AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 91

113TH CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
113–44

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

R E P O R T

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1197]

ON

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, TO PRESCRIBE MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

JUNE 20, 2013.—Ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

Calendar No. 91

113TH CONGRESS, *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 113–44

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

R E P O R T

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1197]

ON

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, TO PRESCRIBE MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

JUNE 20, 2013.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

81–479 WASHINGTON : 2013

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, http://bookstore.gpo.gov. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Printing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-mail, gpo@custhelp.com.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

CARL LEVIN, Michigan, *Chairman*

JACK REED, Rhode Island
BILL NELSON, Florida
CLAIRE McCASKILL, Missouri
MARK UDALL, Colorado
KAY R. HAGAN, North Carolina
JOE MANCHIN III, West Virginia
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
KRISTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York
RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, Connecticut
JOE DONNELLY, Indiana
MAZIE K. HIRONO, Hawaii
TIM KAINE, Virginia
ANGUS S. KING, Jr., Maine

JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi
KELLY AYOTTE, New Hampshire
DEB FISCHER, Nebraska
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina
DAVID VITTER, Louisiana
ROY BLUNT, Missouri
MIKE LEE, Utah
TED CRUZ, Texas

Peter K. Levine, *Staff Director*
John A. Bonsell, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the bill	1
Committee overview	2
Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget authority implication	6
Budgetary effects of this Act (sec. 4)	7
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	8
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	8
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	8
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101)	8
Subtitle C—Navy Programs	8
Multiyear procurement authority for E–2D aircraft (sec. 121)	8
CVN–78 class aircraft carrier program (sec. 122)	8
Repeal of requirements relating to procurement of future surface combatants (sec. 123)	11
Modification of requirements to sustain Navy airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities (sec. 124)	11
Littoral Combat Ship (sec. 125)	12
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs	12
Tactical airlift fleet of the Air Force (sec. 131)	12
Modification of limitations on retirement of B–52 bomber aircraft (sec. 132)	12
Repeal of requirement for maintenance of certain retired KC–135E aircraft (sec. 133)	13
Prohibition of procurement of unnecessary C–27J aircraft by the Air Force (sec. 134)	14
Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters	14
Multiyear procurement authority for C–130J aircraft (sec. 151)	14
Sense of Senate on the United States helicopter industrial base (sec. 152)	14
Budget Items	14
Army	14
Enhanced Medium Altitude Reconnaissance and Surveillance System	14
UH–60M Black Hawk helicopter	15
Paladin Integrated Management	15
XM25 counter defilade target engagement weapon system	15
Carbine	15
5.56mm, 7.62mm, .50 caliber, and 30mm reductions	16
25mm reduction	16
Navy	16
Sustaining capabilities of EP–3 and Special Projects Aircraft	16
Close-in weapon system modifications	17
Afloat forward staging base	17
DDG–51	18
Air Force	18
MQ–9	18
Reaper synthetic aperture radar	18
C–130 aircraft modifications	18
Defense-wide	19
MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle	19
Items of Special Interest	20
Army air-to-ground rocket and missile programs	20
Army and Marine Corps initiatives to improve armored vehicle fuel efficiency	20

Page

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT—Continued
Items of Special Interest—Continued
Close air support requirements 21
Comptroller General review of the Ford-class aircraft carrier program 21
Comptroller General review of the Littoral Combat Ship program 22
Defense ground radar programs 23
Department of the Navy strike fighter inventories 24
Ejection seats 24
Enhanced performance round versus special operations science and technology round 25
F–35 production rate 25
F–35 technical issues 26
Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance 26
Joint high speed vessel 27
Joint surveillance/target attack radar system modernization 27
Joint Tactical Radio System handheld, manpack, and small form fit competition and contracting 28
Long Range Strike Bomber 28
Modernization of B–1 bomber 29
Modernization of the B–52 Strategic Radar System 29
Paladin integrated management program 29
Report on the results of the Army voluntary flight demonstration 29
Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund 30
Small diameter bomb 31
UH–1N replacement strategy 31
UH–72 light utility helicopter 32
Uninterruptable power supply 32
Use of commercially available systems to support certain Navy requirements 32
War readiness engine shortfall 33
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 35
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 35
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201) 35
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 35
Conventional Prompt Global Strike program (sec. 211) 35
Modification of requirements on biennial strategic plan for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (sec. 212) 36
Extension of authority for program to award prizes for advanced technology achievements (sec. 213) 36
Five-year extension of pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of certain defense systems (sec. 214) 36
Extension of mechanisms to provide funds for defense laboratories for research and development of technologies for military missions (sec. 215) 36
Sustainment or replacement of Blue Devil Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance System (sec. 216) 36
Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs 38
Homeland ballistic missile defense (sec. 231) 38
Regional ballistic missile defense (sec. 232) 40
Missile defense cooperation with Russia (sec. 233) 40
Additional missile defense radar for the protection of the United States homeland (sec. 234) 41
Evaluation of options for future ballistic missile defense sensor architectures (sec. 235) 41
Prohibition on the use of funds for the MEADS program (sec. 236) 42
Subtitle D—Reports and Other Matters 42
Annual Comptroller General of the United States report on the acquisition program for the VXX Presidential Helicopter (sec. 251) 42
Budget Items 42
Army 42
Warrior Injury Assessment Manikin project 42
Long endurance multi-intelligence vehicle 43
General Fund Enterprise Business Systems 43

Page

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION—Continued
Budget Items—Continued
Army—Continued
Internet mapping 43
Navy 43
Offensive anti-surface warfare weapon development 43
LHA–8 design effort 44
Marine personnel carrier 45
Air Force 45
Operationally Responsive Space 45
Tactical data networks enterprise 45
Tactical exploitation of national capabilities 45
Joint surveillance/target attack radar system 46
Air Force Applications Software Assurance Center of Excellence 46
Defense-wide 47
National Defense Education Program 47
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Lincoln Laboratory 48
Applied research for the advancement of science and technology priorities 48
Automated software code analysis tool development 48
Counter terrorism, counter-insurgency, and the exploitation of human terrain in conflict 49
Combating Terrorism Technology Support 50
Ballistic missile defense technology programs 50
Rapid Fielding 52
Networked Communications Capability Program 52
Defense industrial capacity innovation and sustainment 52
CWMD Systems 53
Advanced sensor applications program 53
U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs 54
Advanced Innovative Technologies 54
Defense research and development Rapid Innovation Program focus areas 55
Developmental test and evaluation 56
Defense Technical Information Center 56
Conflict Records Research Center 56
MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle 57
Combatant Craft Forward Looking Infrared Radar 57
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency programs 57
Items of Special Interest 58
Army Occupant-Centric Survivability Program 58
Chemical and biological defense medical countermeasures strategy 58
Combat casualty care research 59
Common kill vehicle technology program 60
High energy laser weapons 61
Future Ground-Based Interceptor acquisition 62
Hybrid Airships 63
Implementation of Air Force Strategic Weather Modernization Plan Recommendations 64
Importance of preserving and maintaining mission critical information technology services 64
Improved turbine engine program 64
Independent assessment of Army Distributed Common Ground System analyst tool integration 65
Joint Land-Attack Cruise Missile Elevated Netted Sensor (JLENS) system 66
Metrics for evaluating Commercial Solutions for Classified 66
Military Scientists and Engineers 67
Scientific and technical conferences 68
Tactical power grids 69
Trusted microelectronics 69
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 71
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 71
Operation and maintenance funding (sec. 301) 71
Subtitle B—Logistics and Sustainment 71

