 1308(e) states that, "The Secretary shall make every effort to submit all of the information required by this section in unclassified form. Whenever the Secretary submits any such information in classified form, the Secretary shall submit such classified information in an addendum and shall also submit concurrently a detailed summary, in unclassified form, of that classified information."

After multiple requests by the committee for the unclassified summary required by section 1308(e), representatives of the Department of State informed the committee that it had been deemed less important and that only the classified report had been generated. Although the Department ultimately submitted a two-sentence unclassified summary, the committee believes that such a submission is inconsistent with intent of the law. The committee notes that statutory requirements specifying that detailed unclassified summaries be submitted are legally binding, and should be followed. While respecting the need for classification of certain information, the committee notes the utility of the unclassified report for the purpose of open discussion as the committee monitors missile proliferation and the evolving missile threat.

Audit Readiness of the Department of Defense

The committee is concerned that the blended civilian and contractor workforce within the Department of Defense that is responsible for financial improvement and audit readiness lacks the appropriate skill sets required to achieve a clean audit opinion by 2017, as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Specifically, the committee is concerned that the Department's audit readiness workforce may be lacking in qualified financial managers, including Certified Public Accountants (CPAs), who have prior experience performing complex financial statement audits for large commercial entities and/or large governmental agencies. The committee believes that such prior experience is an essential attribute to properly guide the Department in building its capacity to produce a clean audit by 2017. Therefore, the committee directs the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense to conduct an analysis of its civilian and contractor workforce supporting audit readiness, and provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services no later than October 15, 2011. The analysis should include the following information:

(1) The number and relevant qualifications of Senior Executive Service (SES) personnel currently leading audit readiness efforts for the military services, defense agencies, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense;

(2) The current number of full-time equivalents, including contractors directly supporting audit readiness efforts, for the military services, defense agencies, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and

(3) The current number of civilian and contractor personnel with prior experience performing large, complex financial statement audits, including the number of CPAs, directly sup-

porting audit readiness efforts for the military services, defense agencies and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Comptroller General Review of Security Requirements for Special Nuclear Material

The committee continues to remain concerned about the security requirements associated with facilities that operate with special nuclear materials (SNM). The committee would like to gain a clearer understanding of the similarities and differences in security and inspection procedures at Department of Energy and Department of Defense (DOD) facilities that operate with special nuclear materials, as well as commercial facilities that operate with SNM in direct support of DOD or National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) mission requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the security requirements for SNM and submit a preliminary report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2012, with a final report and classified annex, as necessary, to be submitted by July 2, 2012. The review should consist of the security requirements and inspection procedures for DOD and NNSA facilities that operate with significant quantities of special nuclear materials. These SNM include, but are not limited to, plutonium-239, uranium-233, and uranium-235 in the form of nuclear weapons components, metals, oxides, and reactor fuels.

The review should also examine commercial facilities that operate with significant quantities of SNM in direct support of DOD or NNSA mission requirements. This review is not intended to cover operationally deployed or stored nuclear weapons.

Countering Adversarial Narratives

The committee applauds the U.S. Government, and in particular the Department of Defense, for its efforts to develop and implement an effective communications strategy to counter violent extremist messaging and other adversarial narratives. However, the committee remains concerned that the United States and its allies are losing the ever present information campaign to its adversaries. Through the use of emerging new media capabilities, our enemies make it appear that they are acting more swiftly and with a more unified message than the U.S. Government. Furthermore, many of these media channels originate in the United States or neutral countries and pose an even greater challenge because they threaten our ability to successfully communicate our objectives while negating our ability to counter their information flow.

The committee is concerned that the Armed Forces are increasingly seen as the strategic communications provider for the United States within their areas of responsibilities. The committee is concerned, though, that the Department is increasingly challenged by a shortage of in-house practical expertise and, in general, military and civilian senior leadership has limited or no practical experience in strategic communication. The committee is also concerned that the Department lacks the technical capabilities to respond in a systemic, rapid, sustained and measurable way to the constant bar-

rage of narratives being used to undermine our military and security efforts.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the Department of Defense's efforts to counter adversarial narratives and provide a briefing on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This assessment should address the following:

(1) Does the Department of Defense have the authorities, organizational structure, tools, techniques, procedures, and resources to rapidly analyze and respond to adversarial narratives in the information environment;

(2) Does the Department of Defense have adequate manpower, talent pool and training base to provide the leadership and staffing required to monitor and respond to adversarial narratives in the information environment; and

(3) What additional legal authorities or resources are necessary to remedy any challenges or shortages that limit the Department's ability to succeed.

Countering Network-Based Threats

The committee continues to encourage the Secretary of Defense to pursue efforts to develop innovative, non-materiel, and multi-disciplinary methodologies and strategies for disrupting irregular and asymmetric threats. During his March 2011 Senate confirmation hearing, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence testified that "a comprehensive understanding of the socio-cultural environment is absolutely critical to developing and implementing effective strategies to separate the insurgency from any viable base of support in the general population," and that "a detailed understanding of tribal dynamics is a critical intelligence task, and will likely remain so for the foreseeable future." The committee believes an effective military strategy for operations, such as those in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, must appropriately balance kinetic operations with counterinsurgency operations, emphasizing population protection, tribal dynamics, cultural insight, and the rule of law. However the committee remains concerned that the intelligence community is overwhelmingly focused on kinetic operations to the detriment of the socio-cultural environment critical to counterinsurgency operations.

The committee notes that U.S. Army Field Manual 3–24, dated December 2006, defines the key to all counterinsurgency tasks is developing an effective host-nation security force. Chapter 6 of the manual states: "Few military units can match a good police unit in developing an accurate human intelligence picture of their area of operation. Because of their frequent contact with populace, police often are the best force for countering small insurgent bands supported by the local populace."

The committee remains concerned that the Secretary of Defense has not taken full advantage of a novel approach that takes into account an understanding of the tribal landscape and invests in developing host-nation security forces, particularly local police organizations that maintain close ties with and function to protect the local population. The committee praised this approach, the Legacy program, in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying

the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011. In the report, the committee noted special interest in the "Attack the Network" approach used in the Republic of Iraq and Afghanistan under the Legacy program.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the following:

(1) The applicability of the Legacy program in other operations and regions where network-based threats are present or where conditions are conducive to supporting these threats; and

(2) Options for an appropriate management structure within the Department to institutionalize and sustain the capabilities that Legacy and other similar programs provide.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, by July 31, 2011, on the findings of the aforementioned activities and on the plan in H. Rept. 111–491 for supporting and sustaining innovative approaches, including such approaches that incorporate and blend legal, law enforcement, intelligence, and military tactics, techniques, and procedures.

Counterproliferation Improvements and Efficiencies

The committee notes with concern several counterproliferation and combating weapons of mass destruction program inefficiencies identified in the Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report "Weapons of Mass Destruction: Actions Needed to Track Budget Execution for Counterproliferation Programs and Better Align Resources with Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction Strategy," (GAO–10–755R). The committee directed GAO to examine this issue in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010.

In GAO–10–755R, GAO notes that "The Department of Defense (DOD) cannot precisely identify what proportion of its resources are specifically devoted to counterproliferation." GAO also states that "Visibility over how the Department's resources support its counterproliferation strategies is limited, in part because those resources are not comprehensively aligned with gaps in counterproliferation capabilities identified by the Joint Staff based on inputs from the combatant commands and other DOD sources." The committee is concerned about these and other findings within GAO–10–755R, also since the Department of Defense has not yet provided its comments to GAO on the related classified annex may delay implementation of its report recommendations. Additionally, as noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166), the committee remains concerned about the potential for overlap and redundancy with the coordinating functions of the Counterproliferation Program Review Committee (CPRC) and the Office of the Coordinator for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to work with GAO to identify and implement counterproliferation improvements and efficiencies, and to more effectively align resources with the Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction Strategy. The committee also encourages the Department of Defense to review the efficacy and relevancy of the CPRC and to de-

termine if the CPRC is still required to coordinate activities and programs as directed by Section 1605 the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160) and Section 1502 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337).

Cyber Activity of the People's Republic of China

The committee continues to be concerned with the national security implications of the increasing levels of malicious cyber activity emanating from the People's Republic of China. The U.S.-China Economic Security and Review Commission notes in its 2010 "Report to Congress" that malicious cyber activity such as "Operation Aurora", which targeted proprietary information at Google and other U.S. companies, and instances of Chinese internet service providers and censors disrupting U.S. and other foreign internet traffic, such as China Telecom's routing of U.S. internet traffic, including .gov and .mil data, through Chinese servers, are efforts likely being conducted with the tacit knowledge of the Chinese Government, if not with full government support. The report also notes that in May 2010, the Chinese Government instituted new regulations requiring foreign firms to disclose sensitive encryption and software design information.

Further, the Department of Defense noted in its report "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2010" submitted in accordance with section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) that developing capabilities for cyberwarfare is consistent with authoritative People's Liberation Army military writings and that intrusions emanating from China continue to focus on the exfiltration of U.S. Government information, some of which could be of strategic or military utility.

Given the potential ties between the Chinese Government and malicious actors within China, the committee is alarmed that two state-owned Chinese firms, Huawei and ZTE, have been included on the Department of Agriculture's list of safe and approved telecommunications equipment providers for the U.S. broadband expansion program. As the Department of Defense at times relies on commercial providers through leasing agreements or shared infrastructure for the transmission of information, the committee is concerned about the potential threat this may pose to national security as well as to Department of Defense data.

The committee supports the Department of Defense's ongoing efforts to protect its data and networks and encourages the Department of Defense to collaborate with its interagency partners to share technology, best practices, and knowledge to provide for enhanced cyber security across the Government. The committee also requests that a designee of the Secretary of Defense brief the congressional defense committees on the Department of Defense's assessment of the security implications of the recent addition of two state-owned Chinese firms to the safe and approved telecommunications equipment providers list.

Cyber Threats to Critical Infrastructure

The committee is aware of the Department of Defense's efforts to safeguard its activities from cyber threats but is concerned that the Department remains indirectly vulnerable to cyber attack on critical pieces of civilian infrastructure not under the Department's protection. Because of the nature of their location and construction, U.S. military installations are often supported by the surrounding communities' infrastructure, including civilian power grids, public works, and telecommunications networks. Many of these utilities are poorly protected or completely unprotected from potential cyber attacks. Loss of service from these utilities could have significant implications on the Department's ability to assure mission critical capabilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the threat to the readiness of military installations from possible cyber attacks on civilian critical infrastructure, and brief the results of that study along with a plan to mitigate any risk associated with this vulnerability to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Economic Warfare

The committee is aware that the national security posture of the Nation is directly tied to the health and vitality of the economy. Periods of economic hardship have historically caused pressures on budgeting, execution, and planning for defense capabilities, and thus can slow or halt acquisition and modernization activities. Since U.S. military strength is underpinned by its technological superiority, the committee is aware of the direct dependency that military strength has on economic health.

The committee is concerned that our adversaries understand this dependency, and are developing means to attack our military strength by attacking our economy. The committee is aware that in public statements and documents, Al Qaeda has discussed "bleeding the Nation dry" through economic attacks, and has conducted a number of physical attacks internationally in order to cause economic damage. In addition, other nations have written about using economic warfare to complement or support military actions. Historically, even the United States has planned for and conducted economic warfare to subvert adversaries during World War II and the cold war.

The committee is aware that there is a 2009 report from the Irregular Warfare Support Program titled "Economic Warfare: Risks and Responses" that offered plausible scenarios about how economic warfare might be used against the United States. The committee is concerned that there does not appear to be any organization within the Department responsible for looking at the threats of economic warfare, or the impact economic attacks might have on military capabilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Office of Net Assessment to conduct a study on economic warfare threats to the United States and deliver a report on the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Evaluation of the Alternative Methods for Titanium Production

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate alternative methods for titanium production such as electrochemical processing to determine potential for such production to aid in meeting the Department of Defense's requirements for titanium. The evaluation shall include an assessment of production capability, cost as compared to the cost of traditional methods of titanium production, an assessment of the potential to reduce environmental impact through such processes, and any other items the Secretary deems relevant. The Secretary shall brief the findings of the evaluation to the congressional defense committees not later than December 1, 2011.

Global Posture Review Report

The committee notes that section 1063 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the plan for basing of forces outside the United States, concurrent with the delivery of the report on the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) required by section 118 of title 10, United States Code. Although the report of the 2009 QDR was delivered in February 2010, the Secretary requested additional time to complete the basing report following a global posture review being conducted by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The committee has been briefed on the global posture review, but the report required by section 1063 of Public Law 111–84 is still forthcoming. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to submit the statutorily required report at the earliest possible date.

Government Accountability Office Assessment of Reporting Cost Data Collection

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for implementing a process for collecting an estimate of resources required for the Department of Defense to generate both internally and externally required reports. The committee agrees with the Secretary that additional transparency would be useful for decision makers when determining the utility of various reporting requirements. However, the committee observes that any tool used to collect costs is only as useful as the inputs received. In order to ensure that the Secretary's guidance is consistently and appropriately applied across the Department, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the methodology and tools used to collect cost data on both internal and external reporting requirements of the Department of Defense, and to submit a report of the findings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The Comptroller General's report should also include any recommendations the Comptroller General believes are necessary to improve the data collection, transparency, and utility of the tool.

Management and Security of Nuclear Weapons

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has made notable progress in increasing weapons accountability and improving security for the nuclear weapons in its possession. However, the committee is concerned that the Department may not be fully in compliance with the recommendations of the various task forces chartered to address nuclear weapons management and security. The committee is concerned about the Department's progress in addressing those findings and recommendations and, therefore, directs the Comptroller General of the United States to examine the Department of Defense's nuclear security programs and provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. At a minimum, the report should examine the progress the Department has made in responding to the recommendations of the various task forces, such as the Secretary of Defense Task Force on DOD Nuclear Weapons Management, chartered to address nuclear weapons management and security and the extent to which resource implications of planned security modernization efforts have been considered. The report should also examine the extent to which the military services' requirements are coordinated and synchronized to prevent duplication and overlap, and the Department's efforts to secure nuclear weapons stored outside of the United States.

Nuclear Command, Control and Communications

The committee notes that the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) highlighted an interagency study that was to begin in 2010 and provide a long-term strategy and needed investments to further strengthen nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) capabilities. The NPR also noted that the Secretary of Defense has directed a number of initiatives to further improve the resiliency of the NC3 system.

The committee appreciates the Department's focus on this vital capability. However, the committee understands that the NC3 interagency study has not yet begun.

The committee is concerned about potential capability gaps or shortfalls, particularly with continued delays in the Family of Advanced Beyond-line-of-sight Terminals (FAB–T) program. Further discussion is contained in the classified annex accompanying this report.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks, Information and Infrastructure (ASD NII) is designated as the enterprise architect for NC3 and responsible for the development and maintenance of the defense-wide NC3 architecture. Although the ASD NII has this architecture responsibility, the military services are responsible for funding the individual elements of the NC3 system.

The committee understands that the various NC3 elements are highly interdependent; a reduction in funding by one service may affect other services' NC3 capabilities. Without strong, centralized oversight of the NC3 portfolio and investments, the committee is concerned that such dispersion of activity may have negative consequences for the overarching NC3 capability.

The committee therefore directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks, Information and Infrastructure, in coordination

with the Secretaries of the military departments, to submit to the congressional defense committees by February 6, 2012, a report on the NC3 architecture, long-term strategy, and an identification of the NC3 elements across the services, including current and needed investments across the Future Years Defense Program.

The committee is aware that the Secretary of Defense intends to eliminate the position of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks, Information and Infrastructure as part of the Department's efficiency initiative. If this occurs, the committee expects the report to be submitted by the Department's designated enterprise architect for NC3.

Planning for Electromagnetic Pulse Events

The committee remains concerned with the continued vulnerability of the United States homeland to electromagnetic pulse (EMP) events, both man-made and naturally occurring. The 2008 report of the EMP Commission found that "EMP generated by a high altitude nuclear explosion is one of a small number of threats that can hold our society at risk of catastrophic consequences." The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the U.S. Military has the appropriate authorities, capabilities, procedures, protections, and force structure to prevent or defend against any threats posed by EMP generated by a high altitude nuclear or by a naturally occurring event, as well as response plans for dealing with the aftermath of an EMP event.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on efforts to prepare for, prevent, defend against, and remediate after an EMP event, whether natural or manmade. Within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act the report should include the following:

(1) An assessment of any threats posed by a natural or manmade EMP event, including identifying of the foreign countries that may be developing weapons capable of producing high altitude EMP, the nature of the capabilities, and possible advances in the capabilities over the next 10 years;

(2) A description of any efforts by the Department of Defense since the 2008 EMP Commission Report was released to address the findings in (1);

(3) A description of the appropriate authorities, capabilities, procedures, protections, and force structure that the United States may require over the next 10 years to prevent or defend against threats from foreign actors identified in (1);

(4) A description of Government contingency response plans to prevent an EMP event, or to mitigate the consequences of or remediate after an EMP event, especially with regard to critical infrastructure;

(5) In the event that no Government contingency response plans exist, a description of what steps are being undertaken by the Department on an emergency basis to respond to an EMP event;

(6) A description of plans and guidance for military base commanders to be prepared to act on their own authority to provide support to or receive support from local authorities, police, fire, and other emergency services or critical infrastruc-

ture providers, as well as plans and training with civil first responders in their locality to help restore critical infrastructures and assist the civilian population after a catastrophic EMP event and;

(7) An assessment of additional legal authorities or resources that may be needed to develop contingency response plans and capabilities to protect the American people and critical infrastructures and to remediate after an EMP event.

Reduction in Reporting Requirements

The committee considered the Department of Defense's legislative proposal to reduce the congressionally mandated reporting requirements for the Department of Defense. In reviewing the Department's proposal the committee found that many of the reports listed have value and aid the committee in conducting its oversight responsibilities, or otherwise serve to ensure compliance with the law. In many cases, the reporting requirements proposed to be repealed are just notifications of the Secretary's actions, such as use of a statutorily authorized waiver, or the intent to obligate funds for a specified purpose. The committee believes that these notification requirements should not be repealed. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would repeal reporting requirements that it deemed redundant or no longer relevant.

The committee notes that in the justification material transmitted with the proposal, the Department stated that many of the reports in question provide limited utility or informational value. In many cases, the committee agrees with the Department's assessment, but also notes that the limited utility or value of the report is not a result of congressional mandate, but rather results from the Department's failure to fully comply with the intent of the request. The committee also notes that the Department deemed many reports as unnecessary or stated that they do not appear to be useful to members of Congress or their staff. The committee cautions the Department that it is not its responsibility to determine what is or is not valuable to Congress as it conducts its oversight role.

In its review of the Department's request, the committee notes that there were several reporting requirements proposed for repeal that were mischaracterized, previously repealed, expired, or outside the jurisdiction of the committee. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of reporting requirements and to provide recommendations for repeal of requirements for consideration by the committee on a biennial basis. Furthermore, the committee includes a provision elsewhere in this title that would require the Secretary to deliver reports, to the maximum extent practical, in electronic format in order to reduce printing and reproduction costs.

Secure Telecommuting Centers

The committee is aware that the Defense Intelligence Agency operates two pilot projects at Marine Corps Base Quantico, Virginia, and Fort Meade, Maryland, for secure telecommuting. These 2 centers are available to Department of Defense employees with the ap-

propriate level of security clearance, with 16 seats currently available. However, the committee is concerned that the Department is not adequately taking advantage of these secure facilities. For example, the facility at Marine Corps Base Quantico is located at the Joint Reserve Intelligence Center, which is not a dedicated telecommute center. This facility is used primarily during the weekends when employees are completing their Reserve duty and the seats are generally open during the week.

The committee encourages the Department to better utilize the available space at these two facilities during the work week for secure telecommuting purposes. To do so, the committee encourages the Department to develop an online reservation and facility usage system to generate meaningful quantifiable data on utilization and demand for these secure telecommuting sites. The committee believes that once the Department has analyzed data on the utilization rates and demand, it may wish to expand these pilot projects to other facilities. The committee also encourages the Department to provide regular updates to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on utilization rates for these facilities, including unmet demand and waiting lists, and any other relevant data to be utilized by the Department in assessing the effectiveness of these secure telecommuting sites and possible future plans for expansion.

Special Operations Aviation and Rotary Wing Support

The committee is pleased with the Department of Defense decision to establish a new U.S. Army Special Operations Aviation Command (ARSOAC) to enhance Army Special Operations Aviation as well as provide more capable rotary-wing solutions for Special Operations Forces. The committee is aware that the new command will be challenged to provide additional capabilities and improvements for Army Special Operations Aviation amidst ongoing overseas contingency operations, increased global requirements and potential future fiscal constraints.

The committee therefore encourages the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations, Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities (ASD SO/LIC&IC), the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), and the Commander, U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC) to ensure continued communication with the defense committees to enable operational success and optimization of the rotary-wing force structure. The committee further encourages the Assistant Secretary, Commander, USSOCOM, and Commander, USASOC to continue to aggressively pursue programmatic and operational solutions to include modernization programs in an effort to address rotary-wing shortfalls for direct and indirect special operations activities and Special Operations Forces.

State Partnership Program

The committee continues to believe that the National Guard's State Partnership Program (SPP) is an important part of the larger Department of Defense (DOD) effort to build the capacity of our foreign partners in a wide variety of security related activities. The committee notes, however, that the Department of Defense has yet

to issue regulations regarding the use of Department funds to pay the costs associated with SPP, as required by section 1210 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). The committee understands that the Department of Defense is preparing to issue a Directive Type Memorandum (DTM) on SPP and encourages it to complete that process as soon as possible.

In the meantime, the committee is aware that pending the release of the DTM and DOD regulations, some National Guard units have taken a conservative view of the scope of authorized SPP activities, and have curtailed their engagement with partner countries accordingly. The committee commends this approach, but does not want SPP activities unnecessarily limited and therefore encourages the National Guard to proactively consult the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense if clarification regarding certain engagement programs is required.

The Role of Military Information Support Operations

The committee is aware of the Secretary of Defense's directed name change from Psychological Operations to Military Information Support Operations (MISO). This committee is also aware of an ongoing implementation strategy that will institutionalize this change within the Department. While the committee understands the rationale for this change, the committee notes with concern that the Department did not consult the congressional defense committees in a timely fashion as the Psychological Operations activity and mission is codified in Section 167 and Section 2011 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee supports efforts by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations, Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities to support geographic combatant commander and chiefs of mission requirements through the deployment of Military Information Support Teams and Regional Military Information Support Teams. The committee is encouraged that the Assistant Secretary has recently established an Information Operations Directorate dedicated to information operations (IO) and MISO, and supports ongoing reviews to improve the force structure and readiness framework of the Active Component of MISO through the establishment of the MISO Command. The committee expects these changes to contribute to a more comprehensive information operations and strategic communication (IO/SC) strategy that will effectively utilize and incorporate MISO to inform and influence foreign audiences with cultural precision and enable geographic combatant commanders and chiefs of mission to counter enemy narratives and activities.

However, the committee is concerned about a growing operational, technical, and capability divide between the Active and Reserve Components of MISO forces which could limit options available to geographic combatant commanders and chiefs of mission as a tool to satisfy critical IO/SC requirements. The committee is further concerned about deficiencies in the reserve component of MISO and the resultant capabilities gap to provide support to the general purpose forces across the full spectrum of MISO. This capability divide between Active and Reserve components could fracture

overall U.S. Government efforts and activities, and limit the ability to field a globally persistent and culturally aware MISO force that is capable of informing and influencing foreign audiences, contributing to strategic and tactical IO/SC requirements, and integrating with other information disciplines.

While the committee is encouraged that USSOCOM is shifting overseas contingency operations funds into base budget funds for Major Force Program (MFP) 11 funded MISO, it is concerned that a similar program shift is not taking place for the Reserve Component of MISO and therefore may potentially constitute a force structure, limited in capability, that is dependent on Overseas Contingency Operations funds.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations, Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities in coordination with the Commander, USSOCOM to provide a report to the congressional defense committees that outlines: a comprehensive MISO strategy to include the roles, missions, authorities, and capabilities of MISO Active and Reserve Components; current and future force structure requirements, operational limitations and constraints; and efforts to shift required Active and Reserve Component funding from overseas contingency operations to base funding to support future active and reserve force structure requirements. The report should also examine and include recommendations for the potential transfer of proponency of the MISO Reserve Component from USSOCOM to the Department of the Army, similar to the potential transfer of proponency responsibilities for U.S. Army Reserve Component Civil Affairs forces. The report should also include an analysis of the relationship among all IO/SC disciplines to determine if they are sufficient or could be improved through changes to authorities, processes, procedures, and synchronization mechanisms. The committee further directs the Assistant Secretary to submit the report to the congressional defense committees in unclassified format (with a classified annex as required) within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

U.S. Special Operations Command Undersea Mobility Strategy

The committee supports the recent program and strategy shift in the Undersea Mobility Program by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and U.S. Naval Special Warfare Command (WARCOM). The committee is pleased and supports recent reprogramming requests by USSOCOM and WARCOM to consolidate and shift Joint-Multi-Mission Submersible (JMMS) and Advance SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) program funds into a consolidated Undersea Mobility Way Ahead program designed to deliver more platforms sooner and at less cost across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee recognizes the critical operational importance of this program to provide technologically advanced undersea mobility platforms and address capability gaps for operating in denied maritime areas from strategic distances. The committee therefore stresses the need for continued communication with the congressional defense committees to ensure programmatic success and prevent previous program shortfalls in undersea mobility platform strategies.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—General Transfer Authority

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to make transfers between any amounts of authorizations for fiscal year 2012 in division A of this Act. This section would limit the total amount transferred under this authority to $4.0 billion. This section would also require prompt notification to Congress of each transfer made.

Section 1002—Budgetary Effects of This Act

This section would specify that the budgetary effects of this Act for purposes of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–139) will be determined by reference to a statement submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1011—Extension of Authority for Joint Task Forces To Provide Support to Law Enforcement Agencies Conducting Counterterrorism Activities

This section would extend, by 1 year, the support by joint task forces under section 1022(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as most recently amended by section 1012 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

Section 1012—Extension of Authority of Department of Defense To Provide Additional Support for Counterdrug Activities of Other Governmental Agencies

This section would extend, by 2 years, the authority of the Department of Defense to provide additional support to counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies under section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510).

Section 1013—One-Year Extension of Authority To Provide Additional Support for Counter-Drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments

This section would extend, by 1 year, the authority to provide support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments under subsection (a)(2) of section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 1014(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

Section 1014—Extension of Authority To Support Unified Counter-Drug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would extend, by 1 year, the unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia under

section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as most recently amended by section 1011 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). The committee recognizes that, although the Government of Colombia has made significant progress combating narcotics trafficking and designated terrorist organizations such as Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), these authorities are still required to consolidate the strategic gains made over the past decade.

SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1021—Budgeting for Construction of Naval Vessels

This section would repeal an amendment made by section 1023 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). This section would require that a 30-year shipbuilding plan be delivered to Congress periodically. The section that would be repealed changed the periodicity from an annual requirement to once every 4 years to be delivered with the Quadrennial Defense Review.

The committee believes that returning to an annual submittal of the plan would promote stability and continuity in the planning process, both in the plan itself, and in the shipbuilding industrial base. One aspect of the section that would be retained is the requirement that the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, within 60 days of submittal of the plan, provide an assessment of the sufficiency of funds to execute the plan in the budget year and Future Years Defense Program to the congressional defense committees.

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Section 1031—Definition of Individual Detained at Guantanamo

This section defines the term "individual detained at Guantanamo" for purposes of subtitle D.

Section 1032—Extension of Authority for Making Rewards for Combating Terrorism

This section would extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or Government personnel of Allied Forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. armed forces through fiscal year 2014 and change the annual reporting timeline from December to February.

Section 1033—Clarification of Right To Plead Guilty in Trial of Capital Offense by Military Commission

This section would clarify an accused's right to plead guilty to a capital offense before a military commission.

The committee believes that a guilty plea should only be accepted if the military judge addresses the accused personally and determines that the plea is knowing and voluntary. The committee also

believes that the parties should be required to disclose the terms of any plea agreement in open court at the conclusion of sentencing, unless the military judge for good cause allows the parties to disclose the plea agreement in camera. While the Manual for Military Commissions addresses some of these areas, the Secretary of Defense should ensure that the Manual fully addresses these issues.

Section 1034—Affirmation of Armed Conflict with Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and Associated Forces

This section would affirm that the United States is engaged in an armed conflict with al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note). This section would also affirm that the President's authority pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force includes the authority to detain certain belligerents until the termination of hostilities.

The committee notes that as the United States nears the tenth anniversary of the attacks on September 11, 2001, the terrorist threat has evolved as a result of intense military and diplomatic pressure from the United States and its coalition partners. However, Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces still pose a grave threat to U.S. national security. The Authorization for Use of Military Force necessarily includes the authority to address the continuing and evolving threat posed by these groups.

The committee supports the Executive Branch's interpretation of the Authorization for Use of Military Force, as it was described in a March 13, 2009, filing before the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. While this affirmation is not intended to limit or alter the President's existing authority pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force, the Executive Branch's March 13, 2009, interpretation remains consistent with the scope of the authorities provided by Congress.

Section 1035—Requirement for National Security Protocols Governing Detainee Communications

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a national security protocol governing communications of each individual detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The committee believes that all communications for such individuals should be reviewed for the protection of the Armed Forces and other personnel at Guantanamo Bay as well as to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of classified information.

Section 1036—Process for the Review of Necessity for Continued Detention of Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a review process to determine whether the continued detention of individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, is necessary to protect U.S. national security. This section would not affect the jurisdiction of any Federal court to determine

the legality of detention of any individual detained at Guantanamo Bay.

Section 1037—Prohibition on Use of Funds To Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States To House Detainees Transferred from Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2012 to modify or construct any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any detainee transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

Section 1038—Prohibition on Family Member Visitation of Individuals Detained at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using funds available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2012 for the purpose of allowing family members to visit individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

Section 1039—Prohibition on the Transfer or Release of Certain Detainees to or within the United States

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using funds available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2012 to transfer or release certain detainees to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions. This prohibition applies to individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and to individuals detained by the Department of Defense overseas pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note).

Section 1040—Prohibitions Relating to the Transfer or Release of Certain Detainees to or within Foreign Countries

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 2012 to transfer or release individuals detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within a foreign country or any other foreign entity. This prohibition would apply unless the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies to Congress at least 30 days prior to the transfer of any such individual, that the government of the country or the recognized leadership of the entity to which the individual would be transferred:

(1) is not a designated state sponsor of terrorism or a designated foreign terrorist organization;

(2) maintains effective control over each detention facility in which an individual is to be detained if the individual is to be housed in a detention facility;

(3) is not, as of the date of the certification, facing a threat that is likely to substantially affect its ability to exercise control over the individual;

(4) has agreed to take effective steps to ensure that the individual cannot take action to threaten the United States, its citizens, or its allies in the future;

(5) has taken such steps as the Secretary of Defense determines are necessary to ensure that the individual cannot engage or reengage in any terrorist activity;

(6) has agreed to share any information with the United States that is related to the individual or any associates of the individual and could affect the security of the United States, its citizens, or its allies; and

(7) has agreed to allow appropriate agencies of the United States to have access to the individual, if requested.

This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any funds for the transfer of any such individual to the custody or effective control of a foreign country or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the same country or entity who engaged in terrorist activity subsequent to their transfer. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to waive this additional prohibition if the Secretary of Defense certifies that such a transfer would be in the national security interests of the United States and certifies that the general requirements relating to other transfers or releases to foreign countries or entities described above have been met.

While this section does not prohibit the transfer of third country nationals detained at theater-level detention facilities in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the committee believes that determinations as to the disposition of such individuals who continue to pose a threat to U.S. national security should be carefully reviewed and evaluated. This is of particular concern as primary responsibility for detention operations transitions to the Government of Afghanistan.

Section 1041—Counterterrorism Operational Briefing Requirement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide quarterly briefings to the congressional defense committees outlining Department of Defense counterterrorism operations and related activities involving Special Operations Forces not later than March 1, 2012.

Section 1042—Requirement for Department of Justice Consultation Regarding Prosecution of Terrorists

This section would require the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General, or Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, to consult with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense before instituting any prosecution of an alien in U.S. district court for a terrorist offense.

SUBTITLE E—NUCLEAR FORCES

Section 1051—Annual Assessment and Report on the Delivery Platforms for Nuclear Weapons and the Nuclear Command and Control System

This section would require the director of the Strategic Systems Program, U.S. Navy, commander of the Global Strike Command, U.S. Air Force, and Commander, U.S. Strategic Command to each complete an assessment of the safety, security, reliability, sustainability, performance, and military effectiveness for each type of nuclear weapons delivery platform and the nuclear command and control system of the United States within their direct responsibility.

This section would further require that these assessments be submitted to the Secretary of Defense and Nuclear Weapons Council not later than December 1 of each year, along with several other reporting requirements. The Secretary of Defense would then be required to submit to the President each report along with any comments that the Secretary considers appropriate, not later than March 1 of each year. Finally, the President shall forward to Congress the reports provided by the Secretary of Defense along with any comments the President considers appropriate. The first submissions to Congress would be required by March 15, 2012.

The committee notes a parallel requirement for the assessment of the nuclear weapons stockpile established in section 3141 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314). The committee believes these annual assessments provide oversight value.

Section 1052—Plan on Implementation of the New START Treaty

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy, to submit a plan for implementing nuclear force reductions, limitations, and verification and transparency measures contained in the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START).

The plan would include a description of the nuclear force structure under New START, changes necessary and how such changes would be implemented under New START, the costs and schedule for New START implementation, and options for and feasibility of accelerating New START implementation, including an assessment of potential cost savings, benefits, and risks of accelerating implementation. In this context, the committee notes that the next nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference will occur in 2015.

This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department's implementation plan and submit the results of this review to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, within 180 days after the date the plan is submitted. This section would require the plan and review to be submitted in unclassified form with a classified annex if necessary.

Section 1053—Annual Report on the Plan for the Modernization of the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile, Nuclear Weapons Complex, and Delivery Platforms

This section would require the President to submit an annual report for each of fiscal years 2013 through 2019 to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the plan for the modernization of the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons complex, and delivery platforms. The report would include a detailed account of the plans to enhance the safety, security, and reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile; to modernize the nuclear weapons complex; to maintain, modernize, or replace the delivery platforms for nuclear weapons; and a detailed account of any plans to retire, dismantle, or eliminate any covered nuclear system.

This section would build upon a single year reporting requirement established in section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), and codify direction from the President to the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly provide annual updates to the 1251 Report, as stated in a February 7, 2011, White House press statement regarding the Annual Update to the Report Specified in Section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1054—Sense of Congress on Nuclear Force Reductions

This section would express the sense of Congress that any reduction in the nuclear forces of the United States should be supported by a thorough assessment of the strategic environment, threat, and policy, as well as the technical and operational implications of such reductions. This section would also state that specific criteria are necessary to guide future decisions regarding further reductions in such nuclear forces.

Section 1055—Limitation on Nuclear Force Reductions

This section would limit the obligation of amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense or the Department of Energy for any of the fiscal years 2011 through 2017, to retire, dismantle, eliminate, or remove from deployed status any covered nuclear system (as defined here) of the United States as required by the New START Treaty. This limitation would not preclude the use of funds for any other treaty requirement, including verification. This section would allow this limitation to be jointly waived by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, if they submit written notice of the status of carrying out the modernization plan described in the most recent report required by section 1053 of this Act. If the notice describes that such plan is not being carried out, no funds could be obligated or expended for a period of 180 days following the date on which the President submits the report for the modernization plan. If the notice describes that such a plan is being carried out, no funds could be obligated or expended for a period of 30 days.

This section would further prohibit the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy from obligating or expending amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to their departments to re-

tire, dismantle, or eliminate any nondeployed strategic or non-strategic nuclear weapon, until the date that is 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of Energy submits written certification that the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Nuclear Facility (CMRR–NF) and the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) are fully operational; that CMRR–NF and the Plutonium Facility–4 are together able to deliver to the nuclear weapons stockpile not less than a total of 80 pits per year; that the UPF is able to deliver to the nuclear weapons stockpile not less than 80 refurbished or new canned subassemblies per year; and that the nuclear security enterprise has a capacity that supports two simultaneous life extension programs. This limitation would not apply, however, to the dismantlement of legacy warheads that are awaiting dismantlement on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Lastly, this section would prohibit the President from retiring, dismantling, or eliminating, or preparing to retire, dismantle, or eliminate, any nuclear weapon of the United States, if such action would reduce the number of such weapons to a number that is less than the level described in the New START Treaty, unless such action is required by a treaty or international agreement specifically approved with the advice and consent of the Senate pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution; or specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

Section 1056—Nuclear Employment Strategy

This section would require that the President not make any changes to the nuclear employment strategy of the United States unless the President submits a report to Congress describing the implications of such changes, certifying that such changes do not require a change in targeting strategy from counterforce to counter value targeting, and certifying that such proposed changes preserve the nuclear force structure triad. The President would be required to wait a period of 90 days from submission of such report until changes to the nuclear employment strategy may be made.

Section 1057—Comptroller General Report on Nuclear Weapon Capabilities and Force Structure Requirements

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on the strategic nuclear weapon capabilities, force structure, employment policy, and targeting requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD). The study would be required to include an update to the September 1991 Government Accounting Office (GAO) report titled "Strategic Weapons: Nuclear Weapons Targeting Process" (GAO/NSIAD–91–319FS); an assessment of the process and rigor used by DOD to determine the effectiveness of nuclear-related capabilities and policies in achieving the goals of deterrence, extended deterrence, assurance, and defense; and an assessment of the requirements of DOD for strategic nuclear bomber aircraft and intercontinental ballistic missiles. This section would require the Comptroller General to submit one or more reports on such study to Congress, and require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to provide full cooperation and access to the Comptroller General for the purposes of carrying out this study.

SUBTITLE F—FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

Section 1061—Amendments Relating to Financial Management Workforce

This section would establish a financial management certification program for the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee concurs with the Department on the need to develop capable financial managers that understand the advanced fiscal concepts incorporated with the management of the United States' scarce monetary resources. More than 60 percent of the DOD financial community exists outside the auditing, accounting, and financial management job classifications. In addition, the committee notes that this program should help facilitate the Department's ability to achieve clean financial audits by 2017, as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Furthermore, the committee notes that this program also should ensure that financial managers are able to fully understand total force management issues, and the impact of budget decisions on manpower requirement decisions. Future budget resource managers need to be developed with a broad knowledge base.

However, the committee is concerned that the construction of such a program will create yet another training development track within the financial community. The committee notes that there are similar tracks within each military service. For this new initiative to be successful, and to further the efficiency initiatives within the Department, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, in consultation with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) should look to consolidate these multiple training development programs to effectively train the financial management community, while considering the unique fiscal structures and management held within each military service. Incorporating these multiple tracks into a single defense-wide development strategy would ensure that the Department can develop the most capable financial management cadre for future fiscal success.

Section 1062—Reliability of Department of Defense Financial Statements

This section would amend section 1008(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) by striking "Not later than October 31" and inserting "Not later than the date that is 180 days prior to the date set by the Office of Management and Budget for the submission of financial statements".

Section 1063—Financial Management Personnel Competency Assessment

This section would require the Chief Management Officer (CMO) of the Department of Defense, in coordination with the CMO of each military department, to identify, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the number of financial management personnel and the financial and budgetary skills required to: (1) effectively perform financial and budgetary accounting, including reconciling fund balances with Treasury; (2) document processes and maintain internal controls for financial and budgetary accounting cycles; and (3) maintain professional certification standards. This

section would further require that within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness issue joint guidance regarding the assessment of the competency of the Department of Defense financial management personnel to perform such financial and budgetary accounting skills. Following the issuance of such guidance, this section would require the CMO of the Department of Defense and the CMO of each military department to conduct a competency assessment of the financial management personnel of the defense agencies and military departments, respectively, and to each submit to the Secretary of Defense a report on such an assessment, along with a corrective action plan for any skill gaps identified. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees regarding the assessment and the corrective action plans of the CMOs within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act. Finally, this section would require each CMO to designate in the report to the Secretary of Defense which office will be responsible for monitoring progress in the implementation of any corrective action plan submitted.

Section 1064—Tracking Implementation of Department of Defense Efficiencies

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States, for each fiscal year 2012–16, to assess the extent to which the Department of Defense is tracking and realizing the savings proposed pursuant to the initiative led by the Secretary of Defense to identify at least $100.0 billion in efficiencies during the period of fiscal years 2012–16. This section would require the Comptroller General to submit an annual report on the prior fiscal year's assessment and the Comptroller General's associated recommendations to the congressional defense committees starting on October 30, 2012 and concluding on October 30, 2016.

Section 1065—Business Case Analysis for Department of Defense Efficiencies

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out an assessment of the extent to which components of the Department of Defense conducted business case analysis prior to recommending and implementing efficiencies initiatives. This section would require that such an assessment: (1) use a case study approach, (2) identify best practices used by components of the Department of Defense; and (3) identify deficiencies in the analysis conducted. This section would further require, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General to submit a report of such an assessment to the congressional defense committees. This section would require the Comptroller General to include in the report recommendations relating to the appropriate application of business case analysis and best practices that should be adopted by the Department of Defense prior to the implementation of any future effort to identify savings in defense operations.

The committee intends this assessment to be selective and encourages the Comptroller General to choose case studies from each

of the four major tracks identified by the Secretary of Defense in his May 8, 2010, speech at the Eisenhower Library in Abilene, Kansas. The committee intends that this retrospective assessment form the basis of the Comptroller General's recommendations, to assist the Department of Defense as the Department responds to any future guidance it receives from the President to identify additional savings for fiscal year 2013 and beyond. While the committee supports the reduction of waste and the improvement of efficiency within the Department of Defense, the committee is concerned that short-sighted decisions may be made to achieve savings targets, unless rigorous analysis is conducted in advance of such decision-making.

Section 1066—Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan

This section would establish a specific sub-activity group within each of the operation and maintenance appropriations in section 4301 of this Act to identify funds to be executed in support of the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan. This section would also require additional detail regarding subordinate activities associated with interim milestones for audit readiness, as required to be included in the FIAR plan pursuant to section 881 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

Section 1067—Corrective Action Plan Relating to Execution of Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on a corrective action plan for any weaknesses and deficiencies in the execution of the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan of the Department of Defense required by section 881 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). The corrective action plan shall identify near-term and longer-term measures for resolution of any weaknesses and deficiencies in execution of the FIAR plan, shall assign responsibilities in the Department of Defense for actions to implement such measures, and shall specify steps and identify timelines for implantation of such measures.

SUBTITLE G—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 1071—Repeal of Certain Report Requirements

This section would repeal certain report requirements for the Department of the Defense that were deemed to be redundant or no longer relevant.

Section 1072—Biennial Review of Required Reports

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review, on a biennial basis, of the Department of Defense reports required to be submitted to Congress. In conducting the review, the Secretary would evaluate the content, quality, cost, and timeliness of the Department of Defense's compliance with the reporting requirements. This section also would provide the Secretary the authority to recommend reports for repeal or modification to the congressional defense committees based on the results of the biennial

review. This section also would require the Secretary to conduct a biennial review of the required reports internal to the Department and to take such steps as necessary to eliminate or modify reports deemed by the Secretary to be redundant, overly burdensome, of limited value, unjustifiably costly, or otherwise determined to unduly reduce the efficiency of the Department.

Section 1073—Transmission of Reports in Electronic Format

This section would amend section 122a of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to transmit reports required by law in electronic format to the maximum extent practical in order to reduce the printing and reproduction costs of the Department of Defense.

Section 1074—Modifications to Annual Aircraft Procurement Plan

This section would amend section 231(a) of title 10, United States Code, which requires the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual aviation report to the congressional defense committees covering a 30-year time period. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to: provide more fidelity on cost estimates; include the Department of the Army aviation programs in the report; include an inventory of all Department of Defense aircraft; and include remotely piloted vehicles, rotary-wing aircraft, and operational support and executive airlift programs in the report.

Section 1075—Change of Deadline for Annual Report to Congress on National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment

This section would amend section 10541(a) of title 10, United States Code, to change the date for the annual report from the Secretary of Defense concerning the equipment of National Guard Bureau and the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces from February 15 of each year to March 15 of each year.

Section 1076—Report on Homeland Defense Activities

This section would amend section 908(a) of title 32, United States Code, by adding at the end "For any fiscal year during which no assistance was provided, and no activities were carried out, under this chapter, a report is not required to be submitted under this section."

Section 1077—Report on Nuclear Aspirations of Non-State Entities, Nuclear Weapons, and Related Programs in Non-Nuclear Weapons States and Countries Not Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and Certain Foreign Persons

This section would amend section 1055(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to add the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to the list of committees that receive the required report required by such section.

SUBTITLE H—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 1081—Exemption from Freedom of Information Act for Data Files of the Military Flight Operations Quality Assurance Systems of the Military Departments

This section would amend section 2254 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to exempt data files of the Military Flight Operations Quality Assurance (MFOQA) systems of the military departments from the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and would direct the Secretary of Defense to prescribe guidance for implementation of this authority. The committee is concerned that the release of MFOQA data, either when viewed in the aggregate, when combined with other information already in the public domain, or already subject to release under the Freedom of Information Act, could reveal sensitive information regarding the tactics, techniques, procedures, processes, and operational and maintenance capabilities concerning military combat aircraft, units, and aircrew.

Section 1082—Limitation on Procurement and Fielding of Light Attack Armed Reconnaissance Aircraft

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review the capability of the elements of the Department of Defense to conduct light attack and armed reconnaissance missions, or to fulfill requests of partner nations for training in the conduct of such missions, in the next Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review required by section 118b of title10, United States Code. This section would also prohibit obligation or expenditure of funds for the start of any new program to procurement of field light attack and armed reconnaissance aircraft until the Joint Requirements Oversight Council validates a requirement for such aircraft and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics approves the acquisition strategy for such aircraft. This section would allow the Secretary to waive the prohibition should he determine that acquisition of the aircraft is necessary to support contingency operations in Republic of Iraq or Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The committee is concerned by the disjointed approach taken by the Department of Defense in its many efforts to acquire and field light attack and armed reconnaissance aircraft. The committee is aware of efforts by the Navy and Marine Corps to field an operational demonstration of light attack and armed reconnaissance aircraft in Afghanistan. The committee has not supported these efforts because there has not been a validated requirement for such aircraft and the Combined Force Air Component Commander has not indicated a need for additional assets to provide light attack and armed reconnaissance capability for the U.S. Central Command theater of operations. The committee is also aware that the budget request contained $158.5 million for a new program to procure nine Light Attack Armed Reconnaissance (LAAR) aircraft for the Air Force for fiscal year 2012. The LAAR program is proposed to eventually procure 15 aircraft to provide the Air Force capability to train foreign air forces in light attack aircraft to facilitate building partnership capacity (BPC). The committee is not aware of a validated requirement for such aircraft and is concerned that the

use of Air Force procurement funds for the sole purpose of BPC may be in violation of section 1301(a) title 31, United States Code.

Section 1083—Use of State Partnership Program Funds for Civilians and Non-Defense Agency Personnel

This section authorizes the National Guard to use up to $3.0 million of the funds made available through the State Partnership Program to pay travel and per diem costs associated with the participation of U.S. and foreign civilian and non-defense ministry personnel in authorized National Guard State Partnership Program events.

Section 1084—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for Manufacturing Beyond Low Rate Initial Production at Certain Prototype Integration Facilities

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated for production activities at prototyping integrations facilities beyond initial low rate production in order to ensure that full-rate production activities are accomplished in the most efficient manner possible. The provision also contains a waiver, allowing the Assistant Secretary of the Army to waive the prohibition in emergent cases or to respond to urgent warfighter needs in theater.

SUBTITLE I—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1091—Treatment under Freedom of Information Act of Certain Department of Defense Critical Infrastructure Information

This section would exempt certain Department of Defense critical infrastructure information from disclosure pursuant to Section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code.

Section 1092—Expansion of Scope of Humanitarian Demining Assistance Program to Include Stockpiled Conventional Munitions Assistance

This section would update the Department of Defense definition of "Humanitarian Demining Assistance" to include physical security, stockpile management and explosive safety as components of assistance and training.

Section 1093—Mandatory Implementation of the Standing Advisory Panel on Improving Coordination Among the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development on Matters of National Security

This section would amend section 1054 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to jointly establish a standing advisory panel to advise, review, and make recommendations on ways to improve coordination among the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and USAID on matters relating to national security, including reviewing their respective roles and responsibilities.

The committee believes this panel would provide invaluable, objective information and recommendations to both the agencies and Congress about how to improve interagency coordination and collaboration. The committee encourages the panel to review and make recommendations on coordination among, and the respective roles and responsibilities of, the agencies in activities such as stability operations, foreign assistance, including security assistance, strategic communications, public diplomacy, and countering proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Further, the committee encourages the panel to review and make recommendations on: the structures and systems used to coordinate policymaking and policy execution among the agencies; efforts to share lessons learned; the coordination of activities conducted abroad by the agencies or their contractors; the processes and systems for providing and incentivizing interagency education, training, and rotational assignment opportunities to agency personnel; and other matters as the panel considers appropriate.

Section 1094—Number of Navy Carrier Air-Wings and Carrier Air-Wing Headquarters

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to maintain a minimum force structure of 10 aircraft-carrier air-wings and a dedicated headquarters for each carrier air-wing.

Section 1095—Display of Annual Budget Requirements for Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a budget justification display that covers programs and activities for procurement of organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE). The committee notes that the report on the acquisition strategy of OCIE required by the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) has not been delivered. The committee continues to be concerned that the military services are reliant on overseas contingency operation requests to fund OCIE requirements and believes that greater transparency in annual budget justification materials would enhance oversight.

Section 1096—National Rocket Propulsion Strategy

This section contains five findings concerning the reviews undertaken by the Department of Defense (DOD) of the solid rocket motor and liquid rocket engine propulsion industrial base, the reliance of multiple Government agencies on this industrial base, the impact on the Department of Defense resulting from the end of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Space Shuttle program and termination of the Constellation program, and the increasing cost of DOD systems that are in part due to the uncertainty in the industrial base.

This section would require the President to submit to the appropriate congressional committees a national rocket propulsion strategy for the United States. Lastly, this section would express the sense of Congress that the sustainment of the solid rocket motor and liquid rocket engine industrial base is a national challenge

that spans multiple government agencies and requires the Administration's attention.

Section 1097—Inclusion of Religious Symbols as Part of Military Memorials

This section would add a new section to chapter 21 of title 36, United States Code, and would authorize the inclusion of religious symbols as part of a military memorial that is established or acquired by the U.S. Government. This section would also authorize the inclusion of religious symbols on certain military memorials that are not established by the U.S. Government.

Section 1098—Unmanned Aerial Systems and National Airspace

This section would require a program to integrate unmanned aircraft systems into the national airspace system at six test ranges.

