

such a critically important capability. The committee believes that advanced energetic technology crosses the domain of all the military departments and requires a consolidated and focused approach to enhance the capability across the Department.

#### Section 246—Study on Thorium-Liquid Fueled Reactors for Naval Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) to carry out a study on the use of thorium-liquid fueled nuclear reactors for naval power needs. The report would analyze and compare thorium liquid fueled reactors and uranium fueled reactors for safety, power requirements, and lifecycle costs. The Secretary and CJCS would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on their findings by February 1, 2011.

#### Section 247—Visiting National Institutes of Health Senior Neuroscience Fellowship Program

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to establish a visiting National Institutes of Health (NIH) neuroscience fellowship within the Department of Defense. The program would include fellowships with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the Defense Center of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury for the purposes of expanding collaboration with the NIH on neuroscience research. The period of any fellowship under this program should not last more than two years.

### TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

#### OVERVIEW

The budget request contained approximately \$185.7 billion in operation and maintenance funds to ensure that the Department of Defense can train, deploy, and sustain U.S. military forces. The budget request increased the operation and maintenance account by \$6.6 billion over the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, resulting in a 3.7 percent increase after accounting for inflation. The committee commends the Department for applying additional resources to the readiness accounts in fiscal year 2010, but overall readiness remains tenuous and further attention will be needed in subsequent fiscal years to return U.S. forces to full-spectrum preparedness.

By relying upon Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding to achieve air, ground, and sea training at levels required to maintain military standards, the fiscal year 2010 budget request essentially leaves training at a steady state. Vital to training for the full-spectrum mission are Combat Training Center rotations, sustained air crew training, and increased ship-deployed steaming days. The fiscal year 2010 budget request slightly increases tank training miles to 550 (from 547 funded in fiscal year 2009). Flying hours slightly increase for the Navy. The Air Force's flying-hour program has been reduced by \$67.0 million, or 52,000 hours, due to the retirement of roughly 250 aircraft. Additionally, the Navy

will rely upon OCO funding to achieve 58 ship underway, or steaming, days per quarter.

The Army budget request of \$83.4 billion represents an increase of \$600.0 million over last year's request. This increase is achieved, in part, by the movement of a number of items between the base budget authorization and the OCO request. This flat-lining of operation and maintenance funding comes at a time when the Army's readiness to meet threats across the full spectrum of conflict remains poor. Readiness reports since 2003 have shown a continual downward trend in full-mission readiness ratings. The Army remains under significant strain to meet current requirements in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan in terms of equipment and personnel.

Because of ongoing requirements in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Navy today has more officers and sailors (10,743) on the ground serving as individual augmentees than it has at sea in the Central Command area of responsibility. The Department of the Navy's budget request is \$600.0 million above last year's request. With the funding requested, Navy and Marine Corps pilots both achieve their training goals, but fleet replacement squadrons are budgeted well below their monthly flying-hour goal. Navy aircraft depot maintenance is expected to cover 100 percent of the primary authorized aircraft goal for deployed squadrons' airframes and 97 percent of non-deployed squadrons' airframes, but the budget request of \$5.3 billion for ship maintenance leaves \$186.0 million in deferred maintenance.

Of the Marine Corps' current active end strength of 200,931, some 28,000 are on deployment or forward deployed, including 5,686 in Afghanistan and the majority (16,585) still in Iraq. Specific increases in the Marine Corps budget request were driven primarily by the movement of family support programs out of the OCO request and into the baseline. Receipt of the requested \$554.0 million in OCO funding is critical to reducing risk in Marine Corps depot maintenance which funds the reset of the combat equipment supporting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Department of the Navy budget documents state that Marine Corps equipment is being used at seven times its peacetime rate.

Air Force readiness continues to decline due to the high operational tempo required by ongoing overseas contingency operations. Of the 27,000 airmen deployed to Central Command, 6,600 are providing support for Army and Marine Corps ground combat operations in a variety of roles, including explosive ordnance disposal, military police operations, and logistics support. Since September 11, 2001, the Air Force has flown more than 570,000 sorties, including 50,000 to directly protect the United States. The Air Force has committed more than 250 aircraft to support Central Command combat operations and has been flying more than 200 sorties per day. This high utilization of aging Air Force assets has resulted in readiness rates that are 17 percent below unit operational readiness rates prior to September 11, 2001.

After more than seven years of continuous combat operations, skills not required for the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan have atrophied and will take time to restore once the troops are allowed sufficient dwell time. Readiness will improve in the out years only with intensive management and resourcing as the services require

funding to reset equipment and retrain their forces. The committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to use every available authority to accelerate restoration of a strong readiness posture to reduce risk as soon as possible.

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	Operation and Maintenance, Army			
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
	<b><u>LAND FORCES</u></b>			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,020,490		1,020,490
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	105,178		105,178
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	708,038		708,038
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	718,233		718,233
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,379,529	2,000	1,381,529
	M-Gator		[2,000]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	850,750	8,000	858,750
	MI-17 Aircraft Modifications		[8,000]	
	<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u></b>			
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,088,233		2,088,233
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	633,704	1,000	634,704
	Operational and Technical Training Validation for Joint Maneuver Forces at Fort Bliss		[1,000]	
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	692,601	5,000	697,601
	Texas Defense Manufacturing Supply Chain Initiative		[5,000]	
	<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u></b>			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,586,455	1,700	7,588,155
	Fort Bliss Data Center		[1,700]	

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION Increase in Sustainment to 100%	2,221,446	244,000 [244,000]	2,465,446
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	333,119		333,119
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	123,163		123,163
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES Transfer from Title I	0	237,750 [237,750]	237,750
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	0		0
160	RESET	0		0
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	460,159		460,159
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>18,921,098</b>	<b>499,450</b>	<b>19,420,548</b>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u></b>			
	<b><u>MOBILITY OPERATIONS</u></b>			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	228,376		228,376
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	98,129		98,129
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	5,705		5,705
	<b>TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION</b>	<b>332,210</b>		<b>332,210</b>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
	<b><u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u></b>			

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	125,615		125,615
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	87,488		87,488
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	59,302		59,302
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	449,397		449,397
	<b><u>BASIC SKILL/ ADVANCE TRAINING</u></b>			
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	970,777		970,777
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	843,893		843,893
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	166,812		166,812
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	702,031		702,031
	<b><u>RECRUITING/OTHER TRAINING</u></b>			
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	541,852		541,852
300	EXAMINING	147,915		147,915
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	238,353		238,353
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	217,386		217,386
330	JUNIOR ROTC	156,904	13,000	169,904
	Junior ROTC		[13,000]	
	<b>TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	<b>4,707,725</b>	<b>13,000</b>	<b>4,720,725</b>

**BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES**

**SECURITY PROGRAMS**

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
340	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,017,055		1,017,055
	<b><u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u></b>			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	540,249		540,249
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	614,093		614,093
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	481,318	3,000	484,318
	Operational and Tactical Logistics Asset Visibility (Fuel/Ammo)		[3,000]	
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	434,661	1,000	435,661
	M24 Sniper Weapons System Upgrade		[1,000]	
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
390	ADMINISTRATION	776,866		776,866
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,166,491		1,166,491
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	289,383		289,383
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	221,779		221,779
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	993,852		993,852
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	215,168		215,168
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	118,785		118,785
	<b><u>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</u></b>			
460	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	430,449	10,000	440,449
	NATO Special Operations Coordination Center		[10,000]	
470	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	13,700		13,700

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	7,313,849	14,000	7,327,849
	<b><u>UNDISTRIBUTED</u></b>			
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		-402,900	-402,900
	Fuel Reduction		[-340,000]	
			[-62,900]	
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Army</b>	<b>31,274,882</b>	<b>123,550</b>	<b>31,398,432</b>
	<b>Operation and Maintenance, Navy</b>			
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
	<b><u>AIR OPERATIONS</u></b>			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	3,814,000		3,814,000
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	120,868		120,868
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	52,259		52,259
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	121,649		121,649
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	485,321		485,321
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,057,747	195,000	1,252,747
	Aviation Depot Maintenance		[195,000]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	32,083		32,083
	<b><u>SHIP OPERATIONS</u></b>			

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
080	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,320,222		3,320,222
090	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	699,581		699,581
100	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,296,544	186,000	4,482,544
	Ship Depot Maintenance		[186,000]	
110	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,170,785	1,500	1,172,285
	Ship Life Assessment Pilot Program		[1,500]	
	<b><u>COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT</u></b>			
120	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	601,595		601,595
130	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	86,019		86,019
140	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	167,050		167,050
150	WARFARE TACTICS	407,674		407,674
160	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	315,228		315,228
170	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	758,789	1,000	759,789
	Navy Tactical Development		[1,000]	
180	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	186,794		186,794
190	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,305		3,305
200	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	167,789		167,789
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	259,188		259,188
	<b><u>WEAPONS SUPPORT</u></b>			
220	CRUISE MISSILE	131,895		131,895
230	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,145,020		1,145,020
240	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	64,731		64,731

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
250	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	448,777		448,777
260	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	326,535		326,535
	<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
270	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	1,095,587		1,095,587
280	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION Increase in Sustainment to 100%	1,746,418	148,000 [148,000]	1,894,418
290	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,058,046		4,058,046
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>27,141,499</b>	<b>531,500</b>	<b>27,672,999</b>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u></b>			
	<b><u>READY RESERVE AND POSITIONING FORCES</u></b>			
300	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	407,977		407,977
	<b><u>ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS</u></b>			
310	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	7,491		7,491
320	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	192,401		192,401
	<b><u>MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS</u></b>			
330	FLEET HOSPITAL PROGRAM	24,546		24,546
340	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,409		2,409
350	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	25,727		25,727