Page

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
Subtitle B—Logistics and Sustainment—Continued
Sustainment of critical manufacturing capabilities within Army arsenals (sec. 311) ... 71
Strategic policy for prepositioned materiel and equipment (sec. 312) .. 71
Extension and modification of authority for airlift transportation at Department of Defense rates for non-Department of Defense Federal cargoes (sec. 313) ... 72
Subtitle C—Readiness ... 73
Modification of authorities on prioritization of funds for equipment readiness and strategic capability (sec. 321) ... 73
Strategic policy for the retrograde, reconstitution, and replacement of operating forces used to support overseas contingency operations (sec. 322) ... 73
Subtitle D—Reports ... 73
Strategy for improving asset visibility and in-transit visibility (sec. 331) ... 73
Changes to quarterly reports on personnel and unit readiness (sec. 332) ... 73
Revision to requirement for annual submission of information regarding information technology capital assets (sec. 333) ... 74
Modification of annual corrosion control and prevention reporting requirements (sec. 334) ... 74
Subtitle E—Limitations and Extension of Authority ... 74
Limitation on funding for United States Special Operations Command National Capital Region (sec. 341) ... 74
Limitation on funding for Regional Special Operations Coordination Centers (sec. 342) ... 75
Limitation on availability of funds for Trans Regional Web Initiative (TRWI) (sec. 343) ... 76
Subtitle F—Other Matters ... 76
Revised policy on ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms (sec. 351) ... 76
Authorization to institute a centralized, automated mail redirection system to improve the delivery of absentee ballots to military personnel serving outside the United States (sec. 352) ... 77
Budget Items ... 77
Army readiness funding increases ... 77
U.S. European Command funding decrease ... 78
Navy readiness funding increases ... 78
Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support ... 79
Marine Corps readiness funding increases ... 79
Air Force readiness funding increases ... 79
Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support ... 79
Regional Special Operations Coordination Centers ... 80
U.S. Special Operations Command—National Capital Region ... 80
Department of Defense STARBASE program ... 81
Defense Security Cooperation Agency ... 81
Funding for impact aid ... 82
Defense-wide funding decrease for ahead of need request ... 82
Under Secretary of Defense (Policy) funding decrease ... 83
Continuing support for Operation Observant Compass ... 83
Items of Special Interest ... 83
Additive manufacturing ... 83
Advanced situational awareness training ... 84
Air show support by the Department of Defense ... 84
Coal-to-liquid fuel technology developments ... 84
Combatant command support agent accounting ... 85
Comptroller General of the United States review of United States Central Command ... 85
Consolidated guidance on equipment retrograde ... 86
Contingency basing ... 86
Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management ... 87
Department of Defense and Department of Energy memorandum of understanding to enhance energy security ... 87
Energy metering ... 88
Energy security assessments in the Quadrennial Defense Review ... 88

Page

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued
Items of Special Interest—Continued
Foreign exchange program for Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets and critical military language training 89
Full spectrum operations 89
Government Accountability Office readiness analysis 89
Intergovernmental support agreements with state and local governments 90
Light-weight ammunition project under the Defense Production Act, Title III authority 90
Marine Corps core depot maintenance policy 91
Meals ready to eat war reserve 91
Mission compatibility reviews 91
Open pit burning of waste in Afghanistan 92
Organizational clothing and equipment 92
Policies and procedures in handling of hazardous material shipments 93
Readiness concerns under sequestration 93
Report by Installation Command on Kwajalein Atoll 94
Report on the identification of a hollow force 95
Review of defense headquarters and combatant command resources .. 95
Small modular reaction study 96
Tungsten rhenium wire for Department of Defense requirements 97
Unfunded requirements from the Service Chiefs 97
United States Africa Command 97
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS .....
Subtitle A—Active Forces 99
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) 99
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 99
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) 99
End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412) 100
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) 100
Fiscal year 2014 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414) 100
Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415) 101
Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations 101
Military personnel (sec. 421) 101
Budget Item 101
Military personnel funding changes 101
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY .....
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally 103
Service credit for cyberspace experience or advanced education upon original appointment as a commissioned officer (sec. 501) 103
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 103
Information to be provided to boards considering officers for selective early removal from the reserve active-status list (sec. 506) 103
Removal of restrictions on the transfer of officers between the active and inactive National Guard (sec. 507) 103
Limitation on certain cancellations of deployment of reserve component units within 180 days of scheduled date of deployment (sec. 508) 104
National Guard Youth Challenge Program (sec. 509) 104
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities 105
Expansion and enhancement of authorities relating to protected communications of members of the Armed Forces and prohibited retaliatory actions (sec. 511) 105
Enhancement of protection of rights of conscience of members of the Armed Forces and chaplains of such members (sec. 512) 105
Department of Defense Inspector General reports on compliance with requirements for the protection of rights of conscience of members of the Armed Forces and their chaplains (sec. 513) 105
Subtitle D—Member Education and Training 105
Authority for joint professional military education Phase II instruction and credit to be offered and awarded through senior-level course of School of Advanced Military Studies of the United States Army Command and General Staff College (sec. 521) 105