Section 1099—Sense of Congress Regarding the Killing of Osama bin Laden

This section would express a number of findings regarding Osama bin Laden, al Qa'ida, and the United States Special Operations Command. This section would also express the sense of Congress regarding the service provided to the nation by the United States Special Operations Command and that the killing of Osama bin Laden represents a major victory in the war against terrorism and radical extremists.

Section 1099A—Grants to Certain Regulated Companies for Specified Energy Property Not Subject to Normalization Rules

This section would amend section 1603(f) of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Tax Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) for grants for energy property in lieu of tax credits.

Section 1099B—Submittal of Information Regarding Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to produce certain materials compiled in coordination with the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence relating to current and former Guantanamo detainees to appropriate committees of Congress.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Department of Defense Hiring Processes

The committee is concerned that Federal hiring process has become too lengthy and complicated to attract quality candidates and to enable the timely and responsive execution of hiring actions. This is of particular concern for the Department of Defense (DOD) which currently is seeking to expand its acquisition workforce as well as bring back "in-house" functions that are inherently governmental and currently performed by contractors. To address many

of the current inefficiencies, Congress has provided the Department with direct and expedited hiring authorities for certain health care professions and acquisition workforce positions, and science and technology positions for the DOD laboratories. However, these are temporary solutions for a fundamental problem with the Department's internal hiring processes.

To promote improvements in the Department's hiring process, the committee included section 1113 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) which gave the Department general flexibilities to reform its hiring processes. However, little progress has yet been realized.

The committee notes that the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board (MSPB) has conducted several studies over the years on the Federal hiring process, and has made several recommendations for reforming the Federal hiring process – many of which do not need legislative or regulatory changes. Among the MSPB recommendations are:

(1) Manage hiring as a business function, not an administrative function;

(2) Evaluate internal agency hiring processes and policies to identify barriers to quality, timely and cost-effective hires;

(3) Employ rigorous assessment strategies that emphasize quality; and

(4) Properly prepare human resources staff and managers for their hiring responsibilities.

Within the Department, human resources management is the responsibility of the Civilian Personnel Management System (CPMS), which reports to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness. However, the committee is concerned that the reliance on outdated staffing systems is hindering the Department's ability to recruit and hire qualified individuals to fulfill its mission requirements. Since 1997, the Department has used the Resumix human resources staffing tool, with each component maintaining customized versions. The committee notes that a 2009 report by the Inspector General (IG) of the Department of Defense found that Resumix has "experienced a number of escalating system issues such as the inability to keep pace with continuous technological advancements" and other problems that have made it difficult to maintain and operate. As a result, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness tasked the CPMS office with replacing Resumix; although, as the committee notes, that has not yet occurred.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to take immediate steps to improve the Department's hiring processes, including more involvement of DOD managers in the process as well as modernizing staffing tools. Furthermore, the Under Secretary should provide a briefing by December 1, 2011, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the steps taken to address the findings in the 2009 IG report, the steps taken to incorporate the MSPB recommendations, a description of the initiatives being taken towards hiring reform, a summary of any statutory or regulatory barriers to hiring process improvements, and the actions taken to modernize staffing tools. The briefing also should identify the resources required to implement the changes.

Pay Parity for Department of Defense Federal Wage System Employees Employed at Joint Military Institutions

The committee is aware that the recommendations made under the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Act of 1990, as amended (Public Law 101–510) to create joint military installations throughout the continental United States and Hawaii resulted in instances where the constituent installations are not all located within the same pay locality. The President's Pay Agent subsequently assigned General Schedule employees of certain joint military installations to a single locality area, resulting in a disparity between General Schedule and Federal Wage System employees employed at the particular joint military installation. The committee recognizes the impact of such disparity on effective personnel management.

An example of this is Joint Base McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst where the former McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix are in the Philadelphia cost of living area, and the former Lakehurst NAES is in the New York cost of living area. The President's Pay Agent placed Joint Base McGuire/Dix/Lakehurst in the New York locality pay area effective October 2009. The Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC) recommended consolidation of the Federal Wage System area within the same General Schedule locality pay area in October 2010; however, no further action has been taken.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to make a timely determination on the FPRAC recommendation of October 2010 with respect to Department of Defense Federal Wage System employees employed at joint military institutions constituted on or before the date of enactment whose constituent installations are not all located within the same pay locality. The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall provide a briefing to the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on the actions being taken to address the FPRAC recommendation by November 15, 2011.

Performance Management Authorities for the Department of Defense

Section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) repealed the Department of Defense (DOD) National Security Personnel System. In addition to requiring the conversion of all DOD civilian employees back to the General Schedule (GS) system, section 1113 provided the Department with performance management and hiring flexibilities which would apply across the DOD civilian workforce, within the context of the existing GS system and consistent with collective bargaining principles. The committee is aware that the transition office has been moving forward in its efforts to develop the new authorities, starting with a "New Beginnings" conference held in September 2010 that brought together DOD management and labor representatives to discuss perspectives on performance management. As a next step, design teams have been established to begin the development of a plan for implementing the performance management and

hiring flexibilities authorized in section 1113. In the area of performance management, the committee encourages the design teams to consider methods that more closely link pay with performance rather than tenure, which has been the primary persistent criticism of the GS system. Such incentives could include both monetary (such as quality step increases or cash awards for performance) and non-cash awards. These are just examples of the range of options the committee believes the performance management design team should consider. In addition, the Department should develop measurable personnel performance metrics and consider whether professional certification programs are appropriate.

In addition, the committee recognizes that the Department needs flexibility to efficiently hire and retain qualified individuals. The committee encourages the hiring design team to review the lessons learned from the expedited hiring authorities provided for the acquisition workforce and other demonstration projects as well as undertake a review of, and consider changes to, the current position classification system to allow greater hiring and promotion flexibilities as well as developing career paths that would allow civilian employees to develop professionally. Furthermore, the committee believes that in order for these authorities to be properly implemented, and to ensure enduring leadership and commitment, the Department must establish robust training programs for managers and human resources offices, as called for in section 1113. Finally, the committee recognizes that while the work of the design teams is not expected to be completed until September 2011, legislation may be needed to address issues raised that might hinder the ability of the Department to implement a fair and transparent performance management system. Therefore, the committee has included language a provision elsewhere in this title that may facilitate legislative changes as the process moves forward.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Amendments to Department of Defense Personnel Authorities

This section would make technical amendments to the Department of Defense performance management, hiring and training authorities in section 9902 of title 5, United States Code. This section also would change the heading of chapter 9, title 5, United States Code, to reflect the fact that the Department of Defense National Security Personnel System was repealed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1102—Provisions Related to the Department of Defense Performance Management System

This section would make technical amendments to the reporting requirements in section 9902 of title 5, United States Code. Section 9902 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to implement a performance management system to replace the National Security Personnel System, which was repealed in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Within 1 year after date of enactment (October 28, 2009), the Secretary of Defense was required to report to the Senate and House Commit-

tees on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on the Department's plan for the new personnel management system. However, while significant progress has been made, no new performance management system has been implemented.

This section would extend the reporting requirements to ensure that the relevant congressional committees are kept apprised of the progress toward a new Department of Defense performance management system. In addition, the Comptroller General of the United States was required to review the Department's plan and to assess employee satisfaction with the new system. Since there currently is no plan to review, this provision would extend the existing reporting mandate and clarify the elements on which the Comptroller General Office should report to the relevant congressional committees.

Section 1103—Repeal of Sunset Provision Relating to Direct Hire Authority at Demonstration Laboratories

This section would make permanent the direct hire authorities that were provided to the Department of Defense (DOD) demonstration laboratories by section 1108 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The committee notes that the direct hire authority has been an effective tool to the DOD demonstration laboratories in recruiting qualified individuals with advanced scientific and engineering degrees.

Section 1104—Denial of Certain Pay Adjustments for Unacceptable Performance

This section would prohibit payment of the annual nationwide adjustment to any Federal civilian employee who is rated as "below satisfactory", which is estimated to be about 1 percent of the Department of Defense's more than 700,000 civilian employees. Currently, all Federal civilian employees, no matter how they are rated on their performance, receive the annual nationwide adjustment in January of each year. Federal civilian employees who are rated as "below satisfactory" still receive an increase in salary despite the fact that they are underperforming. An incentive is necessary to entice these employees to improve their job performance.

Section 1105—Revisions to Beneficiary Designation Provisions for Death Gratuity Payable Upon Death of a Government Employee

This section would amend section 8102 of title 5, United States Code, to allow a Federal civilian employee to designate anyone they choose to receive the entirety of a death gratuity if the Federal civilian employee dies of injuries incurred in connection with service with an Armed Force in a contingency operation. Currently, section 8102 restricts Federal civilian employees from designating more than 50 percent of a death gratuity to an unrelated person. This section would provide parity with the beneficiaries of military service members who may receive 100 percent of a death regardless of the relationship to the deceased.

Section 1106—Extension of Authority to Waive Annual Limitation on Premium Pay and Aggregate Limitation on Pay for Federal Civilian Employees Working Overseas

This section would extend, for 2 additional years, the authority of the head of a Federal agency to waive the limitations on the amount of premium pay that may be paid to a Federal civilian employee who performs certain work in an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Central Command, an overseas location that falls under the responsibility of U.S. Africa Command, in support of a military operation, or responding to an emergency declared by the President. The payment may not exceed the annual rate of salary payable to the Vice President under section 104 of title 3, United States Code.

Section 1107—Waiver of Certain Pay Limitations

This section would amend section 9903 of title 5, United States Code, which provides authority to the Secretary of Defense to hire highly qualified experts and prescribes appropriate pay rates. This section would clarify the intent of that statute to allow such individuals who are serving in a contingency operation area, as defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code, to receive similar benefits and compensation as other Federal civilian employees serving in those areas currently receive. This includes premium pay or danger pay allowances, compensatory time off, and other appropriate compensation or allowances authorized under chapter 59 of title 5, United States Code.

The committee is aware that highly qualified experts currently serving in areas of contingency operations have been denied any type of hazardous duty compensation because the Department of Defense and the Office of Personnel Management have interpreted such compensation as an incentive, which is explicitly prohibited under section 9903 of title 5, United States Code. While the committee does not agree with the interpretation that such hazardous duty compensation is an incentive, this section would remove any possible ambiguity. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Department to take immediate action to remedy the compensation inequities experienced by the highly qualified experts currently working in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 1108—Services of Post-Combat Case Coordinators

This section would require that each Federal agency that sends civilian employees on hazardous duty assignments in support of U.S. military operations in a contingency operation assign post-combat case coordinators to employees who sustain a traumatic injury, or experience a serious disease or illness during performance of their duty in the contingency operation. The committee notes that Federal civilian employees increasingly are providing important support in contingency operations, and many are experiencing serious medical problems upon returning to their regular assignment.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense already assigns caseworkers to its civilian expeditionary workforce. The responsibility of these caseworkers is to guide and direct all deployed

civilians to available resources, provide intervention in problem claims, and work with the service component's Injury Compensation Program Administrators to help injured employees navigate the Office of Worker's Compensation Program claims process. However, the committee is concerned that no similar support yet exists for civilians deployed from other Federal agencies who need assistance coordinating benefits between the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and the Federal Employees Compensation Act (Public Law 89–554).

Section 1109—Authority to Waive Recovery of Certain Payments Made under Civilian Employees Voluntary Separation Incentive Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive repayment of the voluntary separation incentive pay (VSIP) for employees who accepted a reassignment with the Department of Defense during the period of April 1, 2004, to May 1, 2008, and had received written assurance that repayment would not be required or would be waived. The committee notes that the individuals who were rehired were assured that they would not be required to repay their separation pay based on an Office of Personnel Management (OPM) national emergency guidance issued following September 1, 2001. However, due to an oversight, the committee understands that it was subsequently determined the guidance did not apply to employees covered under section 9902, title 5, United States Code, which effectively superseded the OPM guidance. The committee understands that approximately 40 individuals were affected by this determination and that the Defense Finance and Accounting Service now is seeking VSIP repayment from these individuals. While the Department no longer waives VSIP repayment for individuals who have been rehired since May 1, 2008, the committee believes those individuals who returned to the Department immediately following the declaration of a national emergency, and who received written assurances that repayment would not be required, deserve to retain, or be repaid, their voluntary separation incentive pay.

Section 1110—Extension of Continued Health Benefits

This section would extend for 5 years the ability of the Department of Defense (DOD) to pay the Federal Government's share and administrative fees for Temporary Continuation of Coverage (TCC) of health insurance premiums for DOD employees who have been separated due to a reduction in force action, as described in section 8905a(d)(4) of title 5, United States Code. Originally authorized by section 346 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484), the current authority expires on: December 31, 2011, or February 1, 2012, if a specific notice of the separation is given to the individual before December 31, 2011. TCC enables Federal employees who are separated from Federal service to continue their Federal Employees Health Benefits Program (FEHB) coverage for up to 18 months. Payment of the Federal Government portion of the TCC FEHB premium and the 2 percent administrative fee has eased a tremendous financial hardship on former DOD employees who lost their jobs due to Base Realign-

ment and Closure activities. This payment also has enabled families to continue health coverage that they otherwise may not have been able to afford.

Section 1111—Authority to Waive Maximum Age Limit for Certain Appointments

This section would amend section 3307 of title 5, United States Code, to allow the Department of Defense (DOD) to waive the hiring and retirement age limits for Federal law enforcement and fire fighter positions in certain circumstances. While the committee supports the Department's plan to scale back significantly the use of contractors in support services, it is concerned that there may be unintended consequences when converting law enforcement and fire fighting functions to Federal Government positions. Even if the contractor employees currently performing these functions would like to transition into positions with the Federal Government, many may not be able to compete for such positions because of the existing statutory age limits. This section would help rectify that situation by explicitly allowing the waiver of the hiring age limits for Federal law enforcement and firefighter personnel in these circumstances, thus ensuring that the Federal Government is able to hire these experienced individuals. The committee expects that any DOD-established physical or medical standards for these positions still would apply.

Section 1112—Sense of Congress Relating to Pay Parity for Federal Employees Serving at Certain Remote Military Installations

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Office of Personnel Management and the Department of Defense (DOD) shall develop procedures for determining locality pay to address circumstances unique to DOD civilian personnel. These circumstances would address pay parity issues for Department of Defense (DOD) civilian personnel employed at military installations located in remote locations where such employees may have to live in a higher cost municipality in the vicinity. An example of this would be the Marine Corps Mountain Warfare Training Center which has had difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified civilians to work at this remote training center.

Section 1113—Reports by Office of Special Counsel

This section would make a technical amendment to section 1213 of title 5, United States Code, regarding the content of whistleblower reports transmitted to Congress. While the committee recommends this as an efficiency initiative, it notes that this section still would ensure that Congress receives sufficient information necessary to determine if any follow-up action is needed on a whistleblower case.

Section 1114—Disclosure of Senior Mentors

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to publicly disclose the names of senior mentors. This section would expand upon section 1102 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) that would cod-

ify Department of Defense policy (issued in April 2010) that senior mentors be hired as highly qualified experts and comply with all Federal laws and regulations on personnel and ethics.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee focused on three broad areas in this title. First, the committee continued its effort to ensure that both the necessary resources and the proper degree of oversight were brought to bear on the war against al Qa'ida and other militant extremists in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Second, the committee worked to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to build the capacity of nations that have chosen to partner with the United States in combating militant extremism. Third, the committee strengthened its oversight of Department of Defense efforts to identify and prepare for future threats to U.S. national security.

On December 16, 2010, the Administration released the findings of its annual Afghanistan and Pakistan Review, noting significant operational gains in Afghanistan due to an increased operational tempo, expanded special operations forces targeting of Taliban leadership in Afghanistan, and expanded local security measures at the village level. These operations have reduced Taliban influence and arrested the momentum they had achieved in recent years. While noting the operational progress achieved in 2010, the Administration's review also noted these gains were "fragile and reversible," and stated "the challenge remains to make our gains durable and sustainable." To consolidate these gains, the committee has extended the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP), adding additional funds made available by the termination of CERP in Iraq as U.S. forces withdraw from that country. The committee has also extended the Afghan Infrastructure Fund.

The committee applauds the declaration of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) at the November 2010 Lisbon Summit of a transition process that will continue through 2014, when the Afghan Government will assume full authority for security in Afghanistan. While guaranteeing a U.S. troop presence through 2014, the committee remains concerned that the Administration still plans to redeploy troops in July 2011 without having specified what conditions will determine the decision regarding troop withdrawals. In order to assist continued allied participation in the fight against al Qa'ida and other violent extremists, the committee has authorized the continuation of the Coalition Support Fund and the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund, although the committee notes with concern the deterioration in relations between the United States and Pakistan in early 2011 and subsequent statements by the Government of Pakistan that threaten to undermine our concerted effort against common threats.

The committee seeks to enhance the ability of the Department of Defense to build the capacity of nations that have chosen to partner with the United States in combating militant extremism. Recent turmoil in the greater Middle East has demonstrated the im-

portance of strong military-to-military relationships, as throughout the region there was a strong correlation between the existence and strength of the military-to-military relationship between the United States and the partner nation and the level of violence in that country during the "Arab Spring" protests. Given the increased uncertainty regarding the nature of the regimes that will emerge from the turbulence of the past months, these military-to-military relationships are more vital than ever. Our forces' ability to conduct in-country training with partner nation counterterrorism units will be critical in disrupting al Qa'ida and affiliated groups' attempts to exploit the region's turmoil. Consequently, the committee has increased the authorization for the 1206 program from $350.0 million to $400.0 million as a hedge against the uncertainty of the region's revolutions.

The committee believes that the stability and security of the Republic of Iraq is an important U.S. national interest. Yet the committee is concerned that the scheduled departure of U.S. forces from Iraq by December 31, 2011, will leave the Iraqi Security Forces with several critical capabilities gaps that may render it unable to achieve minimum combat readiness, thereby jeopardizing Iraq's stability. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to consider multiple methods of strengthening the military-to-military relationship with Iraq, to include – but not limited to – joint military exercises and the expansion of Department of State programs that bring Iraqi officers and non-commissioned officers to the United States for education and training.

The committee has also taken several steps to strengthen its oversight of Department of Defense efforts to identify and prepare for future threats to U.S. national security. While commending the Secretary of Defense for previous reports on the military power of the People's Republic of China and the Islamic Republic of Iran, the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense to provide more detailed reporting on each country's missile capabilities and proliferation activities. The committee has also directed a classified study be undertaken by an independent research entity on any gaps between these country's anti-access capabilities and U.S. forces' ability to overcome them. Furthermore, the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense to conduct assessments of two less conventional, but potentially grave, threats to national security: an assessment of the energy security of the NATO alliance, and an assessment of the risk posed to the United States or U.S. allies as a result of U.S. Federal debt owned by the People's Republic of China. Finally, the committee remains concerned about instability on the Korean peninsula, particularly given anticipated leadership changes within the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). Therefore, the committee includes a requirement for a detailed report on the military and security developments involving the DPRK.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

African Security Sector Reform

The committee supports continued efforts to promote African security sector reform and to increase the professionalism and accountability of civilian control of African security forces. The com-

mittee notes that increased professionalism and accountability of civilian control of security forces reduces the risk posed to civilians by soldiers who might otherwise commit abuses with impunity. Specifically, the committee commends the commitment of the United States armed forces to security sector reform in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), as evidenced by the ongoing U.S.-DRC training and advisement partnership at Kisangani in the DRC. The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue to prioritize such efforts as a part of its overall strategy for promoting peace, stability, and human rights on the African continent.

Closure of United States Military Installations and Alteration of Basing Arrangements in European Command Theater of Operations

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense plans to reduce the number of Brigade Combat Teams (BCT) stationed in Europe from four to three, in accordance with a decision announced in April, 2011. The committee is concerned that reductions below three BCTs in Europe could impair the ability of the combatant command to fulfill the Unites States' commitments to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and theater cooperation activities.

Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to consult with Congress prior to any decision to implement the closure of any installation or alteration of a permanent basing arrangement in the European theater. Furthermore, the committee encourages the Secretary to consider the importance of the United States NATO commitments and the reliance of our allies upon the United States military force structure for deterrence and defense. Likewise, the committee notes that recently expanded missions of the U.S. forces in Europe should also be considered, including the use of Joint Task Forces to train and build mutual capabilities with partner countries, support missile defense, and cybersecurity missions.

Euro-NATO Joint Jet Pilot Training Program

The committee recognizes the Euro-North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Joint Jet Pilot Training (ENJJPT) program as a unique opportunity to improve relationships with international partners and train allied pilots to a consistent standard. Currently, section 21(g) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761(g)) and the ENJJPT memorandum of understanding (MOU) require nations participating in the ENJJPT program to share in the costs of the program. The committee believes that it is in the national security interests of the United States and NATO to expand participation in ENJJPT to include additional NATO and certain Partnership for Peace nations, and to establish mechanisms to assist these nations in meeting the cost-sharing obligations for participation. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to seek an amendment to the ENJJPT MOU to allow signatory nations to sponsor the participation of pilots from other NATO and Partnership for Peace nations in the ENJJPT program.

Joint Military Exercises with Iraq

The committee believes that the stability and security of the Republic of Iraq is an important national interest given Iraq's role as an ally in the global war on terrorism, as a potential counterweight against Iranian aggression, as a bulwark of representative government in the Arab world, and as a potential supplier of energy resources to the United States and allied countries. Yet in November 2010, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense issued a report warning that the pending departure of U.S. forces by December 31, 2011, will leave U.S. forces little time to assist the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) in developing its logistics system, and cautioned that without viable logistical and industrial capabilities, the ISF may be unable to achieve minimum combat readiness, potentially endangering the Republic of Iraq's stability. In January 2011, U.S. Forces-Iraq (USF-I) reported that additional investments will have to be made to fill what it described as "essential gaps" in Iraqi Security Forces capabilities, noting that additional funds and training personnel may be required after 2011 to ensure that the Iraqi Security Force is capable of providing for Iraq's security. Among the gaps cited by analysts are logistics, training, special operations, and air space management. In testimony before the committee on February 16, 2011, the Secretary of Defense said, "The truth of the matter is, the Iraqis are going to have some problems that they're going to have to deal with if we are not there in some numbers," and that "there is certainly, on our part, an interest in having an additional presence" above levels set by the 2008 Strategic Framework Agreement.

There currently is no agreement in place for U.S. forces to remain in Iraq after December 31, 2011, beyond the projected 150–member Office of Security Cooperation-Iraq (OSC-I) to be based in Embassy Baghdad. Yet the committee believes that a residual U.S. force presence in Iraq, after 2011, and above the OSC-I presence would be beneficial in order to continue to train and advise Iraqi units in functional areas where it lacks capability. If the Government of Iraq requests to discuss agreements that would retain a U.S. force-presence in Iraq, the committee would look favorably on such a discussion, and encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of State to pursue such an agreement. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees within 10 days of reaching such an agreement or, in absence of such an agreement, to report on the extent which participation by the Department of Defense in OSC-I programs will address the capability gaps of the Iraqi Security Forces.

In the event that such an agreement proves unattainable, the committee believes the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Department of State, should consider methods to strengthen the military-to-military relationship with Iraq in order to secure the gains that have been made to date, contribute to Iraq's stability, deter potential aggression by Iraq's neighboring countries, further professionalize the Iraqi military, and assist Iraq in becoming a positive force for stability in the Middle East. The committee does not intend to be prescriptive in describing activities, but believes that the Department of Defense and the Department of State

should consider the value of conducting joint exercises with the Iraqi military, similar to the Bright Star exercises carried out with the Arab Republic of Egypt. Further, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of State to explore ways to bring more Iraqi officers and noncommissioned officers to the United States for education, training, and similar activities. The committee further requests that the Department of Defense, within a reasonable period of time, provide a briefing to the committee on ways to strengthen the U.S.-Iraq military relationship.

Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for delivering a comprehensive report on the "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China," in accordance with section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), including a discussion of the extent to which China's ballistic and cruise missiles increase its ability to control access to the western Pacific. The committee does not believe, however, that the report sufficiently addressed China's domestic production capabilities or proliferation of these technologies.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include greater detail on the ballistic and cruise missile activities of the People's Republic of China, in subsequent submission of report required by section 1202, including China's domestic development and production of these capabilities, and any Chinese proliferation activities of technologies related to cruise missiles, ballistic missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles, and weapons of mass destruction to other countries. This detail should include, but should not be limited to, the proliferation of missile technologies and components at or near the threshold prohibited by the Missile Technology Control Regime and other multinational export control regimes, in as much unclassified detail as possible.

Finally, the committee encourages the Secretary to submit the next report by March 1, 2012, as required by section 1202.

Military Power of Iran

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for the 2010 report on the military power of the Islamic Republic of Iran, pursuant to section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), in particular for the report's attention to Iran's rocket and missile capabilities and Iran's proliferation activities. The committee encourages the Department to provide equal or greater detail on Iran's missile programs and missile-related proliferation activities in future reports.

NATO Special Operations Headquarters

The committee recognizes the tremendous achievements of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Operations Headquarters (NSHQ) in advancing and building a self-sustaining and interoperable special operations force across the alliance. The committee further recognizes the courageous direct and indirect contributions that NATO special operations forces have made par-

ticularly in Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee notes that the current authorized base funding level for the NATO Special Operations Headquarters is $50.0 million and recognizes that this base funding level neither precludes nor prevents NSHQ from supplemental funding in support of additional overseas contingency requirements and encourages the Department of Defense to consider using Overseas Contingency Operations funds for this purpose where appropriate.

Report on Deployment of Assets and Personnel to Libya

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to notify the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services upon making a decision to task any asset of the Department of Defense (DOD) to Libya, if such asset is currently tasked to support ongoing contingency operations in Afghanistan or Iraq. Any such notification must be submitted no later than 72 hours after the redeployment or tasking of a DOD asset in support of Operation Odyssey Dawn or Operation Unified Protector. Such a notification should include at a minimum the number and type of assets and associated personnel transferred from supporting operations in Afghanistan or Iraq to supporting operations in Libya, including but not limited to: Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) assets; close air support assets (to include unmanned platforms); aerial refueling assets; and the diversion of any logistical or other resources used to support operations in Afghanistan or Iraq.

The Secretary of Defense is further directed to report the deployment of any U.S. military personnel or Department of Defense civilians to sovereign Libyan territory, whether held by government or rebel forces.

Taxing Foreign Assistance in Afghanistan

The committee is concerned over recent actions by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, which has contravened existing bilateral agreements by sending past-due tax bills to U.S. companies implementing U.S. Government programs to deliver much-needed stabilization and reconstruction assistance to the Afghan people. While the committee understands that taxing foreign companies operating in Afghanistan is a potentially important source of revenue for the Afghan Government, U.S. law forbids the taxing of U.S. Government assistance. Moreover, there are reports that some Afghan Government officials have reportedly threatened companies with arrests of their employees, loss of licenses, and confiscation of aid goods should those companies ignore the tax bills. These actions are counter-productive to both Afghan and U.S. national security, as they threaten to undermine public support for U.S. Government assistance efforts necessary to create a stable Afghanistan capable of preventing that country from once again becoming a safe haven for extremists groups seeking to attack the U.S. homeland.

The U.S. Government and the Afghan Government carefully negotiated bilateral agreements to exempt U.S. companies operating in Afghanistan from such taxation. The committee therefore urges the Department of Defense and the Department of State to exam-

ine the accords and work with their Afghan counterparts to eliminate any confusion or disagreement regarding the tax-exempt status for U.S.-based companies that implement U.S. Government assistance programs in Afghanistan.

Transparency in NATO Arms Sales

The committee is concerned about press reports that indicate members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Alliance have engaged in, or planned to engage in, major sales or financing of defense articles and defense services with non-NATO member states, including the Russian Federation. According to recent press reports, a corporation in the Federal Republic of Germany will build a combat training center for the Russian Army in the Nizhny Novgorod region. The German corporation would also reportedly work with a Russian corporation to handle the support, repair, and modernization of military equipment. Other press reports have indicated that a corporation in the French Republic has recently contracted to sell Mistral amphibious assault craft to the Russian Federation. The committee is concerned that such sales and financing could adversely affect the deterrence and defense capabilities and the cohesion of the NATO alliance, as well as other security commitments by the United States.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Economic Secretariat of NATO, to monitor these trends and purchases, and to analyze any potential dangers that such sales and financing might pose to the cohesion of the NATO alliance. The committee requests a briefing from the Secretary of Defense about any adverse political and strategic impacts that these sales and financing have had or could have on the integrity and cohesion of the NATO alliance.

Unfunded Requirements of the Department of Defense

The committee notes that in the past, the service chiefs have submitted a list of unfunded requirements for each fiscal year, upon the request of the committee. The committee believes these lists have provided valuable insight into the priorities of the military departments, in the event that additional resources can be made available during the annual authorization of appropriations for the Department of Defense. While the committee recognizes that the President's request represents the highest priorities of the Department, there are always programs for which planned funding would be un-executable or circumstances that have changed since the submission of the President's request. The committee has historically reinvested these funds in items from the unfunded requirements list of the service chiefs. However, the committee also assesses that, in recent years, the level of detail of the service chiefs' unfunded requirements lists has diminished. Additionally, the committee notes that the failure of the Department of Defense to provide unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2012 in a timely manner harmed the ability of the committee to perform oversight of the Department of Defense. The committee urges the service chiefs to continue to provide detailed unfunded requirements lists to the committee so it may continue to ensure the most efficient use of funds to meet mission requirements.

United States Missile Defense Cooperation with Russia

The committee welcomes long-standing efforts by the United States and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to seek cooperative opportunities with the Russian Federation on missile defense through bilateral U.S.-Russia discussions and the NATO-Russia Council.

During the November 2010 summit meetings of NATO Heads of State and Government in Lisbon, Portugal, NATO members agreed to continue a joint missile threat assessment with Russia, reaffirmed their readiness to invite Russia to explore jointly the potential for linking NATO and Russian missile defense systems, and sought to resume theater missile defense exercises. However, the committee notes that Russia still appears to oppose the latter phases of the phased, adaptive approach (PAA) for missile defense in Europe. As Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov stated in February 2011, "Experts are fully aware that the 3rd and the 4th stages of the US 'phased, adaptive approach' . . . if implemented, will mean reaching a strategic level which directly infringes the efficiency of Russian nuclear deterrent forces. If our concerns are not taken into account, if no equitable joint work is achieved, then we will have to compensate for the emerging imbalance."

The committee notes a pledge made by the President, in a letter to Senator Mitch McConnell dated December 18, 2010, that "as long as I am President, and as long as the Congress provides the necessary funding, the United States will continue to develop and deploy effective missile defenses to protect the United States, our deployed forces, and our allies and partners. My Administration plans to deploy all four phases of the EPAA [European Phased Adaptive Approach]." The letter further stated that, "the continued development and deployment of U.S. missile defense systems, including qualitative and quantitative improvements to such systems, do not and will not threaten the strategic balance with the Russia Federation."

The committee commends this pledge, supports the full implementation of the four phases of the PAA, and shares the President's view that planned U.S. missile defenses do not and will not threaten the strategic balance with the Russia Federation. Furthermore, the committee believes that the United States should improve U.S. missile defensive capabilities both quantitatively and qualitatively and opposes any efforts by the United States or Russia to negotiate a future treaty or agreement that may limit U.S. missile defense capabilities.

The committee is also aware that Russia has proposed splitting the defense of Europe into "sectors" whereby Russia would protect Eastern Europe and the U.S. and NATO would protect Western Europe, and has also sought integrated command and control of missile defense assets.

The committee does not support either sectoral missile defense or integrated command and control of missile defense assets. The committee notes that the President has also rejected these proposals. In the December 18, 2010 letter to Senator McConnell cited above, the President also wrote, "we have made clear [to Russia] that the system we intend to pursue with Russia will not be a joint system, and it will not in any way limit United States' or NATO's

missile defense capabilities." The committee appreciates such clarification.

Additionally, the committee is aware of proposals made by the United States to establish a missile defense data processing center that would synthesize U.S. and NATO sensor data with Russian sensor data to allow both sides to cue each other's missile defense interceptor systems. While the committee is open to such proposals, it is currently unclear exactly what data and technology would be shared, how they would be shared, and what equitable contributions would be made by Russia. The committee opposes any proposals that involve the transfer of sensitive U.S. missile defense technology and data. Furthermore, the committee expects to receive frequent updates on these proposals and presumes the Department of Defense will take measures necessary to protect U.S. missile defense technology and data.

Lastly, the committee notes that the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) Resolution of Advice and Consent to Ratification as Amended (Treaty Doc. 111–5) stated that "Given its concern about missile defense issues, the Senate expects the executive branch to offer regular briefings . . . to the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services of the Senate on all missile defense issues related to the New START Treaty and on the progress of United States—Russia dialogue and cooperation regarding missile defense." In the spirit of bicameralism, the committee requests that the executive branch offer these same briefings to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

U.S. Africa Command and the Lord's Resistance Army

The committee remains concerned about the Lord's Resistance Army, its nearly two decade long reign of terror in northern Uganda and central Africa, its killing and brutalizing of civilians, and its continued destabilization of the region. The committee further notes that pursuant to the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–172), it is the policy of the United States to work with regional governments toward a comprehensive and lasting resolution to the conflict in northern Uganda, including support of viable multilateral efforts to disarm and demobilize the Lord's Resistance Army. The committee encourages the vigorous implementation of the policy enumerated in Public Law 111–172 and recommends that Department of Defense provide U.S. Africa Command with any and all resources it requires in the execution of its efforts pursuant to this policy.

Village Stability Operations and the Afghan Local Police Program in Afghanistan

The committee is aware of an ongoing expansion of local security initiatives such as Village Stability Operations (VSO) and the Afghan Local Police (ALP) program, which are designed to empower local elders and marginalize the influence of the criminal and extremist insurgency. Under the leadership of the Combined Forces Special Operations Component Command—Afghanistan (CFSOCC–A), these activities have grown in scope and scale, and are effec-

tively empowering Afghans to stand up for themselves with close support from the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and coalition forces. To support VSO and ALP expansion, the committee is also aware that conventional U.S. infantry battalions have been assigned under the operational control of CFSOCC–A, which had heretofore been manned almost exclusively by Special Operations Forces. The committee is aware that U.S. Special Operations Command has responded to critical mission needs and emerging requirements in support of VSO and ALP and has realigned considerable Major Force Program (MFP)–11 resources, including communications equipment, vehicles, alternative energy technologies, and non-standard aviation fixed-wing aircraft.

While these programmatic shifts in MFP–11 funding appear warranted, the committee is concerned about an increased reliance upon Government contracts to provide security guards at forward operating bases and facilities in support of U.S. Special Operations Forces, and Afghan and Coalition Forces. The committee is also concerned that as the Department of Defense expands VSO and ALP activities, other U.S. Government agencies have been unable to contribute a comparable and concomitant expansion of civilian-led U.S. and Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan development and governance initiatives and activities. Improper and inconsistent program expansion may jeopardize realized gains, encourage splinter and outlier activities not coordinated within the overall ALP strategy, and systemically further damage Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan credibility if Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and Coalition Forces are unable to deliver security, development, and governance at the district, provincial, and national level.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Section 1201—Expansion of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would increase the amount authorized for support of special operations to combat terrorism pursuant to section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375; 118 Stat. 2086), as most recently amended by section 1201 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4385), from $45 million to $50 million, extend the authority through fiscal year 2014, and direct the Department of Defense to provide an implementation strategy that outlines the future requirements that would require similar authority in preparation for pending authority expiration.

Section 1202—Modification and Extension of Authorities Relating to Program To Build the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces

This section would extend, by 1 year, the authorities relating to programs to build the capacity of foreign military forces under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), as most recently amended by section 1207(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). This section would increase the amount authorized from fiscal year 2011 by $50.0 million, for a total of $400.0 million in fiscal year 2012. This section would also increase the limitation on the amount for building capacity to participate in or support military and stability operations by $50.0 million, for a total of $150.0 million in fiscal year 2013. This section would also add a new reporting requirement regarding implementation of the authority during the previous fiscal year. The President would be required to submit such a report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs as part of the supporting materials accompanying the President's budget request, submitted pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code.

Section 1203—Five-Year Extension of Authorization for Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

This section would authorize the Department of Defense to continue to develop, manage, and execute a Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery personnel recovery program for isolated Department of Defense, U.S. Government, and other designated personnel supporting United States national interests globally. The initial authorization contained in section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) provided for funds for this program to be available through fiscal year 2011. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to use funds through fiscal year 2016.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND PAKISTAN

Section 1211—Authority To Establish a Program To Develop and Carry Out Infrastructure Projects in Afghanistan

This section would extend for 1 year, through the end of fiscal year 2012, the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund established under section 1217 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). The committee further recommends increasing the amount authorized under this provision to $475.0 million in order to undertake high-priority, large-scale infrastructure projects in support of the civil-military campaign in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Section 1212—Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan

This section would authorize the use of operation and maintenance funds made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2012 to provide funds for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. This section would authorize $425.0 million for activities in fiscal year 2012, and would require the Secretary of Defense to provide quarterly reports to the congressional defense committees.

The committee notes that this section does not authorize the use of the Commanders' Emergency Program in Iraq, as previously authorized by section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 106–163), as amended most re-

cently by section 1212 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). The remaining U.S. forces in the Republic of Iraq are operating in a strictly training and advisory capacity to Iraqi Security Force units. The committee believes that any immediate humanitarian needs such units encounter should be addressed through Iraqi funding sources.

Section 1213—Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would extend, by 1 year, section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1213 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for: (a) logistical, military, and other support provided by that nation to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Operation Enduring Freedom; or (b) logistical and military support provided by that nation to confront the threat posed by Al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and other militant extremists in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The total amount of reimbursements made under this authority during fiscal year 2012 would not exceed $2.2 billion. The congressional notification and reporting requirements relating to reimbursement of Pakistan for support provided by Pakistan as required by section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 1213 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), would apply to Coalition Support Fund reimbursements authorized by this section.

Section 1214—Extension and Modification of Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund

This section would extend, by 1 year, section 1224(h) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as most recently amended by section 1220 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), to provide assistance to the security forces of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to build and maintain those forces' counterinsurgency capability. This section would also withhold authority to obligate more than 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) until the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy to utilize the fund, a discussion of the terrorist or extremist groups that the United States encourages Pakistan to combat, the gaps in capabilities of Pakistani security units, how assistance provided utilizing the fund will address these capability gaps, and metrics of progress. This section directs that future updates of the report be submitted concurrently with the President's budget request, and requires quarterly reporting on progress in achieving U.S. strategic objectives in Pakistan and progress made by programs supported by PCF.

The committee feels that PCF remains a critical part of a comprehensive program to train and equip the Pakistani army and Pakistani Frontier Scouts to be able to conduct counterinsurgency operations in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) of Pakistan. The committee further notes that the Pakistani security forces have undertaken significant operations against some extremist organizations in the FATA, including at least one such organization that has attempted to launch an attack against the United States homeland. However, to date, the committee believes that Pakistan has lacked both the capability and political will to pursue and eliminate some well-armed and dangerous extremist groups that have attacked U.S. forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, such as the Haqqani Network. The committee believes that significantly enhancing the capabilities of Pakistan through PCF, if properly conceived and carried out, should make it easier for the government of Pakistan to make the hard decisions to combat these groups. However, some recent events, such as the public request to cease drone operations against terrorists in Pakistan's tribal areas and requests that the United States reduce the number of special forces trainers and intelligence operatives working in Pakistan, have caused the committee to question if the government of Pakistan will be able to make such a decision in the near future. The committee intends the report required by this section to address such questions in order to determine on an on-going basis, the value of such assistance in promoting security in Pakistan, consistent with the interests of the United States.

Section 1215—Report on Extension of United States-Iraq Status of Forces Agreement

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with formal notification if the U.S. Government and the Government of the Republic of Iraq complete an agreement permitting the United States to maintain a force presence in Iraq above that envisioned for the Office of Security Cooperation-Iraq (OSC-I). This section would require that in the absence of such an agreement in place by December 31, 2011, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 31, 2012, outlining how Department of Defense participation in OSC-I programs will address the capability gaps of the Iraqi Security Forces, should the Government of Iraq request such assistance. This section would also require the Secretary to submit an update to such a report concurrent with the submission of the President's budget requests for fiscal years 2014–15, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, unless such an agreement is reached. The committee intends for these updates to cover Department of Defense OSC–I efforts for calendar year 2012 and 2013, respectively.

Section 1216—Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to utilize funds available for operations and maintenance by the Air Force to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC-I). This section would fund the life support,

transportation, and personal security of Department of Defense personnel in OSC-I. This section would not authorize funding to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of State.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 1221—Review and Report on Iran's and China's Conventional and Anti-Access Capabilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act to submit to the congressional defense committees a classified study undertaken by an independent entity outside the Department of Defense assessing the gaps between the conventional and anti-access capabilities of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the People's Republic of China and the U.S. forces' ability to overcome such capabilities. The committee notes that sections 1238 and 1243 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) required a report and a briefing from the Department of Defense on these subjects. However, given the potentially grave threats posed by these capabilities to U.S. national security and stability in the western Pacific and Middle East, the committee believes an additional, independent assessment is warranted to further inform the Department's planning and the committee's oversight of these issues. The committee encourages the Secretary to select an entity with the necessary security clearances and expertise to review the intelligence assessments upon which the Department's findings were based pursuant to the report and briefing required by sections 1238 and 1243.

Section 1222—Report and Consultation on Energy Security of NATO Alliance

This section would express certain findings related to energy security for members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and would require the Secretary of Defense to direct a federally funded research and development center of the Department of Defense to conduct an assessment of the energy security of the NATO alliance, with an emphasis on the vulnerabilities of NATO alliance members to a sole supplier or distribution network for oil or gas, and how such vulnerabilities could adversely affect the security and cohesion of the alliance. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit a report of such assessment not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act. This section would further direct the Secretary of Defense to consult with other NATO member countries and NATO's Emerging Security Challenges Division on other ways the United States as a NATO member country could contribute to the energy security of the NATO alliance and NATO regional partners.

Section 1223—Extension of Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan

This section would extend the "Report on Progress Toward Stability and Security in Afghanistan," as required by section 1230(a)

of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1231 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

Section 1224—Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than March 1, 2012 and March 1, 2013 to submit, in both classified and unclassified form, a report on the current and future military power of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This section would require the report be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Section 1225—National Security Risk Assessment of the United States Federal Debt Owned by the People's Republic of China

This section would require, within 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to determine and make publicly available the amount of accrued interest on United States Federal debt paid to the People's Republic of China during the five years preceding the date of enactment of this Act. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, to carry out an assessment of the national security risks posed to the United States and United States allies as a result of the Federal debt liabilities owed to China and the amount of interest determined to have been paid by the United States to China. This section would require the Secretary to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs within 120 days following the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 1226—Congressional Notification Requirement before Permanent Relocation of Any United States Military Unit Stationed Outside the United States

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section 162a, that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify Congress at least 30 days before the relocation of a unit stationed outside the United States. Elements of the notification would include how the action supports the national security strategy, commitments undertaken by international security treaties, a combatant commander's area of responsibility, the cost differential between relocation and rotation to maintain the same capabilities, and how such relocation would affect overseas Base Realignment and Closure activities. This section would also waive the notification requirement for relocation of a unit to a contingency operation, for relocation as a result of a closure of an overseas installation at the request of the government of the host nation, or for the planned reduction of brigade combat teams within the European command area of operations from four to three. Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the ability of the Secretary

of Defense to relocate military units stationed outside the United States.

Section 1227—Annual Report on Military Power of the People's Republic of China

This section would amend section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), as most recently amended by section 1246(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), by changing the name of the annual report required by such section from "Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China" to "Annual Report on Military Power of the People's Republic of China". This section would also clarify the reporting requirements relating to China's cyber and espionage activities.

Section 1228—Limitation on Funds to Provide the Russian Federation with Access to United States Missile Defense Technology

This section would establish two limitations on funds made available in this Act to provide the Russian Federation with access to the missile defense technology and data of the United States. The first limitation would limit funds from being used to provide the Russian Federation with access to sensitive U.S. missile defense technology or sensitive data. The second limitation would limit funds from being used to provide the Russian Federation with access, more generally, to U.S. missile defense technology or data as part of a defense technical cooperative agreement unless the President submits a report and certification to certain committees.

Section 1229—International Agreements Relating to Missile Defense

This section includes several findings related to unilateral statements made concerning the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), and several of the understandings and declarations in the Senate's Resolution of Ratification for that treaty, related to United States legal obligations and U.S. national interests with respect to limiting, restricting, and improving the missile defense capabilities of the United States. This section further includes several policy statements concerning further limitations on and improvements to the U.S. missile defense capabilities, and with respect to future agreements restricting those capabilities.

This section would amend title 10, United States Code, to state that, in accordance with the Senate's Resolution of Ratification of the New START Treaty, any agreement with a country or international organization or amendment to the New START Treaty (including an agreement made by the Bilateral Consultative Commission established by the treaty) concerning the limitation of U.S. missile defense capabilities shall not be binding on the United States, and shall not enter into force with respect to the United States, unless after the date of the enactment of this section, such agreement or amendment is specifically approved with the advice and consent of the Senate pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution; or specifically authorized by an Act of Congress.

This section would further require the President to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs an annual notification whether the Russian Federation has recognized during the previous year the sovereign right of the United States to pursue quantitative and qualitative improvements in missile defense capabilities; and furthermore whether during any treaty negotiations or other Government-to-Government contacts between the United States and the Russian Federation during the previous year a representative of the Russian Federation suggested that a treaty or other international agreement include, with respect to the United States, restricting missile defense capabilities, military capabilities in space, or conventional prompt global strike capabilities, or reducing the number of non-strategic nuclear weapons deployed in Europe.

Section 1230—Non-strategic Nuclear Weapon Reductions and Extended Deterrence Policy

This section would express certain policy statements of the United States on Russian and United States non-strategic nuclear weapon reductions and extended deterrence commitments to Europe.

This section would further prohibit any action from being taken to effect or implement the reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal of nuclear forces of the United States that are based in Europe unless either 1) the reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal of such nuclear forces is requested by the government of the host nation in the manner provided in the agreement between the United States and the host nation regarding the forces; or 2) the President certifies that NATO member states have considered the reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal at the High Level Group, that NATO has decided to support such reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal, and that the remaining nuclear forces of the United States that are based in Europe after such reduction, consolidation or withdrawal would provide a commensurate or better level of assurance and credibility as before such reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal.

This section would further require that upon any decision to reduce, consolidate, or withdraw nuclear forces of the United States from Europe, the President to submit to certain congressional committees a notification that the above referenced certification has been made, a justification for such reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal, and an assessment of how NATO member states, in light of such action, assess the credibility of the deterrence capability of the United States in support of its commitments under article f of the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949.

This section would further require the expiration of a 180 day period beginning on the date that the President makes the above referenced certification, before the President may commence a reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal of the nuclear forces of the United States that are based in Europe.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained $508.2 million for fiscal year 2012, representing a decrease of $14.23 million from the amount requested and authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2011. Since the submission of the fiscal year 2011 request, several of the CTR accounts have been reorganized. The request for fiscal year 2012 included $63.2 million for Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination, $9.8 million for Chemical Weapons Destruction, $121.1 million for Global Nuclear Security, $259.5 million for Cooperative Biological Engagement, $28.1 million for Proliferation Prevention, $2.5 million for Threat Reduction Engagement, and $24.0 million for Other Assessments/Administrative support.

The committee continues to support the goals of the CTR program and continues to believe that the program is critical to United States national security. In past years, the committee has expressed concern that a lack of effective policy guidance and leadership, as well as programmatic and funding constraints, have sometimes limited progress of the CTR Program. The committee notes, however, that the CTR program has made significant achievements, and that much threat reduction work remains to be done.

Recent national defense authorization acts addressed these concerns by: repealing limitations on the use of CTR funds; expanding CTR authority outside the former Soviet Union; increasing CTR funding, including funding for new CTR initiatives; requiring reports by the National Academy of Sciences and the Secretary of Defense on the development of new CTR initiatives and metrics; requiring a report by the Secretary of Defense regarding efforts to complete the chemical weapons destruction project in the Russian Federation at Schuch'ye; requiring increased reporting from the Secretary of Defense on CTR defense and military contacts; providing CTR programs with authority for urgent threat reduction activities; authorizing the CTR program to accept international contributions; and ensuring that the CTR program addresses threats involving nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and weapons-related materials, technologies, and expertise.

The committee notes that the CTR Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP), formerly called the Biological Threat Reduction Program (BTRP), now encompasses over one half of the CTR budget request. The committee reaffirms its view, stated in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 that biological threat reduction and engagement "should be guided by a comprehensive long-term interagency engagement and coordination; rigorous Department management and oversight; coordination and integration with other Department programs and activities; and concrete metrics for measuring progress." The committee further reaffirms its view that the CTR program as a whole should "maintain a strong focus" on the full range of threat reduction challenges. The committee further reaffirms its view that concrete metrics remain important for measuring the impact and effective-

ness of all CTR activities. The committee welcomes efforts by the Department of Defense to actively consult with the committee and keep the committee fully informed of efforts and developments in these areas.

Section 1303 of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2010 (Public Law 111–84) placed a limitation on the use of funds for establishing centers of excellence in countries outside the former U.S.S.R. Section 1304 of the same Act required the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy to jointly submit a plan, not later than April 1, 2011, on carrying out CTR program activities planned in the People's Republic of China. The committee notes that this report was not submitted on time. The committee continues to remain deeply interested in the CTR program activities taking place outside of the former U.S.S.R., and in particular those activities in the People's Republic of China. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to ensure that reports are submitted on time, to continue to actively consult with the committee, and to keep the committee fully informed of developments and CTR program activities involving the People's Republic of China.

Finally, the committee believes that the phrases "military-to-military and defense contacts" and "defense and military contacts" as used in section 1501(b)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, as amended, and subsequent relevant legislation, includes defense and military contacts that are used to support participation by foreign non-defense departments and agencies, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations in activities that support the CTR mission.

The committee authorizes $508.2 million, the amount of the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Cooperative Threat Reduction Biological Surveillance Network

The committee is concerned that the proposed biological surveillance network within the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP) could prove insufficient to monitor, detect, and deter manmade pathogens, even if implemented widely. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess whether the biological surveillance network would fall short of addressing the global biological threat. The assessment should examine the potential for dangerous pathogens to be weaponized: (1) by relatively unsophisticated non-state actors, including terrorists, (2) by state or non-state actors in countries that do not fully cooperate with such a network, or (3) by rogue state or sub-state actors who, with modest biological knowledge and equipment, might be able to circumvent such a network even in countries that would participate in such a network. The Secretary should consult with the intelligence community in the conduct of such an assessment. The Secretary is further directed to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, House Committee on Armed Services, and House Committee on Foreign Affairs, on any necessary recommendations regarding the modification of the CBEP mission, in unclassified form with a classified annex, as necessary, within 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Cooperative Threat Reduction of Biological Weapons

The committee has long expressed support for reducing the threats from biological weapons and the proliferation of dangerous pathogens. However, the committee has also expressed concern regarding measures of effectiveness of Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) activities. Section 1304 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) directed the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement metrics to measure the impact and effectiveness of all CTR activities. The "Report on Metrics for the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program" referred to here as the CTR Metrics Report, was completed in September 2010.