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b>TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION</b>	<b>660,551</b>		<b>660,551</b>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
	<b><u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u></b>			
360	OFFICER ACQUISITION	145,027		145,027
370	RECRUIT TRAINING	11,011		11,011
380	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	127,490		127,490
	<b><u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u></b>			
390	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	477,383	1,500	478,883
	Mobile Learning Cultural Training for Military Personnel		[1,500]	
400	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,268,846		1,268,846
410	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	161,922		161,922
420	TRAINING SUPPORT	158,685		158,685
	<b><u>RECRUITING, AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u></b>			
430	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	276,564	651	277,215
	Navy Sea Cadet Corps		[651]	
440	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	154,979		154,979
450	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	101,556		101,556
460	JUNIOR ROTC	49,161	4,900	54,061
	Junior ROTC		[4,900]	

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b>TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	2,932,624	7,051	2,939,675
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
470	ADMINISTRATION	768,048		768,048
480	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	6,171		6,171
490	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	114,675		114,675
500	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	182,115		182,115
510	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	298,729		298,729
520	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	408,744		408,744
530	MEDICAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
				259
	<b><u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT</u></b>			
540	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	246,989		246,989
550	ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS	0		0
560	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	244,337	3,000	247,337
	Mobile Condition Assessment System Pilot for Commander, Navy Region Hawaii		[3,000]	
570	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	778,501		778,501
580	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	60,223		60,223
590	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	17,328		17,328
600	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	79,065		79,065

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>INVESTIGATIONS AND SECURITY PROGRAMS</u></b>			
610	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	515,989		515,989
	<b><u>SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS</u></b>			
670	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES International Headquarters and Agencies	5,918	-2,500 [-2,500]	3,418
	<b><u>CANCELLED ACCOUNTS</u></b>			
680	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
690	JUDGMENT FUND	0		0
	<b><u>OTHER PROGRAMS</u></b>			
999	OTHER PROGRAMS	608,840		608,840
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>4,335,672</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>4,336,172</b>
	<b><u>UNDISTRIBUTED</u></b>			
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		-278,400	-278,400
	Fuel Reduction		[-166,000] [-112,400]	
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy</b>	<b>35,070,346</b>	<b>260,651</b>	<b>35,330,997</b>

Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
	<b><u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u></b>			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	730,931	11,600	742,531
	Cold Weather Layering System		[2,600]	
	Flame Resistant Organizational Gear		[5,000]	
	Ultra Lightweight Camouflage Net System		[4,000]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	591,020		591,020
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	80,971		80,971
				261
	<b><u>USMC PREPOSITIONING</u></b>			
050	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	72,182		72,182
060	NORWAY PREPOSITIONING	5,090		5,090
	<b><u>COMBAT OPERATIONS/SUPPORT</u></b>			
070	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	0		0
	<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
080	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	666,330		666,330
090	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,250,191		2,250,191
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>4,396,715</b>	<b>11,600</b>	<b>4,408,315</b>

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
	<b><u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u></b>			
100	RECRUIT TRAINING	16,129		16,129
110	OFFICER ACQUISITION	418		418
	<b><u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u></b>			
120	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	67,336		67,336
130	FLIGHT TRAINING	369		369
140	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	28,112		28,112
150	TRAINING SUPPORT	330,885		330,885
				262
	<b><u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</u></b>			
160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	240,832		240,832
170	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	64,254		64,254
180	JUNIOR ROTC Junior ROTC	19,305	1,000 [1,000]	20,305
	<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
190	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION Increase in Sustainment to 100%	0	66,000 [66,000]	66,000
200	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	<b>767,640</b>	<b>67,000</b>	<b>834,640</b>

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
210	SPECIAL SUPPORT	299,065		299,065
220	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	28,924		28,924
230	ADMINISTRATION	43,879		43,879
	<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
240	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, AND MODERNIZATION	0		0
250	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>371,868</b>		<b>371,868</b>
	<b><u>UNDISTRIBUTED</u></b>			
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		-44,000	-44,000
	Fuel Reduction		[-35,000]	[-9,000]
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps</b>	<b>5,536,223</b>	<b>34,600</b>	<b>5,570,823</b>
	<b>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force</b>			
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>AIR OPERATIONS</u></b>			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	4,017,156	145,700	4,162,856
	Advanced Autonomous Robotic Inspections for Aging Aircraft		[2,000]	
	Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements		[143,700]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	2,754,563		2,754,563
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,414,913	135,055	1,549,968
	Air Education and Training Command Range Improvements		[4,555]	
	Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements		[130,500]	
050	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,389,738	-3,600	2,386,138
	Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements		[-3,600]	
060	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,420,083	289,000	1,709,083
	Increase in Sustainment to 100%		[289,000]	
070	BASE SUPPORT	2,859,943	240	2,860,183
	Wage Modification for US Azores Portuguese National Employees		[240]	
	<b><u>COMBAT RELATED OPERATIONS</u></b>			
080	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	1,411,813		1,411,813
090	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	880,353	4,000	884,353
	Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements		[4,000]	
110	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	552,148		552,148
	<b><u>SPACE OPERATIONS</u></b>			
120	LAUNCH FACILITIES	356,367		356,367

264

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
130	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	725,646		725,646
	<b><u>COCOM</u></b>			
140	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	608,796		608,796
150	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	216,073		216,073
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>19,607,592</b>	<b>570,395</b>	<b>20,177,987</b>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 02: MOBILIZATION</u></b>			
	<b><u>MOBILITY OPERATIONS</u></b>			
160	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS Warner Robins Air Logistics Center Strategic Airlift Aircraft Availability Improvements Fee for Service Refueling	2,932,080	-8,000 [2,000] [-10,000]	2,924,080
170	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	211,858		211,858
180	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	332,226		332,226
190	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	362,954		362,954
200	BASE SUPPORT	657,830		657,830
	<b>TOTAL, BA 02: MOBILIZATION</b>	<b>4,496,948</b>	<b>-8,000</b>	<b>4,488,948</b>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
	<b><u>ACCESSION TRAINING</u></b>			

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	120,870		120,870
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	18,135		18,135
230	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	88,414		88,414
240	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	372,788		372,788
250	BASE SUPPORT	685,029		685,029
	<b><u>BASIC SKILLS AND ADVANCED TRAINING</u></b>			
260	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	514,048		514,048
270	FLIGHT TRAINING	833,005		833,005
280	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	215,676		215,676
290	TRAINING SUPPORT	118,877		118,877
300	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	576		576
				266
	<b><u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION</u></b>			
320	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	152,983		152,983
330	EXAMINING	5,584		5,584
340	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	188,198		188,198
350	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	174,151		174,151
360	JUNIOR ROTC	67,549	4,500	72,049
	Junior ROTC		[4,500]	
	<b>TOTAL, BA 03: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	<b>3,555,883</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>3,560,383</b>

**BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION & SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES**

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u></b>			
370	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,055,672		1,055,672
380	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	735,036	-36,000	699,036
	Service-wide Technical Support		[-36,000]	
400	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	15,411		15,411
410	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	359,562		359,562
420	BASE SUPPORT	1,410,097		1,410,097
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
430	ADMINISTRATION	646,080	-54,700	591,380
	Service-wide Administration		[-54,700]	
440	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	581,951		581,951
450	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,062,803	-53,000	1,009,803
	Service-wide Other Activities		[-53,000]	
460	CIVIL AIR PATROL	22,433		22,433
	<b><u>SECURITY PROGRAMS</u></b>			
470	SECURITY PROGRAMS	1,148,704		1,148,704
	<b><u>SUPPORT TO OTHER NATIONS</u></b>			
480	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	49,987		49,987
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>7,087,736</b>	<b>-143,700</b>	<b>6,944,036</b>

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>UNDISTRIBUTED</u></b>			
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		-719,700	-719,700
	USAF Civilian Underexecution		[-128,000]	
	Fuel Reduction		[-400,000]	
			[-191,700]	
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force</b>	<b>34,748,159</b>	<b>-296,505</b>	<b>34,451,654</b>
	<b>Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide</b>			
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
	<b><u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	457,169		457,169
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	3,611,492	2,500	3,613,992
	Special Operations Forces Modular Glove System		[2,500]	
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 1:</b>	<b>4,068,661</b>	<b>2,500</b>	<b>4,071,161</b>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: TRAINING AND RECRUITING</u></b>			
	<b><u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	115,497		115,497

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
<b><u>RECRUITING AND OTHER TRAINING EDUCATION</u></b>				
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	103,408		103,408
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 3:</b>	<b>218,905</b>		<b>218,905</b>
<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: ADMIN &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>				
<b><u>DEFENSEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>				
050	AMERICAN FORCES INFORMATION SERVICE	0		0
060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	132,231	27,000	159,231
	National Guard Youth Challenge Program		[20,000]	
	Starbase		[7,000]	
080	CLASSIFIED AND INTELLIGENCE	0		0
090	DEFENSE BUSINESS TRANSFORMATION AGENCY	139,579		139,579
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	458,316		458,316
110	DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICE	0		0
120	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	665,743		665,743
130	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,322,163		1,322,163
150	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES	42,532		42,532
160	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	405,873	9,000	414,873
	Procurement and Technical Assistance Program		[9,000]	
170	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	253,667		253,667
180	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	20,679		20,679

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
190	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY AGENCY	34,325		34,325
200	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	385,453		385,453
210	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION AGENCY	2,302,116	14,400	2,316,516
	SoAR Recruiting Initiative		[3,400]	
	Increase DoDEA Schools Sustainment to 100%		[11,000]	
220	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,058,721		1,058,721
230	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	721,756		721,756
240	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	497,857		497,857
	NATIONAL GUARD BORDER SECURITY	0		0
260	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	37,166	68,000	105,166
	Impact Aid		[65,000]	
	Redevelopment of Naval Station Ingleside		[3,000]	
270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,955,985	671,386	2,627,371
	Transfer from Title XIV		808,386	
	Corrosion Prevention and Control		[6,000]	
	Critical Language Training		[2,000]	
	Reduction to Security and Stabilization Assistance		[-175,000]	
	Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative		[20,000]	
	Tools for Implementation of Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009		[10,000]	
280	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICE	589,309		589,309
	<b><u>OTHER PROGRAMS</u></b>			
999	OTHER PROGRAMS	13,046,209		13,046,209