Page

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY —Continued
Subtitle D—Member Education and Training —Continued
Authority for Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to support undergraduate and other medical education and training programs for military medical personnel (sec. 522) 105
Expansion of eligibility for associate degree programs under the Community College of the Air Force (sec. 523) 106
Additional requirements for approval of educational programs for purposes of certain educational assistance under laws administered by the Secretary of Defense (sec. 524) 106
Enhancement of mechanisms to correlate skills and training for military occupational specialties with skills and training required for civilian certifications and licenses (sec. 525) 106
Coverage of military occupational specialties relating to military information technology under pilot program on receipt of civilian credentials for skills required for military occupational specialties (sec. 526) 106
Sense of Senate on the Troops-to-Teachers Program (sec. 527) 107
Conforming amendment relating to renaming of North Georgia College and State University as University of North Georgia (sec. 528) 107
Subtitle E—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response and Military Justice Matters 107
PART I—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response 107
Prohibition on service in the Armed Forces by individuals who have been convicted of certain sexual offenses (sec. 531) 107
Temporary administrative reassignment or removal of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty who is accused of committing a sexual assault or related offense (sec. 532) 107
Issuance of regulations applicable to the Coast Guard regarding consideration of request for permanent change of station or unit transfer by victim of sexual assault (sec. 533) 107
Inclusion and command review of information on sexual-related offenses in personnel service records of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 534) 108
Enhanced responsibilities of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office for Department of Defense sexual assault prevention and response program (sec. 535) 108
Comprehensive review of adequacy of training for members of the Armed Forces on sexual assault prevention and response (sec. 536) 109
Availability of Sexual Assault Response Coordinators for members of the National Guard and the Reserves (sec. 537) 109
Retention of certain forms in connection with Restricted Reports and Unrestricted Reports on sexual assault involving members of the armed forces (sec. 538) 109
Special Victims' Counsel for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the armed forces (sec. 539) 110
Sense of Congress on commanding officer responsibility for command climate free of retaliation (sec. 540) 110
Commanding officer action on reports on sexual offenses involving members of the Armed Forces (sec. 541) 110
Department of Defense Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault (sec. 542) 110
Advancement of submittal deadline for report of independent panel on assessment of military response systems to sexual assault (sec. 543) 110
Assessment of clemency in the military justice system and of database of alleged offenders of sexual assault as additional duties of independent panel on review and assessment of systems to respond to sexual assault cases (sec. 544) 111

Page

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY —Continued
Subtitle E—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response and Military Justice Matters —Continued
PART I—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response —Continued
Assessment of provisions and proposed provisions of law on sexual assault prevention and response as additional duties of independent panels for review and assessment of Uniform Code of Military Justice and judicial proceedings of sexual assault cases (sec. 545) 111
Assessment of compensation and restitution of victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice as additional duty of independent panel on review and assessment of judicial proceedings of sexual assault cases (sec. 546) 112
PART II—Related Military Justice Matters .....
Elimination of five-year statute of limitations on trial by court-martial for additional offenses involving sex-related crimes (sec. 551) 112
Review of decisions not to refer charges of certain sexual offenses to trial by court-martial (sec. 552) 112
Defense counsel interview of complaining witnesses in presence of trial counsel or outside counsel (sec. 553) 112
Mandatory discharge or dismissal for certain sex-related offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and trial of such offenses by general courts-martial (sec. 554) 113
Limitation on authority of convening authority to modify findings of a court-martial (sec. 555) 113
Participation by complaining witnesses in clemency phase of courts-martial process (sec. 556) 113
Secretary of Defense report on modifications to the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit sexual acts and contacts between military instructors and trainees (sec. 557) 114
Sense of Senate on disposition of charges involving certain sexual misconduct offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice through courts-martial (sec. 558) 114
Sense of Senate on the discharge in lieu of court-martial of members of the Armed Forces who commit sexual-related offenses (sec. 559) 114
PART III—Other Military Justice and Legal Matters .....
Modification of eligibility for appointment as Judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (sec. 561) 114
Repeal of the offense of consensual sodomy under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 562) 115
Prohibition of retaliation against members of the Armed Forces for reporting a criminal offense (sec. 563) 115
Extension of crime victims' rights to victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 564) 115
Modification of Manual for Courts-Martial to eliminate factor relating to character and military service of the accused in rule on initial disposition of offenses (sec. 565) 115
Subtitle F—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters 115
Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 571) 115
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 572) 116
Subtitle G—Decorations and Awards 116
Matters relating to Medals of Honor and other medals of high precedence for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 581) 116
Recodification and revision of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard Medal of Honor Roll (sec. 582) 116
Authority for award of the Distinguished Service Cross to Robert F. Keiser for valor during the Korean War (sec. 583) 116
Authority for award of the Distinguished Service Cross to Sergeant First Class Patrick N. Watkins, Jr., for acts of valor during the Vietnam War (sec. 584) 116
Subtitle H—Other Matters 117

Page

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY —Continued
Subtitle H—Other Matters —Continued
Additional requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing (sec. 591) 117
Expansion of privileged information authorities to debriefing reports of certain recovered persons who were never placed in a missing status (sec. 592) 117
Items of Special Interest 117
Availability of Assaultive Offender's Group Treatment program 117
Combat injured military technician (dual status) retention under Wounded Warrior Act authority 117
Command knowledge of civilian convictions of service members for sexual assault 118
Comprehensive Review of Department of Defense coordination and incorporation of civilian law enforcement best practices in sexual assault prevention and response 119
Department of Defense child development center personnel 119
Department of Defense reports on sexual assault 119
General and flag officer billets 120
Medical management of sexual assault cases 120
Military dependent suicides 121
Prohibition of sale of sexually explicit material 121
Report to Congress on the implementation of the recommendations made by the Military Leadership Diversity Commission 121
Report on whereabouts of Army Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl 122
Retention, career progression, and promotion opportunities for female members of the Armed Forces 122
Sexual assault first responder training 123
Suicide prevention screening 123
U.S. Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force and Families Initiatives 124
Veteran unemployment 125
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS .....
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances .....
Fiscal year 2014 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601) 127
Repeal of authority relating to commencement of basic pay for members of the National Guard called into Federal service for less than 30 days (sec. 602) 127
Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing under certain circumstances (sec. 603) . 127
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 127
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611) 127
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612) 127
One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613) 128
One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614) 128
One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615) 128
Correction of citation for extension of reimbursement authority for travel expenses for inactive-duty training outside of normal commuting distance and additional one-year extension (sec. 616) 128
Expansion to all reserve components of stipend for registered nurses in critical specialties under health professions stipend program (sec. 617) 129
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances .....
Technical and standardizing amendments to Department of Defense travel and transportation authorities in connection with reform of such authorities (sec. 631) 129
Subtitle D—Disability, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits 129
Clarification of prevention of retired pay in version in the case of members whose retired pay is computed using high-three (sec. 641) 129