The committee also notes that the CTR biological program has recently undergone a name change, from the Biological Threat Reduction Program to the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program, and appears to be transforming from the site-specific and arms control threat reduction paradigms to a new global effects paradigm, characterized by engagement and capacity building. Additionally, budget requests for biological threat-related CTR activities have gradually increased and now represent more than half of the program request.

The committee is concerned that this reorientation could both impair CTR's traditional focus on threat reduction and complicate program assessment. To the extent that the biological engagement monitors naturally occurring diseases, it may become more difficult for Congress to monitor CTR's continued focus on threats that are directly related to weapons of mass destruction. Despite the Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention (BWC), there is no shortage of biological weapons material and facilities. For example, as noted in the 2005 Department of State report, "Adherence to and Compliance With Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments," the "United States judges, based on available evidence, that Russia continues to maintain an offensive program in violation of the BWC." The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue its efforts to attempt to gain access to such sites. While there is a hope that engagement could facilitate the attainment of this goal, it is not clear that additional spending on engagement would persuade an uncooperative country from opening or even admitting the existence of such facilities. The CTR Metrics Report notes, "we need better measures to show that these efforts actually result in changed practices or additional effectiveness." Indeed, the CTR Metrics Report further acknowledges that the metrics do not attempt to "determine whether the activities of the CTR program are the 'right' activities."

The committee believes that engagement dollars must yield verifiable results and must result in threat reduction. Therefore, elsewhere in this title the committee includes a provision that would limit the funds available for CBEP until the Secretary certifies that biological engagement efforts do actually result in changed practices or additional effectiveness, and that the program leads to a reduction in the threat from biological weapons, bioterrorism, and pathogen proliferation.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Programs and Funds

This section would define the programs and funds that are Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act and specify that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program element under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program from within the overall $508.2 million that the committee would authorize for the CTR program. The allocation under this section reflects the amount of the budget request for fiscal year 2012. This section would also require notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2012 funds for purposes other than those specifically authorized. In addition, this section would provide limited authority to obligate amounts for a program element under the CTR program in excess of the amount specifically authorized for that purpose.

Section 1303—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cooperative Biological Engagement Program

This section would limit funds that may be obligated or expended for fiscal year 2012 for the cooperative biological engagement program (CBEP) to not more than 75 percent of the amounts authorized or otherwise available for such purpose, until the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits certain information to the appropriate congressional committees. The Secretary would be required to submit a detailed analysis of the effectiveness of CBEP, and either written certification that CBEP results in changed practices and threat reduction, or a detailed list of policy and program recommendations considered by the Secretary to be necessary to modify, expand, or curtail CBEP. This section would require the Secretary to submit the report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize appropriations for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1405—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the level identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1406—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Authorized Uses of National Defense Stockpile Funds

This section would authorize $50.1 million from the National Defense Stockpile Transaction fund for the operation and maintenance of the National Defense Stockpile for fiscal year 2012. This section would also permit the use of additional funds for extraordinary or emergency conditions 45 days after Congress receives notification.

Section 1412—Revision to Required Receipt Objectives for Previously Authorized Disposals from the National Defense Stockpile

This section would authorize revisions on limitations in asset sales contained in section 3402(b)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) as most recently amended by section 1412 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to increase the Department of Defense's stockpile commodity disposal authority from $730.0 million to $830.0 million, and extend this authority from 2013 to 2016.

SUBTITLE C—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION MATTERS

Section 1421—Changes to Management Organization to the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative Program

This section would allow the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternative Program (ACWA) to work closely with the U.S. Army Chemical Materials Agency (CMA). The committee believes that CMAs leadership, engineers, scientists, project managers, technical managers, and safety technicians represent a pool of talent and experience that can and should be leveraged as CMA begins to draw down upon the completion of its mission to help address and anticipate risks and help to underwrite future success of ACWA.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1431—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $67.7 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2012.

Section 1432—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds from the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund created by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1433—Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund

This section would establish a fund to be known as the "Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund". Funds would be authorized to be appropriated for the fund for fiscal year 2012 as specified in the funding table in section 4501 of this Act. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to transfer amounts from the fund to another account of the Department of Defense to mitigate unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2012 for any of the following: (1) ballistic and cruise missile defense; (2) Navy shipbuilding; (3) strike fighter shortfalls; (4) mine warfare; (5) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; (6) capabilities to defeat anti-access/area denial technologies; and (7) basic research. The authority provided to the Secretary of Defense to transfer amounts from the fund to other accounts would be in addition to any other authority provided to the Secretary to transfer funds provided in this Act. This section would specify that the transfer of an amount from the fund to another Department of Defense account would be deemed an increase to the amount authorized to be appropriated for such account. This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from transferring amounts from the fund until the date that is 15 days after the date on which the Secretary notifies the congressional defense committees in writing of the details of the proposed transfer. Finally, the Secretary of Defense would be required to issue guidance, within

90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, regarding the identification and selection of projects to be funded under this section using merit-based selection criteria.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee notes that section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) requires the budget submission to Congress for each fiscal year to include:

(1) A request for the appropriation of funds for ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;

(2) An estimate of all funds expected to be required in that fiscal year for operations; and

(3) A detailed justification of the funds requested.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations to be available upon enactment of this Act to support overseas contingency operations principally associated with Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

CV–22 Combat Loss Replacement Funding

The budget request contained $15 million for combat loss replacement funding and Special Operations Forces peculiar modifications for one CV–22 for a total of $15.0 million.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2011 appropriations included funding for this combat loss replacement.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $15.0 million, for combat loss replacement funding and Special Operations Forces peculiar modifications.

Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained $100.0 million for the Joint Urgent Operational Needs (JUON) Fund.

The committee understands this fund would be used to address unknown operational needs in Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom. However, the committee believes that this request lacks proper justification and is duplicative with other requests for rapid acquisition capabilities to address urgent operational needs. The committee is aware the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has identified 31 entities within the Department of Defense, the military services, and U.S. Special Operations Command whose mission is to respond to urgent operational needs from combat theaters of operation that all have separate budgets that could be used to develop, equip, and field solutions to the warfighter. For example, the committee notes the total budget request contained $2.8 billion for the Joint IED Defeat Organization,

$191.4 million for the Rapid Equipping Force, and $334.4 million for the Rapid Fielding Directorate.

The committee also notes that Congress provided the Department with Rapid Acquisition Authority (RAA) in section 806(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), as amended by section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) and section 803 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) which provides the Secretary of Defense $200.0 million in authority, per fiscal year, to waive any necessary statutes for quick response to immediate warfighter capability requirements in response to combat fatalities. The committee understands the Department has rarely used this authority.

According to GAO, the Department of Defense lacks complete visibility to readily identify the total cost of its urgent operational needs and lacks the internal controls necessary to manage these efforts. For instance, the Department has no comprehensive database for which to track, monitor, and evaluate urgent operational requests and no set of universal metrics to effectively evaluate its performance once the system is fielded. The committee also understands the Secretary of Defense has not issued Department-wide policy guidance that provides for a unified approach for managing quick reaction programs and urgent need efforts to include managing funding requirements. Given the current budgetary challenges, the committee believes it is critical for the Department to reevaluate its current processes for fulfilling its urgent needs and determine whether there is potential to reduce duplication, fragmentation, and overlap to achieve increased efficiencies, cost savings, or both.

Section 804 of Public Law 111–383 requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the Department's urgent operational needs and rapid acquisition process and report the findings to the congressional defense committees by January 2012. The committee believes that the Department should complete this required comprehensive evaluation of its urgent operational needs processes before requesting approval for a separate funding account. The committee also encourages the Secretary to utilize RAA to address urgent operational needs.

The committee recommends $50.0 million, a decrease of $50.0 million, for the Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. Elsewhere in title 1 of this Act, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $100.0 million, for the JUON Fund.

MH–60 Combat Loss Replacement Funding

The budget request contained $7.8 million for combat loss replacement funding and Special Operations Forces peculiar modifications for one MH–60 for a total of $7.8 million.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2011 appropriations included funding for this combat loss replacement.

The committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $7.8 million, for combat loss replacement funding and Special Operations Forces peculiar modifications.

National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Fund

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained $280.0 million for National Guard and Reserve equipment.

The committee notes the specific amount of resources, including equipment, needed to achieve the National Guard and Reserve Component's new operational reserve status remains a challenge, given the dual mission responsibility of the National Guard and Reserve Components, in particular the National Guard. The committee understands that despite recent increases in equipment funding levels that equipment shortfalls still exist for the National Guard and Reserve Components. The committee believes additional funds would help eliminate identified shortfalls in the areas of critical dual-use equipment. The committee expects these funds to be used for the purposes of, but not limited to the procurement of: aircraft, missiles, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios, non-system training devices, logistics automation systems, remote weapon stations, chemical/biological protective shelters, and other critical dual-use procurement items for the National Guard and Reserve Components. The committee understands the National Guard is also in the process of upgrading central pedestal displays for their F–16 block 30 aircraft and recommends the National Guard examine the viability of utilizing a similar upgrade program for F–16 block 40 and 50 aircraft.

The committee recommends $505.0 million, an increase of $225.0 million for National Guard and Reserve equipment within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. Elsewhere in title 1 of this Act, the committee recommends $4.8 billion, an increase of $100.0 million, for National Guard and Reserve equipment.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in additional to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to overseas contingency operations.

Section 1502—Procurement

This section would authorize additional appropriations for procurement at the levels identified in section 4102 of division D of this Act.

Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize additional appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4202 of division D of this Act.

Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize additional appropriations for operation and maintenance programs at the levels identified in section 4302 of division D of this Act.

Section 1505—Military Personnel

This section would authorize additional appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4402 of division D of this Act.

Section 1506—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1507—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1508—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide at the level identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1509—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations

This section would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the transfer of up to $3.0 billion of additional war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

SUBTITLE C—LIMITATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 1531—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would extend, by 1 year, the conditions and limitations on funds made available to the Department of Defense for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) pursuant to section 1513 of the National Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1531 of the Ike

Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

The committee believes that improving the capabilities of Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) and the capacity of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan's security-related ministries is vital to achieving the stated goal of transitioning responsibility for security in Afghanistan by 2014. Consequently, the committee authorizes the Department of Defense to utilize amounts in the ASFF to construct and operate schools for the purpose of providing literacy instruction to recruits for the ANSF and to civilians entering the Afghan Ministry of Defense.

Section 1532—Continuation of Prohibition on Use of United States Funds for Certain Facilities Projects in Iraq

This section would apply the prohibitions of section 1508(a) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to funds authorized to this title, to prohibit the acquisition, conversion, rehabilitation, or installation of facilities for use by the Government of the Republic of Iraq, its subdivisions, agencies, departments, or forces, as well as the political subdivisions of Iraq.

Section 1533—One-Year Extension of Project Authority and Related Requirements of Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan

This section would extend by 1 year the project authority and related requirements of the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations (TFBSO) in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan under section 1535 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) and provide $75.0 million for such purposes.

The committee notes that it has still not received the plan required by section 1545 of Public Law 111–383 Act to transition the activities of the Task Force to the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The committee notes that the function of private sector business development falls outside the core competency of the Department of Defense. Therefore, the committee believes that the mission of TFBSO should eventually fall under the jurisdiction of a different agency, likely USAID or possibly the Department of Commerce. However, the committee notes that the USAID does not appear ready to assume responsibility for the TFBSO by the time the previous authorization expires at the end of fiscal year 2011. The committee understands that developing Afghanistan's private business sector is critical to reviving that nation's economy. Therefore, the committee has provided the authority to extend the TFBSO through fiscal year 2012 in order to support the International Security Assistance Force's comprehensive counterinsurgency strategy to achieve our strategic objectives in Afghanistan.

TITLE XVI—ADDITIONAL BUDGET ITEMS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PROCUREMENT

Section 1601—Budget Item Relating to Modification of Torpedoes and Related Equipment

This section would add $5,000,000 to Weapons Procurement, Navy, for the modification of torpedoes and related equipment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1602—Budget Item Relating to Anti-Submarine Warfare Electronic Equipment

This section would add $9,600,000 to Other Procurement, Navy, for anti-submarine warfare electronic equipment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1603—Budget Item Relating to Shallow Water Mine Counter Measures

This section would add $8,000,000 to Other Procurement, Navy for shallow water mine countermeasures or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1604—Budget Item Relating to LHA–7 Ship Program

This section would add $150,000,000 to Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for the LHA–7 ship program or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1605—Budget Item Relating to Mobility Aircraft Simulators

This section would add $25,000,000 to Aircraft Procurement, Air Force line 105 for mobility aircraft simulators, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1606—Budget Item Relating to Modifications to Aircraft

This section would add $10,000,000 to Aircraft Procurement, Army Line 027 for radio communication systems for National Guard helicopters, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1607—Budget Item Relating to SH–60 Crew and Passenger Survivability Upgrades

This section would add $4.5 million to Aircraft Procurement, Navy, Line 036 for SH–60 crew and survivability upgrades to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1608—Budget Item Relating to Modification of In Service A–10 Aircraft

This section would add $5.0 million to Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, Line 038, for A–10 lightweight airborne recovery systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1609—Budget Item Relating to Radar Support

This section would add $5,000,000 to Other Procurement, Navy, for radar support, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1610—Budget Item Relating to Electronic Equipment-Automation

This section would add $4,000,000 to Other Procurement, Army, for electronic equipment-automation for support of the deployment and adoption of new information processing systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1611—Budget Item Relating to Base Defense Systems

This section would add $6.0 million to Other Procurement, Army, Line 130 for base defense system equipment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1612—Budget Item Relating to Sniper Rifle Modifications

This section would add $2.5 million to the Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army, Budget Activity 002 for modifications of weapons and other combat vehicles, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1613—Budget Item Relating to Generators and Associated Equipment

This section would add $10,000,000 to Other Procurement, Army, Line 177 for generators and associated equipment to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1614—Budget Item Relating to National Guard and Reserve Equipment

This section would add $100,000,000 to Procurement, National Guard and Reserve Equipment, line 007, and reduce the amount for Aircraft Procurement, Army, line 003, for Aerial Common Sensor, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

SUBTITLE B—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Section 1616—Budget Item Relating to New Design SSN

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy line 113 for continued design improvements for new SSNs to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1617—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Submarine System Development

This section would add $9,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy line 42 for advanced submarine system development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1618—Budget Item Relating to Surface Anti-Submarine Warfare

This section would add $3,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy for surface anti-submarine warfare, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1619—Budget Item Relating to Ship Preliminary Design and Feasibility Studies

This section would add $19,900,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy for ship preliminary design and feasibility studies, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1620—Budget Item Relating to Industrial Preparedness

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy line 226 for industrial preparedness, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1621—Budget Item Relating to Mixed Conventional Load Capability for Bomber Aircraft

This section would add $20,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force line 122 for the development of mixed conventional load capability for bomber aircraft to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1622—Budget Item Relating to TACAIR-launched UAS Capability Development

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy line 209 for TACAIR-launched UAS capability development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1623—Budget Item Relating to Electro-photonic Component Capability Development

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation line 186 for electro-photonic component capability development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1624—Budget Item Relating to Airborne Reconnaissance Systems

This section would increase Research, Development, Test and Evaluation line 201 by $3.0 million for airborne reconnaissance systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1625—Budget Item Relating to Small Business Innovative Research

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 139 to accelerate the use of technologies from the small business innovative research program into Army acquisition programs of record, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1626—Budget Item Relating to Defense Research Sciences

This section would add $2,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 003 to conduct research into the magnetic and electric fields of the coastal ocean environment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1627—Budget Item Relating to Defense Research Sciences

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 002 to support research into innovative new techniques combat wound repair, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1628—Budget Item Relating to Communications Advanced Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 034 for the development of communications and information networking technologies to support Army requirements, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1629—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Technology

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 019 to develop radio frequency signals intelligence processing equipment and associated applications, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1630—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Technology

This section would add $8,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 019 for the development of enhanced low-light level visual sensors for persistent surveillance and dismounted soldier applications, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1631—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 050 for the development of deployable force protection sensors, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1632—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 050 for the development and fielding of a solution for helicopter "brownout" situational awareness, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1633—Budget Item Relating to Night Vision Advanced Technology

This section would add $4.8 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 050 for night vision advanced technology development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1634—Budget Item Relating to Rotary Wing Surfaces

This section would add $6,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 025 for the development of mission planning and support tools for rotary wing surfaces, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1635—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Technology

This section would add $30,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 017 for the development of weapons and munitions technologies by small and non-traditional defense businesses, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1636—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology

This section would add $2,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 032 for development of innovative manufacturing techniques and processes for munitions and weap-

ons systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1637—Budget Item Relating to Weapons and Munitions Advanced Technology

This section would add $2,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 032 for the development of innovative manufacturing techniques and processes for munitions and weapons systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1638—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 005 to develop innovative nanomaterials and nanomanufacturing processes for warfighter systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1639—Budget Item Relating to Materials Technology

This section would add $1,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 005 for the development and demonstration of novel lightweight composite packaging and structural materials, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1640—Budgetary Amendment for Materials Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 005 for advanced manufacturing, repair and sustainment technologies for defense needs, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1641—Budgetary Amendment for Lightweight Body Armor

This section would add $5,100,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 016 for the development of new lightweight body armor, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1642—Budgetary Amendment Relating to Industrial Preparedness Manufacturing Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense Wide, Line 248 for sustainment of the body armor industrial base, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1643—Budgetary Amendment for Secure Microelectronics

This section would add $15,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Line 050 to conduct research into the development, identification and management of secure

microelectronics, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1644—Budget Item Relating to Army Tactical Command and Control Hardware and Software

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 115 for the development of interoperable national security information sharing systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1645—Budget Item Relating to Battlespace Knowledge Development and Demonstration

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 026 to conduct research and educational programs that support cyber workforce development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1646—Budget Item Relating to Technology Transfer

This section would add $9,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 045 for small business technology transfer efforts into major Department of Defense acquisition programs of record, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1647—Budget Item Relating to University Research Initiatives

This section would add $7,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 003 for multidisciplinary research into nanotechnology science, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1648—Budget Item Relating to University Research Initiatives

This section would add $7,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 002 for the development hypersonic testing facilities for defense applications, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1649—Budget Item Relating to Clinical Care and Research

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 003 for development of informatics tools to support clinical care and research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1650—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 028 for the development of biomaterials for wound prevention and healing, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1651—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 028 for research in spinal cord injuries, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1652—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology

This section would add $3,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 028 for the development of high-throughput, microarray diagnostic systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1653—Budget Item Relating to Medical Technology

This section would add $1,468,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 028 to support research into innovative new techniques to develop vaccines of interest to the military, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1654—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 030 for functional genomics research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1655—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 030 for the development of telemedicine technologies, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1656—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 030 for the study of health effects from manganese and other potential toxins, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1657—Budget Item Relating to Medical Advanced Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 030 for the development of innovative medical training technologies, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1658—Budget Item Relating to Chemical and Biological Defense Program

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 017 for chemical and biological defense program applied research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1659—Budget Item Relating to Special Operations Advanced Technology Development

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 074 for special operations advanced technology development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1660—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support

This section would add $3,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support and risk assessment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1661—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support

This section would add $1,200,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support and the development of mobile training content, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1662—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support

This section would add $6,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1663—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology Support

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Line 029 for the development

of modeling and simulation technologies for testing of blast structures, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1664—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1665—Budget Item Relating to Combating Terrorism Technology

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Line 029 for combating terrorism technology support to improve the collaborative experimentation model, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1666—Budget Item Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction Defeat Technologies

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 024 for weapons of mass destruction defeat technologies, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1667—Budget Item Relating to Countermine Systems

This section would add $4,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 020 for countermine systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1668—Budget Item Relating to Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research

This section would add $8,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 014 for the development of remote-robotic naval mine countermeasure research and development capability, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1669—Budget Item Relating to Special Applications for Contingencies

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 217 for special operations advanced technology development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1670—Budget Item Relating to Microelectronics Technology Development and Support

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide Line 053 for the development of innovative semiconductor design and fabrication tools, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1671—Budget Item Relating to Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research

This section would add $2,500,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 009 to support research into corrosion control and anti-biofouling coatings, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1672—Budget Item Relating to Marine Corps Landing Force Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy Line 006 for the development of situational awareness and communications networking tools for tactical units, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1673—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Concepts and Simulation

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 012 to develop realistic human representations of software agents for simulation systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1674—Budget Item Relating to Human Effectiveness Applied Research

This section would add $2,200,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 006 to develop training and simulation capabilities for the Air Force, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1675—Budget Item Relating to Aerospace Propulsion

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force Line 007 for the development of innovative aircraft deoxygeneration systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1676—Budget Item Relating to End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities

This section would add $7,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 188 to develop a 3–D model-based design and manufacturing capability, to be committed, obligated, or

expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1677—Budget Item Relating to Sensors and Electronic Survivability

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 006 for the development of command, control and navigation capabilities for manned and unmanned aircraft, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1678—Budget Item Relating to Military Engineering Advanced Technology

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 052 for the development of innovative capabilities that support core missions of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1679—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology

This section would add $8.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for the development and demonstration of a high efficiency air breathing turbine propulsion system for unmanned aircraft systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1680—Budget Item Relating to Establishment of Protocols for Joint Strike Fighter Lead-Free Electronics Components

This section would add $1.0 million to Research Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, Line 077, for development of protocols for the use of lead-free solder products and finished in the Joint Strike Fighter program, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1681—Budget Item Relating to Portable Helicopter Oxygen Delivery Systems

This section would add $3.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 084 for improvements to helicopter portable oxygen delivery systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1682—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research

This section would add $8.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for advanced rotorcraft flight research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1683—Budget Item Relating to Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology

This section would add $6,250,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army Line 045 for the development of missile simulation technology, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1684—Budget Item Relating to Missile and Rocket Advanced Technology

This section would add $4.3 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 045 for development of base defense counter fire intercept systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1685—Budget Item Relating to Combat Vehicle Improvement Programs

This section would add $25.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 163 for Abrams tank engine technology insertion, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

The committee supports continued upgrades to the Army's fleet of M1 Abrams tanks. The Army has stated in multiple committee hearings that the M1 Abrams tank is expected to be in service through fiscal year 2045. As a result, the committee believes that an aggressive upgrade program is necessary to keep the M1 Abrams tank fleet capable of defeating all possible threats. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on March 9, 2011, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army stated that the M1 Abrams tank modernization activities are focused on increasing the space, weight, and power capabilities by specifically improving the power portion of the tank. The committee is concerned, however, that the Army's current incremental plans for M1 Abrams upgrades are not adequately funded to resolve the current space, weight, and power limitations, as the budget request for power improvements contained no funds. The committee understands that there is an engine technology insertion demonstration program and would replace the current axial compressors on existing M1 Abrams engines that would improve fuel efficiency, enhance reliability, and lower maintenance costs. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to address the space, weight, and power limitations on the M1 Abrams tank, specifically by implementing engine technology insertion upgrades that would improve fuel efficiency, enhance reliability, and lower maintenance costs.

Section 1686—Budget Item Relating to Warfighter Advanced Technology

This section would add $5.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 029 for warfighter advanced technology for soldier protection modeling and simulation, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1687—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology

This section would add $2.5 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for the development and demonstration of autonomous cargo for rotorcraft unmanned aerial vehicles, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1688—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology

This section would add $7.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for common data link waveform improvements, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1689—Budget Item Relating to Aviation Advanced Technology

This section would add $2,300,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 031 for aviation advanced technology to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1690—Budget Item Relating to Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness, and Safety

This section would add $5.0 million to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 153 for enhanced survivability and lethality system development, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1691—Budget Item Relating to Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense

This section would add $5,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense Wide, PE 63892C, Line 091 for Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1692—Budget Item Relating to Operationally Responsive Space

This section would add $20,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, PE 64857F, Line 053, for Operationally Responsive Space (ORS), to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1693—Budget Item Relating to Space Technology

This section would add $3,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force, PE 602601F, Line 009, for Space Technology, Applied Research, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1694—Budget Item Relating to Army Net Zero Programs

This section would add $8,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 065 for the Army net zero program to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1695—Budget Item Relating to an Offshore Range Environmental Baseline Assessment

This section would add $1,750,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 052 for an offshore range environmental baseline assessment to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1696—Budget Item Relating to Department of Defense Corrosion Protection Projects

This section would add $10,300,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 104 for Department of Defense corrosion protection projects to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1697—Budget Item Relating to a Study of Renewable and Alternative Energy Applications in the Pacific Region

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, Line 003 for a study of renewable and alternative energy applications in the Pacific region to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1698—Budget Item Relating to Alternative Energy for Mobile Power Applications

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, Line 005 for alternative energy for mobile power applications to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Battery Technologies

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, Line 016 for advanced battery technologies to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699A—Budget Item Relating to an Operational Energy Improvement Pilot Project

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 072 for an operational energy improvement pilot project to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699B—Budget Item Relating to a Microgrid Pilot Program

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 082a for a microgrid pilot program to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures

Section 1699C—Budget Item Relating to Advanced Surface Machinery Systems

This section would add $10,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy, Line 047 for advanced surface machinery systems to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699D—Budget Item Relating to Base Camp Fuel Cells

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army, Line 052 for base camp fuel cells to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699E—Budget Item Relating to Defense Alternative Energy

This section would add $2,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 047 for defense alternative energy to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699F—Budget Item Relating to Radiological Contamination Research

This section would add $4,000,000 to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, Line 052 for radiological contamination research to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

SUBTITLE C—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Section 1699G—Budget Item Relating to Department of Defense Corrosion Prevention Program

This section would add $2,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Line 260 for Department of Defense corrosion prevention program to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699H—Budget Item Relating to Navy Emergency Management and Preparedness

This section would add $2,000,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Navy, Line X for Navy emergency management and preparedness to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699I—Budget Item Relating to Army Simulation Training Systems

This section would add $4,000,000 to Operation & Maintenance, Army Budget Activity 01, Force Readiness Operations Support, Line 070, for Army simulation training systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699J—Budget Item Relating to Army Industrial Facility Energy Monitoring

This section would add $2,380,000 to Operation and Maintenance, Army, Line 110 for Army industrial facility energy monitoring to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699K—Budget Item Relating to Army National Guard Simulation Training Systems

This section would add $2,000,000 to Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard Budget Activity 12, Land Forces Readiness, Line 070, for simulation training systems, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section1699L—Budgetary Amendment on Army Arsenals

This section would add $6,000,000 to Operation & Maintenance, Army Budget Activity 04, Administration and Service-wide Activities, Line 370, for arsenal capital improvements, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 1699M—Budget Item Relating to Cold Weather Protective Equipment

This section would add $3,000,000 to Operations and Maintenance, Defense-wide, Special Operations Command for cold weather protective equipment, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction, family housing, and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2012. As recommended by the committee, division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $14,766,026,000 for construction in support of the active forces, Reserve Components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2012.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $12,489,382,000 for military construction, $582,319,000 for Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities, and $1,694,346,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $12,489,361,000 for military construction, $582,319,000 for BRAC activities, and $1,694,346,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2012.

Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012."

Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to Be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVI shall expire on October 1, 2014, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

Section 2003—Limitation on Implementation of Projects Designated as Various Locations

This section would provide that the authorizations of appropriations provided in sections 2104, 2204, 2304, 2403, 2411, 2502, 2606, and 2703 shall be available for the programs specified in the table provided in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2004—Effective Date This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI and XXVII of this Act take effect on October 1, 2011, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,235,991,000 for Army military construction and $681,755,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $3,305,991,000 for military construction and $681,755,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2010.

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2012.

Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize appropriations for Army military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (division B of Public Law 110–417) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct a loading dock consistent with the Army's construction guidelines for Multipurpose Training Ranges. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2106—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2011 Projects

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2107—Additional Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project Using Prior-Year Unobligated Army Military Construction Funds

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct a water treatment facility for Fort Irwin, California, in the amount of $115,000,000 using unobligated prior-year Army military construction funds. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2108—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Projects

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2109—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2110—Technical Amendments to Correct Certain Project Specifications

This section would make certain technical corrections to project descriptions included in table 3002 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383). This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2111—Additional Budget Items Relating to Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Army military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $2,461,547,000 for Navy military construction and $468,835,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $2,491,547,000 for military construction and $468,835,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $14,998,000 for the Massey Avenue Corridor Improvements and $15,000,000 in Planning and Design for construction activities at Naval Station Mayport, Florida.

The budget request included $14,998,000 to construct road improvements at Naval Station Mayport, Florida, and $15,000,000 to support planning and design efforts to facilitate the homeporting of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy has located a variety of strategic assets at one homeport for many years across the range of Navy assets to include aviation, surface, and subsurface combatants. Furthermore, the committee notes that the Department of the Navy has intentionally rejected the notion of strategic homeporting and has closed multiple locations that were deemed strategic homeports through the Base Realignment and Closure process. The committee believes that the Department of the Navy's assertion that strategic homeporting is required to maintain strategic access is inconsistent with previous naval decisions. As to costs, the onetime construction costs to implement the Department of the Navy's recommendation exceeds $500.0 million, and the recurring costs include a requirement to temporarily relocate nuclear capable shipyard workers from Norfolk, Virginia, to Mayport, Florida, to complete nuclear maintenance requirements. The committee believes that the overall costs to build a redundant carrier homeport do not appear to be in the Government's best interest.

Accordingly, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $29,998,000, for this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2012.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2012.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize appropriations for Navy military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act. Finally, this section would restrict the expenditures of planning and design appropriations to support the establishment of a homeport for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier at Naval Station Mayport, Florida.

Section 2205—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2207—Additional Budget Items Relating to Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Navy military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,364,858,000 for Air Force military construction and $489,565,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $1,330,858,000 for military construction and $489,565,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $64,000,000 for Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar at Joint Region Marianas, Guam.

The budget request included $128,000,000 and would provide the first increment to construct a fuel systems maintenance hangar required to support a Continuous Bomber Presence, a Tanker Task Force, Theater Security Packages, and the Global Hawk beddown.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $64,000,000, a reduction of $64,000,000, to support this project.

(2) $30,000,000 for Technical Applications Center, Increment 2, at Patrick Air Force Base, Florida.

The budget request included $79,000,000 and would provide the second increment to construct a Technical Applications Center.

The committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $49,000,000, a reduction of $30,000,000, to support this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2012.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2012.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize appropriations for Air Force military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2305—Modification of Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project

This section would modify the authority provided in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84) and authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain modifications. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2306—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2307—Limitation on Implementation of Consolidation of Air and Space Operations Center of the Air Force

This section would prohibit the disestablishment, closure, or realignment of any element of the Air and Space Operations Center until the Secretary of the Air Force, in conjunction with the commanders of the combatant commands, provides a notice to the congressional defense committees that include a cost-benefit assessment and the strategic consequences of the proposed disestablishment, closure, or realignment. This notice shall also include a local economic assessment and a description of the continuity of operations for the proposed disestablishment, closure, or realignment.

Section 2308—Additional Budget Items Relating to Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Air Force military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $3,848,757,000 for defense agency military construction and $54,191,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $3,705,457,000 for military construction and $54,191,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2012.

The budget request also contained $75,312,000 for chemical demilitarization construction. The committee recommends authorization of $75,312,000 for chemical demilitarization construction for fiscal year 2012.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction or elimination of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $50,000,000 for the Hospital Replacement, Increment 3, at Fort Bliss, Texas.

The budget request included $136,700,000 and would provide the third increment to construct an Army Medical Center.

The committee continues to support the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $86,700,000, a reduction of $50,000,000, to support this project.

(2) $70,000,000 for the Mountainview Operations Facility at Buckley Air Force Base, Colorado.

The budget request included $140,932,000 to construct an Operations Building to support an Aerospace Data Facility.

However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $70,932,000, a reduction of $70,000,000, to support this project.

(3) $73,300,000 for the Ambulatory Care Center, at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland.

The budget request included $242,900,000 and would construct an ambulatory care center.

The committee supports the full authorization of this project. However, the committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of De-

fense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $169,600,000, a reduction of $73,300,000, to support this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—DEFENSE AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized defense agencies construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects and require that the Secretary of Defense reserve a portion of the amount for energy conservation projects for Reserve Components.

Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize appropriations for Defense Agencies military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2404—Additional Budget Items Relating to Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize defense agencies military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

SUBTITLE B—CHEMICAL DEMILITARIZATION AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 2411—Authorization of Appropriations, Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for Chemical Demilitarization construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $272,611,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization of $272,611,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2012.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this Act and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,230,306,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends authorization for fiscal year 2012 of $1,307,585,000 to be distributed as follows:

Army National Guard	$823,592,000
Air National Guard	$133,525,000
Army Reserve	$280,549,000
Naval and Marine Corps Reserve	$26,299,000
Air Force Reserve	$43,620,000

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustment

The committee recommends a reduction of funding for a project contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. This reduction includes:

(1) $12,721,000 for TFI—F–22 Combat Aircraft Parking Apron at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii.

The budget request included $12,721,000 and would construct an aircraft parking apron for twenty F–22 Aircraft.

The committee supports the requirements associated with this project but notes that other projects authorized for appropriation in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) will have a cascading impact on the timely construction of this project. The committee supports the authorization for appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2012.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $0, a reduction of $12,721,000, to support this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2012. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this report is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—ADDITIONAL BUDGET ITEMS

Section 2611—Additional Budget Items Relating to Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Army National Guard military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 2612—Additional Budget Items Relating to Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Air National Guard military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

Section 2613—Additional Budget Item Relating to Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize Air Force Reserve military construction at various locations, to be committed, obligated, or expended based on merit-based selection procedures or on competitive procedures.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2621—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2008 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

Section 2622—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2009 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2012, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2013, whichever is later. This provision was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $323,543,000 for activities related to prior Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) activities and $258,776,000 for activities related to BRAC 2005. The committee recommends authorization of $323,543,000 for prior BRAC round activities and $258,776,000 for BRAC 2005 activities.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Base Realignment and Closure Community Recovery

The Base Realignment and Closure process has challenged many communities to determine a new direction because of a loss of military mission. Some of these former military installations have unique capabilities that are difficult to replicate in the private sector to include extensive Secure Compartmented Information Facilities (SCIFs) that support specific physical and infrastructure security requirements. Many of these communities also have an experienced labor force, complete with Department of Defense/Department of Homeland Security security clearances.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense may be able to utilize these specialized facilities and support the private sector in reusing these unique capabilities. To this end, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to use all of the available real estate conveyance mechanisms to quickly revert closed military installations into productive, viable business units that support the unique capabilities resident in these local communities. Using installations that have been impacted by Base Realignment and Closure as part of the DARPA program entitled "National Cyber Range" is a good example of how a community can establish new missions and capabilities while still providing a critical national security service. The committee believes that leases in furtherance of conveyance and economic development conveyances represent ideal real estate mechanisms to quickly put closing military installations into the private sector. These conveyance mechanisms should allow communities to recover rapidly from the debilitating effects of Base Realignment and Closure.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990

This section would authorize appropriations for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decision of prior Base Realignment and Closure activities at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2702—Authorized Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize military construction projects for fiscal year 2012 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions to support Base Realignment and Closure 2005 activities.

Section 2703—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 2005

This section would authorize appropriations for military construction projects for fiscal year 2012 that are required to implement the decisions of the Base Closure and Realignment 2005 ac-

tivities at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2704—Authority to Extend Deadline for Completion of Limited Number of Base Closure and Realignment Recommendations

This section would amend section 2904 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101–510) and provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to extend the completion of not more than seven recommendations provided by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission of 2005 for up to 1 year.

Section 2705—Increased Emphasis on Evaluation of Costs and Benefits in Consideration and Selection of Military Installations for Closure or Realignment

This section would amend section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, and require the secretary concerned to include a cost-benefit analysis of all proposed closures and realignments that exceed such thresholds. Finally, this section would restrict the secretary concerned ability to bypass overall thresholds of this section by reducing the workforce to a lower threshold and then realigning the remaining function.

Section 2706—Special Considerations Related to Transportation Infrastructure in Consideration and Selection of Military Installations for Closure or Realignment

This section would amend section 2687 of title 10, United States Code, and require the secretary concerned to include a transportation assessment of a proposed closure or realignment of civilian personnel that exceed certain thresholds.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense Homeporting in Europe

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is exploring the feasibility of homeporting U.S. Aegis ballistic missile defense (BMD) ships in Europe in support of the phased, adaptive approach for missile defense in Europe. The committee understands that such forward-basing of U.S. Aegis BMD ships in Europe may alleviate some force structure demands on the Aegis fleet by reducing their time in transit and providing closer proximity to Europe and the Middle East. Such a naval port in Europe would also further U.S. policy on international missile defense cooperation and burden sharing for the collective defense of Europe and the United States.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a notification to the congressional defense committees preceding the Department's announcement of a decision to homeport U.S. Aegis BMD ships in Europe. The notification should include, at a minimum: the proposed location; number of ships to be homeported in Europe; the implementation schedule and funding profile, including

military construction; and a summary of any analysis of alternatives that supports the decision, including any cost-benefit analysis.

Africa Command Basing Alternatives

The committee notes that a viable model exists to locate a geographic combatant command headquarters outside the respective area of responsibility and in the United States, as demonstrated by U.S. Central Command, U.S. Southern Command, and U.S. Pacific Command. The committee believes that this type of basing model is particularly relevant for U.S. Africa Command because of the sensitivities that many African nations may have with regard to a permanent U.S. combatant command on the African continent. The committee further notes that the Commander, U.S. Africa Command has reviewed alternative basing options in the United States to support mission requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2012, the conclusions of an alternative basing review. This report should include the following:

(1) An assessment of the cost-benefit associated with moving the U.S. Africa Command headquarters from its current location to the United States; and

(2) An assessment of the strategic risk associated with each basing alternative.

The committee urges the Secretary to conduct this basing review in an open and transparent manner consistent with the processes established for such a major review. The committee believes the headquarters of U.S. Africa Command should be located at an installation that provides the maximum military value to the realigned command and at the minimum cost required to implement the relocation.

Army Housing Shortfall at Growth Installations

The committee understands the Army has identified a shortfall of housing at several Army installations as a result of base realignment and closure and other force structure changes. While local communities are working to respond to the increased demand for off-post housing, the committee is concerned that the lingering effects of the financial crisis have made it difficult for civilian developers to obtain construction financing to fulfill the Army's off-post housing requirements. The committee encourages the Army to examine existing authorities which permit the leasing of off-post housing.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide to the committee, no later than September 30, 2011, a report which identifies installations where a housing deficit exists. The report also should detail the efforts being taken by the Army to address unmet housing requirements, including the use of existing authorities.

Assessment of Improvements in Construction Techniques to Achieve Life-Cycle Cost-Effective Facilities

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense failed to submit the report "Assessment of Improvements in Construction Tech-

niques to Achieve Life-Cycle Cost Effective Facilities" directed by the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 by March 1, 2011. The committee believes that the Secretary has allowed disparate construction methods to be incorporated into the military construction program that reduce the committee's ability to determine whether life-cycle, cost-effective facilities are being proposed by the Secretary. Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary expedite the completion of this critical report to maximize efficiencies in the military construction portfolio by identifying the appropriate, qualified entity to conduct the assessment directed by committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 and submit the report to the congressional defense committees by November 1, 2011.

Castner Range Complex

The committee understands that the Department of Defense ceased operations at the Castner Range Complex at Fort Bliss, Texas, in 1971. In testimony, the Army indicated that Castner Range is "wholly impractical to use for any range activity." The committee is interested in maintaining this land for a conservation purpose. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of the Army to assess whether the Castner Range Complex should be retained in the Department's inventory and encourages the Department to enter into a lease or other agreement in furtherance of conveyance with eligible conservation entities.

Collateral Support for Infrastructure and Real Property Programs

The committee is aware that Department of Defense relies extensively on consultants and contractors to support various Department infrastructure initiatives and real estate transactions involving programs such as housing, lodging, and utility privatization programs; real property exchanges; enhanced use leasing; and various other public-private partnerships involving real property. In particular, as the complexity of such initiatives and transactions has increased over the past several years, so too has the Department's use of consultants, contractors, and other experts to help ensure that prudent real property decisions are made to provide the best capabilities and economic outcomes to the Department.

The committee recognizes and supports the Department's efforts to obtain certain economies and achieve other objectives through the various infrastructure and real property initiatives and programs. However, regardless of whether Government employees or consultants and contractors are used to negotiate and implement deals to support the various public-private partnerships and alternatively financed projects, the Government's interests must be well represented from start to finish. As such, the committee is concerned about the preparedness of the Department's employees for negotiating and implementing such deals, the use and cost of consultant and contractor support participation in these arrangements, and the Department's monitoring and oversight of such consultant and contractor involvement. Moreover, the acquisition, management, and disposal of real property and related programs may involve inherently governmental functions, raising questions

about whether they should be performed by qualified government employees.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department's use of consultants and contractors to support infrastructure and real property programs, including negotiations for alternatively financed projects, and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 30, 2012. At a minimum, the review should assess the following:

(1) To what extent and at what cost has the Department used consultants and contractors to assist in negotiating and implementing the various infrastructure and real property programs?

(2) How does the Department determine the level of involvement of consultants and contractors in support of negotiations for various real estate deals and alternatively financed projects, or in the management of the Department's real property programs?

(3) To what extent does the Department's oversight and monitoring of consultant and contractor support in these areas ensure that the level of support is appropriate, expected results are realized, and costs are minimized?

(4) How has the Department ensured that Government employees are sufficiently trained to successfully negotiate and implement the various infrastructure and real property programs as well as oversee related support provided by consultants and contractors?

The Comptroller General may add such additional questions as he deems relevant.

Comptroller General Report Regarding Third-Party Financing for Renewable Energy Projects on Military Installations

In order for the Department of Defense to achieve energy security and reduce energy consumption in accordance with federal laws and executive orders, it has identified mechanisms to partner with industry for third-party financing for the development of renewable energy projects. These include agreements with private-sector entities through Enhanced Use Leases, Energy Savings Performance Contracts, Power Purchase Agreements, and Utility Energy Service Contracts that leverage private investment in developing renewable energy projects and purchasing energy.

These agreements can be of great benefit to the Department of Defense. However, the committee is concerned that Department of Defense project-level officials may not have the necessary information to develop the best possible contracts that most effectively leverage a variety of factors including resource potential, federal and state incentives, payback periods, state regulations, and other regulatory considerations. For the Department of Defense to be successful in its renewable energy partnerships with the private sector, it is critical that Department officials have adequate energy-related technical and contracting expertise. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 29, 2012. At a minimum, the review should assess the following:

(1) What kinds of funding approaches, such as full up-front appropriated funds and alternative financing approaches, are

used by the Department of Defense to enable the construction of renewable energy projects and purchase of such energy?

(2) What are some of the benefits and risks, including cost implications, of the funding approaches used by the Department of Defense in renewable energy projects and purchases?

(3) To what extent has the Department of Defense used each of the funding approaches identified in the first question?

(4) To what extent have oversight mechanisms been developed by the Department of Defense or the military services to monitor the use of these funding approaches and ensure the best value and terms?

The Comptroller General may add such additional questions as he deems appropriate in furtherance of this directive to ensure adequate coverage of the issues related to renewable energy contracting actions.

Comptroller General Review of Department of Defense's Report on the Arctic and Northwest Passage

The committee continues to be concerned about the Department of Defense's resources and preparedness for accessing, operating and protecting national interests in the Arctic. With approximately 20 percent of the world's untapped natural resources located in that region, there are significant national security equities. The Navy estimates that by 2030, shipping lanes will be open for several months during the summer thereby increasing shipping traffic.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on Arctic operations and the Northwest Passage to the congressional defense committees by May 30, 2011. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a copy of the report to the Comptroller General of the United States concurrent with submission to the congressional defense committees. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment of the report to the congressional defense committees including the Secretary's response to the requirements in H. Rept. 111–491, any shortfalls noted, recommendations for legislative action, and any information the Comptroller General deems appropriate in the context of that review, within 180 days after the Secretary's submission.

Construction Unit Costs

The committee notes that the Department recently completed an assessment of construction unit costs and determined that there is a multitude of construction variables that challenge the Department to provide competitive construction costs with comparable type facilities in the commercial sector. These challenges include requirements that drive the overall costs to include Federal contracting requirements (including Davis-Bacon wages, Federal subcontracting and small-business goals, bonding requirements per the Miller Act), Federal design requirements (including Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection measures), energy efficiency objectives, and a robust quality-assurance capacity to manage construction contracts. The committee is alarmed to note that these costs generally add

25–40 percent in construction costs above private-sector construction requirements. The committee believes that these substantive markups are excessive and limit the purchasing ability of the Department to procure vital military construction projects. The committee also believes that it is incumbent on the Department to minimize barriers to competition and ensure the widest participation of construction contractors to military construction programs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to complete a report by March 1, 2012 to the congressional defense committees and should include the following:

(1) An assessment of the programs or policies and the associated costs that contribute to the overall military construction program beyond those costs associated with typical construction projects in the private sector. This review should also include an assessment of specific facility categories to include, at a minimum, child care centers, chapels, dependent schools, and dormitories;

(2) An assessment of the programs and policies and their associated costs that contribute to variances between the Secretaries of the military department's unit costs. This assessment should specifically include variances in the development of military construction justification documents and overall approaches to construction methods to include concrete and wood type construction practices; and

(3) The Secretary's plan of action and milestones to reduce these costs, consistent with the life-cycle, cost-effective assessment as defined by section 2802 of title 10, United States Code.

Cooperative Agreements to Facilitate Defense Posture Review Initiatives

The Defense Posture Review Initiative includes the realignment of military forces in Japan, along with the realignment of Marines from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam. This effort is one of the most extensive realignments of military forces in recent memory.

The committee recognizes the impacts on Guam associated with the strategic realignment of military forces from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam and recognizes that non-governmental organizations, including institutes of higher learning, have provided analysis and research into a variety of environmental and socioeconomic impacts for other projects on Guam and in the Western Pacific region. The committee acknowledges that the Department of Defense has entered into cooperative agreements with institutions of higher learning to provide baseline studies and analyses will be needed to facilitate additional assessments on the location of a proposed firing range and transient nuclear aircraft carrier berthing on Guam over the coming months and years.

The committee recommends that the Department of Defense (DOD) enter into a cooperative agreement to help facilitate further Environmental Impact processes associated with the Defense Posture Review Initiative in the Asia-Pacific region. As such, the committee urges the Department of Defense take all necessary steps pursuant and consistent with DOD directive 3210.6–R, "Department of Defense Grant and Agreement Regulations" and establish a cooperative agreement with appropriate non-governmental orga-

nizations, including qualified institutions of learning, to facilitate better studies and analyses to support the Defense Policy Review Initiatives.

Corrosion Evaluation for Facilities and Infrastructure

Because the costs associated with facilities and infrastructure account for a significant portion of the Department of Defense's $22.5 billion annual cost to address the impact of corrosion, the committee believes that there may be more cost-efficient opportunities for developing strategies for enhancing the sustainability of existing facilities as well as for ensuring the integration of corrosion prevention and mitigation technologies into the buildup of future facilities. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (as designated by section 2228 of title 10, United States Code) to conduct a study of these costs and to submit the findings to the House Committee on Armed Services a report within 300 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The study should include the following:

(1) Identify the key drivers of these costs and recommend strategies for reducing their impact.

(2) Review a sampling of facilities that are representative of facility type, military department, and facility age.

(3) An assessment of at least one planned facility construction program.

(4) Include, but not limited to, information obtained from site visits and the examination of program documentation including maintenance and facility engineering processes.

The Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight is further directed to consult with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to determine the appropriate level of access necessary to conduct an effective and comprehensive evaluation. Lastly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees of the completeness of the evaluation within 60 days of the delivery of the Director's report to the congressional defense committees.

Department of Defense Microgrid Activities

The committee is concerned about the implications and potential consequences of a failure in the public grid and the impact on military installations. However, the committee recognizes that the Department of Defense is taking steps to invest in microgrid and smart grid technologies for installation and operational energy. The committee is concerned that there may be redundancy among these investments. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 29, 2012, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of the total investment being made into Department of Defense microgrid and smart grid activities, including total value, location, duration of project, and transition plan;

(2) An assessment of activities being pursued collaboratively with the Department of Energy to advance microgrids; and

(3) An assessment of policy initiatives and oversight of microgrid and smart grid activities by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Operational Energy Plans, and Programs to streamline investments for the purposes of installation energy and operational energy.

Elementary and Secondary Schools on Military Installations

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has undertaken an assessment of the conditions and capacity of elementary and secondary schools located on military installations that serve children of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees. Furthermore, the committee is aware of preliminary reports that many of these schools face capacity or structural deficiencies. The committee is concerned by these reports and the adverse impact that the substandard capacity and structural conditions may have on the quality of life for military families.

The committee notes that one of the results of this assessment is a $439 million capital investment into the Department of Defense Education Activity for Department of Defense-owned schools in fiscal year 2011. These appropriations will be applied to address some of the structural and quantity deficiencies that exist in the education enterprise. The committee also notes that there is another category of elementary and secondary schools located on military installations; these schools are operated by a Local Education Authority but owned by the Federal Government. For this category of schools, the committee notes that $250 million in fiscal year 2011 defense appropriations were applied toward the recapitalization of existing, structurally deficient elementary and secondary schools.

The committee encourages the prompt disbursement of funds made available in fiscal year 2011 to construct, renovate, repair, or expand educational facilities on military installations in order to address identified capacity or structural deficiencies. For those funds to support a Local Education Authority-operated school but owned by the Federal Government, the committee urges the Department to disburse these funds in a manner that gives priority to schools with the most serious deficiencies as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

Energy and Water Utilities Privatization

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should more aggressively and effectively implement utilities privatization as part of their asset management strategy to allow each military service to focus on core defense missions and functions. The committee further believes that the use of utilities privatization can improve energy and water efficiencies and improve installation infrastructure in a cost effective manner for the long-term benefit of our military members and their families. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by February 1, 2012, to the congressional defense committees that includes the following:

(1) An update of the report elements included in section 2823(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163); and

(2) An assessment of whether it would be beneficial to leverage utilities privatization as part of agency initiatives to increase use of renewable energy and conserve water.