270

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b>TOTAL, BUDGET ACTIVITY 4:</b>	<b>24,069,680</b>	<b>789,786</b>	<b>24,859,466</b>
	<b><u>UNDISTRIBUTED</u></b>			
	Unobligated Balances Estimate		-133,000	-133,000
	Fuel Reduction		[-124,000]	
			[-9,000]	
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide</b>	<b>28,357,246</b>	<b>659,286</b>	<b>29,016,532</b>
	<b>Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve</b>			
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</u></b>			
	<b><u>LAND FORCES</u></b>			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,403		1,403
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	12,707		12,707
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	468,288		468,288
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	152,439		152,439
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	520,420		520,420
060	AVIATION ASSETS	61,063		61,063
	<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u></b>			
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	290,443		290,443
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	106,569		106,569

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	94,499		94,499
	<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u></b>			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	522,310		522,310
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	234,748		234,748
120	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>2,464,889</b>		<b>2,464,889</b>
	<b><u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS</u></b>			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	9,291		9,291
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
140	ADMINISTRATION	72,075		72,075
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,635		3,635
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	9,104		9,104
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	61,202		61,202
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>155,307</b>		<b>155,307</b>
	<b><u>UNDISTRIBUTED</u></b>			
	Unobligated Balances Estimate	0	-48,000	-48,000
			[-48,000]	
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve</b>	<b>2,620,196</b>	<b>-48,000</b>	<b>2,572,196</b>

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
	<b><u>AIR OPERATIONS</u></b>			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	570,319		570,319
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	16,596		16,596
030	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	3,171		3,171
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	125,004		125,004
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	397		397
				273
	<b><u>SHIP OPERATIONS</u></b>			
060	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	55,873		55,873
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	592		592
080	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	41,899	14,000	55,899
	Ship Depot Maintenance		[14,000]	
	<b><u>COMBAT OPERATIONS SUPPORT</u></b>			
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,241		15,241
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	142,924		142,924
	<b><u>WEAPONS SUPPORT</u></b>			

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
110	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	5,494		5,494
	<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	83,611		83,611
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	69,853		69,853
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	124,757		124,757
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>1,255,731</b>	<b>14,000</b>	<b>1,269,731</b>
	<b><u>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
150	ADMINISTRATION	3,323		3,323
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	13,897		13,897
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,957		1,957
180	OTHER SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT	0		0
	<b><u>LOGISTICS OPERATIONS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT</u></b>			
190	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,593		3,593
	<b><u>CANCELLED ACCOUNTS</u></b>			
200	CANCELLED ACCOUNT ADJUSTMENTS	0		0
210	JUDGMENT FUND	0		0

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>OTHER PROGRAMS</u></b>			
999	OTHER PROGRAMS	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	22,770		22,770
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,278,501	14,000	1,292,501
	Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
	<b><u>EXPEDITIONARY FORCES</u></b>			
010	OPERATING FORCES	61,117		61,117
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	13,217		13,217
030	TRAINING SUPPORT	29,373		29,373
	<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
040	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	25,466		25,466
050	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	73,899		73,899
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	203,072		203,072
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
060	SPECIAL SUPPORT	5,639		5,639
070	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	818		818
080	ADMINISTRATION	10,642		10,642
090	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,754		8,754
	<b><u>BASE SUPPORT</u></b>			
100	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>25,853</b>		<b>25,853</b>
	Total Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	<b>228,925</b>		<b>228,925</b>
	<b>Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve</b>			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
	<b><u>AIR OPERATIONS</u></b>			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	2,049,303	10,800	2,060,103
	Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements		[10,800]	
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	121,417	-1,500	119,917
	Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements		[-1,500]	

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	441,958		441,958
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	78,763		78,763
050	BASE SUPPORT	258,091		258,091
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>2,949,532</b>	<b>9,300</b>	<b>2,958,832</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
060	ADMINISTRATION	77,476		77,476
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	24,553		24,553
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	20,838		20,838
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,121		6,121
100	AUDIOVISUAL	708		708
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>129,696</b>		<b>129,696</b>
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve</b>	<b>3,079,228</b>	<b>9,300</b>	<b>3,088,528</b>
	<b>Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard</b>			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>			

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b><u>LAND FORCES</u></b>			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	876,269		876,269
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	173,843		173,843
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	615,160		615,160
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	253,997		253,997
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	34,441	2,200	36,641
	Modular Shoot House		[2,200]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	819,031	2,250	821,281
	Joint Command Vehicle and Supporting C3 Systems		[2,250]	
	<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS</u></b>			
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	436,799		436,799
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	99,757		99,757
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	379,646		379,646
	<b><u>LAND FORCES READINESS SUPPORT</u></b>			
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	798,343	5,100	803,443
	North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers		[1,600]	
	Our Military Kids		[3,500]	
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION, & MODERNIZATION	580,171	300	580,471
	Camp Ethan Allen Training Site Road Equipment		[300]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ	573,452		573,452
130	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	0		0

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>5,640,909</b>	<b>9,850</b>	<b>5,650,759</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE SUPPORT</u></b>			
140	ADMINISTRATION	119,186		119,186
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS Emergency Management Staff Trainer Distributed Learning Courseware	48,020	2,000 [2,000]	50,020
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,920		7,920
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	440,999		440,999
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>616,125</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>618,125</b>
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard</b>	<b>6,257,034</b>	<b>11,850</b>	<b>6,268,884</b>
	<b>Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard</b>			
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>			
	<b><u>AIR OPERATIONS</u></b>			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS MBU-20A/P Oxygen Mask and Mask Light Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements	3,347,685	33,700 [6,000] [27,700]	3,381,385

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	779,917		779,917
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	780,347		780,347
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	302,949		302,949
050	BASE SUPPORT	606,916		606,916
	<b>TOTAL, BA 01: OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>5,817,814</b>	<b>33,700</b>	<b>5,851,514</b>
	<b>BUDGET ACTIVITY 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
	<b><u>SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</u></b>			
060	ADMINISTRATION	35,174		35,174
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	32,773		32,773
	<b>TOTAL, BA 04: ADMINISTRATION &amp; SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>67,947</b>		<b>67,947</b>
	<b>Total Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard</b>	<b>5,885,761</b>	<b>33,700</b>	<b>5,919,461</b>
	<b>MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS</b>			
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,932		13,932
010	ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND	100,000		100,000
010	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	109,869		109,869
010	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	404,093	30,000	434,093
	Program Increase		[30,000]	

**Title III - Operation and Maintenance**  
(Dollars in Thousands)

<u>Line</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>FY 2010 Request</u>	<u>House Change</u>	<u>House Authorized</u>
020	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	415,864		415,864
030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	285,869		285,869
040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	494,276		494,276
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	11,100		11,100
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	267,700		267,700
070	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000		5,000
080	IRAQ FREEDOM FUND	0		0
	<b>TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS</b>	<b>2,107,703</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>2,137,703</b>
	<b>TOTAL TITLE III -- OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>	<b>156,444,204</b>	<b>832,432</b>	<b>157,276,636</b>

## ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

## BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

The committee recommends the following adjustments to the fiscal year 2010 amended budget request:

Operation and Maintenance, Army Adjustments:	
BA 1 M-Gator .....	+2.0
BA 1 Operational & Technical Training Validation for Joint Maneuver Forces at Fort Bliss .....	+1.0
BA 1 Texas Defense Manufacturing Supply Chain Initiative .....	+5.0
BA 1 Fort Bliss Data Center .....	+1.7
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100% .....	+244.0
BA 1 Transfer from Title I .....	+237.8
BA 1 MI-17 Aircraft Modifications .....	+8.0
BA 3 Junior ROTC .....	+13.0
BA 4 Operational and Tactical Logistics Asset Visibility (Fuel/Ammo) .....	+3.0
BA 4 M24 Sniper Weapons System Upgrade .....	+1.0
BA 4 NATO Special Operations Coordination Center .....	+10.0
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate .....	(340.0)
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction .....	(62.9)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Adjustments:	
BA 1 Aviation Depot Maintenance .....	+195.0
BA 1 Ship Depot Maintenance .....	+186.0
BA 1 Ship Life Assessment Pilot Program .....	+1.5
BA 1 Navy Tactical Development .....	+1.0
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100% .....	+148.0
BA 3 Mobile Learning Cultural Training for Military Per- sonnel .....	+1.5
BA 3 Navy Sea Cadet Corps .....	+0.7
BA 3 Junior ROTC .....	+4.9
BA 4 Mobile Condition Assessment System Pilot for Com- mander, Navy Region Hawaii .....	+3.0
BA 4 International Headquarters and Agencies .....	(2.5)
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate .....	(166.0)
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction .....	(112.4)
Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Adjustments:	
BA 1 Cold Weather Layering System .....	+2.6
BA 1 Flame Resistant Organizational Gear .....	+5.0
BA 1 Ultra Lightweight Camouflage Net System .....	+4.0
BA 3 Junior ROTC .....	+1.0
BA 3 Increase in Sustainment to 100% .....	+66.0
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate .....	(35.0)
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction .....	(9.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Adjustments:	
BA 1 Advanced Autonomous Robotic Inspections for Aging Aircraft .....	+2.0
BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements .....	+143.7
BA 1 Air Education and Training Command Range Im- provements .....	+4.6
BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements .....	+130.5
BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements .....	(3.6)
BA 1 Increase in Sustainment to 100% .....	+289.0
BA 1 Wage Modification for US Azores Portugese National Employees .....	+0.2
BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements .....	+4.0
BA 2 Warner Robins Air Logistics Center Strategic Airlift Aircraft Availability Improvements .....	+2.0
BA 2 Fee for Service Refueling .....	(10.0)
BA 3 Junior ROTC .....	+4.5
BA 4 Service-wide Technical Support .....	(36.0)
BA 4 Service-wide Administration .....	(54.7)
BA 4 Service-wide Other Activities .....	(53.0)
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate .....	(128.0)
Undistributed—USAF Civilian Underexecution .....	(400.0)
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction .....	(191.7)

Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide Adjustments:	
BA 1 Special Operations Forces Modular Glove System .....	+2.5
BA 4 National Guard Youth Challenge Program .....	+20.0
BA 4 Starbase .....	+7.0
BA 4 Procurement and Technical Assistance Program .....	+9.0
BA 4 SoAR Recruiting Initiative .....	+3.4
BA 4 Increase DoDEA Schools Sustainment to 100% .....	+11.0
BA 4 Impact Aid .....	+65.0
BA 4 Redevelopment of Naval Station Ingleside .....	+3.0
BA 4 Transfer from Title XIV .....	+808.4
BA 4 Corrosion Prevention and Control .....	+6.0
BA 4 Critical Language Training .....	+2.0
BA 4 Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative .....	+20.0
BA 4 Tools for Implementation of Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 .....	+10.0
BA 4 Reduction to Security and Stabilization Assistance .....	(175.0)
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate .....	(124.0)
Undistributed—Fuel Reduction .....	(9.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve Adjustments:	
Undistributed—Unobligated Balances Estimate .....	(48.0)
Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve Adjustments:	
BA 1 Ship Depot Maintenance .....	+14.0
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve Adjustments:	
BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements .....	+10.8
BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements .....	(1.5)
Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard Adjustments:	
BA 1 Modular Shoot House .....	+2.2
BA 1 Joint Command Vehicle and Supporting C3 Systems ..	+2.3
BA 1 North Carolina National Guard Family Assistance Centers .....	+1.6
BA 1 Our Military Kids .....	+3.5
BA 1 Camp Ethan Allen Training Site Road Equipment .....	+0.3
BA 4 Emergency Management Staff Trainer Distributed Learning Courseware .....	+2.0
Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard Adjustments:	
BA 1 MBU-20A/P Oxygen Mask and Mask Light .....	+6.0
BA 1 Restoration of Legacy Aircraft Retirements .....	+27.7
Miscellaneous Appropriations:	
Cooperative Threat Reduction Program Increase .....	+30.0

#### Assessments and Analytical Tools for Implementation of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009

The budget request included no funding for assessments and analytical tools for implementation of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23). The committee recommends \$10.0 million for the performance of assessments and the purchase of analytical tools by officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense who are assigned additional duties under the Act, particularly those relating to the performance of analyses of alternatives for major defense acquisition programs. The committee notes that the majority of the resources required to implement the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 will involve the hiring of additional personnel for the performance of cost estimation, systems engineering, developmental test and evaluation, and performance assessment in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and throughout the military departments. The committee expects that funding for these purposes can, and should, come initially from the Acquisition Workforce Development Fund and eventually be included in the base budget request of the department concerned.

### Combat Air Forces Restructuring

The budget request contained \$4.1 billion for Primary Combat Forces. Additionally, the budget request contained \$7.1 billion for Administration and Service-wide Activities. Of that amount, \$735.0 million is for Technical Support Activities, \$646.0 million for Administration, and \$1.1 billion for Other Activities.

The committee has identified \$200.9 million in unexecutable peacetime operations due to deployments in the Air Force Operating Forces Primary Combat Forces budget activity. The committee has identified an additional \$143.7 million in unjustified program growth in the Air Force operation and maintenance administrative budget activity, specifically Service-wide Technical Support, Service-wide Administration, and Service-wide Other activities. In title 10 of this Act, the committee has included a provision that requires these funds totaling \$344.6 be used for the continued operation and maintenance of the 249 legacy fighter aircraft that were slated for retirement during fiscal year 2010 until such time as the Secretary of the Air Force provides the report related to the Air Force Combat Air Forces restructuring plan required elsewhere in this Act.

### Fee for Service Refueling

The budget request contained \$10.0 million for a fee-for-service refueling pilot program.

The committee recommends eliminating the funds for the pilot program. A provision is included elsewhere in this title that would repeal the requirement to conduct a fee-for-service pilot program.

### Navy Depot Maintenance

The budget request contained \$4.3 billion for Navy active ship depot maintenance and \$41.9 million for Navy reserve ship depot maintenance. The budget request for ship maintenance would leave \$200.0 in deferred maintenance in fiscal year 2010 for active and reserve ships at a time when it is questionable whether the Navy can sustain ship material readiness while serving as a key element of the nation's strategic reserve force. The budget request of \$1.1 billion for Navy aircraft depot maintenance would cover 100 percent of the primary authorized aircraft goal for deployed squadrons' airframes and 97 percent of non-deployed squadrons' airframes. While the requested funding would meet the zero bare firewall goal for aircraft engines, it would fall far short of the ready-for-issue engine spares goal and represents a risk area for the Navy. Therefore, the committee authorizes \$4.5 billion for active and reserve ship depot maintenance, a total increase of \$200.0, and \$1.3 billion for aviation depot maintenance, an increase of \$195.0 million. The committee notes that these programs were identified by the Chief of Naval Operations as the sole priorities in the Navy's unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2010 that was submitted to the committee.

### Procurement Technical Assistance Program

The budget request contained \$20.7 million for the Procurement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP).

The committee recognizes the importance of PTAP, a nationwide network of community-based procurement professionals that provides critical assistance to small businesses seeking to participate in Department of Defense and other federal agency procurement contracts. The program is authorized under section 2412 of title 10, United States Code. The PTAP helps generate new procurement suppliers for the Department, resulting in a stronger industrial base, greater competition, and higher-quality goods at lower cost for the taxpayer. The committee is concerned that the budget request for the PTAP has been insufficient to fund the needs of the many state and regional centers carrying out the program. The committee urges the Department to increase the PTAP annual budget request to a level sufficient to fully fund the operations of all state and regional centers.

The committee recommends \$29.7 million, an increase of \$9.0 million, for the Procurement Technical Assistance Program.

#### Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative

The budget request contained \$36.7 million for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI).

The committee expects the secretaries of the military departments to use the authority and funding available through REPI to partner with public and private entities to establish protective buffer zones around military installations that have impending encroachment pressures. The committee recognizes the benefits of REPI, including its ability to enhance military readiness, increase protection of key military spaces and natural habitats, foster public safety standards, and encourage economic growth.

The committee recommends \$56.7 million, an increase of \$20.0 million, for the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative.

#### Security and Stabilization Assistance Authority for Transfers to the U.S. Department of State

The budget request included a proposal for authority to transfer \$200.0 million from the operation and maintenance account to the Department of State for security and stabilization assistance. The committee included a provision in title XXII of this Act authorizing \$25.0 million for transfer to the Department of State for this purpose. The committee recommends a reduction of \$175.0 million in operation and maintenance, defense-wide to reflect the reduction in this authority.

### ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

#### Camp Lejeune Drinking Water

The committee is aware that the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) is reconsidering portions of its 1997 public health assessment for Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune. According to ATSDR, this is due, in part, to ATSDR's ongoing water modeling and exposure reconstruction study and to consideration of information about the historical presence of benzene in one drinking-water supply well in the Hadnot Point drinking water system. The committee is aware that that well was shut down sometime prior to 1985. The committee encourages the Commandant of

the Marine Corps to ensure that information about this development is provided to potentially impacted service members. The committee is pleased that the Marine Corps plans to notify more than 130,000 stakeholders about the reason for, and implications of, ATSDR's decision to revisit portions of the assessment. The committee expects that that notification, as well as information made available by the Marine Corps via the internet and other public outreach efforts, will contain specific information regarding the types of toxins being investigated.

#### Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations

The committee is concerned that base operations at forward-deployed locations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan are fuel-reliant, and as such, are dependent upon the delivery of fuel supplies via logistical convoys that are vulnerable to insurgent attacks. As of November 2008, according to United States Central Command, there were more than 300 forward deployed locations in Iraq and more than 100 in Afghanistan that consumed, on average, more than 68 million gallons of fuel per month. In a study titled "Defense Management: DOD Needs to Increase Attention on Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations," the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that base support activities, which do not include air and ground operations, account for more than 70 percent of the fuel consumption at 3 of 5 surveyed forward-deployed locations.

The committee is aware that Department of Defense components have some efforts under way to reduce fuel demand at forward-deployed locations. Some of these efforts include the application of foam insulation to tent structures, the development of more fuel-efficient generators and environmental control units, and research on alternative and renewable energy sources for potential use at forward-deployed locations. The committee is encouraged by these initiatives but is concerned with the GAO finding that many of these efforts are in a research and development phase, and the extent to which they will be fielded and under what time frame is uncertain. The Government Accountability Office makes six recommendations in response to its findings. The first three of the recommendations are that: the combatant commanders, in consultation with their service component commands, establish requirements for managing fuel demand at forward-deployed locations within their areas of responsibility; the military services develop guidance that implements the requirements; and, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff requires that fuel demand considerations be incorporated into the Joint Staff's initiative to develop joint standards of life support at forward-deployed locations. The final three recommendations address roles and responsibilities related to section 902 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417), which establishes a position for a Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs (Director of Operational Energy) and requires designation of senior officials within each of the military services.

The committee expects that the Director of Operational Energy, once confirmed, will work with the combatant commanders and military services to provide the needed guidance to direct operational commanders and forces at forward-deployed locations to re-

duce their fuel demand in ways that enhance operational capability. The committee includes a provision within this title that would require the Director of Operational Energy, or the Secretary of Defense in the event that the Director is not yet confirmed, to provide a report on what specific actions have been taken to address the first three of the Comptroller General's recommendations. The report would be required by February 1, 2010.

#### Overseas Environmental Standards for Solid Waste Disposal

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) has issued guidance establishing environmental compliance standards, criteria, and management practices for overseas installations. The most recent guidance was issued in a May 1, 2007, DOD publication 4715.05G titled "Overseas Environmental Baseline Guidance Document." The committee is aware that this guidance prohibits use of open burn pits for solid waste disposal at certain installations. The committee is aware that open burn pits are currently being used at certain United States military installations in the Republic of Iraq. The committee assesses that either the Department of Defense is using open burn pits for solid waste disposal in violation of the guidance document, or installations in the Republic of Iraq are exempted from the requirements of this guidance document, pursuant to the exemption clauses it contains.