Page

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS — Continued
Subtitle D—Disability, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits —Continued
Effect on division of retired pay of election to receive combat-related special compensation after previous election to receive concurrent retirement and disability compensation (sec. 642) 129
Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for special needs trusts established for the benefit of dependent children incapable of self-support (sec. 643) 129
Periodic notice to members of the Ready Reserve on early retirement credit earned for significant periods of active Federal status or active duty (sec. 644) 130
Preservation of retiree dependent status for certain dependents upon death or permanent incapacitation of the retired member on whom dependent status is based (sec. 645) 130
Subtitle E—Military Lending Matters 130
Enhanced role for the Department of Justice under the Military Lending Act (sec. 661) 130
Subtitle F—Other Matters 130
Authority to provide certain expenses for care and disposition of human remains that were retained by the Department of Defense for forensic pathology investigation (sec. 671) 130
Extension of ongoing pilot programs under temporary Army incentive to provide additional recruitment incentives (sec. 672) 130
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 131
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration 131
Pilot program on increased collection of third-party reimbursements for health care services provided in military medical treatment facilities (sec. 711) 131
Sense of Senate on implementation of integrated electronic health records for the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs (sec. 712) 131
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters 131
Report on provision of advanced prosthetics and orthotics to members of the Armed Forces and veterans (sec. 721) 131
Items of Special Interest 132
Autism spectrum disorder services 132
Education and training of the acquisition workforce of the TRICARE Management Activity 132
Hyperbaric oxygen therapy for mild traumatic brain injury 132
Mental health counselors for service members, veterans, and their families 133
Ribonucleic acid research 133
TRICARE appeals process 133
TRICARE emergency department utilization 134
Use of simulation technology in medical training 135
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 137
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management 137
Restatement and revision of requirements applicable to multiyear defense acquisitions to be specifically authorized by law (sec. 801) .. 137
Extension of authority to acquire products and services produced in countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan (sec. 802) 137
Report on program manager training and experience (sec. 803) 138
Subtitle B-Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs 138
Synchronization of cryptographic systems for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 821) 138
Assessment of dedicated control system before Milestone B approval of major defense acquisition programs constituting a space program (sec. 822) 138
Additional responsibility for product support managers for major weapon systems (sec. 823) 138
Comptroller General of the United States review of Department of Defense processes for the acquisition of weapons systems (sec. 824) 139
Subtitle C—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 139

Page

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS—Continued
Subtitle C—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations—Continued
Maximum amount of allowable costs of compensation of contractor employees (sec. 841) 139
Implementation by Department of Defense of certain recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States on oversight of pensions offered by Department contractors (sec. 842) 140
Subtitle D—Other Matters 140
Extension of prohibition on contracting with the enemy in the United States Central Command theater of operations (sec. 861) 140
Prohibition on contracting with the enemy (sec. 862) 140
Report on the elimination of improper payments (sec. 863) 141
Items of Special Interest 141
Application of the Berry Amendment to the acquisition of athletic footwear in the Department of Defense 141
Clarification pertaining to small business contracting requiring a written justification and approval 141
Competition in the development and procurement of training systems 142
Comptroller General of the United States report on best value competitive source selection techniques 142
Comptroller General of the United States report on in-line management process for the acquisition process 143
Comptroller General report on process and procedures for identifying duplicative and/or inefficient major development and procurement programs 143
Report on the configuration steering boards 143
Required goals for future Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness reports 144
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 147
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 147
Under Secretary of Defense for Management (sec. 901) 147
Supervision of Command Acquisition Executive of the United States Special Operations Command by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (sec. 902) 148
Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System (sec. 903) 149
Transfer of administration of Ocean Research Advisory Panel from Department of the Navy to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (sec. 904) 149
Streamlining of Department of Defense management headquarters (sec. 905) 149
Update of statutory statement of functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relating to doctrine, training, and education (sec. 906) 150
Modification of reference to major Department of Defense headquarters activities instruction (sec. 907) 150
Subtitle B—Space Activities 150
Limitation on use of funds for Space Protection Program (sec. 921) 150
Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related Matters 150
Personnel security (sec. 931) 150
Reports on clandestine human intelligence collection (sec. 932) 152
Navy Broad-Area Maritime Surveillance aircraft (sec. 933) 152
Plan for transfer of Air Force C–12 Liberty Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance aircraft (sec. 934) 153
Subtitle D—Cyberspace-Related Matters 154
Authorities, capabilities, and oversight of United States Cyber Command (sec. 941) 154
Joint software assurance center for the Department of Defense (sec. 942) 155
Supervision of the acquisition of cloud computing capabilities for intelligence analysis (sec. 943) 156
Cyber vulnerabilities of Department of Defense weapons systems and tactical communications systems (sec. 944) 157

Page

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT—Continued
Subtitle D—Cyberspace-Related Matters—Continued
Strategy on use of the reserve components of the Armed Forces to support Department of Defense cyber missions (sec. 945) 158
Control of the proliferation of cyber weapons (sec. 946) 159
Integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyberspace (sec. 947) 160
Centers of Academic Excellence for Information Assurance matters (sec. 948) 160
Items of Special Interest 162
Assessment of multi-year procurement of GPS III satellites 162
Assessment of the costs, risks, and benefits of storage on produced satellites 162
Core staff of the National Reconnaissance Office 162
Estimated cost to relocate spectrum 163
Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle 163
Joint Space Operations Center Mission System Program 164
Mainframe computer security 164
Modernization of Defense Support Program Mobile Ground System ... 165
Payload processing services 165
Report on disaggregation and payload hosting 165
Report on Family of Advanced Beyond Line of Sight Command Terminals for airborne platforms 165
Report on North Korea's ability to develop a functional nuclear-armed long-range ballistic missile 166
Report on space situational awareness 167
Satellite communications strategy 167
Satellite control system modernization plan 168
Space Based Infrared Satellite, GEO 5 and 6 168
Strategic solid rocket motor industrial base 168
Trusted agent for spectrum 168
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 171
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 171
General transfer authority (sec. 1001) 171
Department of Defense Readiness Restoration Fund (sec. 1002) 171
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities 171
Extension of authority to support the unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1011) 171
Extension of authority for joint task forces to provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities (sec. 1012) 172
Extension and expansion of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments (sec. 1013) 172
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 172
Modification of requirements for annual long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels (sec. 1021) 172
Report on naval vessels and the Force Structure Assessment (sec. 1022) 172
Repeal of policy relating to propulsion systems of any new class of major combatant vessels of the strike forces of the United States Navy (sec. 1023) 174
Clarification of sole ownership resulting from ship donations at no cost to the Navy (sec. 1024) 175
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 175
Transfers to foreign countries of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1031) 175
Authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment (sec. 1032) 176
Limitation on the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1033) ... 176
Clarification of procedures for use of alternate members on military commissions (sec. 1034) 177
Subtitle E—Nuclear Forces 177
Modification of responsibilities and reporting requirements of Nuclear Weapons Council (sec. 1041) 177