Fort Bragg Parking Assessment

The committee notes that Fort Bragg has significantly increased the overall base population and this population increase has had a cascading impact on the overall transportation infrastructure on the installation. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2012, that assesses the parking requirements to support the entirety of Fort Bragg's personnel to include all civilian employees and family members. The report should address the significant increase in daily vehicular traffic through Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and surrounding communities not only due to Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities but to the entirety of Fort Bragg's force structure increases as well. At a minimum, this report should include:

(1) The projected number of military and civilian personnel that require parking to support activities on Fort Bragg;

(2) The current parking available;

(3) The parking plan to accommodate the increased number of personnel caused by the BRAC realignment, and the distances that service members have to travel via their personal transportation or military vehicles to conduct day-to-day activities such as vehicular maintenance; and

(4) Options to address the entirety of Fort Bragg's parking deficiencies that could include parking garages or other public transportation mitigation measures.

Homeowners Assistance Program

The Department of Defense's Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP) has provided financial assistance to military personnel and Department of Defense civilians who suffer financial loss on the sale of their home when a base realignment or closure action causes a decline in the local real estate market. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–16) expanded the program to assist additional categories of people, including those who are wounded, injured, or become ill while deployed, the surviving spouses of military personnel and civilians who are killed in the line of duty, and service members who purchased property before July 1, 2006, and were required to permanently relocate between February 1, 2006, and September 30, 2010.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is assessing the magnitude of a potential shortfall in existing resources and is currently projecting a $400.0 million deficit in the expanded Homeowners Assistance Program. This deficit could begin to impact eligible beneficiaries by the end of the current fiscal year and has the potential to impact more than 3,000 beneficiaries. The Department of Defense briefed the committee on its intent to address this deficit issue in its fiscal year 2013 budget submission. Further-

more, even if the program were fully funded, the committee is concerned that while the average time to process a complete application is 60 days, the committee understands that a number of applicants have seen delays of up to 1 year. Finally, the committee is concerned that the eligibility dates that were provided in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–16) have excluded certain localities whose real estate markets declined after July 1, 2006, and service members who receive permanent change of station orders within those localities, after September 30, 2010.

The committee is concerned that the compilation of these issues will have a cascading impact on thousands of beneficiaries who linger in potential foreclosure and bankruptcy because of the inability of the Department of Defense to adequately forecast required investments or to promptly process a completed application. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a brief to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2011, that includes the following:

(1) An assessment of the overall military construction program with a goal to eliminate unnecessary programmatic investments and apply savings toward the potential deficit in the Homeowners Assistance Program; and

(2) An assessment on methods to improve the efficiency of processing applications as well as to include hiring, on a temporary basis, additional staff to assist with the current backlog of claims that has resulted due to the increased volume of applications made under the expanded criteria provided by the Homeowners Assistance Program as expanded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; and

(3) An assessment of large military installations, whose local real estate market declined after July 1, 2006, and options that could be pursued at these large military installations, to include the associated cost impact, that would ameliorate the impact of the declining real estate market.

Leasing of Military Museums

The committee notes that section 2812 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) provided expanded authority to retain proceeds generated from leases of non-excess military museum property by the military museum that developed such proceeds. The committee supports the utilization of leasing agreements to expand the use of military museums for the generation of revenue for these museums through the rental of facilities to the public, commercial and non-profit entities, State and local governments, and other Federal agencies. The committee encourages the Department to expand the use of this authority and pursue such opportunities without additional specific, per-facility authorization for such activities.

Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet Range

The committee notes that the San Diego Shotgun Sports Association has operated a trap and skeet range on Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California since 1957, providing free recreational shooting for active duty military personnel and their families for

more than 50 years and strengthening the bond between the residents of the community and the United States Marine Corps. The committee understands that operation of the trap and skeet range has ceased while environmental mitigation and cleanup measures are conducted.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2011 that includes the following:

(1) Details of a plan to make adjustments to the range property and reopen the trap and skeet range for operation without affecting the environmental sensitive area containing lead shot;

(2) Plans and timeline to reopen the trap and skeet range;

(3) Other locations available on the base where a trap and skeet range could be operated;

(4) Criteria needed to operate a trap and skeet range while properly meeting necessary environmental laws through a Lead Management Plan (LMP);

(5) Possible revenue collected through implementing a lead mining operation on the trap and skeet range guided by a certified LMP;

(6) Details of all environmental clean-up measures necessary to reopen the trap and skeet range;

(7) A copy of the environmental assessment that was completed for the trap and skeet range including documentation detailing the imminent danger and hazard of lead contamination in the local water source directly linked to the lead shot from the trap and skeet range.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Prohibition on Use of Any Cost-Plus System of Contracting for Military Construction and Military Family Housing Projects

This section would amend section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, and prohibit the use of cost-type contracting for military construction projects and military family housing projects. Such prohibition will not apply in case of a declaration of war or the declaration by the President of a national emergency pursuant to section 1621 of title 50, United States Code.

Section 2802—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Unspecified Minor Military Construction Projects

This section would increase the authority provided by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, and establish a $3,000,000 threshold requiring specific military construction authorization. This provision would also amend section 2805 by extending certain temporary authorities associated with defense laboratories.

Section 2803—Condition on Rental of Family Housing in Foreign Countries for General and Flag Officers

This section would amend section 2828 of title 10, United States Code, and limit general and flag officer housing leases in foreign countries to the design criteria for similar housing in the United States.

Section 2804—Protections for Suppliers of Labor and Materials under Contracts for Military Construction Projects and Military Family Housing Projects

This section would amend section 2852 of title 10, United States Code, and increase the performance and payment threshold requirements for construction contracts from $100,000 to $150,000. This change would align performance and payment bonding requirements with the recently revised simplified acquisition threshold.

Section 2805—One-Year Extension of Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects inside United States Central Command Area of Responsibility and Combined Joint Task Force—Horn of Africa Areas of Responsibility and Interest

This section would amend section 2808 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) and extend the Department's ability to use operation and maintenance appropriations for military construction purposes for the U.S. Central Command and Horn of Africa area until September 30, 2012.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Clarification of Authority to Use Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund for Minor Construction and Alteration Activities at Pentagon Reservation

This section would provide unspecified minor construction authority, at the limits prescribed by section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, for the Pentagon Reservation Maintenance Revolving Fund.

Section 2812—Removal of Discretion of Secretaries of the Military Departments Regarding Purposes for Which Easements for Rights-of-Way May Be Granted

This section would amend section 2668 of title 10, United States Code, and prohibit the use of a real estate easement as a method to bypass other real estate authorities. The committee is aware that certain leasing proposals for energy projects have used authority provided by section 2668 of title 10, United States Code, as an expedited method to obtain a real estate lease. The committee believes that the authorities provided by section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, provide the appropriate framework that allows the secretary concerned to manage Government properties and to evaluate leasing proposals.

Section 2813—Limitations on Use or Development of Property in Clear Zone Areas

This section would modify section 2684(a) of title 10, United States Code, to permit the use of the readiness and environmental protection initiative authority to protect clear zone areas from use of encroachment that is incompatible with the mission of the installation.

Section 2814—Defense Access Road Program Enhancements to Address Transportation Infrastructure in Vicinity of Military Installations

This section would amend section 210 of title 23, United States Code, and expand the authority of the Department of Defense to use military construction appropriations to mitigate significant transportation impacts caused as a result of an expanded defense mission. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to convene the Economic Adjustment Committee to consider sources of funding associated with the defense access roads program. Finally, this section would require a separate budget exhibit for the defense access roads program.

SUBTITLE C—ENERGY SECURITY

Section 2821—Consolidation of Definitions Used in Energy Security Chapter

This section would modify subchapter 3 of chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, and create a new chapter 2924 to consolidate energy security definitions.

Section 2822—Consideration of Energy Security in Developing Energy Projects on Military Installations Using Renewable Energy Sources

This section would amend sections 2911, 2917 and 2922a, of title 10, United States Code, to account for energy security when entering into facility energy projects financed by third parties using renewable energy sources on military installations.

The committee is concerned when the Department of Defense contracts for renewable energy projects through third parties on military installations that have no capability to provide power directly to the installation in case of emergency.

Section 2823—Establishment of Interim Objective for Department of Defense 2025 Renewable Energy Goal

This section would modify section 2911(e) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to establish an interim goal for fiscal year 2018 for the production or procurement of facility energy from renewable sources.

Section 2824—Use of Centralized Purchasing Agents for Renewable Energy Certificates to Reduce Cost of Facility Energy Projects Using Renewable Energy Sources and Improve Efficiencies

This section would amend section 2911(e) of title 10, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy

requiring centralized, bulk purchase of replacement renewable energy certificates when entering into agreements for facility energy projects involving renewable technologies to maximize savings for the Department of Defense. This will help the Department of Defense achieve the goal regarding the consumption of electricity from renewable energy sources established by section 203 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15852).

Section 2825—Identification of Energy-Efficient Products for Use in Construction, Repair, or Renovation of Department of Defense Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Energy, to prescribe a list of energy-efficient products for use in construction, repair, or renovation of Department of Defense facilities. The list would be updated annually and submitted with the annual Energy Performance Master Plan. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to consider at a minimum the following technologies in developing the list:

(1) Roof-top solar thermal, photovoltaic, direct solar technology, and energy reducing coating technologies;

(2) On demand solar and tank-less hot water systems;

(3) Energy management control and supervisory control and data acquisition systems;

(4) Energy-efficient heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems;

(5) Thermal windows and insulation systems;

(6) Electric meters;

(7) Lighting, equipment, and appliances that are designed to use less electricity;

(8) Hybrid vehicle plug-in charging and hydrogen-generating fuel stations;

(9) Solar-power collecting structures to shade vehicle parking areas;

(10) Wall and roof insulation systems and air infiltration mitigation systems, such as weather-proofing;

(11) Fuel cells;

(12) Hydrogen; and

(13) Ground source and natural gas heat pumps and combined heat and power systems.

Section 2826—Core Curriculum and Certification Standards for Department of Defense Energy Managers

This section would amend section 2915 of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Secretary of Defense to establish a training program for Department of Defense installation energy managers. The requirement for federal energy managers is defined by section 8253 of title 42, United States Code. The committee encourages the Department to consider industry accreditations in the development of its training and certification of energy managers. The committee recommends that at a minimum, the Secretary of Defense create annual opportunities for energy managers to exchange ideas and lessons learned.

Section 2827—Submission of Annual Department of Defense Energy Management Reports

This section would amend section 2925 of title 10, United States Code, and require the Department of Defense to submit its installation energy management report within 120 days after the end of each fiscal year.

Section 2828—Continuous Commissioning of Department of Defense Facilities to Resolve Operating Problems, Improve Comfort, Optimize Energy Use, and Identify Retrofits

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to include continuous commissioning in its requirements to execute section 8253 of title 42, United States Code. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to modify the plan prepared pursuant to section 8253(e)(3) of title 42, United States Code, to reflect the requirement to include continuous commissioning under subsection (a). The committee expects the Department of Defense to protect its facility energy investments by conducting continuous commissioning to ensure its facilities operate at optimum energy efficiency.

Section 2829—Requirement for Department of Defense to Capture and Track Data Generated in Metering Department Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to capture and track the data that is being metered in accordance with section 8253 of title 42, United States Code. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to modify his plan prepared pursuant to section 8253(e)(3) of title 42, United States Code for the Department of Defense to reflect the requirement to capture and benchmark data that has been metered. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has made significant investments to meter its facilities but is not pursuing technologies to capture the data from the meters across its facilities.

Section 2830—Metering of Navy Piers to Accurately Measure Energy Consumption

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to modify the Navy's plan for implementing section 8253(e)(3) of title 42, United States Code to include a metering requirement for Navy piers, in addition to its buildings to ensure energy consumption can be tracked, captured, and reduced while naval vessels are in port. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to modify his plan prepared pursuant to section 8253(e)(3) of title 42, United States Code, as necessary to reflect the inclusion of Navy piers under subsection (a).

Section 2831—Report on Energy-Efficiency Standards and Prohibition on Use of Funds for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Gold or Platinum Certification

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services regarding a cost benefit analysis of Department of Defense investments in American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers standards and

Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certifications. This section would also prohibit the use of funds for LEED gold or platinum certifications in fiscal year 2012. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is investing significant amounts of funds for more aggressive certifications without demonstrating the appropriate return on investment.

SUBTITLE D—PROVISIONS RELATED TO GUAM REALIGNMENT

Section 2841—Use of Operation and Maintenance Funding to Support Community Adjustments Related to Realignment of Military Installations and Relocation of Military Personnel on Guam

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to assist the Government of Guam in meeting the costs of providing increased municipal services and facilities associated with the realignment of military forces to Guam. This authorization would be provided if the Secretary determines that an unfair and excessive financial burden will be incurred by the Government of Guam to provide the services and facilities in the absence of the Secretary's assistance. This authority would expire on September 30, 2018.

Section 2842—Medical Care Coverage for H–2B Temporary Workforce on Military Construction Projects on Guam

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from awarding any additional construction projects associated with the realignment of military forces to Guam until the Secretary establishes a lead system integrator for health care for the H–2B workers.

Section 2843—Certification of Military Readiness Need for Firing Range on Guam as Condition on Establishment of Range

This section would prohibit the establishment of a firing range on Guam until the Secretary of Defense certifies that the firing range is required to meet a national security need.

Section 2844—Repeal of Condition on Use of Specific Utility Conveyance Authority Regarding Guam Integrated Water and Wastewater Treatment System

This section would modify section 2822 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383) and modify the permissive utility conveyance to the Guam Waterworks Authority. Specifically, this section would eliminate the requirement to allocate representation on the Guam Consolidated Commission on Utilities for the Department of the Navy.

SUBTITLE E—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2851—Land Exchange, Fort Bliss Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange approximately 694 acres of real property at Fort Bliss, Texas, for approximately 2,880 acres of real property from the Texas General Land Office.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2861—Change in Name of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces to the Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy

This section would change the name of the "Industrial College of the Armed Forces" to the "Dwight D. Eisenhower School for National Security and Resource Strategy".

Section 2862—Limitation on Reduction in Number of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Permanent Duty at a Military Installation to Effectuate Realignment of Installation

This section would limit the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the military department concerned from reducing more that 1,000 military service members at a military installation until a notice is provided by the Secretary as to the rationale for such reduction and a period of 90 days expires.

Section 2863—Prohibition on Naming Department of Defense Real Property after a Member of Congress

This section would amend section 2661 of title 10, United States Code, and prohibit the naming of Department of Defense real property after any individual, who is a Member of Congress, at the time the property is so named.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $18.1 billion for atomic energy defense activities, an increase of 2.1 percent from the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. Of this amount, $11.8 billion is for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and $6.3 billion is for environmental and other defense activities.

For NNSA programs, the budget request contained an increase of $568.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. This amount includes a $620.9 million increase for the Weapons Activities account, which supports the management and stewardship of the nuclear weapons stockpile, and a $137.7 million decrease for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation account. The budget request for the Defense Environmental Cleanup account contained a decrease of $181.3 million from the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The committee supports these requests and believes that the budget request for Department of Energy National Security Programs for fiscal year 2012 reflects an appropriately balanced approach to meeting the diverse missions encompassed within the atomic energy defense activities account.

The committee recommends $18.1 billion, the amount of the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request contained $11.8 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends $11.8 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Nuclear Modernization

The fiscal year 2012 budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) is framed by several noteworthy events and key policy and posture documents released in the last few years.

The President's vision for "a world without nuclear weapons," which he outlined in an April 2009 speech in Prague, Czech Republic, along with his emphasis on arms control, changes in U.S. nuclear policy and posture, and direction to review further U.S. nuclear force reductions, has led to a renewed focus within the executive and legislative branches on nuclear security matters.

The bipartisan Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, established by section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), prefaced its May 2009 final report by stating that, "The conditions that might make possible the global elimination of nuclear weapons are not present today and their creation would require a fundamental transformation of the world political order." The committee agrees and, elsewhere in this Act, recommends a sense of Congress that further reductions should be supported by thorough assessments and guided by specific criteria.

Furthermore, while the Commission advised against substantial unilateral U.S. nuclear force reductions, it did conclude that U.S. reliance on reserve warheads could be reduced so long as the nuclear infrastructure was refurbished. To this point, the Commission found that, "the physical infrastructure is in serious need of transformation . . . but [NNSA] lacks the needed funding," and that, "the intellectual infrastructure is in more serious trouble."

The Commission further observed that the "United States requires a stockpile of nuclear weapons that is safe, secure, and reliable, and whose threatened use in military conflict would be credible." However, the Commission went on to state that, "maintaining the reliability of the warheads as they age is an increasing challenge," and that the life extension program (LEP) "is becoming increasingly difficult to continue within the constraints of a rigid adherence to original materials and design as the stockpile continues to age." The three directors of the nation's nuclear weapons laboratories have registered similar concerns in correspondence with the committee to address an unclassified finding in a JASON study which found that "no evidence that accumulation of changes incurred from aging and LEPs have increased risk to certification of today's deployed nuclear warheads." One lab director noted that,

"Thus far we have been able to retain confidence in warhead safety and reliability by offsetting these increased uncertainties with corresponding increases in performance margins . . . or by relaxing and eliminating (in coordination with the Department of Defense) military requirements. Options to further improve these margins using techniques similar to those employed to date have largely been exhausted."

Addressing these concerns, and in the context of the ratification of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), the President made a significant commitment to the modernization of the nation's nuclear stockpile and infrastructure.

The April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review called for making much-needed investments to rebuild the nation's aging nuclear infrastructure, maintaining that a credible modernization plan would "enable further arms reductions."

The May 2010 NNSA Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan provides further detail on NNSA modernization plans, to include plans for stockpile stewardship, life extension programs, facility upgrades and construction, and sustainment of science, technology, and engineering capabilities to ensure the nuclear stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear explosive testing. It also describes specific modernization milestones and baseline capabilities that must be established, such as a capacity to manufacture up to 80 pits and 80 canned subassemblies per year and fabricate up to 500 high explosive hemispheres per year, that will "enable further reductions in the stockpile over time."

The Secretary of Defense committed to transferring over $8.0 billion from the Department of Defense to NNSA in fiscal years 2013 through 2016 to support nuclear modernization. Similarly, a May 2010 report to Congress on nuclear force structure and modernization plans, which was required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) ("Section 1251 Report"), noted a nearly 10-percent increase in the President's fiscal year 2011 budget request for stockpile sustainment and infrastructure over the fiscal year 2010 appropriated level. In a November 2010 update to the Section 1251 Report, the President committed to an additional nine-percent increase in his fiscal year 2012 budget request for NNSA weapons activities over the fiscal year 2011 requested level, and a total increase of $4.1 billion across the Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP) over the fiscal year 2011 FYNSP.

The updated Section 1251 Report noted that, "Given the extremely tight budget environment facing the federal government, these requests to the Congress demonstrate the priority the Administration places on maintaining the safety, security and effectiveness of the deterrent."

The committee commends this commitment and is encouraged by the fiscal year 2012 budget request for NNSA. On a bipartisan basis, the committee has expressed its support for nuclear modernization and the increased investments necessary to carry it out. The committee believes there is a direct linkage between such modernization and consideration of any further reductions. Members of the Senate have also made clear that their support for the nuclear force reductions in New START was directly linked to the mod-

ernization of NNSA's nuclear weapons facilities and the nuclear arsenal.

However, the committee also recognizes that continued progress on nuclear modernization requires the long-term commitment of both the executive and legislative branches of government. The committee acknowledges the demands that such significant investments will place on the nation's budget, particularly in challenging economic times, but it also knows that these crucial national security activities cannot be deferred any longer without increasing the risk to the safety, security, and reliability of the nation's nuclear deterrent.

Lastly, the committee notes that the committee report accompanying the fiscal year 2012 budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) states that the resolution seeks to "prioritiz[e] the nuclear modernization work of the National Nuclear Security Administration. This includes providing fiscal space for the modernization of the nuclear weapons complex and in connection with the implementation of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia." Consistent with this position, the committee reaffirms its belief that nuclear modernization is a national priority and elsewhere in this title recommends authorizing the full amount of the fiscal year 2012 request for NNSA.

Weapons Activities

The budget request contained $7.6 billion for the Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) for fiscal year 2012, an increase of $620.9 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

In May 2009, the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States reported that the "Stockpile Stewardship Program and the Life Extension Program (LEP) have been remarkably successful in refurbishing and modernizing the stockpile." But at the same time, the Commission concluded that these strategies "cannot be counted on for the indefinite future." The Commission noted that the NNSA's "physical infrastructure is in serious need of transformation" and that the "intellectual infrastructure is also in trouble."

The JASON scientific advisory panel report from September 2009 noted: "All options for extending the life of the nuclear weapons stockpile rely on the continuing maintenance and renewal of expertise and capabilities in science, technology, engineering, and production unique to the nuclear weapons program." The JASON panel concluded that "this expertise is threatened by lack of program stability, perceived lack of mission importance, and degradation of the work environment."

In its April 2010 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), the Administration recognized these critical problems, saying, "In order to sustain a safe, secure, and effective U.S. nuclear stockpile as long as nuclear weapons exist, the United States must possess a modern physical infrastructure—comprised of the national security laboratories and a complex of supporting facilities—and a highly capable workforce with the specialized skills needed to sustain the nuclear deterrent." The NPR outlined several proposed investments to improve both the physical infrastructure and the human capital needed to sustain the nuclear weapons stockpile. The committee is en-

couraged by these statements, and supports the vision for a reinvigorated nuclear security enterprise.

The committee welcomes the robust budget request for Weapons Activities for fiscal year 2012, which should enable NNSA to continue modernizing its physical infrastructure and strengthening its human capital. However, the committee notes that these challenges can only be overcome through long-term program and budget stability. In its November 2010 update to the report required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the President stated his plan to increase funding for Weapons Activities across the Future-Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP), from fiscal year 2012 to fiscal year 2016, by more than $4.1 billion beyond that planned in his original May 2010 report. However, the November 2010 update also stated that these FYNSP funding levels "are appropriately called 'projections'" and are "not a 'fixed in stone' judgment." The committee notes these caveats with concern, and encourages the President to sustain these critical investments in the nuclear security enterprise for future years.

The committee recommends $7.6 billion for Weapons Activities, the amount of the budget request.

Stockpile Stewardship

The committee views execution of the Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP) as the first component of the core national security mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The SSP utilizes data from previous nuclear explosive tests, unique experimental tools, advanced simulation and computing capabilities, and the world's foremost scientists, engineers, and technicians to assess and certify the safety, security, and reliability of our nuclear weapons without additional nuclear explosive testing. The SSP enables NNSA to better understand the science of how nuclear weapons work, predict and identify problems in the stockpile, and respond quickly to emerging threats.

In the past, the committee has expressed concern about NNSA's ability to fully utilize the new experimental capabilities that it has developed over the past decade. Such experiments are critical to the long-term management of the stockpile because specific areas of remaining uncertainty about the performance of our nuclear weapons can only be illuminated through scientific experiments using these capabilities. The committee believes the budget request for the SSP should be sufficient to properly utilize all experimental capabilities and to continue improving the nation's ability to certify the nuclear weapons stockpile without additional nuclear explosive testing.

Stockpile Management

The committee views execution of the Stockpile Management Program (SMP) as the second component of the core national security mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). Through the SMP, NNSA sustains the nuclear weapons stockpile and ensures our nuclear weapons are safe, secure, and reliable. Development and execution of the SMP was required by section 3113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

2010 (Public Law 111–84), which also prescribed objectives and limitations for the program.

The SMP includes surveillance of weapons and weapon components in the stockpile, non-nuclear testing, production and exchange of limited life components, dismantlement of retired weapons, and many other important activities. However, the key aspects of the SMP are the Life Extension Programs (LEPs), which seek to extend the life of existing weapon types while improving their safety and security. For fiscal year 2012, the budget request included the following objectives regarding LEPs: continuing the W76–1 LEP, producing enough W76–1 warheads to meet U.S. Navy requirements; initiating a B61–12 LEP, moving from the current feasibility study (phase 6.2/2A) into development engineering activities (phase 6.3); and continuing a life extension study for the W78 by beginning the phase 6.2/2A feasibility study, to include examining the feasibility of a common W78/W88 warhead.

The committee supports these activities, and encourages NNSA to consider the full spectrum of options for managing the nuclear weapons stockpile, as identified by the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States in their May 2009 report. The NNSA laboratories should thoroughly evaluate, on a case-by-case basis, all options for managing and extending the life of any particular weapon system.

Furthermore, the committee encourages NNSA to plan and execute the SMP such that the scientists, engineers, and technicians employed in all parts of the nuclear security enterprise are actively engaged in challenging work that continually utilizes their skill sets in meaningful ways. The committee also encourages NNSA to structure the SMP to ensure that no critical capabilities go unutilized for extended periods of time, and therefore atrophy.

Directed Stockpile Work

The budget request contained $2.0 billion for Directed Stockpile Work (DSW), an increase of $65.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. DSW includes a variety of activities related to stockpile management and stockpile stewardship, including life extension programs, stockpile system surveillance and maintenance, testing and experiments, component manufacturing, and weapons dismantlement and disposition.

The committee recommends $2.0 billion for Directed Stockpile Work, the amount of the budget request.

B61 Phase 6.3 Life Extension Program

The budget request contained $223.6 million for Directed Stockpile Work for the B61 Life Extension Program (LEP). This funding request is new, and would establish the B61 LEP as a full program.

The request would fund phase 6.3 development engineering activities for the B61 LEP, including: development of designs and maturation of technologies for various components; implementation of enhanced surety technologies; qualification and certification testing of components and systems; systems engineering for integrating the B61 with modern aircraft such as the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter; and consolidation of several versions of the B61 (the B61–3, –4, and –7) into a single version (the B61–12). The committee under-

stands that the Nuclear Weapons Council plans to meet at the end of 2011 to determine whether the B61 LEP is ready to enter phase 6.3.

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) expects to deliver the first production unit (FPU) of the B61–12 in fiscal year 2017. Due to prior delays, the NNSA is operating on a compressed schedule to meet the FPU timeline. The committee understands the importance of meeting the 2017 delivery date, and fully supports the B61 LEP. However, the committee is concerned about the scope of technology maturation planned for this program and the impact such activities may have on an already aggressive schedule. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that total costs for the program may grow as NNSA attempts to meet its 2017 FPU deadline. The committee will continue to conduct rigorous oversight of this important program, and expects the NNSA Administrator to keep the committee fully informed of any expected deviations from the schedule and baseline cost estimate, once such estimate is established.

Science Campaign

The budget request contained $405.9 million for the Science Campaign, an increase of $40.7 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. The Science Campaign is a critical component of stockpile stewardship, and provides the tools, experiments, and human capital needed to increase our knowledge of nuclear weapons science and assess and certify the safety, security, and reliability of the stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing. The fiscal year 2012 budget request for the Science Campaign will enable continued experiments to provide data for predictive computer models, enhance methodologies used for certification and assessment of margins and uncertainties, and meet various deliverables and milestones to support life extension program timelines.

The committee recommends $405.9 million for the Science Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

Engineering Campaign

The budget request contained $143.1 million for the Engineering Campaign, an increase of $1.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The Engineering Campaign provides the engineering basis, tools, and capabilities to assess and certify the stockpile throughout the lifecycle of nuclear weapons. Engineering Campaign activities include development of options for improving safety and security of nuclear weapons in future life extension programs, development of tools for designing and qualifying weapons and weapon components in hostile environments, and development of advanced diagnostics for identifying and predicting component aging issues.

The committee recommends $143.1 million for the Engineering Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

Readiness Campaign

The budget request contained $142.5 million for the Readiness Campaign, an increase of $30.4 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. Readiness Campaign activities include

the production of tritium for use in the nuclear weapons stockpile and the selection and maturation of production technologies for manufacturing components of nuclear weapons.

For fiscal year 2012, the budget request aligns all funding for the Readiness Campaign into two programs that focus on tritium production and non-nuclear component manufacturing technologies. The committee is concerned that, should life extension programs not proceed on the planned schedule, important activities formerly funded by the Readiness Campaign will be neglected and critical capabilities will atrophy. The committee encourages the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to ensure that such capabilities, such as the enhancement of production technologies for high explosives, receive appropriate attention.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, the committee expressed concern that the NNSA had not identified effective technical solutions for increased tritium production nor viable alternative supplies. The committee notes that NNSA plans to increase its production of tritium in fiscal year 2012, but has still not resolved certain major technical challenges associated with tritium permeation in the production process. The committee is concerned by an October 2010 report by the Government Accountability Office that found that "NNSA currently meets the nuclear weapons stockpile requirements for tritium, but its ability to do so in the future is in doubt." To ensure required supplies of tritium remain available in the future, the committee supports the requested increase in funds for tritium production and associated research to resolve the ongoing technical challenges, and will continue to conduct vigorous oversight of NNSA's progress in this area.

The committee recommends $142.5 million for the Readiness Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign

The budget request contained $476.3 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion (ICF) Ignition and High-Yield Campaign, a decrease of $5.3 million below the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

Activities in the ICF Ignition and High-Yield Campaign support development of enhanced understanding of high energy density environments, a critical aspect of nuclear explosions. ICF experiments conducted at a variety of facilities are used to inform and validate theoretical models used to assess and certify the stockpile without nuclear explosive testing.

Early in fiscal year 2012, the National Ignition Facility at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory will attempt, for the first time, to demonstrate ignition in a laboratory environment. Achieving ignition would provide important, previously unavailable, experimental data to support assessment and certification of the stockpile, and would be a major advance in nuclear science.

The committee recommends $476.3 million for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High-Yield Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign

The budget request contained $628.9 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing (ASC) Campaign, an increase of $13.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The ASC Campaign provides the simulation and computing capability needed to validate and certify the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing. As experiments are conducted under various other campaigns, the data from those experiments is used to refine simulation codes developed under the ASC Campaign. As the experiments, computing infrastructure, and simulation codes are concurrently improved, confidence in the ability to predict weapon performance, and potential problems, should also improve. Elsewhere in this title, the committee notes its support for the new strategic investments by the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Energy in research and development of "exa-scale" computing.

The committee recommends $628.9 million for the Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign, the amount of the budget request.

Exa-scale computing at the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration National Laboratories

To maintain our economic and national security, the committee believes that the United States must continue to be at the forefront of high-performance computing technology. The committee is encouraged by recent progress in developing and deploying "peta-scale" computing at the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) national laboratories.

The budget request includes new strategic investments in research and development of "exa-scale" computing: $90.0 million through the DOE Office of Science and $36.0 million through the NNSA Advanced Simulation and Computing Campaign. The committee believes these investments in next generation computing systems are critical to the nation, and will not only help ensure the long-term viability of the nuclear weapons stockpile in the absence of nuclear explosive testing, but will also support important technology innovation for the broader economy.

The committee believes the United States must continue its leadership in developing and utilizing state-of-the-art supercomputers, and notes with concern the recent surge of the People's Republic of China in the field of high performance computing. In particular, the committee notes China's deployment of the world's first and third fastest supercomputers in rankings published in November 2010, while the NNSA laboratories did not have a machine in the top five of these rankings for the first time in 20 years.

Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities

The budget request contained $2.3 billion for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities (RTBF), an increase of $477.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

RTBF supports the physical infrastructure and operational readiness of the nuclear security enterprise. RTBF funds are divided between Operations and Maintenance, and Construction programs. The RTBF program is aligned with and provides resources to sup-

port the execution of all other programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), including Directed Stockpile Work, the Campaigns, and Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.

The committee has previously noted its concern regarding funding to support the operations and maintenance of facilities at the Pantex Plant in Amarillo, Texas, and the Y–12 Plant in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The committee appreciates the increase in funds for both facilities in the budget request to support the increased workload at both plants associated with increases in life extension program production rates, surveillance, and dismantlement activities. The committee also notes the increase in funds provided for material recycle and recovery to support a similar workload increase.

The budget request for RTBF included funds for the two largest ongoing NNSA infrastructure projects: $300.0 million for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory and $160.2 million for the Uranium Processing Facility at the Y–12 National Security Complex. Elsewhere in this title, the committee discusses its concerns regarding these important projects, including the continuing cost increases and schedule delays associated with them. The committee recommends $2.3 billion for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities, the amount of the budget request.

Report on project management for large-scale construction programs

The committee believes that successful, efficient, and timely completion of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building Replacement (CMRR) at the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) at the Y–12 National Security Complex are critical to the long-term sustainability of the nuclear weapons stockpile. The committee is concerned that, given its history regarding management of large-scale construction projects, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) may encounter significant difficulty in managing and executing these programs to build two large, and wholly unique, nuclear facilities simultaneously.

The committee notes with concern the large cost growth and schedule delays of both of these programs as they have advanced in the design process. With the designs for UPF and the major nuclear component of CMRR only 45 percent complete, expected total project costs for constructing the facilities have increased several times over compared to original estimates. The original 2004 maximum cost estimate for CMRR was less than $1.0 billion; the current expected maximum cost for CMRR, based on the 45 percent complete design of the nuclear facility, has increased dramatically to over $6.0 billion. Similarly, the expected maximum cost for UPF has increased from $3.5 billion in 2007 to $6.5 billion today. As discussed in documents accompanying the fiscal year 2012 budget request, NNSA will not determine full baseline costs for these facilities until their designs are 90 percent complete. The committee agrees with this decision to establish a mature design before full cost estimates are developed, and expects NNSA to avoid concurrent design and construction for these facilities.

The committee recognizes the one-of-a-kind nature of these facilities and the difficulties in estimating their costs and schedules in

conceptual phases. However, the dramatic increases in the expected costs of these facilities, coupled with their importance to sustaining the Nation's nuclear deterrent, demonstrate the need for strong oversight of the project management approach taken by NNSA for constructing these facilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by March 15, 2012, on NNSA's approach to construction project management for CMRR and UPF. The report should cover NNSA's general approach to managing both large-scale construction projects simultaneously; application of lessons learned by NNSA and the Department of Energy from previous large-scale construction projects; NNSA's approach to ensuring accurate cost and schedule estimates throughout the project design and construction cycle; how NNSA conducts oversight and ensures accountability from its design and construction contractors; alternatives considered for managing and scheduling the two projects; advice and guidance received from other Government organizations with experience managing large-scale construction projects; and any other matters the Administrator determines appropriate. The committee encourages NNSA to think creatively and explore all of its options for managing these projects, and to strive to complete them in an efficient and expeditious manner.

Secure Transportation Asset

The budget request contained $251.3 million for the Secure Transportation Asset (STA), an increase of $3.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. The mission of the STA is to provide safe and secure transport of nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon components, and special nuclear materials to meet the needs of the Department of Energy, the Department of Defense, and other customers. The STA is a key enabler for the nuclear security enterprise, supporting life extension programs, surveillance, dismantlement, and other activities through the movement of nuclear cargos throughout the continental United States.

The committee recommends $251.3 million for the Secure Transportation Asset, the amount of the budget request.

Comptroller General Evaluation of Study on Options for Nuclear Weapon Transportation

In House Report 110–652 accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 111–383), the committee directed the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a feasibility study regarding transporting nuclear weapons and related materials by aircraft. The committee received this report, titled "Report to Congress on the Feasibility of Increasing Air Transportation of Nuclear Weapons, Components, and Materials" in September 2009.

Given the inherent institutional tendency to continue conducting operations in the same manner as before, the committee seeks an independent evaluation of the study and the feasibility of increased transportation of nuclear cargos by air. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an evaluation of the September 2009 study, and submit a report on

that evaluation to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2012. The evaluation should assess the assumptions, methodology, findings, and conclusions of the study conducted by the NNSA and U.S. Air Force, including the study's rigor and completeness. The evaluation should also include rough cost estimates for pursuing various options for the transport of nuclear weapons, and evaluate the September 2009's assessment of safety and security impacts of the various options examined. The evaluation should consider changes in procedures and concepts of operations, incorporation of new or emerging technologies, and the utilization of threat information in its examination of the options.

Work for Others at the National Nuclear Laboratories

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) laboratories provide unique research and development expertise to other Government agencies through the Work for Others (WFO) program. The committee is also aware that partnerships between NNSA laboratories and the Department of Defense (DOD) and the intelligence community have enabled the application of the expertise and capabilities within NNSA to address challenging defense and intelligence priorities.

NNSA's Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, and Sandia National Laboratories, in particular, have a wide-range of capabilities developed for the Nation's nuclear security which are also utilized to support a wide-range of national security requirements. Recent examples of this utilization of laboratory expertise include: employing high explosives experts to support the development of advanced conventional munitions for the military services; applying modeling and simulation and supercomputer capabilities to improve DOD space situational awareness capabilities; leveraging high energy laser capabilities for a wide variety of DOD missions; and teaming with the Department of Defense on nonproliferation research and development programs.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense and other Government agencies to capitalize on WFO partnerships with NNSA laboratories to provide innovative solutions for the national security challenges faced by the United States.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

Nuclear Centers of Excellence

The committee notes that in April 2010, at the nuclear security summit held in the District of Columbia, President Hu of the People's Republic of China announced his intention to pursue a nuclear Center of Excellence (COE). Subsequently, the United States and China entered into a memorandum of understanding in January 2011 and have since begun cooperation on the COE.

The committee further notes that in the budget request, funds are requested in the respective nonproliferation programs within the Department of Defense and Department of Energy for a nuclear COE in India and China. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) requested $26,000,000 for the China COE in fiscal year 2011. An additional $15.0 million has been requested for fiscal year 2012. Materials, reports, and briefings provided to the committee by NNSA indicate that the rationale for the China COE

is to "expand best practices training" and "to establish/expand relationships to better address high-risk sites." With respect to best practices training, China is an economically advanced and prosperous country with robust infrastructure capabilities, and the committee intends to scrutinize whether the United States should pay for best practice implementation in China.

Additionally, over the past two decades, China's weapons of mass destruction and missile-related proliferation records have been mixed. Although China has pledged to improve its domestic export controls, various entities within China have been the subject of U.S. sanctions for proliferation activities. The committee believes that stemming the flow of advanced technologies and dual-use materials must remain a top priority. The committee is therefore concerned that cooperation on the COE may distract from a candid assessment of proliferation by China to third parties, including states of concern. The 2011 update of the Unclassified Report to Congress on the Acquisition of Technology Relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction and Advanced Conventional Munitions, prepared by the Deputy Director of National Intelligence, notes that "Chinese entities—which include private and state-owned companies and individuals—continue to engage in WMD-related proliferation activities." The report further notes that Chinese companies have been sanctioned by the United States "for sales of WMD- and ballistic missile-related technologies to states of concern," and that "Although, China has export control legislation that approximates Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) controls, enforcement continues to fall short. Chinese entities continue to supply a variety of missile-related items to multiple customers, including Iran, Syria, and Pakistan."

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision elsewhere in this title that would limit the availability of funding for the China COE until the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, conducts a review of these matters and submits two related reports to certain congressional committees.

Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention

The committee continues to support the nonproliferation objectives of the Global Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention (GIPP) program. The committee recognizes that the continued success of this program is tied to the unique involvement of the U.S. private sector. The involvement of the United States private sector helps ensure the program's ability to provide non-military, commercial employment opportunities for former and potential weapons of mass destruction scientists and engineers in the former U.S.S.R. and other countries and regions of non-proliferation concern, while also supporting job creation in the United States. Therefore, the committee recommends that the National Nuclear Security Administration ensure that GIPP projects include a commercial U.S. industry partner.

Naval Reactors

The budget request contained $1.2 billion for Naval Reactors, an increase of $83.2 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The Naval Reactors program is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion work, from reactor technology development, to reactor operation, to reactor retirement and disposal. The program ensures the safe and reliable operation of 104 nuclear reactors, most of them in nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers which comprise 40 percent of the Navy's total combatants. Naval Reactors is developing new reactor designs for *Gerald R. Ford*-class aircraft carriers and Virginia-class attack submarines. The requested increase would also support three key deliverables: design of the reactor for the *Ohio*-class submarine replacement; refueling of a land-based prototyping and demonstration reactor in upstate New York; and recapitalization of the spent nuclear fuel infrastructure located at Idaho National Laboratory.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) reduced fiscal year 2011 funding for Naval Reactors by $108.4 million, or 10 percent, from the fiscal year 2011 budget request. The committee is concerned that this reduction will delay design and procurement of critical naval reactors, particularly for the *Ohio*-class submarine replacement, and lead to an unacceptable delay in deployment of the *Ohio*-class submarine replacement. This replacement submarine is critical to the long-term viability of the nation's nuclear deterrent, and the committee encourages full funding for Naval Reactors in the future.

The committee recommends $1.2 billion for Naval Reactors, the amount of the budget request.

Office of the Administrator

The budget request contained $450.1 million for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Office of the Administrator, an increase of $1.8 million above the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The Office of the Administrator provides planning, management, and oversight of the NNSA and its laboratories, production plants, and programs.

The committee recommends $450.1 million for the Office of the Administrator, the amount of the budget request.

Environmental and Other Defense Activities

Overview

The budget request contained $6.3 billion for environmental and other defense activities for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends $6.3 billion, the amount of the budget request.

Defense Environmental Cleanup

The budget request contained $5.4 billion for Defense Environmental Cleanup, a decrease of $181.3 million from the amount requested for fiscal year 2011.

The committee is aware that the America Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) provided an additional $5.1 billion in funding for Defense Environmental Cleanup. This funding was utilized by the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management to accelerate cleanup efforts, and has resulted

in approximately $7.0 billion in cost savings and cost avoidances. The committee applauds the recent efforts of the Office of Environmental Management, which has made major strides in recent years to address the environmental legacy of our Cold War-era defense nuclear facilities. Plans to shrink the legacy footprint, from 900 square miles in 2009 to 90 square miles in 2015, appear to be on track and well managed. Also by 2015, 90 percent of legacy transuranic waste is slated to be disposed of at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico. Furthermore, three major tank waste construction projects are slated for completion by 2016. The committee will continue its oversight of this important long-term cleanup program to ensure it remains on cost and schedule, but recognizes the significant progress being made under the effective leadership of the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management.

The committee recommends $5.4 billion for Defense Environmental Cleanup, the amount of the budget request.

Other Defense Activities

The budget request contained $860.0 million for Other Defense Activities, a decrease of $18.3 million from the amount requested for fiscal year 2011. The request for Other Defense Activities includes: $456.5 million for the Office of Health, Safety, and Security; $170.1 million for the Office of Legacy Management; $188.8 million for Defense Related Administrative Support; and $98.5 million for the Office of Nuclear Energy.

The committee recommends $860.0 million for Other Defense Activities, the amount of the budget request.

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

Report on Mixed Oxide Fuel

In light of the earthquake and tsunami in Japan and the resulting damage to nuclear reactors and spent fuel pools at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant which released radioactivity into the air, soil and sea, the committee seeks additional information on the characteristics of mixed-oxide (MOX) fuel rods in the event of an accident or attack. The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to submit to the defense committees, no later than March 1, 2012 a report on MOX fuel. Such a report should compare the risks to human health and safety of the MOX fuel fabricated at the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility to the use of low-enriched uranium (LEU) fuel, particularly in the event of an accident or attack on a reactor or spent fuel pond resulting in the release of radioactivity. Specifically, the report should include an analysis of the amount of radiation a MOX fuel rod made at the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility at Savannah River Site would release relative to an LEU fuel rod; and a description of whether this technical difference from LEU fuel has been factored into the discussions with potential users of this fuel. The report should be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex if necessary.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2012, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and the Office of the Administrator, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize appropriations for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2012, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize appropriations for other defense activities for fiscal year 2012, including funds for Health, Safety, and Security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3104—Energy Security and Assurance

This section would authorize appropriations for energy security and assurance programs for fiscal year 2012, at the funds identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Consolidated Reporting Requirements relating to Nuclear Stockpile Stewardship, Management, and Infrastructure

This section would consolidate several existing reporting requirements in the Atomic Energy Defense Act, chapter 42 of title 50, United States Code. Specifically, this section would repeal reporting requirements in sections 4202, 4203, 4203A, 4204, and 4208 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act and consolidate them into a new section 4203.

This section would create a consolidated requirement for the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to create a plan for sustaining the nuclear weapons stockpile. The plan would be required to cover, at a minimum, stockpile stewardship, stockpile management, stockpile surveillance, program direction, infrastructure modernization, human capital, and nuclear test readiness. This section would require the Administrator to submit a summary of this plan, including identification of changes to the plan, to the congressional defense committees in each even-numbered year, and a detailed report on the plan in each odd-numbered year. Finally, this section would require the Nuclear Weapons Council, in each odd-numbered year, to submit to Congress an assessment of certain aspects of the plan developed by the Administrator and determine whether the plan adequately sup-

ports nuclear security enterprise infrastructure modernization requirements.

Section 3112—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security

This section would limit funds that may be obligated or expended by the Secretary of Energy for fiscal year 2012 to not more than $7.0 million for a Center of Excellence on Nuclear Security in the People's Republic of China until the date on which the Secretary of Energy submits two reports to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. These two reports would provide additional insight and analysis into the two stated rationales for the Center of Excellence.

The first report would require the Secretary of Energy in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to review and submit a report of such a review of the date of enactment of the Act, on the existing capacity of China to develop and implement best practices training. The second report would require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to submit report within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the extent to which additional best practices training and relationship building activities would contribute to improving the Chinese record of proliferation with respect to weapons of mass destruction, missiles, and related technologies and materials. This report should specifically include an assessment of the potential to improve the Chinese record on the proliferation of these technologies and materials to countries which are currently or have been state sponsors of terrorism.

Section 3113—Use of Savings from Pension Reimbursements for Budgetary Shortfalls

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management to make determinations throughout each fiscal year, until the end of fiscal year 2016, regarding the level of funds needed to meet the minimum funding standard required by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–406) for any defined-benefit pension plan operated by management and operating contractors of either the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management or National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). If economic conditions improve, or efficiencies are identified, such that the amounts originally budgeted for contributions to the contractors' pension plans exceed the minimum required by statute, this section would require the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary to promptly obligate or expend the excess funds on high priority budgetary shortfalls, as identified by the Administrator or the Assistant Secretary, respectively. This section would authorize the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary to transfer any such funds as needed to fulfill this purpose, and would require the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary to promptly notify the congressional defense committees if such excess funds are identified or transferred. The authorities authorized by this section would terminate on September 30, 2016.

The committee recognizes the need to fully fund the pension plans of the highly skilled scientists, engineers, and other workers employed by the contractors managing and operating Department of Energy and NNSA facilities. The committee believes these employees are the backbone of efforts to ensure the safety, security, and reliability of the Nation's nuclear deterrent, and pension promises made to them must be kept. The committee notes that the President's request anticipates NNSA and the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management to make approximately $1.25 billion in contributions to these pension plans in fiscal year 2012. However, the required contributions to these pension plans are uncertain and will not be fully known until well into a given fiscal year. If economic conditions improve or efficiencies are identified, the total amount of contributions required by law may be less than the $1.25 billion anticipated in the budget request. This section would require the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary to determine if such savings are realized at any time during fiscal year 2012–16, from any program within the Office of Environmental Management or NNSA, and require them to promptly obligate such funds on high-priority budgetary shortfalls. The committee expects high-priority budgetary shortfalls to include modernization of the nuclear security enterprise, reduction in deferred maintenance, and acceleration of environmental cleanup activities. The committee believes that modernizing and refurbishing the infrastructure of the nuclear security enterprise must be a top priority for the Department of Energy and NNSA, and this section would ensure that any savings from the anticipated pension contributions are put toward that end or similar high priorities.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS

Section 3121—Repeal of Certain Report Requirements

This section would repeal requirements for several recurring reports from the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security. Specifically, it would repeal section 3132 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107), which requires an annual report to Congress on the financial and programmatic activities of the Nuclear Cities Initiative Program, which ended in 2006. This section would also modify section 4302(a)(6) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2562). The modification would repeal a requirement for the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress each time funds for the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention Program are used to pay a tax or customs duty levied by the Government of the Russian Federation. No such payments have been made since 2000, and the program ended in 2006.

Section 3122—Progress on Nuclear Nonproliferation

This section would express the sense of Congress that the spread of nuclear and radiological weapons, or weapons-usable material, technology, equipment, information and expertise, poses a short- and long-term threat to the security of the United States, and that the U.S. nonproliferation efforts should prioritize those programs which most directly address this threat. This section would require

the Secretary of Energy to submit to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Armed Services, and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, not less than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter on March 1 of each year until 2016, on the strategic plans of the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to prevent nuclear and radiological proliferation and on the implementation of these plans, including progress and challenges of implementation, an estimate of budget requirements over 10 years, and interagency coordination. This section would also require the Secretary of Energy to submit, no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and by March 1 annually thereafter until 2016, an assessment of the risk that non-nuclear weapon countries may acquire nuclear enrichment or reprocessing technology, and a classified list of the location and vulnerability of highly-enriched uranium worldwide. Both the report and the assessments should be submitted in unclassified form, with classified annexes.

The committee is concerned about the danger that additional countries or terrorists may acquire nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons-usable materials, and related technology, equipment, and expertise. The committee is aware of the urgency and importance of the efforts necessary to prevent and counter this threat. The committee also notes the findings of the 2009 Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States that "success in advancing U.S. nonproliferation interests requires U.S. leadership" and that "the risks of a proliferation 'tipping point' and of nuclear terrorism underscore the urgency of acting now."

Section 3123—Reports on Role of Nuclear Sites and Efficiencies

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to submit to the appropriate committees, no later than February 1, 2012, a report assessing the role of the nuclear security complex sites in supporting a safe, secure, and reliable nuclear deterrent, nuclear weapons reductions, and nuclear nonproliferation efforts. The report would also be required to include an assessment of opportunities for efficiencies and cost savings and a long-term plan for the nuclear security complex. Finally, this section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the appropriate committees, no later than 180 days after submission of the Secretary of Energy's report, an assessment of the Secretary's report.

The committee notes past independent assessments by the Comptroller General on the nuclear security complex, including consolidation of special nuclear material, proposals to transform the complex, and management of the complex. Therefore, the committee is pleased that the Department of Energy has made progress in recent years in consolidating sites that use special nuclear material. This consolidation effort has led to the removal of plutonium from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the consolidation of tritium operations at the Savannah River Site. Additionally, the committee notes that the 2008 National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Complex Transformation Plan intended to transform the "nuclear weapons complex to be smaller,

and more responsive, efficient, and secure in order to meet national security requirements." The committee also notes NNSA's most recent Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan outlined progress and plans for sustaining and modernizing the nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive testing, and the 10-year plan and funding commitments required pursuant to section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). The committee seeks an updated analysis of potential opportunities for efficiencies in the nuclear security complex and of the Administration's strategic plan for the nuclear security complex, including how the strategic plan links to efforts to sustain the nuclear arsenal without nuclear explosive testing, modernize the infrastructure of the nuclear security complex, support nuclear weapons reductions by improving verification and detection technologies, and strengthen nuclear nonproliferation efforts.