The committee is concerned that, according to a Department of the Air Force fact sheet, use of open burn pits "can be harmful to human health and environment and should only be used until more suitable disposal capabilities are established." The committee believes that the duration of operations in the Republic of Iraq has provided ample time for the Department of Defense to establish "more suitable disposal capabilities." The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the health and environmental compliance standards the Department of Defense has established for military and contractor operations in the Republic of Iraq with regard to solid waste disposal, including an assessment of whether those standards are being met. The report should also contain the health and environmental compliance standards applicable to military and contractor operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan with regard to solid waste disposal, including an assessment as to whether those standards are being met. The report should describe the ability of existing medical surveillance programs to identify and track exposures to toxic substances as a result of open burn pits, as well as make recommendations on what changes may need to be made to those programs to properly identify and track toxic exposures. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit the report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2010.

#### WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

##### Air Force Civil Engineer Supply Functions

The committee understands that the Air Force is reviewing options for providing civil engineer supply functions at local installations. The committee believes this review should be comprehensive

in nature and include all methods (government, contractor, and third-party contracts) for providing civil engineer supply functions. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to add to his review the following items and to provide a copy of the completed review to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of the date of completion:

- (1) An assessment of the type of contract (i.e., requirement versus indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity, commodity versus service, and statement of work versus performance work statement) that should be employed to provide civil engineer supply functions to achieve best value at the lowest cost to the government;
- (2) An assessment of what is appropriate for inclusion in a civil engineer supply commodity contract versus a service contract;
- (3) An assessment of the Air Force's intent to convert government-operated civil engineer supply operations to contractor operations; and
- (4) A cost-benefit review of using strategic sourcing for high-volume commodity items and a plan to ensure small businesses have the opportunity to participate in strategic sourcing.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force not to take any action to implement the findings of this review until 180 days after the date of the receipt of the review by the congressional defense committees.

#### Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities

The committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense has not included funding for the Commercial Technologies for Maintenance Activities (CTMA) program in its budget request. The CTMA program is a unique partnership that addresses the technology needs of the Department's maintenance facilities by developing maintenance and repair solutions faster and at less cost and less risk. By the Department's own metric, the program historically realized \$70.0 million in annual cost savings with estimates that savings would grow to \$1.2 billion by 2020. With the leverage provided by industry through this program at a two-for-one level, a small investment by the Department would result in substantial cost savings, reductions in repair times, and improved weapon system availability.

Initially funded by the Department, the CTMA program has not been included in the Department's budget despite strong support for the program by Congress and the depot-level activities of the Department, as well as confirmation by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics that the program is providing the outcomes envisioned by the CTMA partnership. The committee continues to believe that the CTMA program is of great value as a technology resource for the maintenance community and will help improve readiness levels of our armed forces.

The committee strongly urges the Department to develop a long-term funding plan for the CMTA program.

### Corrosion Control and Prevention

The committee applauds the military departments for establishing corrosion control and prevention executives to serve as the departments' senior officials for coordinating department-level corrosion control and prevention program activities, as required by section 903 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417) and as consistently recommended by the Government Accountability Office. The committee commends the Department of the Army for programming into its fiscal year 2010 budget submission \$4.4 million in funding for the Army's corrosion prevention and control (CPC) office for "the implementation and management of an effective corrosion prevention and control program for all Army equipment, systems, and components."

Accordingly, the committee directs the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (as designated by section 2228 of title 10, United States Code) to submit a report to the congressional defense committees detailing the actual benefits achieved and benefits expected to be achieved from implementing the efforts funded through the \$4.4 million requested for the Army CPC office, including the return on investment from specific corrosion projects managed by the Army CPC office in fiscal year 2010. The committee directs this report to be submitted by March 1, 2011.

The committee encourages the Navy and Air Force to follow the Army's example and sufficiently resource CPC implementation and management offices at the departmental level and to invest their department's corrosion control and prevention executive with the authority appropriate to carry out the mandates of section 903 of Public Law 110-417.

However, the committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense (DOD), for the second consecutive year, failed to submit with its fiscal year 2010 budget materials, the report on the corrosion control and prevention strategy and funding requirements as required by section 371 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181). The committee is also disappointed that, in the face of demonstrated successes by the DOD Office of Corrosion Control and Prevention Policy, the Department cut the Office's funding in the fiscal year 2010 budget request by \$642,000. The committee notes that the Department of Defense, through its cost-of-corrosion studies, estimates that the annual cost of corrosion to the Department is approximately \$22.5 billion. According to the Government Accountability Office, the Department's budget documents show a fiscal year 2010 unfunded CPC project requirement of \$14.6 million. Based on a 42-1 return on investment for CPC projects, the potential cost avoidance for these requirements would be \$506.0 million.

The budget request contained \$8.2 million for the corrosion prevention program. In light of the potential cost avoidance cited above, the committee recommends \$14.2 million, an increase of \$6.0 million, for the corrosion prevention program.

### Corrosion Evaluation of F-35 Joint Strike Fighter

The committee is concerned that the lessons learned regarding the prevention and management of corrosion in the F-22 Raptor

aircraft have not been fully applied to development and acquisition of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft. The committee's desire to have corrosion prevention and management addressed early in weapons system development and acquisition prompted inclusion of a provision in the Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23) requiring the development of systems engineering master plans for major defense acquisition programs that include considerations of lifecycle management and sustainability.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight (as designated by section 2228 of title 10, United States Code) to evaluate the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program. The evaluation should include, but not be limited to, information obtained from floor inspections and examination of program documentation and should involve any and all manufacturing and engineering processes. The Director of Corrosion Policy and Oversight is directed to consult with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to determine the appropriate level of access necessary to conduct an effective and comprehensive evaluation of the F-35. The committee directs that the findings of the evaluation be reported to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act. The evaluation report should also include implications for existing and future weapons systems based on the findings of the F-35 evaluation. The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees of the completeness of the evaluation within 60 days of the evaluation's delivery to the congressional defense committees.

#### Impact of Contractor Support on Operational Readiness

The committee is concerned that, to date, the Department of Defense (DOD) has neither undertaken formal planning to determine the level of contractor support necessary to sustain overseas contingency operations, nor included contractor employees in any readiness assessment. This hinders awareness of the true readiness of all forces available. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense recently created a task force known as the DOD Dependence on Contractor Support in Contingency Operations Task Force, which is assessing the Department's dependence on contractor support across a range of capability areas. The committee recognizes that the efforts of the task force should assist Congress and the Department in determining the effects contractors have on overall unit and force readiness. In addition, such efforts should allow the Department to track the services being provided by contractors and associated contractor employees to joint capabilities areas, and assess whether the mix of contractors is appropriate for current operations and those anticipated in the next 10 to 15 years. These efforts should also build on information in the service contract inventories required by section 807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181).

The committee notes that in the summer of 2008, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff initiated a study that focused on the Department's use of contractors in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and its dependence on contractor-provided combat and security training. This subsequently led to the

creation of the Dependence on Contractor Support in Contingency Operations Task Force, described above. Results of this study should facilitate congressional oversight of the appropriate use and role of contractors in providing support in areas that are critical to mission accomplishment, not only in contingency operations, but across all key operations.

In the section of this report relating to title VIII in the item of special interest entitled “Contingency Contracting Planning, Oversight, and Visibility”, the committee requires the Secretary of Defense to address these issues in a report to the congressional defense committees.

#### Insourcing New and Contracted-out Functions

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense on his decision to scale back significantly the role of contractors in support services and bring appropriate contracted out functions back in-house. The committee notes that section 324 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) requires the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to develop and implement guidance to provide managers within the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services with the flexibility to consider using federal civilian employees for work that is new or currently being performed by contractors in certain circumstances. Guidance for implementing section 324 was issued on April 4, 2008. The committee expects this policy to be helpful to the Department as it reshapes the DOD workforce to ensure it has the proper skill sets and capabilities in that workforce, and undertakes plans to reduce the number of service support contractors and replace them with full-time DOD employees. The committee expects this policy to assist the Department in fulfilling the intent of the President’s March 4, 2009 government contracting memo to ensure that “inherently governmental” functions and those closely associated with inherently governmental functions, as well as certain personal services contracts, are performed by government personnel and not by contractor personnel.

The committee stresses, however, that this insourcing initiative should not be driven by random goals or arbitrary budget reductions which may prove to be counterproductive. The use of a contractor inventory review and planning process as prescribed by section 807 of Public Law 110–181 establishes a rational basis for goals and reductions. Furthermore, the committee notes that insourcing should not be considered only in the context of contracting, but should be considered as part of an overall strategic plan that looks at the total workforce requirements (military, civilian employee, and contract) required to accomplish the Department’s mission. The committee notes that insourcing initiatives should give appropriate consideration to impacts on contractor employees. The committee notes that a proper balance should be struck between encouraging all qualified candidates to apply for a newly created federal employee position and the appearance of undue pressure on contractor employees to convert to government employees. While the committee commends the Department on its ambitious insourcing initiative, the committee is concerned that neither the Department nor the military services have developed a comprehensive plan to implement the initiative. Therefore, the

committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees an outline of its insourcing plan, including how it intends to address the impacts of insourcing on contractor employees and to comply with sections 324 and 807 of Public Law 110-181 in meeting its insourcing objectives, by October 1, 2009.

#### Lifecycle Operations, Maintenance, and Supply Mission Simulation

The committee is concerned about spare parts inventory and supply management by the services. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has recommended in reports 09-199 and 09-103 that spare parts inventory and supply management should be strengthened, in part, by improving demand forecasting procedures and monitoring effectiveness of providing operational information to item managers. The committee is encouraged by the Army's efforts regarding the UH-60, OH-58, and T-700 engine programs, and the Marine Corps' efforts regarding the light armored vehicle, mine-resistant ambush protected vehicle, MV-22, and H-53 programs to adopt improved spares demand forecasting and lifecycle cost analysis methodologies.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to adopt advanced predictive modeling and simulation methodology that incorporates asset demand-influencing factors to include time, usage, aging of parts, origin of critical parts, maintenance, and logistics support for all aviation and ground equipment programs. To address recommendations made in GAO Report 09-41, the committee further encourages the Department to extend advanced predictive modeling and simulation throughout the weapons system lifecycle, especially with regard to performance-based logistics support arrangements. The committee also encourages the Department to establish, through the military departments, pilot programs for appropriate aircraft and ground systems to demonstrate the benefits of demand forecasting models which include cost savings and avoidance, reduction in unscheduled maintenance, and increased efficiency in supply chain management and budget projections.