Page

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS—Continued
Subtitle E—Nuclear Forces—Continued
Modification of deadline for report on plan for nuclear weapons stockpile and nuclear weapons complex (sec. 1042) 177
Cost estimates and comparisons relating to interoperable warhead (sec. 1043) 178
Sense of Congress on ensuring the modernization of United States nuclear forces (sec. 1044) 178
Readiness and flexibility of intercontinental ballistic missile force (sec. 1045) 178
Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 178
National security spectrum strategy (sec. 1051) 178
Department of Defense representation in dispute resolution regarding surrender of Department of Defense bands of electromagnetic frequencies (sec. 1052) 178
Sense of Senate on parental rights of members of the Armed Forces in child custody determinations (sec. 1053) 179
Subtitle G—Studies and Reports 179
Repeal and modification of reporting requirements (sec. 1061) 179
Report on plans for the disposition of the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle fleet (sec. 1062) 179
Report on foreign language support contracts for the Department of Defense (sec. 1063) 179
Civil Air Patrol (sec. 1064) 180
Eagle Vision system (sec. 1065) 181
Subtitle H—Other Matters 181
Extension of the Ministry of Defense Advisor Program (sec. 1081) 181
Items of Special Interest 182
Airborne Nuclear Command Post 182
Air Force weapons storage areas 182
Army force structure and installation alignment 182
Counter threat finance efforts 183
Department of Defense support to U.S. diplomatic facilities overseas . 184
Fiscal priorities 185
Ground Based Strategic Deterrent 186
Impact of B–61 program delay 186
Reforming the security classification system 187
Report on reductions to the fiscal year 2014 defense budget to meet the savings requirement established by the Budget Control Act 187
Strategic Automated Command Control System Modernization Plan .. 188
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS 189
Extension of voluntary reduction-in-force authority for civilian employees of the Department of Defense (sec. 1101) 189
Extension of authority to make lump sum severance payments to Department of Defense employees (sec. 1102) 189
Expansion of protection of employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities from reprisals (sec. 1103) 189
Extension of enhanced appointment and compensation authority for civilian personnel for care and treatment of wounded and injured members of the Armed Forces (sec. 1104) 189
Amount of educational assistance under Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation Defense Education Program (sec. 1105) 190
Flexibility in employment and compensation of civilian faculty at certain additional Department of Defense schools (sec. 1106) 190
Temporary authority for direct appointment to certain positions at Department of Defense research and engineering facilities (sec. 1107) 190
Modernization of titles of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities for purposes of certain civil service laws (sec. 1108) 190
Item of Special Interest 191
Department of Defense civilian leadership programs 191
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS 193
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 193
Modification and extension of authorities relating to program to build the capacity of foreign military forces (sec. 1201) 193
Revisions to Global Security Contingency Fund authority (sec. 1202) . 193

Page

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS—Continued
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training—Continued
Training of general purpose forces of the United States Armed Forces with military and other security forces of friendly foreign countries (sec. 1203) ... 194
United States counterterrorism assistance and cooperation in North Africa (sec. 1204) ... 194
Assistance to the Government of Jordan for border security operations (sec. 1205) ... 195
Authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1206) ... 195
Support of foreign forces participating in operations to disarm the Lord's Resistance Army (sec. 1207) ... 196
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq ... 196
Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan (sec. 1211) ... 196
Extension and modification of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1212) ... 197
One-year extension and modification of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan (sec. 1213) ... 197
One-year extension and modification of authority for program to develop and carry out infrastructure projects in Afghanistan (sec. 1214) ... 198
Extension of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1215) ... 198
Extension of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations (sec. 1216) ... 199
Extension and improvement of the Iraqi special immigrant visa program (sec. 1217) ... 199
Extension and improvement of the Afghan special immigrant visa program (sec. 1218) ... 199
Sense of Congress on commencement of new long-term nation building or large-scale infrastructure development projects in Afghanistan (sec. 1219) ... 199
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters ... 199
Two-year extension of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1231) ... 199
Element on 5th generation fighter program in annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China (sec. 1232) ... 200
Prohibition on use of funds to enter into contracts or agreements with Rosoboronexport (sec. 1233) ... 200
Modification of statutory references to former North Atlantic Treaty Organization support organizations and related agreements (sec. 1234) ... 200
Technical correction relating to funding for NATO Special Operations Headquarters (sec. 1235) ... 201
Strategy to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and related materials in the Middle East and North Africa region (sec. 1236) ... 201
Items of Special Interest ... 201
Inter-American Defense College ... 201
Military-to-military cooperation with Somalia ... 202
Status of United States military engagements with Burma ... 203
Taiwan air power assessment ... 204
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ... 205
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301) ... 205
Funding allocations (sec. 1302) ... 205
Extension of authority for utilization of contributions to the Cooperative Threat Reduction program (sec. 1303) ... 205
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS ... 207
Subtitle A—Military Programs ... 207
Working Capital Funds (sec. 1401) ... 207
National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1402) ... 207

Page

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS—Continued
Subtitle A—Military Programs—Continued
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1403) 207
Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1404) 207
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1405) 207
Defense Health Program (sec. 1406) 207
Subtitle B—Other Matters 207
Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1421) 207
Authority for transfer of funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois (sec. 1422) 208
Budget Items 208
Department of Defense Inspector General growth plan 208
Defense Health Program funding 209
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities 209
Items of Special Interest 209
Army industrial operations activity group 209
Concerns with working capital fund cash balances and fuel rate pricing 210
Joint Interagency Task Force—South 211
National Guard Counterdrug Program 211
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS 213
Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations 213
Purpose (sec. 1501) 213
Procurement (sec. 1502) 213
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1503) 213
Operation and maintenance (sec. 1504) 213
Military personnel (sec. 1505) 213
Working capital funds (sec. 1506) 213
National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1507) 213
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1508) 213
Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1509) 214
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1510) 214
Defense Health program (sec. 1511) 214
Subtitle B—Financial Matters 214
Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1521) 214
Special transfer authority (sec. 1522) 214
Subtitle C—Other Matters 214
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1531) 214
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1532) 215
Extension of authority for Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan (sec. 1533) 215
Budget Items 216
NATO Special Operations Headquarters 216
BuckEye 216
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization 216
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund 217
Item of Special Interest 218
Counter improvised explosive device training 218
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 219
Summary and explanation of funding tables 219
Short title (sec. 2001) 219
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002) 219
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 221
Summary 221
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) 221
Family housing (sec. 2102) 221
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2103) 221
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2104) 221