Section 3124—Net Assessment of High-Performance Computing Capabilities of Foreign Countries

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, the Under Secretary of Energy for Science, and the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security, to conduct a net assessment of high-performance computing capability possessed by foreign countries. The assessment would be required to cover a variety of matters, including an analysis of current and potential future capabilities and trends in high-performance computing; descriptions of how high-performance computing capabilities are used throughout the world; and an evaluation of similarities and differences in approaches to innovation, development, and utilization of high-performance computing among the United States and major foreign competitors in the field. The section would require the Administrator to coordinate the assessment with other appropriate executive agencies and, upon request by the Administrator, require the Secretary of Defense to provide net assessment expertise through the Department of Defense Office of Net Assessment. The Administrator would be required to submit an unclassified report on the results of the assessment, with a classified annex if appropriate, to the appropriate congressional committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $29.1 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2012. The committee recommends $29.1 million, the amount of the request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

The committee notes that the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10) ap-

propriated $23.3 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), a reduction of $5.3 million from the President's budget request for fiscal year 2011.

The committee is concerned that continuation of this reduction into fiscal year 2012 would have negative impacts on DNFSB's ability to carry out its mission even as the need for independent safety oversight of certain National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) programs increases. In particular, the committee is concerned that the reduction will impact the DNFSB's ability to conduct robust and timely oversight of the designs being developed for the two major new NNSA construction projects currently underway. Prior history has shown that incorporation of safety features at early stages of facility design can result in large cost savings and cost avoidances later on, and the committee believes the ability of the DNFSB to provide timely independent oversight of these designs will be negatively impacted by continued budget reductions.

The committee believes DNFSB provides an important and independent oversight function to ensure the health and safety of workers and the public at facilities across the nuclear security enterprise. The committee supports the work conducted by DNFSB and the scientists and engineers it employs.

Therefore, elsewhere in this title the committee recommends $29.1 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2012, the amount of the budget request.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2012.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $14.9 million for fiscal year 2012 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum and Oil Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2012

This section would authorize a total of $328.9 million for the Maritime Administration of the Department of Transportation for fiscal year 2012. Of the funds authorized, $93.1 million would be available for expenses necessary for operations of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy, $17.1 million would be available for support of the various state maritime academies, $18.5 million for the program to dispose of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, $186.0 million for the Maritime Security Program, and

$14.3 million for the loan guarantee program authorized by chapter 537 of title 46, United States Code, commonly referred to as the Title XI Loan Program.

Section 3502—Use of National Defense Reserve Fleet and Ready Reserve Force Vessels

This section would amend section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 U.S.C. App. 1744(b)) to allow the Secretary of Transportation, with concurrence of the Secretary of Defense, to use National Defense Reserve Fleet vessels for civil contingency and promotional and media events subject to other criteria to be considered.

Section 3503—Recruitment Authority

This section would amend section 51301 of title 46, United States Code, by allowing the Secretary of Transportation, subject to the availability of appropriations, to expend funds available for the operating expenses for the United States Merchant Marine Academy for recruiting activities to obtain recruits for the Academy and cadet applicants.

Section 3504—Ship Scrapping Reporting Requirement

This section would amend section 3502(f) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), as amended by section 3505(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) by eliminating a mandatory reporting requirement for ship scrapping. This section would require the Maritime Administrator to provide briefings, upon request, to the congressional committees with jurisdictional authority on issues concerning the recycling of vessels.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables

This section would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming guidance in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, this section would also require that a decision by an Agency Head to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
001	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT		14,572				14,572
002	C–12 CARGO AIRPLANE						
003	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	18	539,574	–18	–523,900		15,674
	Early to Need			[–14]	[–417,900]		
	Program Decrease			[–4]	[–106,000]		
004	MQ–1 UAV	36	658,798			36	658,798
005	RQ–11 (RAVEN)	1,272	70,762			1,272	70,762
006	BCT UNMANNED AERIAL VEH (UAVS) INCR 1						
	ROTARY						
007	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	39	250,415			39	250,415
008	AH–64 BLOCK II/WRA						
009	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	19	411,005			19	411,005
010	Advance Procurement (CY)		192,764				192,764
011	Advance Procurement (CY)		104,263				104,263
012	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	71	1,325,666			71	1,325,666
013	Advance Procurement (CY)		199,781				199,781
014	CH–47 HELICOPTER	47	1,305,360			47	1,305,360
015	Advance Procurement (CY)		54,956				54,956

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
016	HELICOPTER NEW TRAINING						
017	KIOWA WARRIOR UPGRADE (OH–58 D)/WRA						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
018	C–12 AIRCRAFT MODS						
019	MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS		136,183				136,183
020	MQ–1 WEAPONIZATION—UAS						
021	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		27,575				27,575
022	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		8,362				8,362
023	AH–64 MODS		331,230				331,230
024	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		79,712				79,712
025	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		22,107				22,107
026	AIRCRAFT LONG RANGE MODS						
027	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		80,745		10,000		90,745
	Modifications to Aircraft				[10,000]		
028	KIOWA WARRIOR		162,052				162,052
029	AIRBORNE AVIONICS						
030	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN		138,832				138,832
031	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE		132,855				132,855
032	GATM ROLLUP		105,519				105,519
033	RQ–7 UAV MODS		126,239				126,239
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
034	SPARE PARTS (AIR)						
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
035	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		35,993				35,993
036	SURVIVABILITY CM						
037	CMWS		162,811				162,811

	OTHER SUPPORT						
038	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,840				4,840
039	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		176,212				176,212
040	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		82,883				82,883
041	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		114,844				114,844
042	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,593				1,593
043	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	464	2,878			464	2,878
044	AIRBORNE COMMUNICATIONS						
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,966**	**7,061,381**	**–18**	**–513,900**	**1,948**	**6,547,481**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM						
001	PATRIOT SYSTEM SUMMARY	88	662,231			88	662,231
002	MSE MISSILE/PAC–3		74,953				74,953
003	SURFACE-LAUNCHED AMRAAM SYSTEM SUMMARY:						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		1,410				1,410
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	710	160,767			710	160,767
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	802	61,676			802	61,676
007	Advance Procurement (CY)		19,886				19,886
008	BCT NON LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM—INCREM						
009	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	2,784	314,167			2,784	314,167
010	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,370	18,175			2,370	18,175
011	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM (HIMARS		31,674				31,674
	MODIFICATIONS						
012	PATRIOT MODS		66,925				66,925
013	STINGER MODS		14,495		–14,495		
	Budget Adjustment per Army Request				[–14,495]		
014	ITAS/TOW MODS		13,577				13,577
015	MLRS MODS		8,236				8,236
016	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		11,670				11,670

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
017	HELLFIRE MODIFICATIONS						
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
018	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		8,700				8,700
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
019	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,674				3,674
020	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		1,459				1,459
021	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		5,043				5,043
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**6,754**	**1,478,718**		**–14,495**	**6,754**	**1,464,223**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	STRYKER VEHICLE	100	632,994			100	632,994
002	FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEMS: (FCS)						
003	FCS SPIN OUTS						
004	Advance Procurement (CY)						
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
005	STRYKER (MOD)		52,797				52,797
006	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		43,962				43,962
007	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		250,710		153,000		403,710
	Program Increase				[153,000]		
008	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		46,876				46,876
009	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)		10,452				10,452
010	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	19	99,904			19	99,904
011	M88 FOV MODS		32,483				32,483
012	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE						
013	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		160,578				160,578

014	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM	21	181,329	272,000	21	453,329
	Industrial Base and Guard Modernization			[272,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES					
015	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		1,073			1,073
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES					
016	HOWITZER, LIGHT, TOWED, 105MM, M119					
017	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY	5	16,046		5	16,046
018	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN (7.62MM)					
019	MACHINE GUN, CAL .50 M2 ROLL	4,700	65,102		4,700	65,102
020	LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN	700	28,796		700	28,796
021	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN (5.56MM)					
022	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN (40MM)					
023	MORTAR SYSTEMS	142	12,477		142	12,477
024	M107, CAL. 50, SNIPER RIFLE					
025	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	2,873	12,055		2,873	12,055
026	M110 SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM (SASS)					
027	M4 CARBINE	19,409	35,015		19,409	35,015
028	SHOTGUN, MODULAR ACCESSORY SYSTEM (MASS)	3,038	6,707		3,038	6,707
029	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO					
030	HANDGUN					
031	HOWITZER LT WT 155MM (T)		13,066			13,066
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH					
032	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS					
033	M4 CARBINE MODS		25,092			25,092
034	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		14,856			14,856
035	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		8,480			8,480
036	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		15,718			15,718
037	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		1,994	2,506		4,500
	Program Increase			[2,506]		
038	M119 MODIFICATIONS		38,701			38,701
039	M16 RIFLE MODS		3,476			3,476
040	M14 7.62 RIFLE MODS					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
041	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,973				2,973
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
042	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)						
043	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		10,080				10,080
044	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		424				424
045	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		2,453				2,453
	SPARES						
046	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS (WTCV)		106,843				106,843
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**31,007**	**1,933,512**		**427,506**	**31,007**	**2,361,018**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		210,758				210,758
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		83,730				83,730
003	CTG, 7.62MM, 4 BALL M80 FS, 1 DIM TRCR M276,						
004	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		9,064				9,064
005	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		131,775				131,775
006	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES						
007	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		14,894				14,894
008	OBJECTIVE FAMILY OF WEAPONS AMMUNITION, ALL T		3,399				3,399
009	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		118,966				118,966
010	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		84,799				84,799
011	CTG, CAL .300 WIN MAG, MK 248 MOD 0 (7.62X67M						
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
012	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		31,287				31,287
013	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		12,187				12,187

014	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	108,416	108,416
	TANK AMMUNITION		
015	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES	105,704	105,704
016	CTG, TANK, 120MM, ALL TYPES		
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION		
017	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM AND 105MM, ALL TYP	103,227	103,227
018	CTG, ARTY, 105MM: ALL TYPES		
019	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	32,887	32,887
020	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE XM982	69,074	69,074
021	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	48,205	48,205
	ARTILLERY FUZES		
022	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		
	MINES		
023	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES	2,518	2,518
024	MINE, CLEARING CHARGE, ALL TYPES		
	NETWORKED MUNITIONS		
025	SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	43,123	43,123
026	SCORPION, INTELLIGENT MUNITIONS SYSTEM , ALL		
	ROCKETS		
027	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	19,254	19,254
028	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	127,265	127,265
	OTHER AMMUNITION		
029	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	53,685	53,685
030	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	42,558	42,558
031	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	26,173	26,173
032	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	14,108	14,108
033	ALL OTHER (AMMO)	50	50
	MISCELLANEOUS		
034	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	18,296	18,296
035	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES	14,864	14,864
036	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	5,449	5,449
037	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	11,009	11,009

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
038	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		24,200				24,200
039	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		13,711				13,711
040	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		103				103
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
041	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		199,841				199,841
042	LAYAWAY OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		9,451				9,451
043	MAINTENANCE OF INACTIVE FACILITIES		5,533				5,533
044	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION, ALL		189,789				189,789
045	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,273				3,273
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**1,992,625**				**1,992,625**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS						
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	102	13,496			102	13,496
003	SEMITRAILERS, TANKERS						
004	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)						
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	2,390	432,936			2,390	432,936
006	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		21,930				21,930
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		627,294				627,294
008	PLS ESP		251,667				251,667
009	ARMORED SECURITY VEHICLES (ASV)						
010	MINE PROTECTION VEHICLE FAMILY		56,671				56,671
011	FAMILY OF MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROTEC (MRAP)						
012	TRUCK, TRACTOR, LINE HAUL, M915/M916	6	1,461			6	1,461
013	HVY EZPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	412	156,747			412	156,747

014	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM		161,631			161,631
015	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS		39,908			39,908
016	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		362,672			362,672
017	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		142,862			142,862
018	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (TAC VEH)					
019	TOWING DEVICE-FIFTH WHEEL					
020	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS, OPA1		20,156			20,156
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES					
021	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	6	1,161		6	1,161
022	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		3,222			3,222
023	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		19,869			19,869
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS					
024	JOINT COMBAT IDENTIFICATION MARKING SYSTEM		9,984			9,984
025	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	3,931	974,186		3,931	974,186
026	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		4,826			4,826
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS					
028	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	3	123,859		3	123,859
029	SHF TERM	2	8,910		2	8,910
030	SAT TERM, EMUT (SPACE)					
031	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	6,312	29,568		6,312	29,568
032	SMART-T (SPACE)		49,704			49,704
033	SCAMP (SPACE)		2,415			2,415
034	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS		73,374			73,374
035	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	140	31,799		140	31,799
	COMM—COMBAT SUPPORT COMM					
036	MOD-IN-SERVICE PROFILER		969			969
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM					
037	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		18,788			18,788
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS					
038	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		3,994			3,994
039	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	17,120	775,832	–59,800	17,120	716,032
	Early to Need—GMR			[–35,800]		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Program Decrease—Maritime/Fixed Station				[–24,000]		
040	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		8,336				8,336
041	SINCGARS FAMILY		4,992				4,992
042	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2						
043	TRACTOR DESK		10,827				10,827
044	COMMS-ELEC EQUIP FIELDING						
045	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		36,224				36,224
046	IMS REMOTE CONTROL UNIT						
047	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		1,843				1,843
048	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR (CSEL)						
049	GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM (GDS)	87	3,939			87	3,939
050	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY	550	38,535			550	38,535
051	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)	957	26,232			957	26,232
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM						
053	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,547				1,547
054	CIVIL AFFAIRS/INFO OPS		28,266				28,266
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
055	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)	499	12,541			499	12,541
056	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		39,349				39,349
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
057	TERRESTRIAL TRANSMISSION		2,232				2,232
058	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		37,780				37,780
059	WW TECH CON IMP PROG (WWTCIP)		12,805				12,805
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
060	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	164	187,227			164	187,227
061	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		4,393				4,393

062	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM(		310,761		310,761
063	PENTAGON INFORMATION MGT AND TELECOM		4,992		4,992
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)				
066	JTT/CIBS-M		4,657		4,657
067	PROPHET GROUND	23	72,041	23	72,041
068	DIGITAL TOPOGRAPHIC SPT SYS (DTSS)				
069	DRUG INTERDICTION PROGRAM (DIP) (TIARA)				
070	DCGS-A (MIP)		144,548		144,548
071	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	5	1,199	5	1,199
072	TROJAN (MIP)		32,707		32,707
073	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		9,163		9,163
074	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS) (MIP		3,493		3,493
075	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MIP)		802		802
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)				
076	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	10	33,810	10	33,810
077	CREW		24,104		24,104
078	BCT UNATTENDED GROUND SENSOR				
079	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITES				
080	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		1,252		1,252
081	CI MODERNIZATION		1,332		1,332
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)				
082	FAAD GBS		7,958		7,958
083	SENTINEL MODS	47	41,657	47	41,657
084	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)	5,831	47,498	5,831	47,498
085	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	8,793	156,204	8,793	156,204
086	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	118	102,334	118	102,334
087	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		186,859		186,859
088	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF		10,227		10,227
089	RADIATION MONITORING SYSTEMS				
090	COUNTER-ROCKET, ARTILLERY & MORTAR (C-RAM)	7	15,774	7	15,774
091	BASE EXPEDITIONARY TARGETING AND SURV SYS				
092	GREEN LASER INTERDICTION SYSTEM		25,356		25,356

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
093	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP						
094	ENHANCED PORTABLE INDUCTIVE ARTILLERY FUZE SE						
095	PROFILER	1	3,312			1	3,312
096	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		3,005				3,005
097	FORCE XXI BATTLE CMD BRIGADE & BELOW (FBCB2)						
098	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)		69,514				69,514
099	LIGHTWEIGHT LASER DESIGNATOR/RANGEFINDER	171	58,042			171	58,042
100	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32						
101	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		21,022				21,022
102	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	16	227,629			16	227,629
103	ARMS CONTROL ENHANCED SENSOR & MONITORING SYSTEM		2,226				2,226
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
104	TACTICAL OPERATIONS CENTERS	80	54,907			80	54,907
105	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	898	54,223			898	54,223
106	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC	612	12,454			612	12,454
107	FAAD C2		5,030				5,030
108	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	9	62,710			9	62,710
109	KNIGHT FAMILY	12	51,488			12	51,488
110	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,807				1,807
111	AUTOMATIC IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY		28,924				28,924
112	TC AIMS II						
113	TACTICAL INTERNET MANAGER						
114	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE						
115	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	498	34,031			498	34,031
116	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)	26,660	210,312			26,660	210,312
117	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET		19,113				19,113

118	MOUNTED BATTLE COMMAND ON THE MOVE (MBCOTM)					
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION					
119	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM		23,664			23,664
120	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		11,192			11,192
121	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		220,250			220,250
122	CSS COMMUNICATIONS	452	39,310		452	39,310
123	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		41,248			41,248
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)					
124	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)		10,437			10,437
125	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	168	7,480		168	7,480
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT					
126	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		571			571
127	BCT NETWORK			20,334		20,334
	Budget Adjustment per Army Request			[20,334]		
	UNDISTRIBUTED					
127A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		4,273			4,273
127U	UNDISTRIBUTED OPA2			4,000		4,000
	Electronic Equipment—Automation			[4,000]		
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT					
128	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS					
129	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)		8,636			8,636
130	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)		41,204	6,000		47,204
	Base Defense Systems			[6,000]		
131	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION		10,700			10,700
132	SMOKE & OBSCURANT FAMILY: SOF (NON AAO ITEM)		362			362
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT					
133	TACTICAL BRIDGING		77,428			77,428
134	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		49,154			49,154
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT					
135	HANDHELD STANDOFF MINEFIELD DETECTION SYS-HST		39,263			39,263
136	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)		20,678			20,678
137	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)		30,297			30,297

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
138	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		17,626				17,626
139	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS		14,672				14,672
140	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT		7,352				7,352
141	AERIAL DETECTION						
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
142	HEATERS AND ECU'S		10,109				10,109
143	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES						
144	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		9,591				9,591
145	LIGHTWEIGHT MAINTENANCE ENCLOSURE (LME)						
146	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)		8,509				8,509
147	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM		184,072		–28,000		156,072
	Schedule Slip- Nett Warrior, Increment One				[–28,000]		
148	MOUNTED SOLDIER SYSTEM		43,419				43,419
149	FORCE PROVIDER						
150	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		26,860				26,860
151	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM		68,392				68,392
152	MOBILE INTEGRATED REMAINS COLLECTION SYSTEM:		7,384				7,384
153	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS		54,190				54,190
154	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)		12,482				12,482
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
155	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
156	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		75,457				75,457
	WATER EQUIPMENT						
157	WATER PURIFICATION SYSTEMS						
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
158	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		53,450				53,450

	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT					
159	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		16,572			16,572
160	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)		3,852			3,852
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT					
161	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		2,201			2,201
162	SKID STEER LOADER (SSL) FAMILY OF SYSTEM	54	8,584		54	8,584
163	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	30	21,031		30	21,031
164	MISSION MODULES—ENGINEERING		43,432			43,432
165	COMPACTOR		2,859			2,859
166	LOADERS					
167	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR					
168	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	171	59,534		171	59,534
169	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	4	8,314		4	8,314
170	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR TYPE—FOS		18,974			18,974
171	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPA		15,833			15,833
172	CONST EQUIP ESP		9,771			9,771
173	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		12,654			12,654
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT					
174	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	1	223,845		1	223,845
175	HARBORMASTER COMMAND AND CONTROL CENTER (HCCC					
176	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		10,175			10,175
	GENERATORS					
177	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		31,897	10,000		41,897
	Program Increase			[10,000]		
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT					
178	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)					
179	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	101	10,944		101	10,944
180	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	135	21,859		135	21,859
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					
181	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT		133,178			133,178
182	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		168,392			168,392
183	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER		17,760			17,760

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
184	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		9,413				9,413
185	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING						
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)						
186	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		13,618				13,618
187	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		49,437				49,437
188	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)		30,451				30,451
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
189	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,923				4,923
190	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		69,316				69,316
191	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		1,591				1,591
192	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)		72,271				72,271
193	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,325				2,325
194	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		17,411				17,411
195	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3		34,500				34,500
196	TRACTOR YARD		3,740				3,740
197	BCT UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE		24,805		69,027		93,832
	Budget Adjustment per Army Request				[69,027]		
198	BCT TRAINING/LOGISTICS/MANAGEMENT		149,308		–123,297		26,011
	Budget Adjustment per Army Request				[–123,297]		
199	BCT TRAINING/LOGISTICS/MANAGEMENT INC 2		57,103		–57,103		
	Budget Adjustment per Army Request				[–57,103]		
200	BCT UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE INC 2		11,924		–11,924		
	Budget Adjustment per Army Request				[–11,924]		
	OPA2						
201	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	33	21,647			33	21,647
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**77,621**	**9,682,592**		**–170,763**	**77,621**	**9,511,829**

	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND				
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE				
004	OPERATIONS		220,634		220,634
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**220,634**		**220,634**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT				
001	EA–18G	12	1,079,364	12	1,079,364
002	Advance Procurement (CY)		28,119		28,119
003	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	28	2,366,752	28	2,366,752
004	Advance Procurement (CY)		64,962		64,962
005	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	7	1,503,096	7	1,503,096
006	Advance Procurement (CY)		217,666		217,666
007	JSF STOVL	6	1,141,933	6	1,141,933
008	Advance Procurement (CY)		117,229		117,229
009	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	30	2,224,817	30	2,224,817
010	Advance Procurement (CY)		84,008		84,008
011	UH–1Y/AH–1Z	25	700,306	25	700,306
012	Advance Procurement (CY)		68,310		68,310
013	MH–60S (MYP)	18	408,921	18	408,921
014	Advance Procurement (CY)		74,040		74,040
015	MH–60R	24	791,025	24	791,025
016	Advance Procurement (CY)		209,431		209,431
017	P–8A POSEIDON	11	2,018,851	11	2,018,851
018	Advance Procurement (CY)		256,594		256,594
019	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	5	914,892	5	914,892
020	Advance Procurement (CY)		157,942		157,942
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
021	C–40A				
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT				
022	JPATS	36	266,906	36	266,906

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
023	HC–130J						
024	KC–130J	1	87,288			1	87,288
025	RQ–7 UAV						
026	MQ–8 UAV	12	191,986			12	191,986
027	STUASLO UAV	8	12,772			8	12,772
028	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
029	EA–6 SERIES		27,734				27,734
030	AEA SYSTEMS		34,065				34,065
031	AV–8 SERIES		30,762				30,762
032	F–18 SERIES		499,597				499,597
033	H–46 SERIES		27,112				27,112
034	AH–1W SERIES		15,828				15,828
035	H–53 SERIES		62,820				62,820
036	SH–60 SERIES		83,394		4,500		87,894
	SH–60 Crew and Passenger Survivability Upgrades				[4,500]		
037	H–1 SERIES		11,012				11,012
038	EP–3 SERIES		83,181				83,181
039	P–3 SERIES		171,466				171,466
040	E–2 SERIES		29,215				29,215
041	TRAINER A/C SERIES		22,090				22,090
042	C–2A		16,302				16,302
043	C–130 SERIES		27,139				27,139
044	FLEET EW		2,773				2,773
045	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		16,463				16,463

046	E–6 SERIES		165,253			165,253
047	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		58,011			58,011
048	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		12,248			12,248
049	T–45 SERIES		57,779			57,779
050	AIRCRAFT POWER PLANT CHANGES		21,847			21,847
051	JPATS SERIES		1,524			1,524
052	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		1,069			1,069
053	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		92,072			92,072
054	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		147,093			147,093
055	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM					
056	ID SYSTEMS		37,330			37,330
057	P–8 SERIES		2,930			2,930
058	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		489			489
059	RQ–7 SERIES		11,419			11,419
060	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		60,264			60,264
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
061	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,331,961			1,331,961
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES					
062	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		351,685			351,685
063	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		22,358			22,358
064	WAR CONSUMABLES		27,300			27,300
065	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		10,124			10,124
066	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,395			24,395
067	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,719			1,719
068	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS					
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**223**	**18,587,033**	**4,500**	**223**	**18,591,533**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES					
001	TRIDENT II MODS	24	1,309,102		24	1,309,102
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES					
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		3,492			3,492

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
003	TOMAHAWK	196	303,306			196	303,306
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
004	AMRAAM	161	188,494			161	188,494
005	SIDEWINDER	132	47,098			132	47,098
006	JSOW	266	137,722			266	137,722
007	STANDARD MISSILE	89	420,324			89	420,324
008	RAM	61	66,197			61	66,197
009	HELLFIRE	281	22,703			281	22,703
010	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)						
011	AERIAL TARGETS		46,359				46,359
012	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,561				3,561
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
013	ESSM	35	48,486			35	48,486
014	HARM MODS	72	73,061			72	73,061
015	STANDARD MISSILES MODS						
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
016	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,979				1,979
017	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		238,215				238,215
018	Advance Procurement (CY)						
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
019	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		52,255				52,255
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
020	ASW TARGETS		31,803				31,803
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
021	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS	45	78,045			45	78,045

022	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	48	42,493		48	42,493
023	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		5,770			5,770
023A	UNDISTRIBUTED			5,000		5,000
	Modification of Torpedoes and Related Equipment			[5,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
024	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		43,003			43,003
025	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		9,219			9,219
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION					
026	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,553			3,553
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS					
027	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		15,037			15,037
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS					
028	CIWS MODS		37,550			37,550
029	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		17,525			17,525
030	GUN MOUNT MODS		43,957			43,957
031	LCS MODULE WEAPONS					
032	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		50,013			50,013
033	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		12,203			12,203
	OTHER					
034	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS					
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
035	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		55,953			55,953
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**1,410**	**3,408,478**	**5,000**	**1,410**	**3,413,478**
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY					
	OTHER WARSHIPS					
001	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM					
002	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM		554,798			554,798
003	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,232,215		2	3,232,215
004	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE		1,524,761			1,524,761
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS					
006	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		529,652			529,652

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
007	SSBN ERO						
008	DDG 1000		453,727				453,727
009	DDG–51	1	1,980,709			1	1,980,709
010	Advance Procurement (CY)		100,723				100,723
011	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	4	1,802,093			4	1,802,093
012	Advance Procurement (CY)						
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
013	LPD–17	1	1,847,444			1	1,847,444
014	Advance Procurement (CY)						
015	LHA REPLACEMENT		2,018,691		–50,000		1,968,691
	Contract Delay				[–200,000]		
	Program Increase				[150,000]		
016	Advance Procurement (CY)						
017	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL	1	185,106			1	185,106
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
018	OCEANOGRAPHIC SHIPS	1	89,000			1	89,000
019	Advance Procurement (CY)		155,200				155,200
020	OUTFITTING		292,871				292,871
021	SERVICE CRAFT		3,863				3,863
022	LCAC SLEP	4	84,076			4	84,076
023	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		73,992				73,992
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
024	UNDISTRIBUTED						
	Advance Procurement and Economic Order Quantity				[150,000]		
	Program Decrease				[–150,000]		
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	**14**	**14,928,921**		**–50,000**	**14**	**14,878,921**

	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		
	NAVY AMMUNITION		
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	64,766	64,766
002	JDAM		
003	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	38,264	38,264
004	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	17,788	17,788
005	PRACTICE BOMBS	35,289	35,289
006	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	49,416	49,416
007	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	60,677	60,677
008	JATOS	2,766	2,766
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	19,006	19,006
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	19,320	19,320
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	21,938	21,938
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	51,819	51,819
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	10,199	10,199
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,107	4,107
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	58,812	58,812
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	21,434	21,434
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES	84,864	84,864
018	60MM, ALL TYPES	937	937
019	81MM, ALL TYPES	26,324	26,324
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	9,387	9,387
021	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	3,889	3,889
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	13,452	13,452
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	15,556	15,556
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	42,526	42,526
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	22,786	22,786
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	9,266	9,266
027	NON LETHALS	2,927	2,927
028	AMMO MODERNIZATION	8,557	8,557

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,880				3,880
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**719,952**				**719,952**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
001	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE		13,794				13,794
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		8,643				8,643
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
003	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		22,982				22,982
	PERISCOPES						
004	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP		60,860				60,860
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
005	DDG MOD		119,522				119,522
006	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT		17,637				17,637
007	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD		3,049				3,049
008	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		22,266				22,266
009	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,892				15,892
010	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		100,693				100,693
011	SUBMARINE BATTERIES		42,296				42,296
012	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		25,228				25,228
013	DEEP SUBMERGENCE SYSTEMS		2,600				2,600
014	CG MODERNIZATION		590,349				590,349
015	LCAC						
016	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS		18,499				18,499
017	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		113,809				113,809
018	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS		5,508				5,508

019	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	13,397		13,397
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT			
020	REACTOR POWER UNITS	436,838		436,838
021	REACTOR COMPONENTS	271,600		271,600
	OCEAN ENGINEERING			
022	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	11,244		11,244
	SMALL BOATS			
023	STANDARD BOATS	39,793		39,793
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT			
024	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	29,913		29,913
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT			
025	OPERATING FORCES IPE	54,642		54,642
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT			
026	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	144,175		144,175
027	LCS MODULES	79,583		79,583
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT			
028	LSD MIDLIFE	143,483		143,483
	SHIP RADARS			
029	RADAR SUPPORT	18,818	5,000	23,818
	Program Increase		[5,000]	
	SHIP SONARS			
030	SPQ–9B RADAR	24,613		24,613
031	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	73,829		73,829
032	SSN ACOUSTICS	212,913		212,913
033	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	29,686		29,686
034	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	13,537		13,537
035	ELECTRONIC WARFARE MILDEC	18,141		18,141
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT			
036	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	20,554		20,554
037	SSTD	2,257		2,257
038	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	60,141		60,141
039	SURTASS	29,247		29,247

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
040	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNAISANCE FORCE		13,453				13,453
040A	UNDISTRIBUTED				9,600		9,600
	Anti-Submarine Warfare Electronic Equipment				[9,600]		
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
041	AN/SLQ–32		43,096				43,096
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
042	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		103,645				103,645
043	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)		1,364				1,364
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
044	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG		100,793				100,793
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
045	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY		23,332				23,332
046	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)		426				426
047	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)		33,017				33,017
048	ATDLS		942				942
049	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)		7,896				7,896
050	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT		27,868				27,868
051	SHALLOW WATER MCM		1,048		7,975		9,023
	Shallow Water Mine Counter Measures				[7,975]		
052	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)		9,926				9,926
053	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE		4,370				4,370
054	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP		4,143				4,143
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
055	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT		45,989				45,989
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
056	MATCALS		8,136				8,136

057	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	7,394		7,394
058	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	18,518		18,518
059	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	26,054		26,054
060	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	7,213		7,213
061	LANDING SYSTEMS	7,138		7,138
062	ID SYSTEMS	33,170		33,170
063	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	8,941		8,941
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT			
064	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONT	8,994		8,994
065	MARITIME INTERGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	13,529		13,529
066	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	12,776		12,776
067	DCGS-N	11,201		11,201
068	CANES	195,141		195,141
069	RADIAC	6,201		6,201
070	CANES-INTELL	75,084		75,084
071	ELECTRONIC TEST EQUIPMENT	6,010		6,010
072	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	4,441		4,441
073	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	4,741		4,741
074	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	51,716		51,716
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS			
075	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	26,197	–15,000	11,197
	Program Decrease		[–15,000]	
076	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	177,510		177,510
077	MARITIME DOMAIN AWARENESS (MDA)	24,022		24,022
078	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	33,644		33,644
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS			
079	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	10,357		10,357
080	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	75,447		75,447
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS			
081	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	25,522		25,522
082	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	109,022		109,022
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS			

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
083	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		2,186				2,186
084	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,329				1,329
085	NAVAL SHORE COMMUNICATIONS		2,418				2,418
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
086	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		119,857				119,857
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
087	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		14,820				14,820
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
088	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		6,848				6,848
	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
089	OTHER DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT		2,290				2,290
	SONOBUOYS						
090	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES		96,314				96,314
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
091	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		40,697				40,697
092	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		8,561				8,561
093	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT		8,941				8,941
094	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT		19,777				19,777
095	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		22,003				22,003
096	DIGITAL CAMERA RECEIVING STATION		1,595				1,595
097	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		66,031				66,031
098	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		49,668				49,668
099	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		18,471				18,471
100	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS		7,875				7,875
101	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		12,553				12,553
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						

102	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	2,049	2,049
103	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	4,488	4,488
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		
104	NATO SEASPARROW	8,926	8,926
105	RAM GMLS	4,321	4,321
106	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	60,700	60,700
107	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	43,148	43,148
108	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	72,861	72,861
109	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	732	732
110	MARITIME INTEGRATED PLANNING SYSTEM-MIPS	4,823	4,823
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
111	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	187,807	187,807
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
112	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	81,596	81,596
113	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,241	5,241
114	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,816	5,816
115	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	7,842	7,842
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
116	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	98,847	98,847
117	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,073	4,073
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE		
118	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM	32,716	32,716
119	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	5,814	5,814
120	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	36,777	36,777
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
121	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	6,271	6,271
122	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	3,202	3,202
123	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	9,850	9,850
124	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,315	14,315
125	TACTICAL VEHICLES	16,502	16,502
126	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	3,235	3,235
127	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	7,175	7,175

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
128	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		20,727				20,727
129	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,142				1,142
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
130	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		14,972				14,972
131	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,453				4,453
132	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		6,416				6,416
133	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS (IT)		51,894				51,894
	TRAINING DEVICES						
134	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		16,353				16,353
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
135	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		28,693				28,693
136	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,197				2,197
137	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,175				7,175
138	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,457				1,457
140	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		15,330				15,330
141	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		136				136
142	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		18,639				18,639
143	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		177,240				177,240
144	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		143,022				143,022
	PRODUCTIVITY PROGRAMS						
147	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT						
	OTHER						
148	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS						
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
148A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		14,402				14,402
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

149	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		208,384			208,384
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**6,285,451**	**7,575**		**6,293,026**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS					
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES					
001	AAV7A1 PIP		9,894			9,894
002	LAV PIP		147,051			147,051
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS					
003	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	7	11,961		7	11,961
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		5,552			5,552
005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		14,695			14,695
006	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		14,868			14,868
	OTHER SUPPORT					
007	MODIFICATION KITS		53,932			53,932
008	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		13,795			13,795
	GUIDED MISSILES					
009	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		12,287			12,287
010	JAVELIN					
011	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW		46,563			46,563
012	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)		19,606			19,606
	OTHER SUPPORT					
013	MODIFICATION KITS		4,140			4,140
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS					
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		16,755			16,755
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT					
015	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		24,071			24,071
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)					
016	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		25,461			25,461
017	MODIFICATION KITS					
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)					
018	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		5,926			5,926
019	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		44,152			44,152

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
020	RADAR SYSTEMS		40,352				40,352
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
021	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		8,793				8,793
022	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		64,276				64,276
024	RQ–11 UAV		2,104				2,104
025	DCGS-MC		10,789				10,789
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
028	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		6,847				6,847
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
029	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		218,869				218,869
030	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		84,856				84,856
031	RADIO SYSTEMS		89,479		1,000		90,479
	CBRNE Response Force Capability Enhancement				[1,000]		
032	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		16,598				16,598
033	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		47,505				47,505
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
033A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,606				1,606
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
034	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		894				894
035	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		14,231				14,231
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
036	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)						
037	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		8,389				8,389
038	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	12	5,833			12	5,833
039	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP		972				972

040	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		21,848			21,848
041	TRAILERS					
	OTHER SUPPORT					
042	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,503			4,503
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT					
043	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		2,599			2,599
044	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		16,255			16,255
045	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		26,853			26,853
046	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		27,247			27,247
047	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,533			5,533
048	EOD SYSTEMS		61,753			61,753
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT					
049	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		16,627			16,627
050	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		10,827			10,827
051	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		37,055			37,055
052	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,462			1,462
	GENERAL PROPERTY					
053	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		24,079			24,079
054	TRAINING DEVICES		10,277			10,277
055	CONTAINER FAMILY		3,123			3,123
056	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		18,137			18,137
057	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)					
058	BRIDGE BOATS					
059	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN		5,026			5,026
	OTHER SUPPORT					
060	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,206			5,206
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
061	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		90			90
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**19**	**1,391,602**	**1,000**	**19**	**1,392,602**

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE
TACTICAL FORCES

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
001	F–35	19	3,340,615			19	3,340,615
002	Advance Procurement (CY)		323,477				323,477
003	F–22A		104,118				104,118
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
004	C–17A (MYP)						
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
005	C–130J	1	72,879			1	72,879
006	Advance Procurement (CY)						
007	HC–130J	3	332,899			3	332,899
008	Advance Procurement (CY)						
009	MC–130J	6	582,466			6	582,466
010	Advance Procurement (CY)						
011	HC/MC–130 RECAP						
012	Advance Procurement (CY)						
013	C–27J	9	479,896			9	479,896
	UPT TRAINERS						
014	LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT						
015	USAFA POWERED FLIGHT PROGRAM		1,060				1,060
	OPERATIONAL TRAINERS						
016	T–6						
	HELICOPTERS						
017	COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT	2	52,800			2	52,800
018	Advance Procurement (CY)						
019	V22 OSPREY	5	339,865			5	339,865
020	Advance Procurement (CY)		20,000				20,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						

021	C–12 A						
022	C–40						
023	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C		2,190				2,190
024	HH–60M	3	104,711	–2	–69,900	1	34,811
	Early to Need per H.R. 1473			[–2]	[–69,900]		
025	LIGHT ATTACK ARMED RECON ACFT	9	158,549			9	158,549
026	RQ–11						
027	STUASLO						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
028	ITERIM GATEWAY						
029	TARGET DRONES		64,268				64,268
030	C–37A	3	77,842			3	77,842
031	RQ–4	3	323,964			3	323,964
032	Advance Procurement (CY)		71,500				71,500
033	MC 130	1	108,470			1	108,470
034	MQ–9	48	813,092			48	813,092
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
035	B–2A		41,315				41,315
036	B–1B		198,007				198,007
037	B–52		93,897				93,897
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
038	A–10		153,128		5,000		158,128
	Modification of In Service A–10 Aircraft				[5,000]		
039	F–15		222,386				222,386
040	F–16		73,346		–16,600		56,746
	Early to Need- Mode 5 IFF Block 50/52				[–16,600]		
041	F–22A		232,032				232,032
042	F–35 MODIFICATIONS						
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
043	C–5		11,741		–6,000		5,741
	Program Decrease				[–6,000]		
044	Advance Procurement (CY)						

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
045	C–5M		851,859				851,859
046	Advance Procurement (CY)		112,200				112,200
047	C–9C		9				9
048	C–17A		202,179		–6,000		196,179
	Program Decrease				[–6,000]		
049	C–21		328				328
050	C–32A		12,157				12,157
051	C–37A		21,986				21,986
052	C–130 AMP		235,635				235,635
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
053	GLIDER MODS		123				123
054	T–6		15,086				15,086
055	T–1		238				238
056	T–38		31,032				31,032
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
057	KC–10A (ATCA)		27,220				27,220
058	C–12		1,777				1,777
059	MC–12W		16,767				16,767
060	C–20 MODS		241				241
061	VC–25A MOD		387				387
062	C–40		206				206
063	C–130		45,876		–2,600		43,276
	Budget Adjustment per Air Force Request from RDAF–81				[10,400]		
	Program Decrease				[–13,000]		
064	C–130 INTEL		3,593				3,593
065	C–130J MODS		38,174				38,174

066	C–135	62,210		62,210
067	COMPASS CALL MODS	256,624		256,624
068	RC–135	162,211		162,211
069	E–3	135,031		135,031
070	E–4	57,829		57,829
071	E–8	29,058		29,058
072	H–1	5,280		5,280
073	H–60	34,371	54,600	88,971
	Budget Adjustment per Air Force Request from RDAF–81		[54,600]	
074	RQ–4 MODS	89,177		89,177
075	AC–130 RECAP	431		431
076	OTHER MODIFICATIONS	115,338		115,338
076A	EHF SATCOM			
076B	JTRS			
077	MQ–1 MODS	158,446		158,446
078	MQ–9 MODS	181,302		181,302
079	MQ–9 UAS PAYLOADS	74,866		74,866
080	CV–22 MODS	14,715		14,715
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS			
081	FIGHTER/UAV INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	1,030,364		1,030,364
081A	AIRLIFT/BOMBER INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS			
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
082	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	92,394		92,394
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT			
083	B–1	4,743		4,743
084	B–2A	101		101
085	B–2A	49,319		49,319
086	B–52			
087	C–5	521		521
088	C–5			
089	KC–10A (ATCA)	5,691		5,691
090	C–17A	183,696		183,696

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
091	C–130		25,646				25,646
092	EC–130J						
093	C–135		2,434				2,434
094	F–15		2,076				2,076
095	F–16		4,537				4,537
096	T–6						
097	OTHER AIRCRAFT		40,025				40,025
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
098	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		21,050				21,050
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
099	WAR CONSUMABLES		87,220				87,220
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
100	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		1,072,858				1,072,858
	DARP						
104	U–2		48,875				48,875
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
104A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		16,502				16,502
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
105	UNDISTRIBUTED				85,000		85,000
	Mobility Aircraft				[60,000]		
	Mobility Aircraft Simulators				[25,000]		
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**112**	**14,082,527**	**–2**	**43,500**	**110**	**14,126,027**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS		23,919				23,919

	CARTRIDGES				
002	CARTRIDGES		89,771		89,771
	BOMBS				
003	PRACTICE BOMBS		38,756		38,756
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		168,557		168,557
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	3,250	76,649	3,250	76,649
	FLARE, IR MJU–7B				
006	CAD/PAD		42,410		42,410
007	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		3,119		3,119
008	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		998		998
009	MODIFICATIONS		1,132		1,132
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000		5,075		5,075
	FUZES				
011	FLARES		46,749		46,749
012	FUZES		34,735		34,735
	SMALL ARMS				
013	SMALL ARMS		7,195		7,195
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**3,250**	**539,065**	**3,250**	**539,065**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC				
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		67,745		67,745
	TACTICAL				
002	JASSM	142	236,193	142	236,193
003	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	240	88,769	240	88,769
004	AMRAAM	218	309,561	218	309,561
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	416	46,830	416	46,830
006	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB		7,523		7,523
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES				
007	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		726		726
	CLASS IV				
008	ADVANCED CRUISE MISSILE		39		39

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
009	MM III MODIFICATIONS		125,953				125,953
010	AGM–65D MAVERICK		266				266
011	AGM–88A HARM		25,642				25,642
012	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		14,987				14,987
	MISSILE SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
013	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		43,241				43,241
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
014	ADVANCED EHF	2	552,833			2	552,833
015	Advance Procurement (CY)						
016	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)	1	468,745		416,000	1	884,745
	Transfer from PDW–20				[416,000]		
017	Advance Procurement (CY)						
018	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	2	433,526			2	433,526
019	Advance Procurement (CY)		81,811				81,811
020	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		21,568				21,568
021	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		67,689				67,689
022	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		101,397				101,397
023	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	4	1,740,222			4	1,740,222
024	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)		81,389				81,389
025	Advance Procurement (CY)		243,500				243,500
026	NATL POLAR-ORBITING OP ENV SATELLITE						
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
029	DEFENSE SPACE RECONN PROGRAM						
031	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		154,727				154,727
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
031A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,159,135				1,159,135

	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**1,025**	**6,074,017**	**416,000**	**1,025**	**6,490,017**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES					
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		5,621			5,621
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES					
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		18,411			18,411
003	CAP VEHICLES		917			917
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (CARGO		18,694			18,694
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES					
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		5,982	–5,982		
	Funding No Longer Required			[–5,982]		
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SPECIA		20,677			20,677
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT					
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		22,881			22,881
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT					
008	ITEMS LESS THAT $5,000,000		14,978			14,978
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT					
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV AND CLEANING EQU		16,556			16,556
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M BASE MAINT/CONST		30,225			30,225
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)					
011	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		135,169			135,169
012	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		1,263			1,263
013	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY					
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS					
014	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,645			2,645
015	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		21,762			21,762
016	ADVANCE TECH SENSORS		899			899
017	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		18,529			18,529
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS					
018	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		32,473			32,473
019	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		51,426			51,426

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
020	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED		32,468				32,468
021	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMEN		22,813				22,813
022	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		14,619				14,619
023	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		39,144				39,144
024	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		25,992				25,992
025	TAC SIGNIT SPT		217				217
026	DRUG INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
027	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		52,263				52,263
028	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		16,951				16,951
029	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		26,433				26,433
030	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		90,015				90,015
031	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		23,955				23,955
032	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		7,518				7,518
033	GCSS-AF FOS		72,641				72,641
034	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		22,301				22,301
035	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS		15,525				15,525
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
036	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS		49,377				49,377
037	BASE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE		41,239				41,239
038	AFNET		228,978				228,978
039	VOICE SYSTEMS		43,603				43,603
040	USCENTCOM- JCSE		30,983				30,983
	DISA PROGRAMS						
041	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE		49,570				49,570
042	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE		2,008				2,008

043	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	4,863	4,863
044	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	61,386	61,386
045	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	125,947	125,947
046	MILSATCOM SPACE	104,720	104,720
047	SPACE MODS SPACE	28,075	28,075
048	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	20,718	20,718
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
049	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	227,866	227,866
050	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER	22,184	22,184
051	RADIO EQUIPMENT	11,408	11,408
052	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	11,559	11,559
053	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	105,977	105,977
	MODIFICATIONS		
054	COMM ELECT MODS	76,810	76,810
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
055	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	20,008	20,008
056	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SAFETY)	25,499	25,499
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ		
057	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	37,829	37,829
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
058	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	16,483	16,483
059	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	16,754	16,754
060	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	3,653	3,653
061	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	30,345	30,345
062	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S)	2,819	2,819
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
064	DARP RC135	23,341	23,341
065	DCGS-AF	212,146	212,146
067	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	410,069	410,069
068	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	41,066	41,066
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
068A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,618,160	14,618,160

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
069	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		14,630				14,630
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**17,602,036**		**–5,982**		**17,596,054**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA						
001	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, BTA						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
002	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,473				1,473
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA						
003	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,076				2,076
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
004	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		11,019				11,019
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
013	INTERDICTION SUPPORT						
014	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		19,952				19,952
015	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM		5,324				5,324
016	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,955				2,955
017	TELEPORT PROGRAM		54,743				54,743
018	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		174,805				174,805
019	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		3,429				3,429
020	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		500,932		–416,000		84,932
	Transfer to MPAF–16				[–416,000]		
021	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE		1,788				1,788
022	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		24,085				24,085
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						

023	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		11,537			11,537
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT					
024	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	5	14,542		5	14,542
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA					
025	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,444			1,444
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY					
026	EQUIPMENT		971			971
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS					
027	OTHER CAPITAL EQUIPMENT		974			974
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY					
028	VEHICLES	4	200		4	200
029	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	12,806		3	12,806
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DTSA					
030	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		447			447
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY					
031	THAAD PROCUREMENT					
032	AEGIS BMD PROCUREMENT					
033	THAAD	68	833,150	50,000	68	883,150
	Program Increase			[50,000]		
034	AEGIS BMD	46	565,393	50,000	46	615,393
	Program Increase			[50,000]		
035	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS	2	380,195		2	380,195
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA					
043	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		5,787			5,787
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD					
045	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		47,123			47,123
045A	JCTD					
046	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		20,176			20,176
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS					
047	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		29,729			29,729
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS					
048	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		31,974			31,974

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
048A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		554,408				554,408
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
049	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		41,411				41,411
050	MH–47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM						
051	MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		171,456				171,456
052	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	15	272,623		–50,000	15	222,623
	Unjustified Growth				[–50,000]		
053	TANKER RECAPITALIZATION						
054	U–28		5,100				5,100
055	MH–47 CHINOOK		142,783				142,783
056	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		486				486
057	CV–22 MODIFICATION	27	118,002			27	118,002
058	MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		3,025				3,025
059	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		3,024				3,024
060	RQ–7 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		450				450
061	STUASL0		12,276				12,276
062	AC/MC–130J		74,891				74,891
063	C–130 MODIFICATIONS		19,665				19,665
064	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT		6,207				6,207
	SHIPBUILDING						
065	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS		6,999				6,999
066	SEAL DELIVERY VEHICLE						
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
067	ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT		116,009				116,009
068	ORDNANCE ACQUISITION		28,281				28,281

	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS			
069	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS	87,489	62,800	150,289
	Program Growth		[62,800]	
070	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	74,702		74,702
071	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	9,196		9,196
072	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	15,621		15,621
074	MARITIME EQUIPMENT MODIFICATIONS			
076	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	6,899	60,000	66,899
	Program Growth		[60,000]	
077	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	594		594
078	TACTICAL VEHICLES	33,915		33,915
079	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS			
080	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS	46,242		46,242
081	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	50,000		50,000
082	MILCON COLLATERAL EQUIPMENT	18,723		18,723
084	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
085	AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	51,232		51,232
086	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	7,782		7,782
087	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	22,960		22,960
088	SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	362		362
089	VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	15,758		15,758
090	TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	76,459	25,000	101,459
	Program Increase		[25,000]	
091	MARITIME EQUIPMENT			
092	DRUG INTERDICTION			
093	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	1,895		1,895
094	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	246,893		246,893
095	MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	4,142		4,142
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
095A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,012		4,012
	CBDP			
096	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION	15,900		15,900

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
097	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION		71,376				71,376
098	DECONTAMINATION		6,466				6,466
099	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL)		11,143				11,143
100	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION		9,414				9,414
101	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE		139,948				139,948
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**170**	**5,365,248**		**–218,200**	**170**	**5,147,048**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		100,000		–100,000		
	Unjustified Requirement				[–100,000]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**100,000**		**–100,000**		
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
007	UNDISTRIBUTED				100,000		100,000
	Program Increase				[100,000]		
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT				**100,000**		**100,000**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**123,571**	**111,453,792**	**–20**	**–68,259**	**123,551**	**111,385,533**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
002	C–12 CARGO AIRPLANE	1	10,500			1	10,500
	ROTARY						
008	AH–64 BLOCK II/WRA	1	35,500	–1	–35,500		
	Post 2012 Contract Award			[–1]	[–35,500]		
012	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	4	72,000			4	72,000
017	KIOWA WARRIOR UPGRADE (OH–58 D)/WRA	15	145,500			15	145,500
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
019	MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS		10,800				10,800
022	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		54,500				54,500
033	RQ–7 UAV MODS		94,600				94,600
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**21**	**423,400**	**–1**	**–35,500**	**20**	**387,900**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	907	107,556			907	107,556
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
009	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	210	19,000			210	19,000
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,117**	**126,556**			**1,117**	**126,556**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
020	LIGHTWEIGHT .50 CALIBER MACHINE GUN	118	5,427			118	5,427

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
029	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION (CRO	64	14,890			64	14,890
033	M4 CARBINE MODS		16,800				16,800
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**182**	**37,117**			**182**	**37,117**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
004	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		1,200				1,200
009	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		4,800				4,800
010	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		38,000				38,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
013	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		8,000				8,000
014	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		49,140				49,140
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
019	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		10,000				10,000
	ARTILLERY FUZES						
022	ARTILLERY FUZES, ALL TYPES		5,000				5,000
	ROCKETS						
027	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		5,000				5,000
028	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		53,841				53,841
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
029	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		16,000				16,000
031	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		7,000				7,000
032	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		8,000				8,000
	MISCELLANEOUS						
036	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,000				2,000
037	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		400				400