#### Repair Capability for Low-Observable Technology

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the capability, including facilities, personnel, and equipment, to carry out state-of-the-art maintenance, repair, and overhaul support to military weapons systems that employ low-observable technology, as required in section 2464 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretary is further directed to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010, on the results of the assessment, including the efforts being made, in the context of section 2464, to provide organic workload for the maintenance, repair, and overhaul of systems that employ low-observable technology. In reviewing this important capability area, the committee recognizes the high quality of work and capabilities taking place in the public and private sectors. The committee directs the Secretary to give consideration to establishment of a Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence at Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri, for the maintenance, repair, and overhaul of systems that employ low-observable technology.

## Other Matters

### Accessibility of Military Historical Information

The committee recognizes that military historians and public affairs officers are presently collecting a variety of data on unit history, membership, training, deployments, social activities, and awards. These records are already being collected for historical preservation purposes under long-standing Department of Defense directives and policies, predominantly in digital formats. Unfortunately, most of that data is presently inaccessible to service members and their families.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the military departments to utilize cost-effective commercial-off-the-shelf technologies to organize this data and make it available to service members, customized at the unit level as a permanent commemoration of their time in service. The committee believes that this historical information could serve as a powerful tool for recruitment and retention, as well as a good public relations communications opportunity. The committee anticipates that such products could be offered through the use of existing funds otherwise used by military units for commemorative awards.

### Air Force Combat Support Forces

The committee recognizes that, as a result of the high pace of ongoing contingency operations, much attention has been focused on the current stress on U.S. military forces. While most of this attention has been focused on ground forces, all the military services have been affected by the high tempo of operations since September 11, 2001. During this period of increased operational tempo, the Air Force has experienced increased stress on certain career fields and challenges in maintaining the availability of certain units and personnel for future deployments in support of ongoing operations and other commitments. In view of the Government Accountability Office's prior work on readiness issues, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by June 1, 2010, that evaluates the Air Force's ability to provide combat and expeditionary combat support forces. This review should identify: the extent and type of demand for Air Force combat and expeditionary combat support capabilities; factors affecting the Air Force's ability to meet demands for ongoing operations, as well as to maintain sufficient forces and capabilities to meet other global commitments; and any potential gaps in meeting demands and Air Force plans to address such gaps, including adjustments to force structure and manning authorizations.

### Combat Skills Training for Support Units

Operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan have demonstrated that combat service and combat service support units are often exposed to hostile fire. These units are required to respond to enemy attacks on a regular basis under dynamic situations and, in some cases, without support from friendly combat arms units. The committee understands that support units receive a different level of combat training and that this

may impede their ability to operate in asymmetric combat environments. To better understand the situation, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the adequacy of combat skills training provided for non-combat arms units operating in the Central Command area of responsibility. The committee directs that the Comptroller General provide a report on this review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2010. This review and report should include:

- (1) An evaluation of the adequacy of existing combat skills training for support units performing missions in an asymmetric combat environment;
- (2) An assessment of the system the services are using to determine the appropriate level of combat training for non-combat arms military occupational specialties and to adjust that training to support the realities of current combat operations; and
- (3) Recommendations on potential improvements that could be made to increase the effectiveness of support units operating in current and future combat environments.

#### Critical Infrastructure Interdependencies Vulnerability Assessments

The committee is concerned that cybersecurity vulnerabilities in many sectors of critical infrastructure pose a significant risk to the Department's ability to assure its own mission capabilities. The Comprehensive National Cybersecurity Initiative articulated the need to extend the government's protective envelope to the critical infrastructure sector, but failed to provide any concrete recommendations. The current Administration's new Cyberspace Policy Review also points to the need to develop a process between government and the private sector to assist in preventing, detecting, and responding to cyber incidents.

The committee is aware that there are efforts underway for the Department of Defense to actively assess vulnerabilities of critical infrastructure providers on which the Department is dependent to support critical warfighting missions. The Air Force's 262 Network Warfare Squadron (NWS) has been active in developing and executing the Critical Infrastructure Interdependencies Vulnerability Assessment (CIIVA) program. The CIIVA program supports a full-spectrum analysis of critical infrastructures, such as power, water, communications, and transportation, which are critical to the functioning of a military installation.

The committee supports the activities of the 262 NWS and recommends that the Department of Defense fund the 262 NWS to conduct additional critical infrastructure interdependencies vulnerability assessments and migrate their methodologies to other units within the Department of Defense.

#### Defense Travel System

The committee remains concerned that the web-based Defense Travel System (DTS) is not user-friendly and does not serve as the Department of Defense's single online travel system as required by the Department's March 2008 directive. Travelers continue to experience difficulties using the system and consequently revert back to

inefficient legacy systems that cost significantly more to maintain per trip than DTS. The Department is still unable to identify the number of legacy systems in existence, or identify funding for these systems so that redundancy among systems can be minimized.

The committee recognizes the recent actions the Department has taken to improve DTS by including more types of travel, and by making progress with system testing to measure the proper functioning of DTS requirements. The committee acknowledges that DTS, despite its problems, has the potential to be a viable and cost-effective travel system for the Department.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to: enforce the March 2008 directive that DTS serve as the Department's only on-line travel system; speed efforts to make DTS more user-friendly; incorporate more travel types; and develop consistent measures for system testing. The committee directs the Secretary to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services on the Department's progress in meeting these directives by December 31, 2009.

The committee directs the Secretary to include in this report the number, functionality, cost, and funding sources of current operating legacy systems.

The committee further directs the Secretary to accelerate the schedule for shutting down redundant portions of legacy systems and provide this schedule to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2009.

#### Evaluation of Readiness of U.S. Forces

As the Department of Defense draws down forces in the Republic of Iraq and increases force levels in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, it will likely face challenges in providing trained and ready forces to meet the needs of warfighting commanders and in managing and synchronizing these deployments and redeployments. For example, due to operational demands over the past several years, the entire U.S. force, particularly ground forces, is stressed and facing readiness challenges. These challenges include maintaining the availability of units and personnel for future deployments to ongoing operations and meeting other national security commitments.

Current training capacity has been primarily focused on operations in Iraq, thereby requiring adjustments in training regimens to shift the focus to preparing larger numbers of ground forces to deploy to Afghanistan. Similarly, requirements to provide units or personnel to fill specialized requirements, such as transition teams to train Iraq and Afghanistan security forces, are projected to continue. Other needs could also arise as the drawdown in Iraq and deployments to Afghanistan progress.

The committee is aware of the Government Accountability Office's prior evaluations of the readiness of U.S. forces and directs the Comptroller General to review the Department of Defense's approach to managing the deployment of forces to meet operational needs in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as the implications of these commitments for overall force readiness. This review should evaluate: the Department's efforts to establish processes and responsibilities for analyzing and responding to requests for force capabilities from operational commanders; the Department's ability to provide ground forces, combat support, and other specialized capabilities,

such as transition teams to train Iraq and Afghanistan security forces; factors affecting the Department's ability to meet demands for, and maintain sufficient forces and capabilities to meet, other global commitments; and any challenges the Department faces in adjusting training capacity and scope to support larger deployments to Afghanistan while still preparing forces for deployments to Iraq.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit this review by June 1, 2010, to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services.

#### Facilitation of Strategic Deployment

The committee recognizes that strategic embarkation ports are critical to efficient and effective deployment and redeployment of forces to support combatant commander requirements. The committee is concerned that less than one-quarter of current first-call contingency sealift is positioned at layberths that support expeditious embarkation. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Transportation Command to develop criteria for the selection of strategic embarkation ports and ship layberth locations that place primary importance on facilitation of strategic deployment and reduction of combatant commander force closure timelines. In developing such criteria, consideration should be given to such factors as time required to crew, activate, and sail the sealift vessel to the embarkation port; distance and travel times for the forces from the assigned installation(s) to the embarkation port; availability of adequate infrastructure to transport forces from the assigned installation(s) to the embarkation port; and time required to move forces from the embarkation port to likely areas of force employment around the world. Furthermore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Transportation Command to provide to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act a listing of the established criteria and a description of the manner in which the criteria will be used to inform selection of strategic embarkation ports and to inform the procurement of ship layberthing services.

#### Medical Care Provided by the Military for Contractors in Combat Zones

The committee is aware that many contractors whose personnel receive care in U.S. military medical facilities in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan are not reimbursing the U.S. Government for that care. At the same time, the committee does not believe that it is appropriate to hold field medical units responsible for medical billing, as they are neither designed nor resourced to perform that function. As a result, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense build a contractual reimbursement mechanism by requiring a medical treatment clause in all current and future contracts for services provided in Iraq, Afghanistan, or other combat zones that does not require billing activities by military medical personnel.

### Remediation of Cybersecurity System Vulnerabilities

The committee is concerned that systemic issues within the Department of Defense create disincentives for conducting information assurance vulnerability assessments, thus masking the need for proactively identifying and remediating hardware and software vulnerabilities. The committee believes that sustained senior leadership, coupled with a standardized process across the military departments and defense agencies, is necessary for the Department of Defense to overcome this challenge.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the heads of the military departments and defense agencies, to establish a process for addressing hardware or software vulnerabilities to defense information technology systems identified during an information assurance vulnerability assessment. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act detailing how this process should work, and an estimate of the resources needed to ensure hardware and software vulnerabilities identified through the assessments are remediated.

### Report on Navy Training

As a result of the high pace of ongoing operations, much attention has been focused on the current stress on our military forces. While most of this attention has been focused on the Army and Marine Corps, all the services have been affected by the increased tempo of operations since September 11, 2001. During this period of increased operations, the Navy has undertaken a number of initiatives designed to improve fleet readiness while achieving cost savings. Because the cost of a ship's crew is the single largest cost incurred over the ship's lifecycle, many of these initiatives have led to changes in the ways the Navy trains its surface personnel and crews its ships.