Page

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2010 project (sec. 2105) 222
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project (sec. 2106) 222
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects (sec. 2107) 222
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2108) 222
Limitation on construction of cadet barracks at United States Military Academy, New York (sec. 2109) 222
Items of Special Interest 223
Access Control Point Equipment Program 223
Comptroller General review of litigation costs incurred by the Military Housing Privatization Initiative 223
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 225
Summary 225
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) 225
Family housing (sec. 2202) 225
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) 225
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) 225
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2205) 226
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2206) 226
One-year extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2207) 226
Two-year extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2208) 226
Item of Special Interest 226
Townsend Bombing Range land acquisition 226
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 227
Summary 227
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) 227
Family housing (sec. 2302) 228
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303) 228
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304) 228
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2305) 228
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 229
Summary 229
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations 230
Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) 230
Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402) 230
Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403) 230
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations 230
Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, Defense-wide (sec. 2411) 230
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM 231
Summary 231
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) 231
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) 231
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES 233
Summary 233
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations 233
Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) 233
Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602) 233
Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603) 233

Page

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES—Continued
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations—Continued
Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604) 233
Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605) 233
Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606) 234
Subtitle B—Other Matters 234
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2611) 234
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2612) 234
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2613) 234
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES 235
Summary and explanation of tables 235
Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account (sec. 2701) 235
Precondition for any future base realignment and closure round (sec. 2702) 235
Report on 2005 base closure and realignment joint basing initiative (sec. 2703) 235
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS 237
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 237
Modification of authorities to fund military construction through payments-in-kind and to use residual value payments-in-kind (sec. 2801) 237
Extension and modification of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2802) 238
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 238
Authority for acceptance of funds to cover administrative expenses associated with real property leases and easements (sec. 2811) 238
Application of cash payments received for utilities and services (sec. 2812) 238
Modification of authority to enter into long-term contracts for receipt of utility services as consideration for utility systems conveyances (sec. 2813) 238
Acquisition of real property at Naval Base Ventura County, California (sec. 2814) 238
Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment 239
Realignment of Marine Corps forces in Asia-Pacific Region (sec. 2821) 239
Modification of reporting requirements relating to Guam realignment (sec. 2822) 239
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances 239
Land conveyance Joint Base Pearl Harbor Hickam, Hawaii (sec. 2831) 239
Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial transfer (sec. 2832) 239
Subtitle E—Other Matters 239
Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (sec. 2841) 239
Items of Special Interest 239
Department of Defense policy for sustainable buildings 239
Homeowners Assistance Program 240
Military Construction Project Data Sheets 241
Scope of work variations for military construction projects 242
Traffic safety 242
U.S. military posture and resiliency in the Asia-Pacific 243
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 245

Page

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 245
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations Overview 245
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) 246
Weapons activities 246
Directed stockpile work 246
Campaigns 247
Site Stewardship and Nuclear Operations 248
Secure transportation asset 248
Defense Nuclear Security and Chief Information Officer 248
Naval Reactors 249
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs 249
Nonproliferation and verification research and development 249
Nonproliferation and international security 250
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation 250
Fissile Materials Disposition program 250
Global threat reduction initiative 251
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response 251
Office of the Administrator 251
Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102) 251
Savannah River Site 251
Waste Treatment Plant 252
Hanford Site 252
Idaho National Laboratory 252
Los Alamos National Laboratory 252
Oak Ridge Reservation 252
Office of River Protection 253
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant 253
Security 253
Technology Development 253
Program Direction 253
Other defense activities (sec. 3103) 253
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 254
Establishment of Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation in National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3111) 254
Plan for improvement and integration of financial management of nuclear security enterprise (sec. 3112) 254
Certification of security measures at atomic energy defense facilities (sec. 3113) 255
Plan for incorporating exascale computing into the stockpile stewardship program (sec. 3114) 255
Integrated plutonium strategy (sec. 3115) 256
Authorization of modular building strategy as an alternative to the replacement project for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico (sec. 3116) 256
Increase in construction design threshold (sec. 3117) 256
Clarification of form of submission of cost estimates on life extension programs and new nuclear facilities (sec. 3118) 256
Subtitle C—Reports 256
Assessment of nuclear nonproliferation programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3121) 256
Modification of reviews relating to cost-benefit analysis of management and operating contracts of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3122) 256
Modification of deadline for certain reports relating to program on scientific engagement for nonproliferation (sec. 3123) 257
Modification of certain reports on cost containment for uranium capabilities replacement project (sec. 3124) 257
Submission of interim report of Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 3125) 257
Subtitle D—Technical Corrections 257
Technical corrections to the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (sec. 3131) 257
Technical corrections to the Atomic Energy Defense Act (sec. 3132) 257
Budget Item 257
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund 257

Page

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS—Continued
Items of Special Interest 258
B–61 Mod 12 life extension program 258
Review of National Nuclear Security Administration Capital Projects 258
Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant project 259
Assessment of Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities that will be transferred to the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management 260
Travel by scientists and other technical personnel to conferences and other venues of benefit to the NNSA mission 260
Use of the term National Security Laboratory in the Atomic Energy Defense Act 260
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD 261
Authorization (sec. 3201) 261
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION 263
Maritime Administration (sec. 3501) 263
DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES 265
Authorization of amounts in funding tables (sec. 4001) 265
Summary of National Defense Authorizations For Fiscal Year 2014 Table 267
National Defense Budget Authority Implication Table 273
TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT 277
Procurement (sec. 4101) 278
Procurement for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4102) 317
TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 327
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 4201) 328
Research, development, test, and evaluation for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4202) 359
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 361
Operation and maintenance (sec. 4301) 362
Operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4302) 377
TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL 387
Military personnel (sec. 4401) 388
Military personnel for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4402) 388
TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 391
Other authorizations (sec. 4501) 391
Other authorizations for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4502) 395
TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 397
Military construction (sec. 4601) 398
TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 415
Department of Energy national security authorizations (sec. 4701) 416
LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS 427
Departmental Recommendations 427
Committee Action 427
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 429
Regulatory Impact 429
Changes in Existing Law 430
ADDITIONAL VIEWS 431
Additional Views of Mr. Inhofe 431
Additional Views of Mr. McCain 438
Additional Views of Mr. Ayotte 442
Additional Views of Mr. Vitter 448
Additional Views of Messrs. Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ms. Ayotte, Mrs. Fischer, and Messrs. Vitter, Blunt, and Cruz 450
Additional Views of Messrs. Inhofe and Sessions, Ms. Ayotte, Mrs. Fischer, and Mr. Vitter 453

Calendar No. 91

113TH CONGRESS *1st Session* | SENATE | REPORT 113–44

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AND FOR DEFENSE ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, TO PRESCRIBE PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JUNE 20, 2013.—Ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 1197]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill (S. 1197) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2014;

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2014;

(4) impose certain reporting requirements;

(5) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and research, development, test and evaluation actions

81–479

and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, and make certain changes to existing law;

(6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2014.