	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**208,381**		**208,381**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY				
	TACTICAL VEHICLES				
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	32	11,094	32	11,094
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)		47,214		47,214
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES				
023	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		3,600		3,600
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS				
025	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK		547		547
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS				
039	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM		450		450
042	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2		8,141		8,141
049	GUNSHOT DETECTION SYSTEM (GDS)		44,100		44,100
051	MEDICAL COMM FOR CBT CASUALTY CARE (MC4)		6,443		6,443
	INFORMATION SECURITY				
055	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)				
056	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP		54,730		54,730
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS				
058	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		5,000		5,000
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS				
062	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM(		169,500		169,500
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)				
070	DCGS-A (MIP)		83,000		83,000
072	TROJAN (MIP)		61,100		61,100
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)				
076	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		54,100		54,100
079	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITES		53,000		53,000
080	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		48,600		48,600
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)				
084	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)		10,000		10,000
095	PROFILER		2,000		2,000

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
096	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		30,400				30,400
098	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)		148,335				148,335
102	COUNTERFIRE RADARS		110,548				110,548
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
105	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		15,081				15,081
106	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM (BC		10,000				10,000
108	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS		28,000				28,000
109	KNIGHT FAMILY		42,000				42,000
114	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		32,800				32,800
115	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		44,000				44,000
116	SINGLE ARMY LOGISTICS ENTERPRISE (SALE)		18,000				18,000
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION						
121	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		10,000				10,000
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
127A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		795				795
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
128	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS		11,472				11,472
129	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)		30,000				30,000
131	CBRN SOLDIER PROTECTION		1,200				1,200
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
133	TACTICAL BRIDGING		15,000				15,000
134	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON		26,900				26,900
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
138	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)		3,205				3,205
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
149	FORCE PROVIDER		68,000				68,000

	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT				
158	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		15,011		15,011
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT				
159	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		25,129		25,129
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
180	ALL TERRAIN LIFTING ARMY SYSTEM	10	1,800	10	1,800
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
189	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		43,000		43,000
190	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		4,900		4,900
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**42**	**1,398,195**	**42**	**1,398,195**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND				
	NETWORK ATTACK				
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK		1,368,800		1,368,800
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT				
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		961,200		961,200
	FORCE TRAINING				
003	TRAIN THE FORCE		247,500		247,500
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**2,577,500**		**2,577,500**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT				
011	UH–1Y/AH–1Z	1	30,000	1	30,000
019	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	1	163,500	1	163,500
	OTHER AIRCRAFT				
028	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT		21,882		21,882
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT				
030	AEA SYSTEMS		53,100		53,100
031	AV–8 SERIES		53,485		53,485
032	F–18 SERIES		46,992		46,992
034	AH–1W SERIES		39,418		39,418
035	H–53 SERIES		70,747		70,747

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
037	H–1 SERIES		6,420				6,420
038	EP–3 SERIES		20,800				20,800
043	C–130 SERIES		59,625				59,625
045	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		25,880				25,880
048	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		11,184				11,184
053	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		27,200				27,200
054	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		13,467				13,467
055	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		3,300				3,300
060	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		30,000				30,000
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
061	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		39,060				39,060
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
062	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		10,800				10,800
065	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		4,100				4,100
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**2**	**730,960**			**2**	**730,960**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
009	HELLFIRE	140	14,000			140	14,000
010	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	150	20,000			150	20,000
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
027	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		7,070				7,070
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**290**	**41,070**			**290**	**41,070**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						

003	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	80,200	80,200
004	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	22,400	22,400
007	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	20,000	20,000
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	182	182
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	4,545	4,545
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	1,656	1,656
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,000	6,000
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	19,575	19,575
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	6,691	6,691
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES	12,184	12,184
018	60MM, ALL TYPES	10,988	10,988
019	81MM, ALL TYPES	24,515	24,515
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	11,227	11,227
021	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES	802	802
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	5,911	5,911
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	18,871	18,871
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	57,003	57,003
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	7,831	7,831
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	5,177	5,177
027	NON LETHALS	712	712
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	630	630
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**317,100**	**317,100**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	SMALL BOATS		
023	STANDARD BOATS	13,729	13,729
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
056	MATCALS	7,232	7,232
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
066	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	4,000	4,000
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
092	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS		47,000				47,000
095	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		10,800				10,800
097	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT		14,000				14,000
101	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		18,226				18,226
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
112	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS		7,500				7,500
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
116	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		15,700				15,700
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
121	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,628				2,628
123	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		13,290				13,290
124	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		3,672				3,672
128	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		1,002				1,002
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
130	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		3,644				3,644
	TRAINING DEVICES						
134	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,789				5,789
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
135	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,310				3,310
140	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,977				6,977
141	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		24,762				24,762
143	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		78,241				78,241
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
149	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		473				473
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**281,975**				**281,975**

	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES		
002	LAV PIP	23,962	23,962
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS		
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	16,000	16,000
005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	10,488	10,488
	GUIDED MISSILES		
010	JAVELIN	2,527	2,527
	OTHER SUPPORT		
013	MODIFICATION KITS	59,730	59,730
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		
015	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	19,040	19,040
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)		
017	MODIFICATION KITS	2,331	2,331
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)		
018	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	3,090	3,090
019	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	5,236	5,236
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
020	RADAR SYSTEMS	26,506	26,506
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
021	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	35	35
022	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	47,132	47,132
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)		
028	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	9,850	9,850
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)		
029	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	18,629	18,629
030	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	31,491	31,491
031	RADIO SYSTEMS	87,027	87,027
032	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	54,177	54,177
033	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	2,200	2,200
	TACTICAL VEHICLES		
037	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	95,800	95,800

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
038	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE REPLACEMENT	783	392,391		–50,000	783	342,391
	Early to Need				[–50,000]		
039	LOGISTICS VEHICLE SYSTEM REP	66	38,382			66	38,382
040	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		24,826				24,826
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
043	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		18,775				18,775
044	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		7,361				7,361
046	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		51,895				51,895
048	EOD SYSTEMS		57,237				57,237
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
049	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		42,900				42,900
051	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		42,553				42,553
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
053	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT		8,307				8,307
054	TRAINING DEVICES		5,200				5,200
055	CONTAINER FAMILY		12				12
056	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		28,533				28,533
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**849**	**1,260,996**		**–50,000**	**849**	**1,210,996**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	HELICOPTERS						
019	V22 OSPREY	2	70,000	–2	–70,000		
	Funded in H.R. 1473			[–2]	[–70,000]		
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
024	HH–60M	2	39,300			2	39,300
027	STUASLO		2,472				2,472

	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
043	C–5		59,299				59,299
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
059	MC–12W		17,300				17,300
063	C–130		164,041				164,041
064	C–130 INTEL		4,600				4,600
065	C–130J MODS		27,983				27,983
067	COMPASS CALL MODS		12,000				12,000
075	AC–130 RECAP		34,000				34,000
076	OTHER MODIFICATIONS		15,000				15,000
077	MQ–1 MODS		2,800				2,800
	AIRCRAFT SPARES + REPAIR PARTS						
081	FIGHTER/UAV INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		2,800				2,800
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
090	C–17A		10,970				10,970
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
100	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		23,000				23,000
	DARP						
104	U–2		42,300				42,300
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**4**	**527,865**	**–2**	**–70,000**	**2**	**457,865**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS		329				329
	CARTRIDGES						
002	CARTRIDGES		8,014				8,014
	BOMBS						
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		17,385				17,385
005	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	1,338	34,100			1,338	34,100
	FLARE, IR MJU–7B						
007	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		1,200				1,200
	FUZES						

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
011	FLARES		11,217				11,217
012	FUZES		8,765				8,765
	SMALL ARMS						
013	SMALL ARMS		11,500				11,500
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**1,338**	**92,510**			**1,338**	**92,510**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL						
005	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	154	16,120			154	16,120
006	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	100	12,300			100	12,300
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**254**	**28,420**			**254**	**28,420**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,658				2,658
	CARGO + UTILITY VEHICLES						
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (CARGO		32,824				32,824
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (SPECIA		110				110
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		1,662				1,662
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
008	ITEMS LESS THAT $5,000,000		772				772
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M BASE MAINT/CONST		13,983				13,983
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						

013	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY		500		500
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS				
022	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	3	1,800	3	1,800
025	TAC SIGNIT SPT		7,020		7,020
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS				
030	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		25,920		25,920
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE				
049	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		9,445		9,445
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP				
055	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		12,900		12,900
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
059	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		18,100		18,100
061	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		9,800		9,800
062	ITEMS LESS THAN $5,000,000 (BASE S)		8,400		8,400
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS				
065	DCGS-AF		3,000		3,000
068	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		64,400		64,400
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
068A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,991,347		2,991,347
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**3**	**3,204,641**	**3**	**3,204,641**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE				
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA				
017	TELEPORT PROGRAM		3,307		3,307
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA				
043	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		3,000		3,000
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD				
046	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		8,300		8,300
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
048A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		101,548		101,548
	AVIATION PROGRAMS				
050	MH–47 SERVICE LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM	2	40,500	2	40,500

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
051	MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1	7,800	–1	–7,800		
	MH–60 Combat Loss Replacement Funding			[–1]	[–7,800]		
052	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	9	8,500			9	8,500
057	CV–22 MODIFICATION	1	15,000	–1	–15,000		
	CV–22 Combat Loss Replacement Funding			[–1]	[–15,000]		
063	C–130 MODIFICATIONS	5	4,800			5	4,800
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
067	ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	8,682,966	71,659			8,682,966	71,659
068	ORDNANCE ACQUISITION	235	25,400			235	25,400
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
069	COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS	5	2,325			5	2,325
070	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	149	43,558			149	43,558
071	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	2,522	6,488			2,522	6,488
072	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	1	2,601			1	2,601
078	TACTICAL VEHICLES	88	15,818			88	15,818
085	AUTOMATION SYSTEMS	15	13,387			15	13,387
087	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	4	5,800			4	5,800
088	SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	1,103	34,900			1,103	34,900
089	VISUAL AUGMENTATION LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	578	3,531			578	3,531
090	TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS	18	2,894			18	2,894
093	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT	30	7,220			30	7,220
094	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	50	41,632			50	41,632
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**8,687,782**	**469,968**	**–2**	**–22,800**	**8,687,780**	**447,168**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		100,000		–50,000		50,000

	Unjustified Requirement				[–50,000]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**100,000**		**–50,000**		**50,000**
	MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND						
001	MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND		3,195,170				3,195,170
	TOTAL MINE RESISTANT AMBUSH PROT VEH FUND		**3,195,170**				**3,195,170**
	NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
007	UNDISTRIBUTED				225,000		225,000
	Program Increase				[225,000]		
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE EQUIPMENT				**225,000**		**225,000**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**8,691,884**	**15,021,824**	**–5**	**–3,300**	**8,691,879**	**15,018,524**

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	21,064		21,064
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	213,942	2,000	215,942
		Program Increase		[2,000]	
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	80,977	9,000	89,977
		Clinical Care and Research		[2,000]	
		Program Increase		[7,000]	
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	120,937	–15,245	105,692
		Realignment of Funds for Proper Oversight and Execution		[–15,245]	
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**436,920**	**–4,245**	**432,675**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	30,258	10,500	40,758
		Program Increase		[10,500]	
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	43,521	10,000	53,521
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	14,230		14,230

008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	44,610		44,610
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	15,790		15,790
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	50,685		50,685
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	20,034		20,034
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	20,933	10,000	30,933
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	64,306		64,306
014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	59,214		59,214
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	4,877		4,877
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	8,244		8,244
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	39,813	30,000	69,813
		Program Increase		[30,000]	
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	62,962		62,962
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	57,203	12,000	69,203
		Program Increase		[12,000]	
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	20,280	4,500	24,780
		Program Increase		[4,500]	
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	21,801		21,801
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	20,837		20,837
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	26,116		26,116
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	8,591		8,591
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	80,317	6,000	86,317
		Rotary Wing Surfaces		[6,000]	
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	18,946		18,946
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	29,835		29,835
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	105,929	12,968	118,897
		Program Increase		[12,968]	
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**869,332**	**95,968**	**965,300**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	52,979	5,000	57,979
		Program Increase		[5,000]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	68,171	26,000	94,171
		Program Increase		[23,000]	
		Treatment of Wounded Warriors		[3,000]	
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	62,193	27,800	89,993
		Advanced Rotorcraft Flight Research		[8,000]	
		Program Increase		[19,800]	
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	77,077	5,000	82,077
		Program Increase		[5,000]	
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	106,145		106,145
034	0603006A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,312	3,000	8,312
		Communications Advanced Technology		[3,000]	
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	10,298		10,298
036	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,963		57,963
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	8,155		8,155
038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	17,936		17,936
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	12,597		12,597
040	0603105A	MILITARY HIV RESEARCH	6,796		6,796
041	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,191		12,191
042	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	4,278		4,278
043	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,261		2,261
044	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	23,677		23,677
045	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	90,602	10,550	101,152
		Program Increase		[10,550]	
046	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	10,315		10,315
047	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	183,150		183,150
048	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	31,541		31,541
049	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,686		7,686

050	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	42,414	13,800	56,214
		Night Vision Advanced Technology		[4,800]	
		Program Increase		[9,000]	
051	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	15,959		15,959
052	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	36,516	7,000	43,516
		Base Camp Fuel		[2,000]	
		Military Engineering Advanced Technology		[5,000]	
053	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	30,600		30,600
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**976,812**	**98,150**	**1,074,962**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
054	0603024A	UNIQUE ITEM IDENTIFICATION (UID)			
055	0603305A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION(NON SPACE)	21,126		21,126
055A	0603XXXA	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION	14,883		14,883
056	0603308A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION (SPACE)	9,612		9,612
057	0603327A	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING			
058	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	35,383		35,383
059	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	9,501	–5,000	4,501
		Engineering, Modeling and Environmental Studies for SOD and SOM systems – funding unjustified.		[–5,000]	
060	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	39,693		39,693
061	0603653A	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	101,408		101,408
062	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	9,747		9,747
063	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	5,766		5,766
064	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT			
065	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	4,946	8,000	12,946
		Army Net Zero Programs		[8,000]	
066	0603782A	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL	297,955		297,955
067	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,765		4,765
068	0603801A	AVIATION—ADV DEV	7,107		7,107
069	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	19,509		19,509
070	0603805A	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT CONTROL SYSTEM EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS	5,258		5,258

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
071	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	34,997		34,997
072	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	19,598		19,598
073	0603850A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	1,496		1,496
074	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	10,181		10,181
075	0604131A	TRACTOR JUTE	15,609	–15,609	
		Unjustified Requirement		[–15,609]	
076	0604284A	JOINT COOPERATIVE TARGET IDENTIFICATION—GROUND (JCTI-G) / TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPME	41,652		41,652
077	0305205A	ENDURANCE UAVS	42,892		42,892
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**753,084**	**–12,609**	**740,475**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
078	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	144,687		144,687
079	0604220A	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE HELOS	166,132	–35,500	130,632
		Early to Need		[–35,500]	
080	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	101,265		101,265
081	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO			
082	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	17,412		17,412
083	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	26,577		26,577
084	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	73,728	3,000	76,728
		Portable Helicopter Oxygen Delivery Systems		[3,000]	
085	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,961		3,961
086	0604609A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-SDD			
087	0604611A	JAVELIN	17,340		17,340
088	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	5,478		5,478
089	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	22,922		22,922
090	0604642A	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES			
091	0604646A	NON-LINE OF SIGHT LAUNCH SYSTEM			

092	0604660A	FCS MANNED GRD VEHICLES & COMMON GRD VEHICLE			
093	0604661A	FCS SYSTEMS OF SYSTEMS ENGR & PROGRAM MGMT	383,872		383,872
094	0604662A	FCS RECONNAISSANCE (UAV) PLATFORMS			
095	0604663A	FCS UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLES	143,840		143,840
096	0604664A	FCS UNATTENDED GROUND SENSORS	499		499
097	0604665A	FCS SUSTAINMENT & TRAINING R&D			
098	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—SDD	59,265		59,265
099	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,075		2,075
100	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—SDD	30,021		30,021
101	0604716A	TERRAIN INFORMATION—SDD	1,596		1,596
102	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—SDD	83,010		83,010
103	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	28,305		28,305
104	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	14,375		14,375
105	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—SDD	15,803		15,803
106	0604778A	POSITIONING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT (SPACE)			
107	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	22,226		22,226
108	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—SDD	13,828	–10,000	3,828
		Program Reduction- Precision Guidance Kit		[–10,000]	
109	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—SDD	251,104	–25,000	226,104
		Joint Light Tactical Vehicle Schedule Slip		[–25,000]	
110	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—SDD	137,811		137,811
111	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—SDD	27,160		27,160
112	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—SDD	87,426		87,426
113	0604814A	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS	42,627		42,627
114	0604817A	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION			
115	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	123,935	2,000	125,935
		Army Tactical Command and Control Hardware and Software		[2,000]	
116	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	2,890		2,890
117	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	794		794
118	0604823A	FIREFINDER	10,358		10,358
119	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	48,309	–7,600	40,709
		Early to Need- Nett Warrior		[–7,600]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
120	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS	120,146		120,146
121	0604869A	PATRIOT/MEADS COMBINED AGGREGATE PROGRAM (CAP)	406,605	–149,500	257,105
		Program Decrease		[–149,500]	
122	0604870A	NUCLEAR ARMS CONTROL MONITORING SENSOR NETWORK	7,398		7,398
123	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	37,098		37,098
124	0605018A	ARMY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (A-IMHRS)	68,693		68,693
125	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	127,095		127,095
126	0605455A	SLAMRAAM	19,931		19,931
127	0605456A	PAC–3/MSE MISSILE	88,993		88,993
128	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	270,607		270,607
129	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	884,387		884,387
130	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	31,465		31,465
131	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	3,920		3,920
132	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	13,819		13,819
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**4,190,788**	**–222,600**	**3,968,188**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
133	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	16,992		16,992
134	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	11,247		11,247
135	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	49,437		49,437
136	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,384		20,384
137	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	145,606		145,606
138	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	28,800		28,800
139	0605502A	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH		5,000	5,000
		Small Business Innovative Research		[5,000]	
140	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	262,456	100,000	362,456
		Program Increase		[100,000]	

141	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	70,227		70,227
142	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	43,483		43,483
143	0605605A	DOD HIGH ENERGY LASER TEST FACILITY	18		18
144	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	5,630		5,630
145	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	7,182		7,182
146	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	19,669		19,669
147	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	5,445		5,445
148	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	68,786		68,786
149	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	63,302		63,302
150	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	3,420		3,420
151	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	83,054		83,054
152	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	63,872	–5,000	58,872
		Program Reduction		[–5,000]	
153	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	57,142	5,000	62,142
		Program Increase		[5,000]	
154	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	4,961		4,961
155	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	17,558		17,558
156	0909980A	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT			
157	0909999A	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,048,671**	**105,000**	**1,153,671**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
158	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	66,641		66,641
159	0603820A	WEAPONS CAPABILITY MODIFICATIONS UAV	24,142	–24,142	
		Unjustified Requirement		[–24,142]	
160	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	344,655		344,655
161	0203347A	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO CYBER (ISC) MIP			
162	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	29,546		29,546
163	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	53,307	25,000	78,307
		Program Increase		[25,000]	
164	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	65,002		65,002
165	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	163,205		163,205

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
166	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	823		823
167	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	8,029		8,029
168	0203759A	FORCE XXI BATTLE COMMAND, BRIGADE AND BELOW (FBCB2)			
169	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	44,560	14,500	59,060
		Program Increase for Stinger per Army Request		[14,500]	
170	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS			
171	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	42,554		42,554
172	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	27,630		27,630
173	0208058A	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	3,044		3,044
175	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	2,854		2,854
176	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	61,220		61,220
177	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	100,505		100,505
178	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	12,104		12,104
179	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	23,937		23,937
181	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	40,650		40,650
182	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	44,198		44,198
183	0305219A	MQ–1 SKY WARRIOR A UAV	137,038		137,038
184	0305232A	RQ–11 UAV	1,938		1,938
185	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	31,940		31,940
186	0307207A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS)			
187	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	15,018		15,018
188	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	59,297	7,000	66,297
		End Item Industrial Preparedness Activities		[7,000]	
188A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,536		4,536
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,408,373**	**22,358**	**1,430,731**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**9,683,980**	**82,022**	**9,766,002**

		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	113,157	10,000	123,157
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,092		18,092
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	446,123	4,500	450,623
		Program Increase		[2,500]	
		Study of Renewable and Alternative Energy Applications in the Pacific Region		[2,000]	
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**577,372**	**14,500**	**591,872**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	104,804		104,804
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	156,901	2,000	158,901
		Alternative Energy for Mobile Power Applications		[2,000]	
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	44,845	3,000	47,845
		Marine Corps Landing Force Technology		[3,000]	
007	0602234N	MATERIALS, ELECTRONICS AND COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY			
008	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	65,448		65,448
009	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	101,205	2,500	103,705
		Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research		[2,500]	
010	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	108,329		108,329
011	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	50,076		50,076
012	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	5,937		5,937
013	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	108,666		108,666
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	37,583	8,000	45,583
		Mine and Expeditionary Warfare Applied Research		[8,000]	
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**783,794**	**15,500**	**799,294**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
015	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	114,270		114,270
016	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,057	7,100	71,157

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Advanced Battery Technologies		[2,000]	
		Lightweight Body Armor		[5,100]	
017	0603235N	COMMON PICTURE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	49,068		49,068
018	0603236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	71,232		71,232
019	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	102,535		102,535
020	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	124,324		124,324
021	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,286		11,286
022	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	18,119		18,119
023	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,121		37,121
024	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	50,157		50,157
025	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,048		6,048
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**648,217**	**7,100**	**655,317**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
026	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	94,972		94,972
027	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	10,893		10,893
028	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	3,702		3,702
029	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	10,497		10,497
030	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,915		7,915
031	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	5,978		5,978
032	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,418		1,418
033	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	142,657		142,657
034	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	118,764		118,764
035	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	54,072		54,072
036	0603513N	SHIPBOARD SYSTEM COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT			
037	0603525N	PILOT FISH	96,012		96,012
038	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	73,421		73,421

039	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	130,267		130,267
040	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	1,338		1,338
041	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	29,797	3,500	33,297
		Surface Anti-Submarine Warfare		[3,500]	
042	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	856,326	9,000	865,326
		Program Increase		[9,000]	
043	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	9,253		9,253
044	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	14,308		14,308
045	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	22,213	19,900	42,113
		Ship Preliminary Design and Feasibility Studies		[19,900]	
046	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	463,683		463,683
047	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	18,249	10,000	28,249
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
048	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	584,159		584,159
049	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	286,784		286,784
050	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	34,157		34,157
051	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	4,753		4,753
052	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	12,000		12,000
053	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	79,858	–25,000	54,858
		Joint Light Tactical Vehicle Schedule Slip		[–25,000]	
054	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	33,654		33,654
055	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	54,783		54,783
056	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	9,996		9,996
057	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	21,714		21,714
058	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	70,538		70,538
059	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	3,754		3,754
060	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	79,415		79,415
061	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	4,137		4,137
062	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	276,383		276,383
063	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	52,721		52,721
064	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	160,964		160,964
065	0603755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE			

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
066	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	144,985		144,985
067	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	43,704		43,704
068	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,140		9,140
069	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	421		421
070	0603851M	NONLETHAL WEAPONS	40,992		40,992
071	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	121,455		121,455
072	0603879N	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP) SYSTEM ENGINEER (SE)			
073	0603889N	COUNTERDRUG RDT&E PROJECTS			
074	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS			
075	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	64,107		64,107
076	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	711		711
077	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	62,044		62,044
078	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	22,665	–18,200	4,465
		Cancelation of FMU–164/B Bomb Fuze Program		[–18,200]	
079	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	33,621		33,621
080	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	1,078		1,078
081	0303562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS—MIP			
082	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	625		625
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**4,481,053**	**–800**	**4,480,253**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
083	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	35,651		35,651
084	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	30,676		30,676
085	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	51,191		51,191
086	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	17,673		17,673
087	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	5,922		5,922
088	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	3,417		3,417

089	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	9,944		9,944
090	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	81,257		81,257
091	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	110,994		110,994
092	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	72,569		72,569
093	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	56,509		56,509
094	0604262N	V–22A	84,477		84,477
095	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	3,249		3,249
096	0604269N	EA–18	17,100		17,100
097	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	89,418		89,418
098	0604273N	VH–71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	180,070		180,070
099	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	189,919		189,919
100	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	688,146		688,146
101	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	223,283		223,283
102	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	884		884
103	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	47,635		47,635
104	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	46,705		46,705
105	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	41,142		41,142
106	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	24,898		24,898
107	0604404N	FUTURE UNMANNED CARRIER-BASED STRIKE SYSTEM	121,150		121,150
108	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	60,790		60,790
108A	0604XXXN	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR	166,568		166,568
109	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	100,591		100,591
110	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	5,521		5,521
111	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	45,445		45,445
112	0604518N	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	3,400		3,400
113	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	97,235	10,000	107,235
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
114	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	48,466		48,466
115	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	161,099		161,099
116	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,848		3,848
117	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	3,933		3,933
118	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	32,592		32,592

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
119	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	9,960		9,960
120	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	12,992		12,992
121	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	7,506		7,506
122	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	71,222		71,222
123	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	6,631		6,631
124	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	184,095		184,095
125	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	2,217		2,217
126	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	12,984		12,984
127	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	50,178		50,178
128	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	670,723		670,723
129	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	677,486		677,486
130	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	27,461		27,461
131	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	58,764		58,764
132	0605018N	NAVY INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (N-IMHRS)	55,050		55,050
133	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	629,461		629,461
134	0605430N	C/KC–130 AVIONICS MODERNIZATION PROGRAM (AMP)			
135	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	118,395		118,395
136	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	622,713		622,713
137	0204201N	CG(X)			
138	0204202N	DDG–1000	261,604		261,604
139	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	979		979
140	0304503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION—MIP			
141	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	31,740		31,740
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**6,475,528**	**10,000**	**6,485,528**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
142	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	28,318		28,318

143	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	44,700	44,700
144	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	37,957	37,957
145	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	2,970	2,970
146	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	23,454	23,454
147	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	47,127	47,127
148	0605502N	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	10	10
149	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	571	571
150	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	68,301	68,301
151	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,277	3,277
152	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	73,917	73,917
153	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	136,531	136,531
154	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	335,367	335,367
155	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	16,634	16,634
156	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	4,228	4,228
157	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	7,642	7,642
158	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	25,655	25,655
159	0305885N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	2,764	2,764
160	0804758N	SERVICE SUPPORT TO JFCOM, JNTC		
161	0909980N	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT		
162	0909999N	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS		
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**859,423**	**859,423**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
164	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT.	198,298	198,298
165	0604717M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	400	400
166	0604766M	MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS	1,650	1,650
167	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	88,873	88,873
168	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	33,553	33,553
169	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	6,360	6,360
170	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	23,208	23,208
171	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	30,021	30,021

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
172	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	151,030		151,030
173	0204152N	E–2 SQUADRONS	6,696		6,696
174	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	1,739		1,739
175	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	3,377		3,377
176	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	8,819		8,819
177	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	21,259		21,259
178	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	5,214		5,214
179	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	42,244		42,244
180	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,447		1,447
181	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	18,142		18,142
182	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	11,147		11,147
183	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	69,224		69,224
184	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	22,010		22,010
185	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	39,288		39,288
186	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	123,012	–12,600	110,412
		Cancelation of Multi-Purpose Bomb Racks Program		[–22,600]	
		Electrophotonic Component Capability Development		[10,000]	
187	0205658N	NAVY SCIENCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	1,957		1,957
188	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	82,705		82,705
189	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	320,864		320,864
190	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	209,396		209,396
191	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	45,172		45,172
192	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	14,101		14,101
193	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	8,765		8,765
194	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	2,913		2,913
195	0208058N	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	4,108		4,108
200	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	263,712		263,712

201	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	12,906		12,906
202	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	25,229		25,229
203	0303150M	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	1,250		1,250
204	0303238N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)—MIP	6,602		6,602
206	0305149N	COBRA JUDY	40,605		40,605
207	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	904		904
208	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	4,099		4,099
209	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	9,353	10,000	19,353
		TACAIR-Launched UAS Capability Development		[10,000]	
210	0305206N	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS		3,000	3,000
		Advance Reconnaissance Systems		[3,000]	
211	0305207N	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS			
212	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	23,785		23,785
213	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	25,487		25,487
214	0305220N	RQ–4 UAV	548,482		548,482
215	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	108,248		108,248
216	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	979		979
217	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	872		872
218	0305234M	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASLO)			
219	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASLO)	22,698		22,698
220	0305237N	MEDIUM RANGE MARITIME UAS	15,000		15,000
221	0305239M	RQ–21A	26,301		26,301
222	0307217N	EP–3E REPLACEMENT (EPX)			
223	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	8,292		8,292
224	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	21,609		21,609
225	0702239N	AVIONICS COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM			
226	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	54,031	5,000	59,031
		Industrial Preparedness		[5,000]	
227	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	5,000		5,000
227A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,308,608		1,308,608
227U	0607UNDN	UNDISTRIBUTED			
		Aviation Component Development		[10,000]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Program Decrease		[–20,000]	
		UAS Development		[10,000]	
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**4,131,044**	**5,400**	**4,136,444**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**17,956,431**	**51,700**	**18,008,131**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	364,328		364,328
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	140,273	7,000	147,273
		Program Increase		[7,000]	
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	14,258		14,258
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**518,859**	**7,000**	**525,859**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	136,230		136,230
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	147,628		147,628
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	86,663	2,200	88,863
		Program Increase		[2,200]	
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	207,508	2,000	209,508
		Program Increase		[2,000]	
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	134,787		134,787
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	115,285	3,000	118,285
		Program Increase		[3,000]	
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	60,692		60,692
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	111,156		111,156
012	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	127,866		127,866

013	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	54,059		54,059
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,181,874**	**7,200**	**1,189,074**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
014	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	39,738	10,000	49,738
		Program Increase—Metals Affordability Iniatitive		[10,000]	
015	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	5,780		5,780
016	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	53,075		53,075
017	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	67,474		67,474
018	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY			
018A	0603XXXF	FUELS	6,770		6,770
018B	0603XXXF	POWER TECHNOLOGY	5,747		5,747
018C	0603XXXF	PROPULSION	80,833		80,833
018D	0603XXXF	ROCKET PROPULSION	27,603		27,603
019	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	22,268		22,268
020	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	74,636		74,636
021	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	13,555		13,555
022	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	25,319		25,319
023	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	54,042		54,042
024	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	28,683		28,683
025	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	40,103		40,103
026	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	38,656	4,000	42,656
		Program Increase		[4,000]	
027	0603924F	HIGH ENERGY LASER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	1,122		1,122
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**585,404**	**14,000**	**599,404**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
028	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	4,013		4,013
029	0603287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,586		3,586
030	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT			
031	0603430F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	421,687	–142,200	279,487
		Transfer to RDAF–49		[–142,200]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
032	0603432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	122,991		122,991
033	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	45,755		45,755
034	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	38,496		38,496
035	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,424		4,424
036	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	642		642
037	0603830F	SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP)	9,819		9,819
038	0603850F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	20,046		20,046
039	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	67,202	20,000	87,202
		Program increase		[20,000]	
040	0603854F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM RDT&E (SPACE)	12,804		12,804
041	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION	2,075		2,075
042	0603860F	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS	20,112		20,112
043	0604015F	NEXT GENERATION BOMBER	197,023		197,023
044	0604283F	BATTLE MGMT COM & CTRL SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	60,250		60,250
045	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,553	9,000	11,553
		Program Increase		[9,000]	
046	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	38,248		38,248
047	0604330F	JOINT DUAL ROLE AIR DOMINANCE MISSILE	29,759		29,759
048	0604337F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	24,217		24,217
049	0604436F	NEXT-GENERATION MILSATCOM TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		142,200	142,200
		Transfer from RDAF-031		[142,200]	
050	0604635F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	24,467		24,467
051	0604796F	ALTERNATIVE FUELS			
052	0604830F	AUTOMATED AIR-TO-AIR REFUELING			
053	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	86,543	20,000	106,543
		Program Increase		[20,000]	
054	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	2,773		2,773

055	0305178F	NATIONAL POLAR-ORBITING OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SATELLITE SYSTEM (NPOESS)	444,900		444,900
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,684,385**	**49,000**	**1,733,385**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
056	0603840F	GLOBAL BROADCAST SERVICE (GBS)	5,680		5,680
057	0604222F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS SUPPORT	18,538		18,538
058	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	21,780		21,780
059	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	26,880		26,880
060	0604280F	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO			
061	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	52,355		52,355
062	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	51		51
063	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	132,891		132,891
064	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	31,913		31,913
065	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	273,689		273,689
066	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	47,100		47,100
067	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	621,629	20,000	641,629
		Program Increase		[20,000]	
068	0604443F	THIRD GENERATION INFRARED SURVEILLANCE (3GIRS)			
069	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	10,055		10,055
070	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,427		2,427
071	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	11,878		11,878
072	0604618F	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION			
073	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	11,280		11,280
074	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	28,106		28,106
075	0604740F	INTEGRATED COMMAND & CONTROL APPLICATIONS (IC2A)	10		10
076	0604750F	INTELLIGENCE EQUIPMENT	995		995
077	0604800F	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)	1,387,926	1,000	1,388,926
		Establish Protocols for Joint Strike Fighter Lead-Free Electronic Components		[1,000]	
078	0604851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE	158,477		158,477
079	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)	20,028		20,028
080	0605221F	NEXT GENERATION AERIAL REFUELING AIRCRAFT	877,084	–27,200	849,884
		Program Reduction		[–27,200]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
081	0605229F	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	94,113	–83,113	11,000
		Budget Adjustment per Air Force Request to APAF–63		[–10,400]	
		Budget Adjustment per Air Force Request to APAF–73		[–54,600]	
		Program Reduction		[–18,113]	
082	0605277F	CSAR-X RDT&E			
083	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	27,071		27,071
084	0605452F	JOINT SIAP EXECUTIVE PROGRAM OFFICE			
085	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	93,867		93,867
086	0207100F	LIGHT ATTACK ARMED RECONNAISSANCE (LAAR) SQUADRONS	23,721		23,721
087	0207451F	SINGLE INTEGRATED AIR PICTURE (SIAP)			
088	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	39,826		39,826
089	0401138F	JOINT CARGO AIRCRAFT (JCA)	27,089		27,089
090	0401318F	CV–22	20,723		20,723
091	0401845F	AIRBORNE SENIOR LEADER C3 (SLC3S)	12,535		12,535
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**4,079,717**	**–89,313**	**3,990,404**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
092	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	22,420		22,420
093	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	62,206		62,206
094	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	27,579		27,579
095	0605502F	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
096	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	17,767		17,767
097	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	654,475	109,000	763,475
		Program Increase		[109,000]	
098	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	158,096	–124,500	33,596
		Program Reduction		[–124,500]	
099	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	47,926		47,926

100	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	44,547		44,547
101	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,953		27,953
102	0606323F	MULTI-SERVICE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INITIATIVE	13,953		13,953
103	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	31,966		31,966
104	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,510		1,510
105	0909999F	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
106	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,798		3,798
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,114,196**	**–15,500**	**1,098,696**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
107	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	390,889		390,889
108	0604263F	COMMON VERTICAL LIFT SUPPORT PLATFORM	5,365		5,365
109	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	91,866		91,866
110	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	35,467		35,467
112	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	133,261		133,261
113	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	803		803
114	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	33,011		33,011
115	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	340,819		340,819
116	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	23,072		23,072
117	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	5,421	–5,421	
		Program Termination		[–5,421]	
119	0102325F	ATMOSPHERIC EARLY WARNING SYSTEM	4,485		4,485
120	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	12,672		12,672
121	0102823F	STRATEGIC AEROSPACE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	14		14
122	0203761F	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND	19,934	20,000	39,934
		Mixed Conventional Load Capacity for Bomber Aircraft		[20,000]	
123	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	146,824		146,824
124	0207040F	MULTI-PLATFORM ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT			
125	0207131F	A–10 SQUADRONS	11,051		11,051
126	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	143,869		143,869
127	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	207,531		207,531
128	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	13,253		13,253

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
129	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	718,432		718,432
130	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	47,841		47,841
131	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	8,023		8,023
132	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	77,830		77,830
133	0207170F	JOINT HELMET MOUNTED CUEING SYSTEM (JHMCS)	1,436		1,436
134	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	2,292		2,292
135	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	927		927
136	0207247F	AF TENCAP	20,727		20,727
137	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	3,128		3,128
138	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	18,509		18,509
139	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	182,967		182,967
140	0207277F	ISR INNOVATIONS			
141	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	5,796		5,796
142	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	121,880		121,880
143	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	3,954		3,954
144	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	135,961		135,961
145	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	8,309		8,309
146	0207423F	ADVANCED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	90,083		90,083
148	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	5,428		5,428
149	0207438F	THEATER BATTLE MANAGEMENT (TBM) C4I	15,528		15,528
150	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	15,978		15,978
151	0207445F	FIGHTER TACTICAL DATA LINK			
152	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,536		1,536
153	0207449F	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	18,102		18,102
154	0207581F	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	121,610		121,610
155	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	18,599		18,599
156	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	23,091		23,091

157	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,779	5,779
158	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	5,264	5,264
159	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	69,918	69,918
160	0208021F	INFORMATION WARFARE SUPPORT	2,322	2,322
161	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	702	702
168	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	11,866	11,866
169	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	5,845	5,845
170	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	43,811	43,811
171	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	101,788	101,788
172	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	449	449
173	0303150F	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	3,854	3,854
174	0303158F	JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL PROGRAM (JC2)		
175	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	238,729	238,729
177	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE		
177A	0304XXXF	RE–135	34,744	34,744
177B	0304XXXF	COMMON DEVELOPMENT	87,004	87,004
180	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,604	4,604
181	0305103F	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,026	2,026
182	0305105F	DOD CYBER CRIME CENTER	282	282
183	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	18,337	18,337
184	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	31,084	31,084
185	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	63,367	63,367
186	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	50,620	50,620
189	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	366	366
190	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	39	39
192	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	133,601	133,601
193	0305165F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE AND CONTROL SEGMENTS)	17,893	17,893
195	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	196,254	196,254
196	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER	2,961	2,961
197	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	9,940	9,940
198	0305193F	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	1,271	1,271
199	0305202F	DRAGON U–2		

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
200	0305205F	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	52,425		52,425
201	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	106,877		106,877
202	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,049		13,049
203	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	90,724		90,724
204	0305219F	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	14,112		14,112
205	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	423,462		423,462
206	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	7,348		7,348
207	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	463,081		463,081
208	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	118,950		118,950
209	0305887F	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION WARFARE	14,736		14,736
210	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	81,989		81,989
211	0305924F	NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE OFFICE			
212	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	31,956		31,956
213	0307141F	INFORMATION OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY INTEGRATION & TOOL DEVELOPMENT	23,931		23,931
214	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	1,663		1,663
215	0401115F	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	24,509		24,509
216	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	24,941		24,941
217	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	128,169		128,169
218	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	39,537		39,537
219	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	7,438		7,438
220	0401139F	LIGHT MOBILITY AIRCRAFT (LIMA)	1,308		1,308
221	0401218F	KC–135S	6,161		6,161
222	0401219F	KC–10S	30,868		30,868
223	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	82,591		82,591
224	0401315F	C-STOL AIRCRAFT			
225	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	7,118		7,118
226	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,531		1,531

227	0702976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION—LOGISTICS			
228	0708012F	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	944		944
229	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	140,284		140,284
230	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,990		10,990
231	0801711F	RECRUITING ACTIVITIES			
232	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	322		322
233	0804757F	JOINT NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER	11		11
234	0804772F	TRAINING DEVELOPMENTS			
235	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	113		113
236	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	2,483		2,483
237	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	1,508		1,508
238	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	8,041		8,041
239	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	928		928
240	0901279F	FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE	12,118		12,118
241	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	101,317		101,317
242	0902998F	MANAGEMENT HQ—ADP SUPPORT (AF)	299		299
242A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,063,140	25,000	12,088,140
		Defense Reconnaissance Support Activites		[25,000]	
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**18,573,266**	**39,579**	**18,612,845**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**27,737,701**	**11,966**	**27,749,667**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	47,737		47,737
002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	290,773		290,773
003	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	14,731		14,731
004	0601111D8Z	GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY COSPONSORSHIP OF UNIVERSITY RESEARCH			
005	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	37,870		37,870
006	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	101,591	–15,000	86,591
		Program Reduction		[–15,000]	
007	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	52,617		52,617

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**545,319**	**–15,000**	**530,319**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
008	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	21,592		21,592
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	110,000		110,000
010	0602228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBCU) SCIENCE		25,245	25,245
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
		Realignment of Funds for Proper Oversight and Execution		[15,245]	
011	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	37,916		37,916
012	0602250D8Z	SYSTEMS 2020 APPLIED RESEARCH	4,381		4,381
013	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	400,499	–50,000	350,499
		Program Reduction		[–50,000]	
014	0602304E	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	49,365		49,365
015	0602305E	MACHINE INTELLIGENCE	61,351		61,351
016	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	30,421		30,421
017	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	219,873	5,000	224,873
		Program Increase		[5,000]	
018	0602663D8Z	DATA TO DECISIONS APPLIED RESEARCH	9,235	–4,000	5,235
		Program Reduction		[–4,000]	
019	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	9,735		9,735
020	0602670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APPLIED RESEARCH	14,923	–4,000	10,923
		Program Reduction		[–4,000]	
021	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	206,422		206,422
022	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	237,837		237,837
023	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	215,178		215,178
024	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	196,954	5,000	201,954
		Program Increase		[5,000]	

025	1160401BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	26,591		26,591
026	1160407BB	SOF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,852,273**	**–22,755**	**1,829,518**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)			
027	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	24,771		24,771
028	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	45,028		45,028
029	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	77,019	23,200	100,219
		Program Increase		[23,200]	
030	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	283,073		283,073
031	0603175C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	75,003		75,003
032	0603200D8Z	JOINT ADVANCED CONCEPTS	7,903		7,903
033	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	20,372		20,372
034	0603250D8Z	SYSTEMS 2020 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,381		4,381
035	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	998		998
036	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	61,458		61,458
037	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	98,878		98,878
038	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	97,541		97,541
039	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	229,235		229,235
040	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	7,287		7,287
041	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	187,707	–20,000	167,707
		Unjustified Growth		[–20,000]	
042	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	23,890		23,890
043	0603663D8Z	DATA TO DECISIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	9,235	–4,000	5,235
		Program Reduction		[–4,000]	
044	0603665D8Z	BIOMETRICS SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	10,762		10,762
045	0603668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY ADVANCED RESEARCH	10,709		10,709
046	0603670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	18,179	–4,000	14,179
		Program Reduction		[–4,000]	
047	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	17,888	2,000	19,888
		Defense Alternative Energy		[2,000]	
048	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	26,972		26,972

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
049	0603711D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM/AUTONOMOUS SYSTEMS	9,756		9,756
050	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	23,887	15,000	38,887
		Secure Microelectronics		[15,000]	
051	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	41,976		41,976
052	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	66,409	10,750	77,159
		Offshore Range Environmental Baseline Assessment		[1,750]	
		Program Increase		[5,000]	
		Radiological Contamination Research		[4,000]	
053	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	91,132	–8,000	83,132
		Microelectronics Technlogy Development and Support		[3,000]	
		Program Reduction		[–11,000]	
054	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	10,547		10,547
055	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	160,286		160,286
056	0603745D8Z	SYNTHETIC APERTURE RADAR (SAR) COHERENT CHANGE DETECTION (CDD)			
057	0603755D8Z	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM			
058	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	296,537	–50,000	246,537
		Program Reduction		[–50,000]	
059	0603765E	CLASSIFIED DARPA PROGRAMS	107,226		107,226
060	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	235,245		235,245
061	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	271,802		271,802
062	0603768E	GUIDANCE TECHNOLOGY			
063	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,579		13,579
064	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	30,424		30,424
065	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	89,925		89,925
066	0603828D8Z	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	58,130		58,130
067	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	37,029	–6,000	31,029
		Program Reduction		[–6,000]	

068	0603901C	DIRECTED ENERGY RESEARCH	96,329	50,000	146,329
		Program Increase		[50,000]	
069	0603902C	NEXT GENERATION AEGIS MISSILE	123,456		123,456
070	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	99,593		99,593
071	0603942D8Z	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER			
072	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	20,444	14,000	34,444
		Operational Energy Improvement Pilot Project		[4,000]	
		Program Increase		[10,000]	
073	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	7,788		7,788
074	1160402BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	35,242	5,000	40,242
		Program Increase		[5,000]	
075	1160422BB	AVIATION ENGINEERING ANALYSIS	837		837
076	1160472BB	SOF INFORMATION AND BROADCAST SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,924		4,924
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT (ATD)	**3,270,792**	**27,950**	**3,298,742**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
077	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	36,798		36,798
078	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	21,040		21,040
079	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	112,142		112,142
080	0603709D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	11,129		11,129
081	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSOR APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	18,408		18,408
082	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	63,606	–30,000	33,606
		Realignment to RDDW-082A		[–30,000]	
082A	0603XXXD8Z	INSTALLATION ENERGY TEST BED		47,000	47,000
		Installation Energy Test Bed Program Increase		[15,000]	
		Microgrid Pilot Program		[2,000]	
		Realignment from RDDW-082		[30,000]	
083	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	290,452		290,452
084	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,161,001	100,000	1,261,001
		Program increase		[100,000]	
085	0603883C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE BOOST DEFENSE SEGMENT			
086	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	261,143		261,143

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
087	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	222,374		222,374
088	0603888C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST & TARGETS	1,071,039		1,071,039
089	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	373,563		373,563
090	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	296,554		296,554
091	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	960,267	5,000	965,267
		AEGIS Ballistic Missile Defense		[5,000]	
092	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	96,353		96,353
093	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	7,951		7,951
094	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI.	364,103		364,103
095	0603897C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE HERCULES			
096	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	41,225		41,225
097	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	69,325		69,325
098	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	15,797		15,797
099	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	177,058		177,058
100	0603911C	BMD EUROPEAN CAPABILITY			
101	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	106,100	110,000	216,100
		Program Increase		[110,000]	
102	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	14,996		14,996
103	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	12,743		12,743
104	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	3,221	10,300	13,521
		Department of Defense Corrosion Protection Projects		[10,300]	
105	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	25,120		25,120
106	0604648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS			
107	0604670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING	10,309		10,309
108	0604787D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION COMMAND (JSIC)	13,024		13,024
109	0604828D8Z	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	9,290		9,290

110	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	306,595		306,595
111	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	424,454	40,000	464,454
		Program Increase		[40,000]	
112	0604883C	PRECISION TRACKING SPACE SENSOR RDT&E	160,818	–160,818	
		Program Reduction		[–160,818]	
113	0604884C	AIRBORNE INFRARED (ABIR)	46,877	20,000	66,877
		Program Increase		[20,000]	
114	0605017D8Z	REDUCTION OF TOTAL OWNERSHIP COST			
115	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,358		3,358
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**6,808,233**	**141,482**	**6,949,715**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD)			
116	0604051D8Z	DEFENSE ACQUISITION CHALLENGE PROGRAM (DACP)			
117	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	7,220		7,220
118	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	204,824	–25,000	179,824
		Program Reduction		[–25,000]	
119	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	400,608		400,608
120	0604709D8Z	JOINT ROBOTICS PROGRAM	2,782		2,782
121	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	49,198		49,198
122	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	17,395		17,395
123	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	5,888		5,888
124	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,228		12,228
125	0605018BTA	DEFENSE INTEGRATED MILITARY HUMAN RESOURCES SYSTEM (DIMHRS)			
126	0605020BTA	BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY R&D ACTIVITIES			
127	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	389		389
128	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	1,929		1,929
129	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	4,993		4,993
130	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	134,285		134,285
131	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	41,808		41,808
132	0605140D8Z	TRUSTED FOUNDRY			
133	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	14,950		14,950
134	0605648D8Z	DEFENSE ACQUISITION EXECUTIVE (DAE) PILOT PROGRAM			

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
135	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	19,837		19,837
136	0807708D8Z	WOUNDED ILL AND INJURED SENIOR OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (WII-SOC) STAFF OFFICE			
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION (SDD)	**918,334**	**–25,000**	**893,334**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
137	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	6,658		6,658
138	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	4,731		4,731
139	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVAULATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	140,231		140,231
140	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	2,757		2,757
141	0604943D8Z	THERMAL VICAR	7,827		7,827
142	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	10,479		10,479
143	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	34,213		34,213
144	0605110D8Z	USD(A&T)--CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	1,486	–1,468	18
		Program Decrease		[–1,468]	
145	0605117D8Z	FOREIGN MATERIAL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	64,524		64,524
146	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	79,859		79,859
147	0605128D8Z	CLASSIFIED PROGRAM USD(P)			
148	0605130D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	19,080		19,080
149	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	41,884		41,884
150	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,261		4,261
151	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	9,437		9,437
152	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	6,549		6,549
153	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	92,806		92,806
154	0605502BP	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH—CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL DEF			
155	0605502BR	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH			
156	0605502C	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH—MDA			
157	0605502D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			

158	0605502E	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
159	0605502S	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH			
160	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER (S	1,924		1,924
161	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	16,135		16,135
162	0605799D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES			
163	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	56,269	–5,000	51,269
		Program Increase		[–5,000]	
164	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	49,810		49,810
165	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	15,805		15,805
166	0605897E	DARPA AGENCY RELOCATION	1,000		1,000
167	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	66,689		66,689
168	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,528		4,528
169	0606301D8Z	AVIATION SAFETY TECHNOLOGIES	6,925		6,925
170	0203345D8Z	OPERATIONS SECURITY (OPSEC)	1,777		1,777
171	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	18		18
174	0303166D8Z	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	12,209		12,209
175	0303169D8Z	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RAPID ACQUISITION	4,288		4,288
176	0305103E	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	10,000		10,000
177	0305193D8Z	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO)	15,002		15,002
179	0305400D8Z	WARFIGHTING AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED SUPPORT	861		861
180	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	59,958		59,958
181	0901585C	PENTAGON RESERVATION			
182	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	28,908		28,908
183	0901598D8W	IT SOFTWARE DEV INITIATIVES	167		167
184	0909999D8Z	FINANCING FOR CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
184A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	82,627		82,627
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**961,682**	**–6,468**	**955,214**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
185	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	8,706		8,706
186	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA	2,165		2,165
187	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	288		288