In view of these changes, which can affect the Navy's personnel and the readiness of its ships, on March 16, 2009, the committee requested the Government Accountability Office (GAO) review the training, size, composition, and capabilities of the Navy's ship crews. Specifically, the committee requested that GAO:

- (1) Evaluate current requirement, authorization, and on-hand personnel levels for selected ship types compared to historical data for the same or similar ship types, including underlying reasons for any differences;
- (2) Compare shipboard rank/rate distributions over time and analyze underlying reasons for any changes, and their impact on ship capabilities;
- (3) Evaluate qualification training for personnel in selected shipboard designators/ratings to determine any changes to formal off-ship training programs, including whether such changes have affected personnel availability and the amounts and types of on-the-job training that is required for personnel to achieve required qualifications; and
- (4) Evaluate to what extent, if any, requirements to provide personnel for individual augmentee positions and transition

and training teams in support of ongoing operations are impacting the levels or composition of shipboard manning.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit this report to the congressional defense committees by May 1, 2010.

#### Secure Telework Center Pilot Project

Teleworking provides benefits for continuity of operations during emergencies by providing alternate locations for workers to operate when their primary workplace is not available. The committee is concerned that there are limited facilities for teleworking in a secure environment for federal workers whose primary duties require access to highly classified processing systems.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Office of Personnel Management and the General Services Administration, to assess sites within the Washington Metropolitan Area in order to identify at least two sites for a possible pilot program to provide secure teleworking for federal employees. Possible sites must meet the security requirements necessary to process classified information at the Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information level. Ideal sites would be designated, or have a portion of the facility designated, as a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility and would be built to or meet the standards established by the Director of Central Intelligence Directive 6/9. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on this assessment within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### Security Clearance Reform

The committee is aware of the continuing challenges inherent in reforming the security clearance process, with primary emphasis on the impacts to the Department of Defense mission. The committee notes that unauthorized release of classified and sensitive information impacts readiness and poses a severe security risk, especially in the current global terrorism environment. In addition, delays in clearance processing increase risks to national security and increase the cost of classified work for the government. Furthermore, the committee recognizes that, while the Government Accountability Office has placed the Department's security program on its annual high risk list, many of the security clearance process problems are not limited to the Department but are government-wide in nature. Among other calls for reform, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) required the Department and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence to implement a demonstration project on new and innovative approaches to improve the process.

In December 2008, the Joint Security and Suitability Reform Team, which also included the Office of Management and Budget and the Office of Personnel Management, released its plan for substantially modernizing and automating the security clearance process across the federal government by the end of 2010. The committee endorses this transformation plan which outlines policies, standards and electronic tools, including modifications to existing forms, to make the system more efficient and effective. The committee is concerned, however, that the reform initiative may be en-

countering bureaucratic resistance and that the status of key initiatives is unclear. Given the extensive work already done by the Joint Security and Suitability Reform Team, the committee expects the Department and its agency partners to move forward expeditiously in implementing the reforms to the security clearance process. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the status of implementing all elements of the reform plan, rationale for any delays, and any obstacles that have been encountered. The committee directs the Secretary to submit the report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2009.

#### Ship Material Readiness

The committee is concerned that, at a time when the Navy intends to extend the operational life of its surface ships five years or more beyond their designed lifespan, systemic problems with the Navy's manning, training, and maintenance call into question the Navy's ability to achieve even the expected service life of the fleet and sustain fleet readiness, let alone extend the service life of entire ship classes in support of force-level objectives.

The committee commends the Navy for establishing a pilot program of technical inspections to assess the surface force ships' true lifespans through assessments of their material readiness. The pilot program is designed to provide an objective assessment to the fleet regarding the capability of its ships to meet their expected service life, predict where serious or limiting material conditions may develop, establish a process for structured assessment of the degree to which current fleet ships vary from established technical criteria, and provide the analytical basis for required maintenance investment to achieve expected service life.

However, the committee is concerned that assessing only one ship each from the amphibious, destroyer, cruise, and frigate classes will not provide sufficient data to achieve the pilot program's desired outcomes. The committee has added \$1.5 million in funding in the ship depot operations support account to extend the technical inspections pilot program through fiscal year 2010. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to assess multiple ships in each class.

Additionally, the committee supports the partnership between Naval Sea Systems Command and the Navy Surface Warfare Enterprise to address acknowledged deficiencies in class planning and technical support created by the shift from an engineered operating cycle for maintenance planning to a progressive maintenance strategy. The Surface Ship Life Cycle Management Activity should instill rigor into the Integrated Class Maintenance Plan, both in work package development and in availability execution, and restore emphasis to deep, long-term maintenance tasks that have recently been subject to deferral or cancellation.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit with the fiscal year 2011 budget documents a report on the findings of the technical inspections pilot program and actions planned as a result of the assessment findings to achieve and extend ships' expected service life. The report also should include a description of the steps taken to mitigate material readiness deficiencies through

actions initiated by the Surface Ship Life Cycle Management Activity.

#### Strategic Port Optimization

In December 2008, the military's Surface Deployment and Distribution Command, a component of the United States Transportation Command, submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a plan on optimizing the use of strategic ports. The plan is based on a report, *Port Outlook 2008*, required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181). Strategic seaports are designated as those the Department of Defense intends to utilize for the rapid movement of personnel and equipment overseas in a time of crisis. The report noted that the currently designated commercial strategic and military seaports (which are located on the East, West, Gulf, and Alaskan Coasts) do not provide an optimum number of ports to meet the future needs of the Department. The committee supports the recommendation that alternative seaports should be assessed for suitability as strategic seaports in addition to those currently designated in order to increase capacity.

In selecting additional strategic seaports, the committee encourages the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to consider the Port of Guam. The increasing military presence on Guam, and its strategic location in the Asia-Pacific region, would facilitate movement of military cargo in the event of a national emergency or major mobilization. The committee recognizes that the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command has outlined an implementation plan based on the recommendations of the *Port Outlook 2008* report, including establishing a selection team to enhance existing strategic seaports and identify additional ones to provide future capacity to the Department. The committee supports this effort and directs the Commander of the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to provide to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services a progress report on its implementation of the *Port Outlook 2008* recommendations by January 15, 2010.

#### Tire Privatization

As part of the Tire Commodity Management Privatization initiative, undertaken in compliance with the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510) as amended, the Department of Defense shifted responsibility for tire supply, storage, and distribution from the Defense Logistics Agency to a contractor who would be in charge of procuring and distributing all ground and air military tires worldwide for the Department and the military services. The committee recognizes that the intent of this initiative was to lower costs as well as streamline and improve the process of getting tires to the warfighter. However, the committee has longstanding concerns that the original acquisition strategy did not provide all qualified tire manufacturers with an equal opportunity to compete in the defense market.

The committee recognizes that the Defense Logistics Agency has recently taken steps to start developing an acquisition strategy for its follow-on contracts to maximize competition and ensure that all

qualified tire manufacturers have a fair opportunity to compete, and that technical performance, reliability, service, and price are all fully considered. The committee notes that the Defense Logistics Agency has reported that tires for both the aviation and ground vehicle contracts are being delivered within the allowable logistics response time and with high on-time delivery rates. The committee, therefore, urges the Defense Logistics Agency ensure that there are no contract delays in providing ground vehicle or aviation tires to the warfighter. The committee directs the Director, Defense Logistics Agency, to provide the congressional defense committees a description of the selected acquisition strategy 30 days prior to release of any request for proposal for procurement and distribution of ground and air military tires.

## LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

### SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

#### Section 301—Operation and Maintenance Funding

This section would authorize \$157.3 billion in operation and maintenance funding for the military departments and defense-wide activities.

### SUBTITLE B—ENVIRONMENTAL PROVISIONS

#### Section 311—Clarification of Requirement for Use of Available Funds for Department of Defense Participation in Conservation Banking Programs

This section would clarify authority for the Department of Defense to participate in conservation banking and in-lieu fee programs provided by section 311 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

#### Section 312—Reauthorization of Title I of Sikes Act

This section would amend section 670f of title 16, United States Code, to reauthorize title I of the Sikes Act.

#### Section 313—Authority of Secretary of a Military Department to Enter into Interagency Agreements for Land Management on Department of Defense Installations

This section would amend section 670c–1 of title 16, United States Code, to authorize the Department of Defense to enter into interagency agreements with other Federal agencies regarding the maintenance and improvement of natural resources.

#### Section 314—Reauthorization of Pilot Program for Invasive Species Management for Military Installations in Guam

This section would amend subsection (g) of section 670a of title 16, United States Code, to reauthorize a pilot program for invasive species management for military installations in Guam from 2010 through 2015.

Section 315—Reimbursement of Environmental Protection Agency for Certain Costs in Connection with the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer not more than \$68,623 to the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site Special Account, within the Hazardous Substance Superfund. This transfer is final payment to reimburse the Environmental Protection Agency for all costs incurred in overseeing a time critical removal action under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for ordnance and explosive safety hazards at the Former Nansemond Ordnance Depot Site, Suffolk, Virginia.

SUBTITLE C—WORKPLACE AND DEPOT ISSUES

Section 321—Public-Private Competition Required Before Conversion of Any Department of Defense Function Performed by Civilian Employees to Contractor Performance

This section would require a public-private competition whenever the Department of Defense (DOD) intends to convert to contractor performance functions performed by DOD civilian personnel.

Section 322—Time Limitation on Duration of Public-Private Competitions

This section would restrict to 540 days the time from the beginning of preliminary planning to when a final performance decision is made for any public-private competitions conducted pursuant to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76. The time period would take into account any delays resulting from a protest before the Government Accountability Office or the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. The committee does not intend this statute to be used by the Department of Defense to stop an A-76 competition that has overrun the 540 days to then restart at a later date. The committee notes that public-private competitions that last a lengthy amount of time create an unfair strain on the federal employees whose jobs are being competed, as well as on the contractors who have submitted bids for the work. In addition, estimated savings will less likely be achieved the longer a competition takes to reach a final performance decision.