Committee overview

The United States armed forces have been involved in armed conflict since September 11, 2001. Now, after almost twelve years of continuous conflict, U.S. forces are drawing down in Afghanistan and are no longer deployed in Iraq. By the end of 2014, the United States plans to have completed the transition of security responsibility in Afghanistan to the Afghanistan National Security Forces (ANSF). Already, there are clear signs that Afghan security forces are capable of taking the fight to the Taliban, and are doing so effectively.

Nonetheless, the United States continues to face serious security challenges around the globe.

In the Middle East, the situation in Syria continues to grow worse, with the death toll rising, the refugee population rapidly growing, the extremist al Nusrah Front expanding, the security of Syria's chemical weapons stockpile in doubt, and the risk of regional instability increasing, while Iran continues to flout the international community with its unacceptable pursuit of a nuclear weapons program.

In the Asia-Pacific region, the dictatorial North Korean regime has made a series of belligerent declarations, while announcing its intention to restart plutonium production, testing a nuclear device, putting a satellite in orbit using technologies associated with long range ballistic missiles, and displaying a road-mobile missile launcher.

Al Qaeda continues to demonstrate an ability to mutate and exploit safe havens in areas such as North Africa, the Horn of Africa, and Yemen. While weakened, al Qaeda and its associated forces remain focused on carrying out terrorist activities against the United States and U.S. interests around the world.

Here at home, the United States remains uniquely vulnerable to attacks on computer networks critical to our economy, to the provision of public services, and to national security.

The men and women of our armed forces have worked honorably and courageously to take on these challenges on our behalf, often at great personal risk and significant sacrifice to themselves and their families. The committee, the Congress, and the American people owe them a debt of gratitude for this service.

To date in this First Session of the 113th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services has conducted 44 hearings and formal briefings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2014, threats to our national security, and related matters. In order to provide a framework for the consideration of these matters, the committee identified 10 guidelines for its consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. These guidelines are as follows:

1. Sustain the quality of life of the men and women of the all-volunteer force (active duty, National Guard and Reserves) and

their families, as well as Department of Defense civilian personnel, through fair pay, policies and benefits, and address the needs of the wounded, ill, and injured service members and their families.

2. Reduce our Nation's strategic risk by taking action aimed at restoring, as soon as possible, the readiness of the military services to conduct the full range of their assigned missions.

3. Provide our servicemen and women with the resources, training, technology, equipment, and authorities they will need to succeed in future combat, counterinsurgency, and stability operations.

4. Enhance the capability of the U.S. armed forces to support the ANSF and Afghan Local Police as the lead responsibility for security throughout Afghanistan transitions to the ANSF.

5. Enhance the capability of the U.S. armed forces and the security forces of allied and friendly nations to defeat al Qaeda, its affiliates and other violent extremist organizations.

6. Improve the ability of the armed forces to counter emerging and nontraditional threats, focusing on terrorism, cyber warfare, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

7. Address the threats from nuclear weapons and materials by strengthening nonproliferation programs, maintaining a credible nuclear deterrent, reducing the size of the nuclear weapons stockpile, and ensuring the safety, security and reliability of the stockpile, the delivery systems, and the nuclear infrastructure.

8. Terminate troubled or unnecessary programs and activities, identify efficiencies, and reduce defense expenditures in light of the Nation's budget deficit problems. Ensure the future capability, viability, and fiscal sustainability of the all-volunteer force.

9. Emphasize the reduction of dependency on fossil fuels and seek greater energy security and independence and pursue technological advances in traditional and alternative energy storage, power systems, operational energy tactical advantages, renewable energy production, and more energy efficient ground, air, and naval systems.

10. Promote aggressive and thorough oversight of the Department's programs and activities to ensure proper stewardship of taxpayer dollars and compliance with relevant laws and regulations.

11. At the same time, the committee remains deeply concerned about the continuing impact of sequestration on the United States armed forces, and on U.S. national security. While the committee has endeavored to address some of the adverse impacts of sequestration in fiscal year 2013 on the Department of Defense, the bill recommended by the committee uses the budget level commonly recommended by the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives as a guidepost. None of these budgets accounts for the possibility of continued sequestration in fiscal year 2014.

12. Our senior military leaders have uniformly cautioned Congress and the American people that the continuation of sequestration in fiscal year 2014 will damage our security and harm the troops they lead.

The Secretary of Defense testified that continued sequestration will "require dramatic reductions in core military capabilities" and "the scope and activities of our [armed forces around the] world." The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff warned the committee that it will "severely limit our ability to implement our defense

strategy. It will put the nation at greater risk of coercion, and it will break faith with men and women in uniform."

The Secretary of the Army told the committee: "Simply put, to continue sequestration into fiscal year '14 and beyond would not only be irresponsible [and] devastating to the force, but it would also directly hamper our ability to . . . provide sufficiently trained and ready forces to protect our national interests." The Chief of Staff of the Army testified:

> "The fiscal year '13 fiscal situation will have grave and immediate readiness impacts on all forces not serving in Afghanistan or forward in Korea—impacts which will have a significant impact well into fiscal year '14 and beyond. Just a few of the actions we will be forced to take are, for example, we'll curtail training for 80 percent of ground forces. This will impact our units' basic warfighting skills and induce shortfalls across critical specialties, including aviation, intelligence, engineering, and even our ability to recruit soldiers into our Army. . . . For fiscal year '14 and beyond, sequestration will result in the loss of at least an additional 100,000 personnel, soldiers from the active Army, the Army National Guard, and the U.S. Army Reserve. . . . Sequestration will result in delays to every one of our 10 major modernization programs, the inability to re-set our equipment after 12 years of war, and unacceptable reductions in unit and individual training. . . . It will place an unreasonable burden on the shoulders of our soldiers and civilians. . . . If we do not have the resources to train and equip the force, our soldiers, our young men and women, are the ones who will pay the price, potentially with their lives."