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
188	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	15,956		15,956
189	0607828D8Z	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	29,880		29,880
190	0208043J	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,402		2,402
191	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	72,403		72,403
193	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	7,093		7,093
200	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	481		481
201	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	8,366		8,366
202	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	11,324		11,324
203	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	12,514		12,514
204	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	6,548		6,548
205	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	33,751		33,751
206	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	11,753		11,753
207	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	348,593		348,593
208	0303140K	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	5,500		5,500
209	0303148K	DISA MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS			
210	0303149J	C4I FOR THE WARRIOR			
211	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	54,739		54,739
212	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	29,154		29,154
213	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	1,830		1,830
214	0303260D8Z	JOINT MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE	1,241		1,241
215	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	6,418		6,418
217	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPILCATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	5,045	4,000	9,045
		Special Applications for Contingencies		[4,000]	
220	0305103D8Z	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	411		411
222	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	4,341		4,341
223	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	13,008		13,008
227	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	6,603		6,603

229	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	14,926		14,926
232	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	4,303		4,303
235	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,154		3,154
237	0305219BB	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	2,499		2,499
239	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,660		2,660
240	0305600D8Z	INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES	1,444		1,444
248	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	23,103	5,000	28,103
		Industrial Preparedness Manufacturing Technology		[5,000]	
249	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,466		2,466
250	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS (JCS)	2,730		2,730
251	1001018D8Z	NATO AGS			
252	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	2,499		2,499
253	1105232BB	RQ–11 UAV	3,000		3,000
254	1105233BB	RQ–7 UAV	450		450
255	1160279BB	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH/SMALL BUS TECH TRANSFER PILOT PROG			
256	1160403BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS AVIATION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	89,382		89,382
257	1160404BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TACTICAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	799		799
258	1160405BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	27,916		27,916
259	1160408BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	60,915		60,915
260	1160421BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS CV–22 DEVELOPMENT	10,775		10,775
261	1160423BB	JOINT MULTI-MISSION SUBMERSIBLE			
262	1160426BB	OPERATIONS ADVANCED SEAL DELIVERY SYSTEM (ASDS) DEVELOPMENT			
263	1160427BB	MISSION TRAINING AND PREPARATION SYSTEMS (MTPS)	4,617		4,617
264	1160428BB	UNMANNED VEHICLES (UV)			
265	1160429BB	AC/MC–130J	18,571		18,571
266	1160474BB	SOF COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND ELECTRONICS SYSTEMS	1,392		1,392
267	1160476BB	SOF TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEMS			
268	1160477BB	SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS	2,610		2,610
269	1160478BB	SOF SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	2,971		2,971
270	1160479BB	SOF VISUAL AUGMENTATION, LASERS AND SENSOR SYSTEMS	3,000		3,000
271	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,522		3,522
272	1160481BB	SOF MUNITIONS	1,500		1,500

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
273	1160482BB	SOF ROTARY WING AVIATION	51,123		51,123
274	1160483BB	SOF UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	92,424		92,424
275	1160484BB	SOF SURFACE CRAFT	14,475		14,475
276	1160488BB	SOF MILITARY INFORMATION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	2,990		2,990
277	1160489BB	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	8,923		8,923
278	1160490BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	9,473		9,473
278A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,227,920		4,227,920
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**5,399,045**	**9,000**	**5,408,045**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**19,755,678**	**109,209**	**19,864,887**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	60,444		60,444
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	12,126		12,126
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	118,722		118,722
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**191,292**		**191,292**
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**191,292**		**191,292**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**75,325,082**	**254,897**	**75,579,979**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
140	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	8,513		8,513
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**8,513**		**8,513**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**8,513**		**8,513**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
054	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	1,500		1,500
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,500**		**1,500**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
097	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	5,600		5,600
119	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	3,500		3,500
126	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	1,950		1,950
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**11,050**		**11,050**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
172	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	2,000		2,000
189	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	1,500		1,500
192	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	4,050		4,050
227A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	33,784		33,784
227U	0607UNDN	UNDISTRIBUTED			
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**41,334**		**41,334**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**53,884**		**53,884**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
200	0305205F	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	73,000		73,000
242A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	69,000		69,000
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**142,000**		**142,000**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**142,000**		**142,000**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
152	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	9,200		9,200
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**9,200**		**9,200**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
202	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	10,500		10,500
207	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	32,850		32,850
211	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	2,000		2,000
254	1105233BB	RQ–7 UAV	2,450		2,450
278A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	135,361		135,361
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**183,161**		**183,161**
		UNDISTRIBUTED			
279	0901560D	CONTINUING RESOLUTION PROGRAMS			
		SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED			

TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	192,361	192,361
TOTAL RDT&E	396,758	396,758

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,399,804		1,399,804
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	104,629		104,629
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	815,920		815,920
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	825,587		825,587
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,245,231		1,245,231
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,199,340		1,199,340
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,939,455	4,000	2,943,455
	Simulation Training Systems		[4,000]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	451,228		451,228
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,179,675		1,179,675
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,637,052	230,000	7,867,052
	Army Base Operating Services		[230,000]	
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	2,495,667	261,380	2,757,047
	Army Industrial Facility Energy monitoring		[2,380]	
	Army Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[259,000]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	397,952		397,952
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	171,179		171,179
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES			
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM			

160	RESET			
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	459,585		459,585
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**21,322,304**	**495,380**	**21,817,684**
	MOBILIZATION			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	390,394		390,394
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	169,535		169,535
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,675		6,675
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**566,604**		**566,604**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	113,262		113,262
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	71,012		71,012
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	49,275		49,275
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	417,071		417,071
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	1,045,948		1,045,948
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,083,808		1,083,808
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	191,073		191,073
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	607,896		607,896
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	523,501		523,501
300	EXAMINING	139,159		139,159
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	238,978		238,978
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	221,156		221,156
330	JUNIOR ROTC	170,889		170,889
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**4,873,028**		**4,873,028**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
340	SECURITY PROGRAMS	995,161		995,161
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	524,334		524,334
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	705,668		705,668
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	484,075	6,000	490,075
	Army Arsenals		[6,000]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	457,741		457,741
390	ADMINISTRATION	775,313		775,313
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,534,706	–44,000	1,490,706
	Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan		[–44,000]	
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	316,924		316,924
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	214,356		214,356
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,093,877	–10,000	1,083,877
	Unjustified program growth—Joint DOD Support		[–5,000]	
	Unjustified program growth—PA Strategic Communications		[–5,000]	
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	216,621		216,621
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	180,717		180,717
455	FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS		44,000	44,000
	Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan		[44,000]	
460	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	449,901		449,901
470	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	23,886		23,886
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**7,973,280**	**–4,000**	**7,969,280**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
480	UNDISTRIBUTED		–395,600	–395,600
	Army unobligated balances estimate		[–384,600]	
	Center for Military Family and Community Outreach		[1,000]	
	Printing & Reproduction (10% cut)		[–10,600]	
	Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut)		[–1,400]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–395,600**	**–395,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**34,735,216**	**95,780**	**34,830,996**

OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY

OPERATING FORCES

010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,762,887		4,762,887
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,771,644		1,771,644
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	46,321		46,321
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	104,751		104,751
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	431,576		431,576
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,030,303	71,200	1,101,503
	Aviation Depot Maintenance (Active)		[71,200]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	37,403		37,403
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	238,007	27,000	265,007
	Aviation Logistics		[27,000]	
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,820,186		3,820,186
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	734,866		734,866
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,972,609	366,000	5,338,609
	Ship Depot Maintenance (Active)		[366,000]	
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,304,271		1,304,271
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	583,659		583,659
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	97,011		97,011
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	162,303		162,303
160	WARFARE TACTICS	423,187		423,187
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	320,141		320,141
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,076,478		1,076,478
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	187,037		187,037
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	4,352		4,352
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	103,830		103,830
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	180,800		180,800
230	CRUISE MISSILE	125,333		125,333
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,209,410		1,209,410
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	99,063		99,063
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	450,454		450,454
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	358,002		358,002

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	971,189		971,189
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,946,779	352,000	2,298,779
	Navy Metering		[3,000]	
	Navy Sustainment Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[349,000]	
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,610,525		4,610,525
305	UNDISTRIBUTED		2,000	2,000
	Navy Emergency Management and Preparedness		[2,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**32,164,377**	**818,200**	**32,982,577**
	MOBILIZATION			
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	493,326		493,326
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,228		6,228
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	205,898		205,898
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	68,634		68,634
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,684		2,684
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	25,192		25,192
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**801,962**		**801,962**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION	147,540		147,540
380	RECRUIT TRAINING	10,655		10,655
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	151,147		151,147
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	594,799		594,799
410	FLIGHT TRAINING	9,034		9,034
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	173,452		173,452
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	168,025		168,025
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	254,860	983	255,843

	Navy Recruiting and Advertising		[983]	
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	140,279		140,279
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	107,561		107,561
470	JUNIOR ROTC	52,689		52,689
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,810,041**	**983**	**1,811,024**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	754,483	–62,000	692,483
	Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan		[–62,000]	
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	14,275		14,275
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	112,616		112,616
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	216,483		216,483
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	282,295		282,295
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	534,873		534,873
540	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES			
545	FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS		62,000	62,000
	Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan		[62,000]	
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	190,662		190,662
560	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS			
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	303,636		303,636
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	903,885		903,885
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	54,880		54,880
600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	20,687		20,687
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	68,374		68,374
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	572,928		572,928
630	CONSOLIDATED CRYPTOLOGICAL PROGRAM			
650	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE			
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	5,516		5,516
690	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
700	JUDGEMENT FUND			
705	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	552,715		552,715
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**4,588,308**		**4,588,308**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
710	UNDISTRIBUTED		–445,700	–445,700
	Navy unobligated balances estimate		[–435,900]	
	Printing & Reproduction (10% cut)		[–7,100]	
	Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut)		[–2,700]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–445,700**	**–445,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**39,364,688**	**373,483**	**39,738,171**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	715,196	8,500	723,696
	CBRNE Response Force Capability Enhancement		[8,500]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	677,608		677,608
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	190,713		190,713
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	101,464		101,464
050	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING			
060	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	823,390	68,000	891,390
	Marine Corps Sustainment Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[68,000]	
070	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,208,949		2,208,949
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,717,320**	**76,500**	**4,793,820**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
080	RECRUIT TRAINING	18,280		18,280
090	OFFICER ACQUISITION	820		820
100	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	85,816		85,816

110	FLIGHT TRAINING			
120	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	33,142		33,142
130	TRAINING SUPPORT	324,643		324,643
140	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	184,432		184,432
150	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	43,708		43,708
160	JUNIOR ROTC	19,671		19,671
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**710,512**		**710,512**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
170	SPECIAL SUPPORT			
180	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	36,021		36,021
190	ADMINISTRATION	405,431	9,000	414,431
	USMC Expeditionary Energy Office—Experimental Forward Operating Base		[9,000]	
200	ACQUISITION & PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	91,153		91,153
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**532,605**	**9,000**	**541,605**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
210	UNDISTRIBUTED		–70,000	–70,000
	Marine Corps unobligated balances estimate		[–66,000]	
	Mental Health Support for Military Personnel and Families		[3,000]	
	Printing & Reproduction (10% cut)		[–6,500]	
	Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut)		[–500]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–70,000**	**–70,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**5,960,437**	**15,500**	**5,975,937**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,224,400		4,224,400
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	3,417,731		3,417,731
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,482,814		1,482,814
040	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,204,131		2,204,131
060	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,652,318	271,920	1,924,238
	Air Force Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[271,920]	
070	BASE SUPPORT	2,507,179		2,507,179
080	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,492,459		1,492,459
090	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	1,046,226		1,046,226
100	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	696,188		696,188
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	321,484		321,484
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	633,738		633,738
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	735,488		735,488
140	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	170,481		170,481
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**20,584,637**	**271,920**	**20,856,557**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,988,221		2,988,221
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	150,724		150,724
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	373,568		373,568
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	388,103	54,118	442,221
	Air Force Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[54,118]	
190	BASE SUPPORT	674,230		674,230
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**4,574,846**	**54,118**	**4,628,964**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
200	OFFICER ACQUISITION	114,448		114,448
210	RECRUIT TRAINING	22,192		22,192
220	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	90,545		90,545
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	430,090	71,340	501,430

	Air Force Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[71,340]	
240	BASE SUPPORT	789,654		789,654
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	481,357		481,357
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	957,538		957,538
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	198,897		198,897
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	108,248		108,248
290	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,386		6,386
300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	136,102		136,102
310	EXAMINING	3,079		3,079
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	167,660		167,660
330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	202,767		202,767
340	JUNIOR ROTC	75,259		75,259
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,784,222**	**71,340**	**3,855,562**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
350	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,112,878		1,112,878
360	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	785,150		785,150
370	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	14,356		14,356
380	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	416,588	82,364	498,952
	Air Force Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[82,364]	
390	BASE SUPPORT	1,219,043		1,219,043
400	ADMINISTRATION	662,180		662,180
410	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	650,689		650,689
420	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,078,769	–124,000	954,769
	Air Force funds for Space Shuttle (for museum)		[–14,000]	
	Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan		[–110,000]	
425	FINANCIAL IMPROVEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS		110,000	110,000
	Realignment of funds to support the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan		[110,000]	
430	CIVIL AIR PATROL	23,338		23,338
440	JUDGMENT FUND REIMBURSEMENT			
460	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	72,589		72,589
465	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,215,848		1,215,848

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**7,251,428**	**68,364**	**7,319,792**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
470	UNDISTRIBUTED		–410,500	–410,500
	Air Force unobligated balances estimate		[–400,800]	
	Printing & Reproduction (10% cut)		[–7,200]	
	Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut)		[–2,500]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–410,500**	**–410,500**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**36,195,133**	**55,242**	**36,250,375**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	563,787		563,787
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,986,766	3,000	3,989,766
	Cold Weather Protective Equipment		[3,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,550,553**	**3,000**	**4,553,553**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	124,075		124,075
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	93,348		93,348
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**217,423**		**217,423**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
050	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	159,692	–10,369	149,323
	Innovative Readiness Training (Section 591)		[–10,369]	
070	DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY			

080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	508,822		508,822
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,147,366		1,147,366
100	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	12,000		12,000
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	676,419	1,000	677,419
	Voluntary Separation Repayment		[1,000]	
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,360,392		1,360,392
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	37,367		37,367
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	450,863	6,000	456,863
	Procurement Technical Assistance Centers		[6,000]	
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	256,133		256,133
170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	22,372		22,372
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY—GLOBAL TRAIN AND EQUIP	500,000	–100,000	400,000
	Reduction to Global Train and Equip		[–100,000]	
185	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY—OTHER	182,831		182,831
190	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	505,366		505,366
200	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	33,848		33,848
210	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	432,133		432,133
220	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,768,677		2,768,677
230	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	202,758		202,758
250	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	81,754		81,754
260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	2,201,964	99,000	2,300,964
	Department of Defense Corrosion Protection Projects		[22,700]	
	DOD Installation Energy Manager Training Program		[3,000]	
	Education and Employment Advocacy Program for Wounded Members of the Armed Forces		[15,000]	
	Establish Office of Language and Policy		[6,000]	
	Insider Threat Detection Program		[5,000]	
	Office of Net Assessment		[1,300]	
	Sexual Assault Response Coordinators and Victim Advocates		[45,000]	
	Wounded Warriors Career Program		[1,000]	
270	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	563,184		563,184
275	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,068,492		14,068,492
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**26,172,433**	**–4,369**	**26,168,064**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
280	UNDISTRIBUTED		–413,000	–413,000
	Defense-wide unobligated balances estimate		[–456,800]	
	DOD Impact Aid (Section 581)		[40,000]	
	Printing & Reproduction (10% cut)		[–4,300]	
	Red Cross Reimbursement for Humanitarian Support to Service Members		[25,000]	
	Studies, Analysis & Evaluations (10% cut)		[–16,900]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–413,000**	**–413,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**30,940,409**	**–414,369**	**30,526,040**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,091		1,091
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	18,129		18,129
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	492,705		492,705
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	137,304		137,304
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	597,786		597,786
060	AVIATION ASSETS	67,366	4,300	71,666
	Restore Flying Hours to Army Reserve		[4,300]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	474,966		474,966
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	69,841		69,841
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	247,010		247,010
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	590,078		590,078
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	255,618	27,000	282,618
	Army Reserve Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[27,000]	

120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,951,894**	**31,300**	**2,983,194**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	14,447		14,447
140	ADMINISTRATION	76,393		76,393
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,844		3,844
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	9,033		9,033
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	53,565		53,565
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**157,282**		**157,282**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	**3,109,176**	**31,300**	**3,140,476**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	622,868		622,868
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,041		16,041
030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	1,511		1,511
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	123,547	1,500	125,047
	Aviation Depot Maintenance		[1,500]	
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	379		379
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	49,701		49,701
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	593		593
080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	53,916	1,000	54,916
	Ship Depot Maintenance (Reserve)		[1,000]	
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,445		15,445
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	153,942		153,942
110	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	7,292		7,292
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	75,131		75,131
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	72,083		72,083
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	109,024		109,024
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,301,473**	**2,500**	**1,303,973**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	ADMINISTRATION	1,857		1,857
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	14,438		14,438
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,394		2,394
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	2,972		2,972
190	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS			
200	JUDGMENT FUND			
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**21,661**		**21,661**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	**1,323,134**	**2,500**	**1,325,634**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	94,604		94,604
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	16,382		16,382
030	TRAINING SUPPORT			
040	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	31,520		31,520
050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	105,809		105,809
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**248,315**		**248,315**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
060	SPECIAL SUPPORT			
070	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	852		852
080	ADMINISTRATION	13,257		13,257
090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,019		9,019
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**23,128**		**23,128**

	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	**271,443**		**271,443**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,171,853	36,900	2,208,753
	Restore Flying Hours to FY11 levels		[36,900]	
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	116,513		116,513
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	471,707		471,707
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	77,161	14,000	91,161
	Air Force Reserve Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[14,000]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	308,974		308,974
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,146,208**	**50,900**	**3,197,108**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	84,423		84,423
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	17,076		17,076
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	19,688		19,688
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,170		6,170
100	AUDIOVISUAL	794		794
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**128,151**		**128,151**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	**3,274,359**	**50,900**	**3,325,259**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	634,181		634,181
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	189,899		189,899
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	751,899		751,899
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	112,971		112,971
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	33,972		33,972
060	AVIATION ASSETS	854,048	7,720	861,768

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	Restore O&M Funding for Guard C–23		[7,720]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	706,299	7,000	713,299
	Increase funding for Guard simulator training		[5,000]	
	Simulation Training Systems		[2,000]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	50,453		50,453
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	646,608		646,608
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,028,126		1,028,126
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	618,513	66,000	684,513
	Army National Guard Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[66,000]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	792,575		792,575
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES			
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,419,544**	**80,720**	**6,500,264**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
140	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	11,703		11,703
150	ADMINISTRATION	178,655		178,655
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	42,073		42,073
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	6,789		6,789
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	382,668		382,668
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**621,888**		**621,888**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	**7,041,432**	**80,720**	**7,122,152**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,651,900	51,100	3,703,000
	Restore Flying Hours to FY11 Levels		[51,100]	

020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	751,519		751,519
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	753,525		753,525
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	284,348	46,000	330,348
	Air National Guard Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization to 100%		[46,000]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	621,942		621,942
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,063,234**	**97,100**	**6,160,334**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	39,387		39,387
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	33,659		33,659
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**73,046**		**73,046**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	**6,136,280**	**97,100**	**6,233,380**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,861		13,861
020	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	107,662		107,662
030	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	508,219		508,219
040	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	305,501		305,501
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	346,031		346,031
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	308,668		308,668
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	525,453	–22,000	503,453
	Unjustified program growth		[–22,000]	
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	10,716		10,716
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, FORMERLY USED SITES	276,495		276,495
100	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000	–5,000	
	Program Reduction		[–5,000]	
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,407,606**	**–27,000**	**2,380,606**
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,407,606**	**–27,000**	**2,380,606**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**170,759,313**	**361,156**	**171,120,469**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	3,424,314		3,424,314
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,534,886		1,534,886
060	AVIATION ASSETS	87,166		87,166
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,675,821		2,675,821
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	579,000		579,000
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,000,000		1,000,000
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	951,371		951,371
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	250,000		250,000
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	22,998,441		22,998,441
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	425,000		425,000
160	RESET	3,955,429		3,955,429
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**37,881,428**		**37,881,428**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
340	SECURITY PROGRAMS	2,476,766		2,476,766
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	3,507,186		3,507,186
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	50,740		50,740
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	84,427		84,427
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	66,275		66,275
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	143,391		143,391
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	92,067		92,067
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**6,420,852**		**6,420,852**

	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**44,302,280**	**44,302,280**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	1,058,114	1,058,114
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	7,700	7,700
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	9,200	9,200
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	12,934	12,934
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	39,566	39,566
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	174,052	174,052
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,586	1,586
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	50,852	50,852
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,132,948	1,132,948
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	26,822	26,822
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	998,172	998,172
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	26,533	26,533
160	WARFARE TACTICS	22,657	22,657
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	28,141	28,141
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,932,640	1,932,640
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	19,891	19,891
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	5,465	5,465
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	2,093	2,093
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	125,460	125,460
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	201,083	201,083
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	1,457	1,457
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	5,095	5,095
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	26,793	26,793
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	352,210	352,210
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,261,464**	**6,261,464**
	MOBILIZATION		

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	29,010		29,010
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	34,300		34,300
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	258,278		258,278
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**321,588**		**321,588**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	69,961		69,961
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	5,400		5,400
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**75,361**		**75,361**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	2,348		2,348
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	6,142		6,142
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	5,849		5,849
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	28,511		28,511
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	263,593		263,593
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	17,414		17,414
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	1,075		1,075
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	6,564		6,564
650	FOREIGN COUNTERINTELLIGENCE	14,598		14,598
705	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,060		2,060
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**348,154**		**348,154**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**7,006,567**		**7,006,567**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			

010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	2,069,485	2,069,485
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	575,843	575,843
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	251,100	251,100
070	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	82,514	82,514
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,978,942**	**2,978,942**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
130	TRAINING SUPPORT	209,784	209,784
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**209,784**	**209,784**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
180	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	376,495	376,495
190	ADMINISTRATION	5,989	5,989
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**382,484**	**382,484**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**3,571,210**	**3,571,210**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,115,901	2,115,901
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	2,033,929	2,033,929
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	46,844	46,844
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	312,361	312,361
060	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	334,950	334,950
070	BASE SUPPORT	641,404	641,404
080	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	69,330	69,330
090	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	297,015	297,015
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	16,833	16,833
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	46,390	46,390
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,914,957**	**5,914,957**
	MOBILIZATION		

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	3,533,338		3,533,338
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	85,416		85,416
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	161,678		161,678
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	9,485		9,485
190	BASE SUPPORT	30,033		30,033
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**3,819,950**		**3,819,950**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	908		908
240	BASE SUPPORT	2,280		2,280
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	29,592		29,592
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	154		154
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	691		691
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	753		753
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**34,378**		**34,378**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
350	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	155,121		155,121
390	BASE SUPPORT	20,677		20,677
400	ADMINISTRATION	3,320		3,320
410	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	111,561		111,561
420	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	605,223		605,223
465	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	54,000		54,000
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**949,902**		**949,902**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**10,719,187**		**10,719,187**

	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	2,000	2,000
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,269,939	3,269,939
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,271,939**	**3,271,939**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	23,478	23,478
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	87,925	87,925
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	164,520	164,520
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	102,322	102,322
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	15,457	15,457
185	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY—OTHER	2,200,000	2,200,000
220	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	194,100	194,100
260	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	143,870	143,870
275	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,065,800	3,065,800
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**5,997,472**	**5,997,472**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**9,269,411**	**9,269,411**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	84,200	84,200
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	28,100	28,100
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,700	20,700
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	84,500	84,500
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**217,500**	**217,500**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RESERVE	**217,500**	**217,500**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	38,402		38,402
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	400		400
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	11,330		11,330
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	10,137		10,137
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	13,827		13,827
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	52		52
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**74,148**		**74,148**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE	**74,148**		**74,148**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	31,284		31,284
050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,800		4,800
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**36,084**		**36,084**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS RESERVE	**36,084**		**36,084**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,800		4,800
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	131,000		131,000
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION			
050	BASE SUPPORT	6,250		6,250
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**142,050**		**142,050**

	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE RESERVE	**142,050**	**142,050**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MANEUVER UNITS	89,930	89,930
060	AVIATION ASSETS	130,848	130,848
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	110,011	110,011
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	34,788	34,788
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	21,967	21,967
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**387,544**	**387,544**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD	**387,544**	**387,544**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	34,050	34,050
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**34,050**	**34,050**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR NATIONAL GUARD	**34,050**	**34,050**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND		
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE		
010	INFRASTRUCTURE	1,304,350	1,304,350
020	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	1,667,905	1,667,905
030	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	751,073	751,073
040	SUSTAINMENT	3,331,774	3,331,774
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**7,055,102**	**7,055,102**
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR		
060	INFRASTRUCTURE	1,128,584	1,128,584
070	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	1,530,420	1,530,420
080	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	1,102,430	1,102,430

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
090	SUSTAINMENT	1,938,715		1,938,715
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**5,700,149**		**5,700,149**
	ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES			
110	SUSTAINMENT	21,187		21,187
120	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	7,344		7,344
130	INFRASTRUCTURE	15,000		15,000
140	COIN ACTIVITIES			
150	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	1,218		1,218
	SUBTOTAL ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES	**44,749**		**44,749**
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**12,800,000**		**12,800,000**
	PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY FUND			
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
010	UNDISTRIBUTED		1,100,000	1,100,000
	Realignment of funds from Department of State		[1,100,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**1,100,000**	**1,100,000**
	TOTAL PAKISTAN COUNTERINSURGENCY FUND		**1,100,000**	**1,100,000**
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND			
	POWER			
010	POWER	300,000		300,000
020	TRANSPORTATION	100,000		100,000
030	WATER	50,000		50,000
040	OTHER RELATED ACTIVITIES	25,000		25,000

SUBTOTAL POWER	475,000		475,000
TOTAL AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND	475,000		475,000
TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	89,035,031	1,100,000	90,135,031

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL	142,828,848	–664,690	142,164,158
Increase in Authorized Strengths for Marine Corps Officers on Active Duty in Field Grades (Section 501)		6,000	
Retain Carrier Air Wing Staff (Section 1095)		2,310	
Travel and Transportation Allowances for Non-Medical Attendants		20,000	
Unobligated Balances (Section 421)		[–693,000]	

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL	11,228,566		11,228,566

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	101,194		101,194
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**101,194**		**101,194**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
WAR RESERVE MATERIAL	65,372		65,372
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**65,372**		**65,372**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	31,614		31,614
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**31,614**		**31,614**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,376,830	2,000	1,378,830
Enhanced Commissary Stores Pilot Program		[2,000]	
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,376,830**	**2,000**	**1,378,830**
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
MPF MLP	425,865		425,865
POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	24,161		24,161
NATIONAL DEF SEALIFT VESSEL	1,138		1,138

LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	92,567		92,567
DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	184,109		184,109
TAH MAINTENANCE	40,831		40,831
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	48,443		48,443
READY RESERVE FORCE	309,270		309,270
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	**1,126,384**		**1,126,384**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
IN-HOUSE CARE	8,148,856		8,148,856
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	16,377,272		16,377,272
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,193,821		2,193,821
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,422,697	–19,230	1,403,467
Electronic Health Record Way Ahead		[–15,480]	
Virtual Electronic Health Record		[–3,750]	
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	312,102		312,102
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	705,347		705,347
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,742,451		1,742,451
UNDISTRIBUTED		–178,500	–178,500
Collaborative Military-Civilian Trauma Training Programs		[3,000]	
Competitive Programs for Alcohol and Substance Use Disorders		[5,000]	
Cooperative Health Care Agreements		[500]	
Defense Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury		[2,000]	
GAO Estimate of Unobligated Balances		[–225,000]	
Mental Health Initiatives		[10,000]	
Military Adaptive Sports Programs Section 582		[5,000]	
Prohibit TRICARE Prime Fee Increase for 1 year		[45,000]	
Prohibit TRICARE Prime Fee Increase for 1 year		[–25,000]	
Prohibit TRICARE Prime Fee Increase for 1 year		[–20,000]	
TBI and PTSD Initiatives		[20,000]	
Traumatic Brain Injury		[1,000]	
RDT&E			

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	2,935		2,935
APPLIED BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	33,805		33,805
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	3,694		3,694
MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	767		767
MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	181,042		181,042
MEDICAL PRODUCTS SUPPORT AND ADVANCED CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT	167,481		167,481
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	176,345	–12,110	164,235
Electronic Health Record Way Ahead		[–11,360]	
Virtual Electronic Health Record		[–750]	
MEDICAL PRODUCTS AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	34,559		34,559
MEDICAL PROGRAM-WIDE ACTIVITIES	48,313		48,313
MEDICAL PRODUCTS AND CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES	14,765		14,765
UNDISTRIBUTED		2,000	2,000
Prostate Cancer Imaging Research Initiative		[2,000]	
PROCUREMENT			
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	632,518	–28,170	604,348
Electronic Health Record Way Ahead		[–28,170]	
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**32,198,770**	**–236,010**	**31,962,760**
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—O&M	1,147,691		1,147,691
CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—RDT&E	406,731		406,731
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**1,554,422**		**1,554,422**
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	1,156,282		1,156,282
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES	**1,156,282**		**1,156,282**

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	286,919	1,000	287,919
DOD IG Inspection of Military Cemeteries, Section 562		[1,000]	
RDT&E	1,600		1,600
PROCUREMENT	1,000		1,000
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**289,519**	**1,000**	**290,519**
MISSION FORCE ENHANCEMENT TRANSFER FUND			
		348,256	348,256
Creation of the Mission Force Enhancement Transfer Fund		[1,000,000]	
Program Decreases		[–651,744]	
TOTAL MISSION FORCE ENHANCEMENT TRANSFER FUND		**348,256**	**348,256**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**37,900,387**	**115,246**	**38,015,633**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	54,000		54,000
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**54,000**		**54,000**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
TRANSPORTATION FALLEN HEROES	10,000		10,000
CONTAINER DECONSOLIDATION	2,000		2,000
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**12,000**		**12,000**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	369,013		369,013
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**369,013**		**369,013**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
IN-HOUSE CARE	641,996		641,996
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	464,869		464,869
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	95,994		95,994
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	5,548		5,548
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	751		751
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	16,859		16,859
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	2,271		2,271
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**1,228,288**		**1,228,288**

DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES		
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	486,458	486,458
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES	**486,458**	**486,458**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL		
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	11,055	11,055
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**11,055**	**11,055**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**2,160,814**	**2,160,814**

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	AFGHANISTAN	Bagram Air Base	Barracks, Ph 5	29,000		29,000
Army	AFGHANISTAN	Bagram Air Base	Construct Drainage System, Ph 3	31,000		31,000
Army	AFGHANISTAN	Bagram Air Base	Entry Control Point	20,000		20,000
Army	ALABAMA	Fort Rucker	Combat Readiness Center	11,600		11,600
Army	ALASKA	Fort Wainwright	Aviation Complex, Ph 3A	114,000		114,000
Army	ALASKA	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	Brigade Complex, Ph 2	74,000		74,000
Army	ALASKA	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	Organizational Parking	3,600		3,600
Army	ALASKA	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	Physical Fitness Facility	26,000		26,000
Army	CALIFORNIA	Fort Irwin	Infantry Squad Battle Course	7,500		7,500
Army	CALIFORNIA	Fort Irwin	Qualification Training Range	15,500		15,500
Army	CALIFORNIA	Presidio Monterey	General Instruction Building	3,000		3,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Aircraft Loading Area	34,000		34,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	63,000		63,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Barracks	46,000		46,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Barracks	67,000		67,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Brigade Headquarters	14,400		14,400
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Control Tower	14,200		14,200
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	25,000		25,000
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Benning	Land Acquisition	5,100		5,100
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Benning	Rail Loading Facility	13,600		13,600
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Benning	Trainee Barracks Complex, Ph 3	23,000		23,000

Army	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	Hand Grenade Familiarization Range	1,450	1,450
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Stewart	Dog Kennel	2,600	2,600
Army	GERMANY	Germersheim	Central Distribution Facility	21,000	21,000
Army	GERMANY	Germersheim	Infrastructure	16,500	16,500
Army	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	Barracks	17,500	17,500
Army	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	Chapel	15,500	15,500
Army	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	Convoy Live Fire Range	5,000	5,000
Army	GERMANY	Landstuhl	Satellite Communications Center	39,000	39,000
Army	GERMANY	Landstuhl	Satellite Communications Center	24,000	24,000
Army	GERMANY	Oberdachstetten	Automated Record Fire Range	12,200	12,200
Army	GERMANY	Stuttgart	Access Control Point	12,200	12,200
Army	GERMANY	Vilseck	Barracks	20,000	20,000
Army	HAWAII	Fort Shafter	Child Development Center	17,500	17,500
Army	HAWAII	Schofield Barracks	Centralized Wash Facility	32,000	32,000
Army	HAWAII	Schofield Barracks	Combat Aviation Brigade Complex, Ph 1	73,000	73,000
Army	HONDURAS	Honduras Various	Barracks	25,000	25,000
Army	KANSAS	Forbes Air Field	Deployment Support Facility	5,300	5,300
Army	KANSAS	Fort Riley	Chapel	10,400	10,400
Army	KANSAS	Fort Riley	Physical Fitness Facility	13,000	13,000
Army	KANSAS	Fort Riley	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar	60,000	60,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Barracks	23,000	23,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Barracks Complex	65,000	65,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Physical Fitness Facility	18,500	18,500
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Scout/RECCE Gunnery Range	18,000	18,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar	67,000	67,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	16,000	16,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	40,000	40,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Knox	Automated Infantry Platoon Battle Course	7,000	7,000
Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Knox	Battalion Complex	48,000	48,000
Army	KOREA	Camp Carroll	Barracks	41,000	41,000
Army	KOREA	Camp Henry	Barracks Complex	48,000	48,000
Army	LOUISIANA	Fort Polk	Brigade Complex	23,000	23,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	LOUISIANA	Fort Polk	Fire Station	9,200		9,200
Army	LOUISIANA	Fort Polk	Land Acquisition	27,000		27,000
Army	LOUISIANA	Fort Polk	Military Working Dog Facility	2,600		2,600
Army	LOUISIANA	Fort Polk	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	8,300		8,300
Army	MARYLAND	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Auto Technology Evaluation Fac, Ph 3	15,500		15,500
Army	MARYLAND	Aberdeen Proving Ground	Command and Control Facility	63,000		63,000
Army	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	Applied Instruction Facility	43,000		43,000
Army	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	Brigade Complex	36,000		36,000
Army	MISSOURI	Fort Leonard Wood	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	49,000		49,000
Army	NEW YORK	Fort Drum	Ammunition Supply Point	5,700		5,700
Army	NEW YORK	Fort Drum	Chapel	7,600		7,600
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Access Roads, Ph 2	18,000		18,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Battle Command Training Center	23,000		23,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Brigade Complex Facilities	49,000		49,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	NCO Academy	42,000		42,000
Army	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar	54,000		54,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	Battle Command Training Center	23,000		23,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	Chapel	13,200		13,200
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	Physical Fitness Facility	25,000		25,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	Rail Deployment Facility	3,400		3,400
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	Reception Station, Ph 1	36,000		36,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	THAAD Instruction Facility	33,000		33,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	51,000		51,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	McAlester	Ammunition Loading Pads	1,700		1,700
Army	OKLAHOMA	McAlester	Railroad Tracks	6,300		6,300
Army	SOUTH CAROLINA	Fort Jackson	Modified Record Fire Range	4,900		4,900
Army	SOUTH CAROLINA	Fort Jackson	Trainee Barracks Complex, Ph 2	59,000		59,000

Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Applied Instruction Building	8,300		8,300
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Barracks Complex	13,000		13,000
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Electronics Maintenance Facility	14,600		14,600
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Infrastructure	14,600		14,600
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	JLENS Tactical Training Facility	39,000		39,000
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	24,000		24,000
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	19,000		19,000
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	14,600		14,600
Army	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Water Well, Potable	2,400		2,400
Army	TEXAS	Fort Hood	Operational Readiness Training Complex	51,000		51,000
Army	TEXAS	Fort Hood	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Maintenance Hangar	47,000		47,000
Army	TEXAS	Fort Hood	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	15,500		15,500
Army	TEXAS	Fort Hood	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	18,500		18,500
Army	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Vehicle Maintenance Facility	10,400		10,400
Army	TEXAS	Red River Army Depot	Maneuver Systems Sustainment Ctr, Ph 3	44,000		44,000
Army	UTAH	Dugway Proving Ground	Life Sciences Test Facility Addition	32,000		32,000
Army	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	Information Dominance Center, Ph 1	52,000		52,000
Army	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	Road and Infrastucture Improvements	31,000		31,000
Army	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley Eustis	Aviation Training Facility	26,000		26,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	Air Support Operations Facilities	7,300		7,300
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	Aviation Complex, Ph 1B	48,000		48,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	Aviation Unit Complex, Ph 1A	34,000		34,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	Battalion Complex	59,000		59,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	Brigade Complex, Ph 2	56,000		56,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	Infrastructure, Ph 1	64,000		64,000
Army	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	Operational Readiness Training Cplx, Ph 1	28,000		28,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Community Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Host Nation Support	25,500		25,500
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction	20,000		20,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	229,741		229,741
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	R&D Facilities	0	20,000	20,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Supply Facilities	0		0
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Training Facilities	0	20,000	20,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Troop Housing Facilities	0		0
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Troop Housing Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities and Ground Improvements	0	10,000	10,000
Total Military Construction, Army				**3,235,991**	**70,000**	**3,305,991**
Navy	ARIZONA	Yuma	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	39,515		39,515
Navy	ARIZONA	Yuma	Double Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	81,897		81,897
Navy	ARIZONA	Yuma	JSF Auxiliary Landing Field	41,373		41,373
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	55,010		55,010
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	Waterfront Development Phase 4	45,194		45,194
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Barstow	Dip Tank Cleaning Facility	8,590		8,590
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Bridgeport	Multi-Purpose Building—Addition	19,238		19,238
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	Armory, 1ST Marine Division	12,606		12,606
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	Individual Equipment Issue Warehouse	16,411		16,411
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	Infantry Squad Defense Range	29,187		29,187
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	Intersection Bridge and Improvements	12,476		12,476

Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	MV–22 Aviation Fuel Storage	6,163		6,163
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	MV–22 Aviation Pavement	18,530		18,530
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	MV–22 Double Hangar Replacement	48,345		48,345
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	New Potable Water Conveyance	113,091		113,091
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	North Area Waste Water Conveyance	78,271		78,271
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	FITNESS CENTER NORTH ISLAND	46,763		46,763
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	Rotary Aircraft Depot Maint Fac (North Is.)	61,672		61,672
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Point Mugu	E–2D AIRCREW TRAINING FACILITY	15,377		15,377
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Twentynine Palms	Child Development Center	23,743		23,743
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Twentynine Palms	Land Expansion	8,665		8,665
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Twentynine Palms	Multi-Use Operational Fitness Area	18,819		18,819
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Twentynine Palms	Tracked Vehicle Maintenance Cover	15,882		15,882
Navy	DIEGO GARCIA	Diego Garcia	Potable Water Plant Modernization	35,444		35,444
Navy	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier	Aircraft Logistics Apron	35,170		35,170
Navy	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier	Bachelor Quarters	43,529		43,529
Navy	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier	TAXIWAY ENHANCEMENT	10,800		10,800
Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	BAMS UAS Operator Training Facility	4,482		4,482
Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	P–8A Hangar Upgrades	6,085		6,085
Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	P–8A Training Facility	25,985		25,985
Navy	FLORIDA	Mayport	Massey Avenue Corridor Improvements	14,998	–14,998	0
Navy	FLORIDA	Whiting Field	Applied Instruction Facilities, EOD Course	20,620		20,620
Navy	GEORGIA	Kings Bay	Crab Island Security Enclave	52,913		52,913
Navy	GEORGIA	Kings Bay	WRA Land/Water Interface	33,150		33,150
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Finegayan Water Utilities	77,267		77,267
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	North Ramp Utilities—Anderson AFB (INC)	78,654		78,654
Navy	HAWAII	Barking Sands	North Loop Electrical Replacement	9,679		9,679
Navy	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Navy Information Operations Command FES Fac	7,492		7,492
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	MCAS Operations Complex	57,704		57,704
Navy	ILLINOIS	Great Lakes	Decentralize Steam System	91,042		91,042
Navy	MARYLAND	Indian Head	Decentralize Steam System	67,779		67,779
Navy	MARYLAND	Patuxent River	Aircraft Prototype Facility Phase 2	45,844		45,844
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	2nd Combat Engineer Maintenance/Ops Complex	75,214		75,214

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters—Wallace Creek	27,439		27,439
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Base Entry Point and Road	81,008		81,008
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Squad Battle Course	16,821		16,821
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	H–1 HELICOPTER GEARBOX REPAIR & TEST FACILITY	17,760		17,760
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar and Apron	69,511		69,511
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	Ordnance Loading Area Additiion	9,419		9,419
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	Beaufort	VERTICAL LANDING PADS	21,096		21,096
Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	Bachelor Quarters, Homeport Ashore	81,304		81,304
Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	Decentralize Steam System	26,924		26,924
Navy	VIRGINIA	Portsmouth	Controlled Industrial Facility	74,864		74,864
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Academic Instruction Facility	75,304		75,304
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	31,374		31,374
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Embassy Security Group Facilities	27,079		27,079
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Enlisted Dining Facility	5,034		5,034
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Realign Purvis Rd/Russell Rd Intersection	6,442		6,442
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	The Basic School Student Quarters—Phase 6	28,488		28,488
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Waste Water Treatment Plant—Upshur	9,969		9,969
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bremerton	Integrated Dry Dock Water Treatment Fac Ph1	13,341		13,341
Navy	WASHINGTON	Kitsap	EHW Security Force Facility (Bangor)	25,948		25,948
Navy	WASHINGTON	Kitsap	Explosives Handling Wharf #2 (Inc. 1)	78,002		78,002
Navy	WASHINGTON	Kitsap	WATERFRONT RESTRICTED AREA VEHICLE BARRIERS	17,894		17,894
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance & Production Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	84,362	–15,000	69,362

Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	R&D Facilities	0	20,000	20,000
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Troop Housing Facilities	0	29,998	29,998
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Constr	21,495		21,495
Total Military Construction, Navy				**2,461,547**	**30,000**	**2,491,547**
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	Dormitory (168 RM)	45,000		45,000
AF	ALASKA	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	Brigade Combat Team (Light) Complex, (480 RM)	97,000		97,000
AF	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	EC–130H Simulator/Training Operations	20,500		20,500
AF	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC–130J Joint Use Fuel Cell	12,500		12,500
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35 ADAL Aircraft Maintenance Unit	6,000		6,000
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35 Squad Ops/AMU 2	18,000		18,000
AF	CALIFORNIA	Travis AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	22,000		22,000
AF	CALIFORNIA	Vandenberg AFB	Education Center	14,200		14,200
AF	COLORADO	U.S. Air Force Academy	Construct Large Vehicle Inspection Facility	13,400		13,400
AF	DELAWARE	Dover AFB	C–5M Formal Training Unit Facility	2,800		2,800
AF	FLORIDA	Patrick AFB	Air Force Technical Applications Ctr—Incr 2	79,000	–30,000	49,000
AF	GERMANY	Ramstein AB	Dormitory (192 RM)	34,697		34,697
AF	GREENLAND	Thule AB	Dormitory (72 PN)	28,000		28,000
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Air Freight Terminal Complex	35,000		35,000
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Guam Strike Clear Water Rinse Facility	7,500		7,500
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Guam Strike Conventional Munitions Maintenanc	11,700		11,700
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Guam Strike Fuel Systems Maintenance Hangar, Incr 1	128,000	–64,000	64,000
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC Combat Communications Combat Support	9,800		9,800
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC Combat Communications Transmission Syst	5,600		5,600
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC RED HORSE Cantonment Operations Facility	14,000		14,000
AF	ITALY	Sigonella	UAS SATCOM Relay Pads and Facility	15,000		15,000
AF	KANSAS	Fort Riley	Air Support Operations Center	7,600		7,600
AF	KOREA	Osan AB	Dormitory (156 RM)	23,000		23,000
AF	LOUISIANA	Barksdale AFB	Mission Support Group Complex	23,500		23,500

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
AF	MISSOURI	Whiteman AFB	WSA Security Control Facility	4,800		4,800
AF	NEBRASKA	Offutt AFB	STRATCOM Replacement Facility Incr 1	150,000		150,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	Communications Network Control Center	11,600		11,600
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35 Add/Alter Engine Shop	2,750		2,750
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35A AGE Facility	21,500		21,500
AF	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	ADAL Wastewater Treatment Plant	7,598		7,598
AF	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	Dormitory (96 RM)	15,000		15,000
AF	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	Child Development Center	11,200		11,200
AF	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	F–16 Academic Facility	5,800		5,800
AF	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	F–16 SEAD Training Facility	4,200		4,200
AF	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	Parallel Taxiway 07/25	8,000		8,000
AF	NEW MEXICO	Kirtland AFB	AFNWC Sustainment Center	25,000		25,000
AF	NORTH CAROLINA	Pope AFB	C–130 Flight Simulator	6,000		6,000
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	Minot AFB	B–52 3–Bay Conventional Munitions Maintenance	11,800		11,800
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	Minot AFB	B–52 Two-Bay Phase Maintenance Dock	34,000		34,000
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	Minot AFB	Dormitory (168 RM)	22,000		22,000
AF	QATAR	Al Udeid	Blatchford Preston Complex, Phase IV	37,000		37,000
AF	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Adv Indiv Training (AIT) Barracks (300 RM)	46,000		46,000
AF	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT Recruit Dormitory 4, Phase IV	64,000		64,000
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	F–22 System Support Facility	16,500		16,500
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	F–35 ADAL Hangar 45E/AMU	6,800		6,800
AF	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley Eustis	AIT Barracks Complex, Ph 2	50,000		50,000
AF	WASHINGTON	Fairchild AFB	SERE Force Support Ph 2	14,000		14,000
AF	WASHINGTON	Fairchild AFB	Wing Headquarters	13,600		13,600
AF	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Community Facilities	0	10,000	10,000

AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Community Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance & Production Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operational Facilities	0	20,000	20,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING & DESIGN	81,913		81,913
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Supporting Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	20,000		20,000
Total Military Construction, Air Force				**1,364,858**	**–34,000**	**1,330,858**
Def-Wide	ALABAMA	Redstone Arsenal	Von Braun Complex Phase IV	58,800		58,800
Def-Wide	ALASKA	Anchorage	SOF Cold Weather Maritime Training Facility	18,400		18,400
Def-Wide	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	Upgrade Rail Line	14,800		14,800
Def-Wide	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	23,000		23,000
Def-Wide	BELGIUM	Brussels	NATO Headquarters Facility	24,118		24,118
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	SOF Military Working Dog Facility	3,500		3,500
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	SOF Range 130 Support Projects	8,641		8,641
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Support Activity Operations Facility	42,000		42,000
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Defense Distribution Depot-Tracy	Replace Public Safety Center	15,500		15,500
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Point Loma Annex	Replace Fuel Storage Facilities Incr 4	27,000		27,000
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	San Clemente	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE TANKS & PIPELINE	21,800		21,800
Def-Wide	COLORADO	Buckley AFB	Mountainview Operations Facility, Incr 1	140,932	–70,000	70,932
Def-Wide	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Bolling AFB	Cooling Tower Expansion	2,070		2,070
Def-Wide	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Bolling AFB	DIAC Parking Garage	13,586		13,586
Def-Wide	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Bolling AFB	Electrical Upgrades	1,080		1,080

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	Medical Clinic	11,600		11,600
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	SOF Company Operations Facility (GSB)	21,000		21,000
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	SOF Company Operations Facility (GSTB)	19,000		19,000
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Eglin AUX 9	SOF Enclosed Engine Noise Suppressors	3,200		3,200
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Eglin AUX 9	SOF Simulator Facility	6,300		6,300
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	MacDill AFB	SOF Acquisition Center (Phase II)	15,200		15,200
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Whiting Field	TRUCK LOAD/UNLOAD FACILITY	3,800		3,800
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Fort Benning	Replace McBride Elementary School	37,205		37,205
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	WHITELAW WEDGE BUILDING ADDITION	11,340		11,340
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Fort Stewart	Hospital Addition/Alteration Phase 2	72,300		72,300
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Ansbach	Ansbach Middle/High School Addition	11,672		11,672
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Baumholder	Replace Wetzel-Smith Elementary Schools	59,419		59,419
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	Netzaberg MS School Addition	6,529		6,529
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Medical Center Replacement Incr 1	70,592		70,592
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Spangdalem AB	Replace Bitburg Elementary School	41,876		41,876
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Spangdalem AB	Replace Bitburg Middle & High School	87,167		87,167
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Stuttgart-Patch Barracks	DISA Europe Facility Upgrades	2,434		2,434
Def-Wide	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Alter Warehouse Space	9,200		9,200
Def-Wide	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	UPGRADE REFULER TRUCK PARKING AREA	5,200		5,200
Def-Wide	ILLINOIS	Great Lakes	Health Clinic Demolition	16,900		16,900
Def-Wide	ITALY	Vicenza	Replace Vicenza High School	41,864		41,864
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Yokota AB	Replace Temp Classrm/Joan K. Mendel ES	12,236		12,236
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Yokota AB	Replace Yokota High School	49,606		49,606
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	Hospital Addition/Alteration	56,600		56,600
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	SOF MH47 Aviation Facility	43,000		43,000
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	SOF Rotary Wing Hangar	38,900		38,900
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Knox	Replace Kingsolver-Pierce Elementary Schools	38,845		38,845