Section 323—Inclusion of Installation of Major Modifications in Definition of Depot-Level Maintenance and Repair

This section would amend section 2460 of title 10, United States Code, to include the installation of major weapons system modifications in the definition of depot-level maintenance and repair. The amendment would clarify the original intent of section 2460, namely to allow for the installation of major modifications to be performed by private- or public-sector depot-level activities. The committee is aware of recent Department of Defense documents that state the “50/50 rule” promulgated in section 2466, title 10, United States Code, in conjunction with section 2460, does not apply to procurement-funded projects, particularly the installation of major modifications. The committee disagrees with this interpretation of the statutes. Section 2466 simply limits the amount of contracted

depot maintenance to not more than 50 percent of the funds made available in a fiscal year to a military department or agency for depot-level maintenance and repair, regardless of type of funds (i.e., procurement, research and development, or operation and maintenance).

**Section 324—Modification of Authority for Army Industrial Facilities to Engage in Cooperative Activities with Non-Army Entities**

This section would amend section 4544(a) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the eight contracts or cooperative agreements referred to in section 328(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) are in addition to the contracts or agreements in effect as the date of enactment of Public Law 110–181.

**Section 325—Cost-Benefit Analysis of Alternatives for Performance of Planned Maintenance Interval Events and Concurrent Modifications Performed on the AV–8B Harrier Weapons System**

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Commandant of the Marine Corps, to perform a thorough economic analysis of the costs and benefits associated with each alternative under consideration for AV–8B Harrier aircraft periodic maintenance inspections. The economic analysis would include an estimate of the impact of the loss of workload on organic depot labor rates, and the impact this could have on the depot maintenance costs of other weapon systems for each alternative under consideration. In addition, this section would prohibit the Secretary from entering into any contract for AV–8B Harrier periodic maintenance inspections or associated maintenance activities until 45 days after the Secretary delivers a report to the congressional defense committees that includes: the results of the cost-benefit analysis; the criteria and rationale used to classify work as organization-level or depot-level maintenance; an explanation of the core logistics capabilities and associated workload for the AV–8B; and an assessment of the effects of proposed workload transfers on the Department of the Navy’s division of depot maintenance funding between the public and private sectors.

**Section 326—Termination of Certain Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Performance by a Contractor**

This section would halt any public-private competition conducted pursuant to section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, or Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 that had not resulted in award to a contractor as of March 26, 2009, until the Secretary of Defense has an opportunity to review whether such studies should be continued, and provides a report to Congress. In addition, all studies that have extended beyond 18 months would be terminated unless the Secretary provides a justification to Congress for the continuation of such studies.

In light of concerns raised by the military services, on March 25, 2009, the committee wrote to Secretary of Defense Robert Gates urging an immediate halt to any pending A–76 studies as well as the initiation or announcement of any A–76 study, and to rescind

the 2008 competitive sourcing policy memo. The committee's letter noted that this suspension would allow the Administration and Congress time to conduct a comprehensive review of the Department's A-76 program and to determine the best course for moving forward with a sound competitive sourcing policy.

**Section 327—Temporary Suspension of Public-Private Competitions for Conversion of Department of Defense Functions to Performance by a Contractor**

This section would suspend until Fiscal Year 2012 any Department of Defense public-private competitions conducted pursuant to section 2461 of title 10, United States Code, or Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76.

**Section 328—Requirement for Debriefings Related to Conversion of Functions from Performance by Federal Employees to Performance by Contractor**

This section would require the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy to revise the Federal Acquisition Regulation to allow for pre-award and post-award debriefings of federal employee representatives in the case of a public-private competition for conversion of any function performed by a federal employee to performance by a contractor.

**Section 329—Amendments to Bid Protest Procedures by Federal Employees and Agency Officials in Conversion of Functions from Performance by Federal Employees to Performance by a Contractor**

This section would make technical and clarifying amendments to sections 3551 and 3557 of title 31 of United States Code related to the filing of bid protests by federal employee representatives to appeal the outcome of a public-private competition that resulted in award to performance by a contractor.

**SUBTITLE D—ENERGY SECURITY**

**Section 331—Authorization of Appropriations for Director of Operational Energy**

This section would authorize \$5.0 million for the Director of Operational Energy Plans and Programs established by section 902 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417), to be made available upon the confirmation of an individual to serve as the Director.

**Section 332—Report on Implementation of Comptroller General Recommendations on Fuel Demand Management at Forward-Deployed Locations**

This section would require the Director of Operational Energy, or the Secretary of Defense in the event that the Director is not yet confirmed, to provide a report on what specific actions have been taken to address three of the recommendations in a report by the Comptroller General dated February 20, 2009, titled "Defense Management: DOD Needs to Increase Attention on Fuel Demand Man-

agement at Forward-Deployed Locations.” The report would be required to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2010.

#### Section 333—Consideration of Renewable Fuels

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to consider renewable fuels for testing, certification, and use in aviation, maritime, and ground transportation fleets. This section also would require a report on the use of renewable fuels to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2010.

#### Section 334—Department of Defense Goal Regarding Procurement of Renewable Aviation Fuels

This section would establish a goal for the Department of Defense to procure 25 percent of the total quantity of aviation fuel consumed by the Department in the contiguous United States from renewable aviation fuel sources in fiscal year 2025 and each subsequent fiscal year.

### SUBTITLE E—REPORTS

#### Section 341—Annual Report on Procurement of Military Working Dogs

This section would amend section 358 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to Congress on the procurement of military working dogs for the previous fiscal year. The report would include the following: the number of military working dogs procured from domestic breeders categorized by service or defense agency; the number of military working dogs procured from non-domestic breeders broken down by service or defense agency; and the total cost to procure military working dogs broken down by source (domestic or non-domestic) and service or defense agency.

### SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

#### Section 351—Authority for Airlift Transportation at Department of Defense Rates for Non-Department of Defense Federal Cargoes

This section would grant authority to the Secretary of Defense, for a five-year period, to charge the same rates for airlift services to all federal customers supporting national security objectives in order to maximize loads into areas where the Department of Defense might otherwise fly missions with partial aircraft loads. This section would also require the Secretary to submit an annual report by March 1 of each year to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the use of this authority.

#### Section 352—Requirements for Standard Ground Combat Uniform

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Defense Logistics Agency, to require that future

ground combat uniforms be standardized in order to ensure increased interoperability of ground combat forces and reduce tactical risks encountered when military personnel wear a different uniform from their counterparts in the other military services in a combat area. The committee notes that, previously all the military services used the same desert camouflage uniform or the standard battle dress uniform, both in the temperate and enhanced weather versions. However, the Defense Supply Center Philadelphia of the Defense Logistics Agency, which is responsible for the manufacture of all U.S. military uniforms, now procures unique camouflage utility uniforms for each of the military services: the Army combat uniform, the Airman battle uniform, the Navy working uniform, and the Marine Corps combat utility uniform.

The committee is concerned that the recent move toward unique service camouflage uniforms has resulted in increased costs and production inefficiencies. For example, problems with consistency in fabric shading have required remanufacture of some uniforms. In addition, the costs for the unique uniforms are substantially more than for the standard battle dress uniform because of the differences in design, camouflage pattern, and type of fabric. Most importantly, the committee is concerned that this uniqueness poses a tactical risk in theater, especially for those assigned to combatant commands or as individual augmentees who may be wearing a different uniform from those they are serving with in combat. The committee also notes that service-specific battle dress uniforms magnify the challenges and costs associated with procuring personal protective gear and body armor that conform to the design and coloration of the basic uniform.

#### Section 353—Restriction on Use of Funds for Counterthreat Finance Efforts

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to limit Department of Defense (DOD) financial support of counterthreat finance (CTF) efforts to only those activities carried out by DOD personnel and supporting DOD contract personnel until a report is provided to the congressional defense committees describing the nature, extent, and expected future cost requirements associated with the mission.

The committee is uncertain about the extent and scope of current and future CTF activities and is concerned about the generation and imposition of non-DOD cost requirements competing with Department of Defense priorities. The committee believes greater fidelity on CTF requirement and projected activities would allow for better Department of Defense budget planning and congressional oversight.

#### Section 354—Limitation on Obligation of Funds Pending Submission of Classified Justification Material

This section would limit the obligation of operation and maintenance funds for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, in budget activity 4, to not more than 90 percent until 15 days after the information cited in the classified annex accompanying this Act relating to the provision of classified justification material to Congress, is provided to the congressional defense committees.

### Section 355—Condition-Based Maintenance Demonstration Programs

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to conduct 12-month condition-based maintenance demonstration programs on, respectively, tactical wheeled vehicles and four systems or components of the guided missile destroyer class of surface combatant ships. This section would specify the issues to be addressed in the demonstration programs and would require that the demonstration programs be conducted with an open architecture approach. Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2010, that assesses whether the respective military departments could reduce maintenance costs and improve operational readiness by implementing condition-based maintenance for the current and future tactical wheeled vehicle fleets and Navy surface combatants.

## TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

### OVERVIEW

The committee is pleased that the fiscal year 2010 budget request includes a permanent increase in the authorized end strength for the active Army of 547,400 and 202,100 for the active Marine Corps. It also commends the Secretary of Defense for his commitment to include the increase in active duty end strength in the base budget. However, while the increases in end strength for the Army and Marine Corps will help to reduce the pressure on the current forces, the committee is concerned that these increases may not be sufficient to meet both the increased operational tempo and the increasing support requirements that are being generated by a nation that has been at war for over seven years.

The committee urges the Secretary of Defense, and the service chiefs, to review both the new operational and support requirements that are developing, and determine whether a change to their force structure will allow them to meet these increasing demands, or whether additional permanent end strength is needed to support these new and emerging requirements. Under current law, the services have the ability to increase the active duty end strength up to three percent above the authorized levels, and the committee notes that the services have availed themselves of this authority. However, the committee is concerned that the steady increase in operational demand and the increasing numbers of non-deployable personnel in the Army will require a hard look at whether an increase in permanent end strength is needed for the foreseeable future. As such, the committee provided authority for the Army to increase its end strength in fiscal years 2011 and 2012, and would require the additional funding to be included in the baseline budget.

The committee is pleased that the Department of Defense has restored the military-to-civilian positions within the military medical community in the fiscal year 2010 budget request, as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Pub-