Def-Wide	LOUISIANA	Barksdale AFB	Hydrant Fuel System	6,200		6,200
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Aberdeen Proving Ground	USAMRICD Replacement, Inc 4	22,850		22,850
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Bethesda Naval Hospital	Child Development Center Addition/Alteration	18,000		18,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Detrick	USAMRIID Stage I, Inc 6	137,600		137,600
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	High Performance Computing Capacity Inc 1	29,640		29,640
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	Ambulatory Care Center, Incr 1	242,900	–73,300	169,600
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	Dental Clinic Replacement	22,800		22,800
Def-Wide	MASSACHUSETTS	Hanscom AFB	Replace Hanscom Middle School	34,040		34,040
Def-Wide	MASSACHUSETTS	Westover ARB	REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	23,300		23,300
Def-Wide	MISSISSIPPI	Columbus AFB	REPLACE REFUELER PARKING FACILITY	2,600		2,600
Def-Wide	MISSISSIPPI	Gulfport	Medical Clinic Replacement	34,700		34,700
Def-Wide	MISSOURI	Arnold	Data Ctr West #1 Power & Cooling Upgrade	9,253		9,253
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF ADAL Simulator Facility	9,600		9,600
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF Aircraft Maintenance Squadron Facility	15,000		15,000
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF Apron And Taxiway	28,100		28,100
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF C–130 Squadron Operations Facility	10,941		10,941
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF C–130 Wash Rack Hangar	10,856		10,856
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF Hangar Aircraft Maintenance Unit	41,200		41,200
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF Squadron Operations Facility	17,300		17,300
Def-Wide	NEW YORK	Fort Drum	Dental clinic Addition/Alteration	4,700		4,700
Def-Wide	NEW YORK	Fort Drum	Medical Clinic	15,700		15,700
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	SOF Armory Facility Expansion	6,670		6,670
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Hospital Alteration	57,600		57,600
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Replace District Superintendant's Office	3,138		3,138
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Administrative Annex	12,000		12,000
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Battalion Operations Complex	23,478		23,478
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Battalion Operations Facility	41,000		41,000
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Brigade Headquarters	19,000		19,000
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Communications Training Complex	10,758		10,758
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Entry Control Point	2,300		2,300
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Group Headquarters	26,000		26,000
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Squadron HQ Addition	11,000		11,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	Replace Delalio Elementary School	22,687		22,687
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Pope AFB	SOF Training Facility	5,400		5,400
Def-Wide	OHIO	Columbus	Security Enhancements	10,000		10,000
Def-Wide	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	Replace Fuel Transfer Pipeline	8,200		8,200
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF Distribution Depot New Cumberland	Enclose Open-Sided Shed	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF Distribution Depot New Cumberland	Replace General Purpose Warehouse	25,500		25,500
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF Distribution Depot New Cumberland	UPGRADE ACCESS CONTROL POINTS	17,500		17,500
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	Philadelphia	Upgrade HVAC System	8,000		8,000
Def-Wide	SOUTH CAROLINA	Joint Base Charleston	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE & DISTRIBUTION FACILITY	24,868		24,868
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Hospital Replacement Incr 3	136,700	–50,000	86,700
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Ambulatory Care Center Phase 3	161,300		161,300
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Hospital Nutrition Care Department Add/Alt	33,000		33,000
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Menwith Hill Station	MHS PSC CONSTRUCTION GENERATOR PLANT	68,601		68,601
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	Royal Air Force Alconbury	Replace Alconbury High School	35,030		35,030
Def-Wide	UTAH	Camp Williams	IC CNCI Data Center 1 Inc 3	246,401		246,401
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Charlottesville	Remote Delivery Facility	10,805		10,805
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Dahlgren	Dahlgren E/MS School Addition	1,988		1,988
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	SOF Building Renovation	3,814		3,814
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	SOF Logistic Support Facility	14,402		14,402
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	SOF Military Working Dog Facility	4,900		4,900
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	Technology Center Third Floor Fit-out	54,625		54,625
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story	SOF Seal Team Operations Facility	37,000		37,000
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Heliport Control Tower/Fire Station	6,457		6,457

Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Pentagon Memorial Pedestrian Plaza	2,285		2,285
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Defense Access Road Improvements-Telegraph Rd	4,000		4,000
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Quantico	DSS Headquarters Addition	42,727		42,727
Def-Wide	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	REPLACE FUEL DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES	14,000		14,000
Def-Wide	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis McChord	SOF Company Operations Facility	21,000		21,000
Def-Wide	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	Replace Fuel Pipeline	25,000		25,000
Def-Wide	WEST VIRGINIA	Camp Dawson	REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	2,200		2,200
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Defense Access Roads	0	40,000	40,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Energy Conservation Investment Program	135,000		135,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Exercise Related Construction	8,417		8,417
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction	6,100		6,100
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	31,468		31,468
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	3,043		3,043
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	52,974		52,974
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	8,368		8,368
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	5,277		5,277
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	48,007		48,007

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	6,000		6,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	1,993		1,993
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SOF Land Acquisition	0	10,000	10,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Supporting Activities	0		0
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	8,876		8,876
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Milcon	6,365		6,365
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	66,974		66,974
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	227,498		227,498
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,571		6,571
Total Military Construction, Defense-Wide				**3,848,757**	**–143,300**	**3,705,457**
Chem Demil	COLORADO	Pueblo Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph XIII	15,338		15,338
Chem Demil	KENTUCKY	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Ph XII	59,974		59,974
Total Chemical Demilitarization Construction, Defense				**75,312**	**0**	**75,312**

NATO	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NATO Security Investment Program	Nato Security Investment Program	272,611		272,611
Total NATO Security Investment Program				**272,611**	**0**	**272,611**
Army NG	ALABAMA	Fort McClellan	Readiness Center PH2	16,500		16,500
Army NG	ARIZONA	Papago Military Reservation	Readiness Center	17,800		17,800
Army NG	ARKANSAS	Fort Chaffee	Convoy Live Fire/Entry Control Point Range	3,500		3,500
Army NG	CALIFORNIA	Camp Roberts	Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility	6,160		6,160
Army NG	CALIFORNIA	Camp Roberts	Utilities Replacement Ph1	32,000		32,000
Army NG	CALIFORNIA	Camp San Luis Obispo	Field Maintenance Shop	8,000		8,000
Army NG	COLORADO	Alamosa	Readiness Center	6,400		6,400
Army NG	COLORADO	Aurora	Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility	3,600		3,600
Army NG	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Barracks Complex (ORTC)	43,000		43,000
Army NG	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	Anacostia	US Property & Fiscal Office Add/Alt	5,300		5,300
Army NG	FLORIDA	Camp Blanding	Convoy Live Fire/Entry Control Point Range	2,400		2,400
Army NG	FLORIDA	Camp Blanding	Live Fire Shoot House	3,100		3,100
Army NG	GEORGIA	Atlanta	Readiness Center	11,000		11,000
Army NG	GEORGIA	Hinesville	Maneuver Area Training & Equipment Site Ph1	17,500		17,500
Army NG	GEORGIA	Macon	Readiness Center Ph1	14,500		14,500
Army NG	HAWAII	Kalaeloa	Readiness Center Ph1	33,000		33,000
Army NG	ILLINOIS	Normal	Readiness Center	10,000		10,000
Army NG	INDIANA	Camp Atterbury	Deployment Processing Facility	8,900		8,900
Army NG	INDIANA	Camp Atterbury	Operations Readiness Training Cmplx 2	27,000		27,000
Army NG	INDIANA	Camp Atterbury	Operations Readiness Training Complex 1	25,000		25,000
Army NG	INDIANA	Camp Atterbury	Railhead Expansion & Container Facility	21,000		21,000
Army NG	INDIANA	Indianapolis	JFHQ Add/Alt	25,700		25,700
Army NG	MAINE	Bangor	Readiness Center	15,600		15,600
Army NG	MAINE	Brunswick	Armed Forces Reserve Center	23,000		23,000
Army NG	MARYLAND	Dundalk	Readiness Center Add/Alt	16,000		16,000
Army NG	MARYLAND	La Plata	Readiness Center	9,000		9,000
Army NG	MARYLAND	Westminster	Readiness Center Add/Alt	10,400		10,400

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army NG	MASSACHUSETTS	Natick	Readiness Center	9,000		9,000
Army NG	MINNESOTA	Camp Ripley	Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	8,400		8,400
Army NG	MISSISSIPPI	Camp Shelby	Deployment Processing Facility	12,600		12,600
Army NG	MISSISSIPPI	Camp Shelby	Operational Readiness Training Cmplx Ph1	27,000		27,000
Army NG	MISSISSIPPI	Camp Shelby	Troop Housing (ORTC) Ph1	25,000		25,000
Army NG	NEBRASKA	Grand Island	Readiness Center	22,000		22,000
Army NG	NEBRASKA	Mead	Readiness Center	9,100		9,100
Army NG	NEVADA	Las Vegas	Field Maintenance Shop	23,000		23,000
Army NG	NEW JERSEY	Lakehurst	Army Aviation Suport Facility	49,000		49,000
Army NG	NEW MEXICO	Santa Fe	Readiness Center Add/Alt	5,200		5,200
Army NG	NORTH CAROLINA	Greensboro	Readiness Center Add/Alt	3,700		3,700
Army NG	OKLAHOMA	Camp Gruber	Live Fire Shoot House	3,000		3,000
Army NG	OKLAHOMA	Camp Gruber	Upgrade-Combined Arms Collective Training Fac	10,361		10,361
Army NG	OREGON	The Dalles	Readiness Center	13,800		13,800
Army NG	PUERTO RICO	Fort Buchanan	Readiness Center	57,000		57,000
Army NG	SOUTH CAROLINA	Allendale	Readiness Center Add/Alt	4,300		4,300
Army NG	UTAH	Camp Williams	Multi Purpose Machine Gun Range	6,500		6,500
Army NG	VIRGINIA	Fort Pickett	Combined Arms Collective Training Facility	11,000		11,000
Army NG	WEST VIRGINIA	Buckhannon	Readiness Center Ph1	10,000		10,000
Army NG	WISCONSIN	Camp Williams	Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facility	7,000		7,000
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance & Production Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance & Production Facilities	0	20,000	20,000
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UN-SPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operational Facilities	0	10,000	10,000

Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	20,671		20,671
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Training Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	11,700		11,700
Army NG	WYOMING	Cheyenne	Readiness Center	8,900		8,900
Total Military Construction, Army National Guard				**773,592**	**50,000**	**823,592**
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Fort Hunter Liggett	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun (MPMG)	5,200		5,200
Army Res	COLORADO	Fort Collins	Army Reserve Center	13,600		13,600
Army Res	ILLINOIS	Homewood	Army Reserve Center	16,000		16,000
Army Res	ILLINOIS	Rockford	Army Reserve Center/Land	12,800		12,800
Army Res	INDIANA	Lawrence	Army Reserve Center	57,000		57,000
Army Res	KANSAS	Kansas City	Army Reserve Center/Land	13,000		13,000
Army Res	MASSACHUSETTS	Attleboro	Army Reserve Center/Land	22,000		22,000
Army Res	MINNESOTA	Saint Joseph	Army Reserve Center	11,800		11,800
Army Res	MISSOURI	Weldon Springs	Army Reserve Center	19,000		19,000
Army Res	NEW YORK	Schenectady	Army Reserve Center	20,000		20,000
Army Res	NORTH CAROLINA	Greensboro	Army Reserve Center/Land	19,000		19,000
Army Res	SOUTH CAROLINA	Orangeburg	Army Reserve Center/Land	12,000		12,000
Army Res	WISCONSIN	Fort McCoy	Automated Record Fire Range	4,600		4,600
Army Res	WISCONSIN	Fort McCoy	Container Loading Facility	5,300		5,300
Army Res	WISCONSIN	Fort McCoy	Modified Record Fire Known Distance Range	5,400		5,400
Army Res	WISCONSIN	Fort McCoy	NCOA Phase III—Billeting	12,000		12,000
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	28,924		28,924
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,925		2,925
Total Military Construction, Army Reserve				**280,549**	**0**	**280,549**
N/MC Res	PENNSYLVANIA	Pittsburg	Armed Forces Reserve Center (Pittsburgh)	13,759		13,759

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
N/MC Res	TENNESSEE	Memphis	Reserve Training Center	7,949		7,949
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000		2,000
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning And Design	2,591		2,591
Total Military Construction, Navy and Marine Corps Reserve				**26,299**	**0**	**26,299**
Air NG	CALIFORNIA	Beale AFB	Wing Operations and Training Facility	6,100		6,100
Air NG	CALIFORNIA	Moffett Field	Replace Pararescue Training Facility	26,000		26,000
Air NG	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	TFI—F–22 Combat Aircraft Parking Apron	12,721	–12,721	0
Air NG	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	TFI—F–22 Flight Simulator Facility	19,800		19,800
Air NG	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	TFI—F–22 Weapons Load Crew Training Facilit	7,000		7,000
Air NG	INDIANA	Fort Wayne IAP	A–10 Facility Conversion—Munitions	4,000		4,000
Air NG	MARYLAND	Martin State Airport	TFI—C–27 Conversion - Squadron Operations	4,900		4,900
Air NG	MASSACHUSETTS	Otis ANGB	TFI—cNAF Beddown - Upgrade Facility	7,800		7,800
Air NG	OHIO	Springfield Beckley-MAP	Alter Predator Operations Center	6,700		6,700
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance & Production Facilities	0	20,000	20,000
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Operational Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	9,000		9,000
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	12,225		12,225
Total Military Construction, Air National Guard				**116,246**	**17,279**	**133,525**
AF Res	CALIFORNIA	March AFB	Airfield Control Tower/Base Ops	16,393		16,393

AF Res	SOUTH CAROLINA	Charleston AFB	TFI Red Horse Readiness & Trng Center	9,593		9,593
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	2,200		2,200
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Training Facilities	0	10,000	10,000
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,434		5,434
Total Military Construction, Air Force Reserve				**33,620**	**10,000**	**43,620**
FH Con Army	BELGIUM	Brussels	Land Purchase for GFOQ (10 units)	10,000		10,000
FH Con Army	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	Family Housing New Construction (26 units)	13,000		13,000
FH Con Army	GERMANY	Illesheim	Family Housing Replacement Construc(80 units)	41,000		41,000
FH Con Army	GERMANY	Vilseck	Family Housing New Construction (22 units)	12,000		12,000
FH Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements (276 units)	103,000		103,000
FH Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Family Housing P&D	7,897		7,897
Total Family Housing Construction, Army				**186,897**	**0**	**186,897**
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	14,256		14,256
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	204,426		204,426
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	105,668		105,668
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	54,728		54,728
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	605		605
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Privatization Support Costs	25,741		25,741

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	15,797		15,797
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	73,637		73,637
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Army				**494,858**	**0**	**494,858**
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Classified Improvements	50		50
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements	80,546		80,546
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	4,208		4,208
Total Family Housing Construction, Air Force				**84,804**	**0**	**84,804**
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	35,290		35,290
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Housing Privatization	47,571		47,571
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	80,775		80,775
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing Account	122		122
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance (RPMA & RPMC)	98,132		98,132
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance Account	2,001		2,001

FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	1,996		1,996
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	55,395		55,395
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	2,165		2,165
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	13,675		13,675
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	67,639		67,639
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Air Force				**404,761**	**0**	**404,761**
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Design	3,199		3,199
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Improvements	97,773		97,773
Total Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps				**100,972**	**0**	**100,972**
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	15,979		15,979
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	79,798		79,798
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	97,231		97,231
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	61,090		61,090
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	476		476
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Privatization Support Costs	28,582		28,582
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	14,510		14,510

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	70,197		70,197
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps				**367,863**	**0**	**367,863**
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	70		70
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	19		19
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	2,699		2,699
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	36,552		36,552
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	10,100		10,100
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	70		70
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance Of Real Property	546		546
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	347		347
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	30		30
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	280		280
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	10		10
Total Family Housing Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide				**50,723**	**0**	**50,723**

HOAP	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Homeowers Assistance Program	1,284		1,284
Total Homeowners Assistance Fund				**1,284**	**0**	**1,284**
FHIF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Family Housing Improvement Fund	2,184		2,184
Total DOD Family Housing Improvement Fund				**2,184**	**0**	**2,184**
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	COMM ADD 3: GALENA FOL, AK	933		933
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–100: PLANING, DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT	6,090		6,090
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–101: VARIOUS LOCATIONS	5,021		5,021
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–126: NSCS, ATHENS, GA	325		325
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–138: NAS BRUNSWICK, ME	421		421
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–157: MCSA KANSAS CITY, MO	1,442		1,442
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–158: NSA NEW ORLEANS, LA	2,056		2,056
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–172: NWS SEAL BEACH, CONCORD, CA	9,763		9,763
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–2: NS PASCAGOULA, MS	515		515
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–84: JRB WILLOW GROVE & CAMBRIA REG AP	196		196
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IND–106: KANSAS ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT, KS	45,769		45,769

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	House Change	House Agreement
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IND–110: MISSISSIPPI ARMY AMMO PLANT, MS	122		122
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IND–112: RIVER BANK ARMY AMMO PLANT, CA	320		320
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IND–117: DESERET CHEMICAL DEPOT, UT	34,011		34,011
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IND–119: NEWPORT CHEMICAL DEPOT, IN	467		467
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IND–120: UMATILLA CHEMICAL DEPOT, OR	9,092		9,092
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IND–122: LONE STAR ARMY AMMO PLANT, TX	19,367		19,367
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	INT–4: NGA ACTIVITIES	1,791		1,791
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MED–2: WALTER REED NMMC, BETHESDA, MD	18,586		18,586
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MED–57: BROOKS CITY BASE, TX	205		205
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT VARIOUS LOCATIONS	32,298		32,298
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PROGRAM MANAGEMENT VARIOUS LOCATIONS	828		828
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–113: FORT MONROE, VA	23,601		23,601
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–121: FORT GILLEM, GA	8,903		8,903

BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–131: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL -SE	250		250
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–166: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL—NW	1,000		1,000
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–167: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL—NE	250		250
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–168: USAR COMMAND AND CONTROL—SW	250		250
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–222: FORT MCPHERSON, GA	9,921		9,921
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–223: FORT MONMOUTH, NJ	21,908		21,908
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–242: RC TRANSFORMATION IN NY	259		259
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–36: RED RIVER ARMY DEPOT	1,207		1,207
BRAC 05	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	USA–63: U.S. ARMY GARRISON (SELFRIDGE)	1,609		1,609
Total Base Realignment and Closure Account 2005				**258,776**	**0**	**258,776**
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, AIR FORCE	Base Realignment & Closure	123,476		123,476
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, ARMY	Base Realignment & Closure	70,716		70,716
BRAC IV	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE, NAVY	Base Realignment & Closure	129,351		129,351
Total Base Realignment and Closure Account 1990				**323,543**	**0**	**323,543**
Total Military Construction				**14,766,047**	**–21**	**14,766,026**

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies			
Appropriation Summary:			
Energy Programs			
ENERGY SECURITY AND ASSURANCE	6,187		6,187
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National nuclear security administration:			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	7,629,716		7,629,716
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	2,549,492		2,549,492
NAVAL REACTORS	1,153,662		1,153,662
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	450,060		450,060
Total, National nuclear security administration	**11,782,930**	**0**	**11,782,930**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	5,406,781		5,406,781
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	859,952		859,952
DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL	0		0

Total, Environmental & other defense activities	6,266,733		6,266,733
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	18,049,663		18,049,663
Total, Discretionary Funding	**18,055,850**	**0**	**18,055,850**
Electricity Delivery & Energy Reliability			
Infrastructure security & energy restoration	6,187	**0**	6,187
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
B61 Life extension program	223,562		223,562
W76 Life extension program	257,035		257,035
Total, Life extension programs	**480,597**	**0**	**480,597**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	72,396		72,396
W76 Stockpile systems	63,383		63,383
W78 Stockpile systems	109,518		109,518
W80 Stockpile systems	44,444		44,444
B83 Stockpile systems	48,215		48,215
W87 Stockpile systems	83,943		83,943
W88 Stockpile systems	75,728		75,728
Total, Stockpile systems	**497,627**	**0**	**497,627**
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	56,770		56,770
Total, Weapons dismantlement and disposition	**56,770**	**0**	**56,770**
Stockpile services			
Production support	354,502		354,502
Research and development support	30,264		30,264
R&D certification and safety	190,892		190,892

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Management, technology, and production	198,700		198,700
Plutonium sustainment	154,231		154,231
Total, Stockpile services	**928,589**	**0**	**928,589**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**1,963,583**	**0**	**1,963,583**
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Advanced certification	94,929		94,929
Primary assessment technologies	86,055		86,055
Dynamic materials properties	111,836		111,836
Advanced radiography	27,058		27,058
Secondary assessment technologies	86,061		86,061
Total, Science campaign	**405,939**	**0**	**405,939**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	41,696		41,696
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	15,663		15,663
Nuclear survivability	19,545		19,545
Enhanced surveillance	66,174		66,174
Total, Engineering campaign	**143,078**	**0**	**143,078**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Ignition	109,888		109,888
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	86,259		86,259
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	4,997		4,997
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	9,100		9,100
Facility operations and target production	266,030		266,030

Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**476,274**	**0**	**476,274**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	**628,945**	**0**	**628,945**
Readiness Campaign			
Nonnuclear readiness	65,000		65,000
Tritium readiness	77,491		77,491
Total, Readiness campaign	**142,491**	**0**	**142,491**
Total, Campaigns	**1,796,727**	**0**	**1,796,727**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant	156,217		156,217
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	83,990		83,990
Los Alamos National Laboratory	318,526		318,526
Nevada Test Site	97,559		97,559
Pantex	164,848		164,848
Sandia National Laboratory	120,708		120,708
Savannah River Site	97,767		97,767
Y–12 National security complex	246,001		246,001
Institutional site support	199,638		199,638
Total, Operations of facilities	**1,485,254**	**0**	**1,485,254**
Program readiness	74,180		74,180
Material recycle and recovery	85,939		85,939
Containers	28,979		28,979
Storage	31,272		31,272
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,705,624**	**0**	**1,705,624**
Construction:			
12–D–301 TRU waste facilities, LANL	9,881		9,881
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project, LANL	19,402		19,402
10–D–501 Nuclear facilities risk reduction Y–12 National security complex, Oakridge, TN	35,387		35,387
09–D–404 Test capabilities revitalization II, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM	25,168		25,168

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
08–D–802 High explosive pressing facility Pantex Plant, Amarillo, TX	66,960		66,960
07–D–140 Project engineering and design (PED) various locations	3,518		3,518
06–D–141 Project engineering & design (PED) Y–12 National Security Complex, Oakridge, TN	160,194		160,194
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy facility replacement project, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM	300,000		300,000
Total, Construction	**620,510**	**0**	**620,510**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**2,326,134**	**0**	**2,326,134**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	149,274		149,274
Program direction	101,998		101,998
Total, Secure transportation asset	**251,272**	**0**	**251,272**
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	**222,147**		**222,147**
Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program			
Operations and maintenance	96,380		96,380
Total, Facilities and infrastructure recapitalization program	**96,380**	**0**	**96,380**
Site stewardship			
Operations and maintenance	104,002		104,002
Total, Site stewardship	**104,002**	**0**	**104,002**
Safeguards and security			
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	711,105		711,105
Construction:			

08–D–701 Nuclear materials S&S upgrade project Los Alamos National Laboratory	11,752		11,752
Total, Construction	**11,752**	**0**	**11,752**
Total, Defense nuclear security	**722,857**	**0**	**722,857**
Cyber security	126,614		126,614
Total, Safeguards and security	**849,471**	**0**	**849,471**
National security applications	**20,000**		20,000
Subtotal, Weapons activities	**7,629,716**	**0**	**7,629,716**
Adjustments			
Use of prior year balances	0		0
Total, Weapons Activities	**7,629,716**	**0**	**7,629,716**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Nonproliferation and verification R&D			
Operations and maintenance	417,598		417,598
Total, Operations and maintenance	**417,598**	**0**	**417,598**
Total, Nonproliferation & verification R&D	**417,598**	**0**	**417,598**
Nonproliferation and international security	**161,833**		**161,833**
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation	**571,639**		**571,639**
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition			
Operations and maintenance			
U.S. plutonium disposition	274,790		274,790
U.S. uranium disposition	26,435		26,435
Total, Operations and maintenance	**301,225**	**0**	**301,225**
Construction:			
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	385,172		385,172
99–D–141–01 Pit disassembly and conversion facility, Savannah River, SC	176,000		176,000
99–D–141–02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC	17,582		17,582

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, Construction	**578,754**	**0**	**578,754**
Total, U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition	**879,979**	**0**	**879,979**
Russian surplus materials disposition	10,174		10,174
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**890,153**	**0**	**890,153**
Global threat reduction initiative	508,269		508,269
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**2,549,492**	**0**	**2,549,492**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors development			
Operation and maintenance			
Operation and maintenance	1,069,262		1,069,262
Total, Operation and maintenance	**1,069,262**	**0**	**1,069,262**
Construction:			
10–D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL	100		100
10–D–904, NRF infrastructure upgrades, Idaho	12,000		12,000
08–D–190 Expended Core Facility M–290 recovering discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	27,800		27,800
Total, Construction	**39,900**	**0**	**39,900**
Total, Naval reactors development	**1,109,162**	**0**	**1,109,162**
Program direction	44,500		44,500
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,153,662**	**0**	**1,153,662**
Office Of The Administrator			
Office of the administrator	450,060		450,060
Congressionally directed projects	0		0
Subtotal, Office of the Administrator	**450,060**	**0**	**450,060**

Adjustments:			
Use of prior year balances	0		0
Subtotal, Office of the Administrator	**450,060**	**0**	**450,060**
Transfer of prior year balances (OMB scoring)	0		0
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**450,060**	**0**	**450,060**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	5,375		5,375
Total, Closure sites	**5,375**	**0**	**5,375**
Hanford site:			
Nuclear facility D&D—remainder of Hanford	56,288		56,288
Nuclear facility D&D river corridor closure project	330,534		330,534
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition PFP	48,458		48,458
SNF stabilization and disposition	112,250		112,250
Soil and water remediation—groundwater vadose zone	222,285		222,285
Solid waste stabilization and disposition 200 area	143,897		143,897
Total, Hanford site	**913,712**	**0**	**913,712**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
SNF stabilization and disposition—2012	20,114		20,114
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	165,035		165,035
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	110,169		110,169
Soil and water remediation—2012	87,451		87,451
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**382,769**	**0**	**382,769**
NNSA sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	873		873

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Nuclear facility D & D Separations Process Research Unit	1,500		1,500
Nevada	63,380		63,380
Los Alamos National Laboratory	357,939		357,939
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**423,692**	**0**	**423,692**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
Nuclear facility D & D ORNL	44,000		44,000
Nuclear facility D & D Y–12	30,000		30,000
Nuclear facility D & D, E. Tennessee technology park	100		100
OR reservation community and regulatory support Soil and water remediation—offsites	3,000		3,000
Solid waste stabilization and disposition—2012	99,000		99,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**176,100**	**0**	**176,100**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
ORP–0060 / Major construction Waste treatment plant (WTP)	840,000		840,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**840,000**	**0**	**840,000**
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	521,391		521,391
Total, Tank farm activities	**521,391**	**0**	**521,391**
Total, Office of River protection	**1,361,391**	**0**	**1,361,391**
Savannah River site:			
Nuclear material stabilization and disposition	235,000		235,000
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	748,896		748,896
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	170,071		170,071

SNF stabilization and disposition	40,137		40,137
Solid waste stabilization and disposition	30,040		30,040
Total, Savannah River site	**1,224,144**	**0**	**1,224,144**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	147,136		147,136
Central characterization project	23,975		23,975
Transportation	29,044		29,044
Community and regulatory support	28,771		28,771
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**228,926**	**0**	**228,926**
Program direction	321,628		321,628
Community, regulatory and program support	91,279		91,279
Safeguards and Security:			
Oak Ridge Reservation	17,300		17,300
Paducah	9,435		9,435
Portsmouth	16,412		16,412
Richland/Hanford Site	69,234		69,234
Savannah River Site	130,000		130,000
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,845		4,845
West Valley	1,600		1,600
Total, Safeguards and Security	**248,826**	**0**	**248,826**
Technology development	32,320		32,320
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,410,162**	**0**	**5,410,162**
Use of prior year balances	–3,381		–3,381
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,406,781**	**0**	**5,406,781**
Other Defense Activities			
Health, safety and security			
Health, safety and security	349,445		349,445

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2012 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Program direction	107,037		107,037
Total, Health, safety and security	**456,482**	**0**	**456,482**
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	157,514		157,514
Program direction	12,586		12,586
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**170,100**	**0**	**170,100**
Defense-related activities			
Infrastructure			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	98,500		98,500
Total, Defense-related activities	**98,500**	**0**	**98,500**
Defense related administrative support	118,836		118,836
Acquisitions workforce improvement	11,892		11,892
Office of hearings and appeals	4,142		4,142
Total, Other Defense Activities	**859,952**	**0**	**859,952**

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

MARCH 17, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find a draft of proposed legislation, titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012", which the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress.

The purpose of each provision in the proposed bill is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

MARCH 25, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find four legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-one to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 1, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find seven legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 7, 2011.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find eight legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH L. KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 12, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find three legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 15, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

Included in this transmittal is a proposal to transition future enrollees in the Uniformed Services Family Health Plan to TRICARE for Life once they become Medicare-eligible due to age. Because this proposal would affect direct spending, it is subject to Pay-As-You-Go (PAYGO) requirements. This proposal is estimated to decrease direct spending by $34 million over five years and $279 million over ten years, which would result in savings on the five- and ten-year PAYGO scorecards.

	Fiscal Years (dollars in millions)											
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Receipts:												
Outlays	.....	−1	−4	−12	−4	−13	−18	−29	−47	−63	−88	−279
Net Deficit impact	.....	−1	−4	−12	−4	−13	−18	−29	−47	−63	−88	−279

Also included in this transmittal is a proposal to allow funds collected for damage to all Government property controlled by the Department of Defense to be deposited into and obligated from the account responsible for the repair or replacement of the damaged

Government property. This proposal also affects direct spending and is therefore subject to PAYGO requirements. This proposal is estimated to increase direct spending by $10 million over five years and $20 million over ten years, which would result in costs on the five- and ten-year PAYGO scorecards.

	Fiscal Years (dollars in millions)											
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	Total
Receipts:												
Outlays	.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20
Net Deficit impact	.....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	20

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

MAY 3, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

MAY 6, 2011.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 112th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH KING,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs).

Enclosure: As Stated

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year of 2011.

Our Committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1540 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This is, of course, conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Further, I request your support for the appointment of Science, Space, and Technology Committee conferees during any House-Senate conference convened on this legislation. I also ask that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest be placed in the legislative report on H.R. 1540 and the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill.

I look forward to working with you on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

RALPH M. HALL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. RALPH HALL,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning the Committee on Natural Resources' jurisdiction interest in H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

To allow the Armed Services Committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, the Committee on Natural Resources will waive its right to a sequential referral of H.R. 1540. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Natural Resources does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill that fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee named to consider H.R. 1540.

I would appreciate you including this letter in the Armed Service Committee's report on H.R. 1540. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you and your able staff have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. DOC HASTINGS,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of House Veterans' Affairs Committee. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1540 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JEFF MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. JEFF MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 13, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. However, in order to expedite Floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee will not markup this bill.

The Committee takes this action with the mutual understanding that the Committee's jurisdiction over this, and similar legislation, is in no way diminished or altered. That understanding includes the agreement reached with the Armed Services Committee on the provisions provided under separate cover.

However, of particular concern to the Committee is Section 1034: Affirmation of Armed Conflict with al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated Forces.

The Committee agrees to the language in this provision. The Armed Services Committee has recognized, and reaffirmed in this exchange of letters, that the War Powers Resolution and associated Authorizations for the Use of Military Force, such as those contained in Public Law 107–40 (post-9/11) and Public Law 107–243 (Iraq), are within the primary jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Clause 1(i)(9) of Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that the Foreign Affairs Committee is assigned jurisdiction over "Intervention abroad and declarations of war." Authorizations for the use of military force (such as H.J. Res. 64 and H.J. Res. 114 in the 107th Congress) have been referred by the Parliamentarian solely to the Foreign Affairs Committee.

The Foreign Affairs Committee therefore requests that it be included in any briefing by any Executive Branch agency, including the Department of Defense, relating to the Authorization for the Use of Military Force, including operations or activities conducted pursuant to the Authorization of Use of Military Force.

The Committee reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation, and requests your support if such a request is made. I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1540 on the House Floor.

Sincerely,

ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write concerning H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration, I am willing to waive the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1540 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. MICA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. JOHN MICA,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing concerning H.R. 1540, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012." There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means under Rule X of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over part A of Title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), and a provision in H.R. 1540 concerning the transition of future Medicare eligible Uniformed Services Family Health Plan enrollees to TRICARE for life would fall within that jurisdiction. Additionally, a provision requiring the assessment of the national security risk of the United States' debt owned by the People's Republic of China would fall under the Committee's jurisdiction over the issuance and sale of bonded U.S. debt. Lastly, the Committee has jurisdiction over matters related to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and a provision amending grants made in lieu of tax credits under Section 1603 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 would also fall under the Committee's jurisdiction.

In order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, I am willing to waive this Committee's right to a sequential referral. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means' jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of conferees to any House-Senate conference and requests your support if such a request is made.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 1540, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. DAVE CAMP,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 10, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of Committee on the Judiciary in matters being considered in H.R. 1540, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions in H.R. 1540 that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I do not intend to request a sequential referral in order that this bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Judiciary Committee takes this action with our mutual understanding that by foregoing consideration of H.R. 1540 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will

be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues in our jurisdiction. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for any such request.

I appreciate your including this letter and a copy of your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest on this matter in your committee report and in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 1540.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you

urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1540 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. DARRELL ISSA,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Education and the Workforce in matters being considered in H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1540 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Education and the Workforce Committee also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm my understanding regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this legislation, the Committee waives consideration of those provisions in the jurisdiction of our Committee where we reviewed your language and reached an agreement on the wording. The provisions where we waiver our right to a referral include:

- The travel, transportation, pay, and bonus provisions for uniformed service members (Title VI);
- Assessment of High-Performance Computing (Sec. 31); and
- An amendment allowing utilities to pass through tax benefits to ratepayers in a lump sum.

For these negotiated provisions, the Committee on Energy and Commerce takes this action only with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. For any other provision that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and

Commerce and where our mutual Committees have not come to a resolution, I reserve the right to seek a referral of H.R. 1540 to consider those provisions.

The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the *Congressional Record* during consideration of H.R. 1540 on the House floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In recognition of the importance of expediting the passage of H.R. 1540, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012," the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence hereby waives further consideration of the bill. The Committee has jurisdictional interests in H.R. 1540, including intelligence and intelligence-related authorizations and provisions contained in the bill.

The Committee takes this action only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's jurisdictional interest over this bill or any similar bill and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future. In addition, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will seek conferees on any provisions of

the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the *Congressional Record* during the House debate on H.R. 1540. I appreciate the constructive work between our committees on this matter and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

MIKE ROGERS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. MIKE ROGERS,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 10, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing concerning the jurisdiction interest of the Committee on Financial Services in an amendment to be offered by Rep. Walter Jones at your scheduled markup of H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, on Wednesday, May 11, 2011. Rep. Jones' amendment would allow the military exchanges to have access to credit available through the Federal Financing Bank. As such, the amendment clearly falls within the Committee on Financial Services' jurisdiction over banks, banking, money and credit pursuant to rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1540 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while the Committee on Financial Services has jurisdiction over the subject matter of Rep. Jones' amendment under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I do not intend to request a sequential referral of the legislation if it includes the amendment. By agreeing

to waiver its right to a sequential referral of the bill, the Committee on Financial Services does not waive its jurisdiction over H.R. 1540 if Rep. Jones' amendment or other similar amendment is adopted. In addition, I make this commitment with the understanding that this will not prejudice the Committee on Financial Services with respect to its prerogatives on this or similar legislation. Further, the Committee on Financial Services reserves its authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. I ask your commitment to support any request by the Committee on Financial Services for conferees on H.R. 1540 or related legislation.

Lastly, I request that you include this letter and your response in your committee's report on and in the *Congressional Record* during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. SPENCER BACHUS,
Chairman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Financial Services has valid jurisdictional claims to a certain provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Financial Services is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within Rule X(p) of the Committee on Small Business.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the right of the Committee on Small Business to sequential referral as a result of the agreement to address my

concerns with respect to section 804 of the bill. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill the Committee on Small Business does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall with its Rule X(p) jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1540 and into the *Congressional Record* during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this issue and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

SAM GRAVES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. SAM GRAVES,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 12, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Budget. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on the Budget takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your

including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1540 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I agree that the Committee on the Budget has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Budget is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, May 4, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MCKEON: I write to you regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I am aware that there are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously with consideration of this important legislation, I am waiving the Committee on Homeland Security's jurisdiction pertaining to a sequential referral. However, I do so with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional claims over subject matters contained in this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of this committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter in the committee report on H.R. 1540 and into the *Congressional Record* during consideration of the measure

on the House floor. Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

PETER T. KING,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 16, 2011.

Hon. PETER KING,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012. I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman.

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2012 and each of the following five fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the committee cost estimate, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE

MAY 16, 2011.

Hon. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has completed a preliminary estimate of the direct spending effects of H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on May 11, 2011. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 1540, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

Based on legislative language for H.R. 1540 that was provided to CBO from May 9th through May 11th, CBO estimates that this bill would have an insignificant effect on direct spending in 2012 and would, on net, decrease such spending by $1 million over the 2012–2016 period and $3 million over the 2012–2021 period. The largest costs over that 10-year period would result from an increase in the special survivor allowance paid to certain beneficiaries of the military Survivor Benefit Plan, and from a change in the growth rate of enrollment fees charged to certain retirees who use TRICARE Prime, a health benefit plan for both active-duty and retired members of the uniformed services and their dependents.

Those costs would be offset by new receipts from additional sales of material in the National Defense Stockpile and savings from a provision to limit enrollment in the Uniformed Services Family Health Plan.

Enacting the bill would not affect revenues.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Schmit.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
Director.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

Pursuant to clause (3)(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344):

(1) This legislation does not provide budget authority subject to an allocation made pursuant to section 302(b) of Public Law 93–344;

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Estimate included in this report pursuant to clause (3)(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives contains CBO's projection of how this legislation will affect the levels of budget authority, budget outlays, revenues, and tax expenditures for fiscal year 2012 and for the ensuring five fiscal years; and

(3) The CBO Estimate does not identify any new budget authority for assistance to state and local governments by this measure at the time that this report was filed.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause (3)(d)(2)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Congressional Budget Office Estimate included in this report satisfies the requirement for the committee to include an estimate by the committee of the costs incurred in carrying out this bill.

ADVISORY OF EARMARKS

The committee finds that H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as reported, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

With respect to clause 3(c) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this legislation does not include any new spending or credit authority, nor does it provide for any increase or decrease in tax revenues or expenditures. The bill does, however, authorize appropriations. Other fiscal features of this legislation are addressed in the estimate prepared by the committee under clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the general goal and objective of H.R. 1540 is to meet the national security needs of a nation at war while preparing our warfighters for the threats of tomorrow wherever and whenever they might emerge. This legislation meets that goal while making the difficult choices of fiscal stewardship incumbent upon the Congress in a time of economic stress. Only by providing for the common defense in an efficient, fiscally responsible manner can the nation address the breathtaking size and scope of our national security challenges.

The bill mandates fiscal responsibility, transparency, and accountability within the Department of Defense.

The bill strengthens oversight of financial management at the Department of Defense and insists upon reliable financial statements. The bill establishes a financial management certification program, requires a financial management personnel competency assessment, and enhances oversight of the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan.

The bill sustains equipment and weapons systems vital to the success of our servicemen and women while taking steps to provide them more efficiently. The bill strengthens our military depots and arsenals and requires competition throughout the life-cycle of weapons systems.

The bill takes steps to enhance total workforce management at the Department of Defense with a holistic review of its manpower and elimination of arbitrary cost targets. The bill requires the Department of Defense to project the annual civilian personnel and contractor requirements for support services and determine the appropriate mix of military, civilian and contractor personnel to meet those projected requirements.

The bill reforms Department of Defense reporting requirements by repealing redundant or irrelevant reports and requiring electronic transmission of required reports to Congress.

The bill takes steps to strengthen the 2011 Quadrennial Roles and Missions Review in order to provide a solid basis for reducing waste while protecting the joint warfighting capability of the Department of Defense from arbitrary cuts. In recognition of the service and sacrifice of the men and women of our armed forces and

their families, the bill includes a 1.6 percent increase in military pay. While the bill does allow for modest increases in TRICARE fees, it recognizes the service of our servicemen and women as a down payment for their healthcare benefits. Therefore, the bill caps future fee increases to cost of living adjustments. The death of Osama bin Laden underscores the evolving and continuing nature of the terrorist threat to the United States. Therefore, the bill strengthens policies and procedures used to prosecute and detain terrorists. The bill affirms the President's authority pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force. The bill requires national security protocols governing detainee communications to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of classified information as well as the establishment of a reviews process to evaluate detentions at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The bill clarifies the right to plead guilty in a trial of a capital offense by military commission. The bill prohibits family member visitation of Guantanamo detainees. The bill prohibits the transfer or release of certain detainees to or within the United States, as well as to or within foreign countries or entities without certification from the Secretary of Defense. The bill also prohibits funds for the housing of Guantanamo detainees in the United States. The bill accounts for the warnings of top military leaders that the burden of federal debt is a national security concern that must be addressed. The bill requires a national security risk assessment on the amount of U.S. Federal debt owned by the People's Republic of China.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no federal intergovernmental mandates.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

No advisory committees within the meaning of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act are created by this legislation.

APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee finds that this legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104–1).

COMMITTEE VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 1540. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 1540 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60–1, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112th Congress
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 274 **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: Provides support and allows use, at no cost to US Government of property with the F-136 Engine

Offered by: Mr. Andrews

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers				Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich	X		
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens	X		
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson	X		
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor	X		
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton	X		
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	55	5	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 142 **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: **Guidelines regarding nuclear stockpiles.** **Offered by: Mr. Lamborn**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	35	26	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 261 **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: Reduction, consolidation, or withdrawal of US nuclear forces from Europe/NATO. **Offered by: Mr. Turner**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Mike Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	35	26	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 248R **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: Presidential requirements for changes to US nuclear employment strategy **Offered by: Dr. Fleming**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Mike Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	35	26	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 267 **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: **Second degree amendment to Ms. Sanchez amendment #227** **Offered by: Mr. Turner**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr.Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson		X		Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck		X		Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	33	28	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 250 **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: **Limitations of Administration on US missile defense international agreements** **Offered by: Mr. Turner**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	35	26	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 213R **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: **Pilot program on scholarships for military dependents with special needs** **Offered by: Mr. Hunter**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin			
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	26	34	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 210 **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: Requires all service chiefs to certify repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell **Offered by: Mr. Hunter**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner				Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson		X		Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	33	27	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 98R **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: **Defines 'marriage' as a legal union between one man and one woman throughout DOD** **Offered by: Mrs. Hartzler**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin			
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz		X	
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	39	22	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 205 **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: **Prohibits military facilities/ employees facilitating marriages except as provided by DoMA** **Offered by: Mr. Akin**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith		X	
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes		X	
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez		X	
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady		X	
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews		X	
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis		X	
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin		X	
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen		X	
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper		X	
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo		X	
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney		X	
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack		X	
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas		X	
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree		X	
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich		X	
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan		X	
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson		X	
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor		X	
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton		X	
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa		X	
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	38	23	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Amendment # 265 **Date: May 11, 2011**

Description: Strikes Section 1039 - Transfer of Guantanamo detainees to the U.S. **Offered by: Mr. Smith**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon		X		Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett				Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry		X		Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones		X		Mr. McIntyre		X	
Mr. Akin		X		Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes		X		Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller		X		Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson		X		Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo		X		Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner		X		Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline		X		Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers		X		Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks		X		Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster		X		Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway		X		Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Lamborn		X		Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Wittman		X		Mr. Kissell		X	
Mr. Hunter		X		Mr. Heinrich	X		
Dr. Fleming		X		Mr. Owens		X	
Mr. Coffman		X		Mr. Garamendi	X		
Mr. Rooney		X		Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Platts		X		Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Rigell		X		Mr. Ruppersberger		X	
Mr. Gibson		X		Mr. Johnson	X		
Mrs. Hartzler		X		Mr. Castor	X		
Dr. Heck		X		Mr. Sutton	X		
Mr. Schilling		X		Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Mr. Runyan		X					
Mr. Scott		X					
Mr. Griffin		X					
Mr. Palazzo		X					
Mr. West		X					
Mrs. Roby		X					
Mr. Brooks		X					
Mr. Young		X					

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	22	38	

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
112TH CONGRESS
ROLL CALL

Description: Final passage of H.R. 1540 and order to be reported, as amended **Date: May 11, 2011**

Rep.	Aye	No	Present	Rep.	Aye	No	Present
Mr. McKeon	X			Mr. Smith	X		
Mr. Bartlett	X			Mr. Reyes	X		
Mr. Thornberry	X			Ms. Sanchez	X		
Mr. Jones	X			Mr. McIntyre	X		
Mr. Akin	X			Mr. Brady	X		
Mr. Forbes	X			Mr. Andrews	X		
Mr. Jeff Miller	X			Mrs. S. Davis	X		
Mr. Wilson	X			Mr. Langevin	X		
Mr. LoBiondo	X			Mr. Larsen	X		
Mr. Turner	X			Mr. Cooper	X		
Mr. Kline	X			Ms. Bordallo	X		
Mr. Rogers	X			Mr. Courtney	X		
Mr. Franks	X			Mr. Loebsack	X		
Mr. Shuster	X			Ms. Giffords			
Mr. Conaway	X			Ms. Tsongas	X		
Mr. Lamborn	X			Ms. Pingree	X		
Mr. Wittman	X			Mr. Kissell	X		
Mr. Hunter	X			Mr. Heinrich	X		
Dr. Fleming	X			Mr. Owens	X		
Mr. Coffman	X			Mr. Garamendi		X	
Mr. Rooney	X			Mr. Critz	X		
Mr. Platts	X			Mr. Ryan	X		
Mr. Rigell	X			Mr. Ruppersberger	X		
Mr. Gibson	X			Mr. Johnson	X		
Mrs. Hartzler	X			Mr. Castor	X		
Dr. Heck	X			Mr. Sutton	X		
Mr. Schilling	X			Ms. Hanabusa	X		
Mr. Runyan	X						
Mr. Scott	X						
Mr. Griffin	X						
Mr. Palazzo	X						
Mr. West	X						
Mrs. Roby	X						
Mr. Brooks	X						
Mr. Young	X						

	Ayes	Noes	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	60	1	

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee has taken steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and will make the analysis available as soon as possible.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT J. WITTMAN

I have deep concerns regarding the increase in federal spending and growth of federal deficits. I believe spending in Washington has spiraled out of control. It is imperative that Congress turn its attention to controlling federal spending and addressing growing federal deficits. There is no question that efficiencies and savings should and can be found across the federal government and that tough decisions have to be made. However, the responsibility of curtailing our out of control spending should not solely ride on the shoulders of those who have sacrificed for their country, our nation's military members and veterans.

I am disappointed that the committee did not debate an amendment offered by Military Personnel Subcommittee Chairman Joe Wilson that would have stripped the increase in TRICARE Prime fees from the bill. I remain adamantly opposed to raising TRICARE fees or premiums on our veterans and current servicemembers. I have long held the belief that the benefits afforded our men and women in uniform have been earned through sacrifice and hardship. Of the benefits provided to our military members and retirees, one of the most important is the medical benefit. It is our job to protect the TRICARE system now and for future generations, as it is unique and designed to fulfill certain requirements that are not shared by the private sector.

Sadly, the TRICARE system as it exists today is not sustainable. Fees and copayments within the TRICARE system have not been increased since inception 16 years ago while the cost of medical care in our country has significantly increased. There is no doubt that TRICARE will not be sustainable into the future unless Congress implements a change today. While I am adamantly against changing the benefit for current military members and retirees, I believe we must explore options to ensure that TRICARE is viable for future servicemembers while holding current and near-term retirees harmless. We must maintain this Nation's commitment to support our bravest men and women who risk their lives to defend our freedom. The only way to keep our all volunteer force staffed with the best and brightest is honesty. Let us not break promises, and instead, let us focus on how to recalibrate the benefit for our nation's next generation of warriors.

ROB WITTMAN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE MIKE COFFMAN

Although I am supportive of House Resolution 1540, I remain concerned about some of the provisions in the bill. While I believe that the House Armed Services Committee has produced a bill that streamlines the operations of the Department of Defense and cuts unnecessary and redundant programs, there are still perfections to be made to this legislation.

I am specifically concerned about language in Section 215 of this bill that sends an ambiguous message to the Department of Defense and industry regarding the F–136 propulsion system for the F–35 Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter.

The Secretary of Defense and senior leadership of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps have repeatedly testified before the House Armed Services Committee that they do not require the F–136 engine and believe it to be an unnecessary and extravagant expense. Congress has also extensively analyzed and debated this issue, ultimately resolving to strip funding for the F–136 program in February 2011. I believe that this issue has been decided and any provision that sends an unclear message to the Department of Defense on Congress' view on the F–136 program will only cause further unnecessary spending.

I also believe that more should be done to end the outdated and unneeded Selective Service System. I am pleased the committee included an amendment that would require the Comptroller General to conduct a comprehensive study of the System, but I believe that will merely postpone the obvious.

The United States has not had a draft since 1973. In 1979, Jimmy Carter reinstated the requirement for men to register with Selective Service in response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. This requirement to register was meant to be for a limited period and has never been used. The Selective Service system has cost the taxpayers over $700 million since it was reinstated, and ending the program will result in annual savings of $25 million that can be used to pay down our national debt.

I will continue to press to end this System, but in the meantime I am confident this Government Accountability Office report will provide more proof that it is the right thing to do.

MIKE COFFMAN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE CHRIS GIBSON

I greatly appreciate the efforts made by the Chairman to address the shortcomings of the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review as identified in the Independent Panel chartered by the U.S. Congress. Earlier this year, the Administration came before the House Committee on Armed Services, and put forth a proposal to cut billions from the Department of Defense budget over a series of several years. While I believe that our country's federal debt represents a significant national security threat and concur that significant savings are possible, I was disappointed to learn that the Administration's proposed reductions were not supported by any significant long-term analysis of the nation's security threats, capabilities and priorities. The document tasked with providing this level of comprehensive analysis by law, the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), did not fully accomplish this purpose. Decisions regarding our security threats and capabilities should not be made without thorough supporting analysis, something the Independent Panel clearly identifies.

Going forward, my preference would be to adopt the Independent Panel's recommendation that moves us beyond the QDR, towards an Independent Strategic Review Panel comprised of experts appointed by the Executive and Legislative branches. The Strategic Review Panel would review the global security environment; assess the existing national security strategy; assess our roles, missions and organizations; and, in turn, provide a list of goals, recommendations and analysis that Congress and the Administration can use when adapting our national security strategy. In this way, the Strategic Review Panel would work in concert with the Planning Programming Budgeting and Execution Process at the Pentagon.

In closing, I wish to thank the Chairman, the ranking member, all the members of the committee, and the staff for their leadership and hard work. This is a bill we can all be proud of, and I look forward to working with the Committee to implement recommendations of the Independent Panel and to reform the national security establishment.

CHRIS GIBSON.