The Chief of Naval Operations testified that sequestration "would fundamentally change the Navy as currently organized, trained and equipped." If sequestration is allowed to remain in place in fiscal year 2014 and beyond, he told the committee:

> "[O]ur Navy may be a fleet of around 230 ships. That would be a loss of more than 50 ships, including the loss of at least two carrier strike groups. We would be compelled to retire ships early and reduce procurement of new ships and aircraft. This would result in a requisite reduction in our end strength. Every program will be affected and . . . programs such as the F–35 Lightning II, next generation ballistic missile submarine and Littoral Combat Ship might be reduced or terminated. Inevitably, these changes will severely damage our industrial base. Some shipyards will not be able to sustain steady construction or maintenance operations and may close or be inactivated. Aviation depots will reduce their operations or become idle. Aircraft and weapons manufacturers will slow or stop their work entirely. In particular, the small firms that are often the sole source for particular ship and aircraft components will quickly be forced to shut down. Once these companies and their engineers and craftspeople move on to other work, they are hard to reconstitute, sometimes im-

possible, at a later date when our national security demands it."

Even before the imposition of further sequestration cuts in fiscal year 2014, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations told the committee, the Navy will have to "reduce intermediate-level ship maintenance, defer an additional 84 aircraft and 184 engines for depot maintenance, and defer eight of 33 planned depot-level surface ship maintenance availabilities. At our shore bases, we have deferred about 16% of our planned FY13 shore facility sustainment and upgrades, about $1 billion worth of work. . . . By the end of FY13, a majority of our non-deployed ships and aviation squadrons—nearly two thirds of the fleet—will be less than fully mission capable and not certified for Major Combat Operations."

The Commandant of the Marine Corps stated: "Sequestration will leave ships in ports, aircraft grounded for want of necessary maintenance and flying hours, units only partially trained and reset after 12 years of continuous combat, and modernization programs canceled." The result, he added, would be "a lapse in American leadership" that "will have a deleterious effect on the stability of global order, the perceptions of our enemies, and the confidence of our allies." The Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps testified that as a result of sequestration in fiscal year 2013 alone: "The Marine Corps will have 44 scheduled aircraft depot inductions across all type/model/series that will not occur as a result of sequestration reduction to the FY13 budget. Of the 44 aircraft, 23 are F/A–18A-D aircraft. This will result in less aircraft available for assignment to Marine F/A–18 squadrons and reduce the assets available for training and operational support. . . . The long term effect on non-deployed F/A–18 squadrons is the inability of the unit to achieve and maintain minimum combat readiness required for follow-on deployments."

The Secretary of the Air Force told the committee that sequestration will "severely degrade Air Force readiness." He explained:

> "Lost flight hours will cause unit stand downs which will result in severe, rapid, and long-term unit combat readiness degradation. We have already ceased operations for one-third of our fighter and bomber force. Within 60 days of a stand down, the affected units will be unable to meet emergent or operations plans requirements. Lost currency training requires six months to a year to return to current suboptimal levels, with desired flying proficiency for crewmembers requiring even longer. . . . Depot delays will also result in the grounding of some affected aircraft. The deferments mean idled production shops, a degradation of workforce proficiency and productivity, and corresponding future volatility and operational costs. It can take two-to-three years to recover full restoration of depot workforce productivity and proficiency. . . . All of these sequestration impacts negatively affect Air Force full-spectrum readiness at a time when we have been striving to reverse a declining trend in this critical area. . . . Sequestration cuts to Air Force modernization will impact every one of our investment programs. These program disruptions will, over time, cost more taxpayer dollars to rectify contract re-

> structures and program inefficiencies, raise unit costs, and delay delivery of validated capabilities to warfighters in the field. The drastic reduction to modernization programs reduces our Air Force's competitive advantage and decreases the probability of mission success. . . ."

The Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force warned: "Lost flight hours will cause unit stand-downs which will result in severe, rapid, and long-term unit combat readiness degradation. We have already ceased operations for one-third of our fighter and bomber force. Within 60 days of a stand down, the affected units will be unable to meet emergent or operations plans requirements. Lost currency training requires six months to a year to return to current sub-optimal levels, with desired flying proficiency for crewmembers requiring even longer."

Our country relies on the men and women of our military and the civilians who support them to keep us safe, and to help us meet U.S. national security objectives around the world. We expect them to put their lives on the line every day, and in return we tell them that we will stand by them and their families, that we will provide them the best training, the best equipment, and the best support available to any military anywhere in the world. Sequestration in fiscal year 2013 is already undermining that commitment. The testimony of our military leaders is clear: if sequestration continues, our commitment to our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines—and our national security itself—will be severely damaged.

Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget authority implication

The Administration's budget request for national defense discretionary programs within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services for fiscal year 2014 was $625.2 billion. Of this amount, $526.6 billion was requested for base Department of Defense programs, $80.7 billion was requested for overseas contingency operations, and $17.9 billion was requested for national security programs in the Department of Energy.

The bill authorizes $625.1 billion for national defense discretionary programs for fiscal year 2014. This total includes $526.6 billion for base Department of Defense programs, $80.7 billion for overseas contingency operations, and $17.8 billion for national security programs in the Department of Energy.

The Administration's fiscal year 2014 budget for national defense also included discretionary programs outside the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, discretionary programs that do not require further authorization and mandatory programs that are in current law. When these programs are added to the Administration's budget the request for national defense totaled $641.1 billion.

The two tables preceding the detailed program adjustments in division D of this report summarize the direct authorizations and the equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2014 defense programs. The first table summarizes committee action on the authorizations within the jurisdiction of this committee. It includes the authorization for spending from the trust fund of the Armed Forces Retirement Home which is outside the national defense budget function. The second table summarizes the total budget authority

implication for national defense by adding funding for items that are not within the jurisdiction of this committee or are already authorized.

Budgetary effects of this Act (sec. 4)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the budgetary effects of this Act be determined in accordance with the procedures established in the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010 (title I of Public Law 111–139).

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for procurement activities at the levels identified in section 4101 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Multiyear procurement authority for E–2D aircraft (sec. 121)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to buy E–2D aircraft under a multiyear procurement contract. The Navy estimates that it stands to achieve a roughly 10 percent savings under the multiyear approach, as compared to annual procurement contracts.

CVN–78 class aircraft carrier program (sec. 122)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) by: (1) in subsection (a)(1), striking "$10,500,000,000" and inserting "$12,887,000,000;" (2) in subsection (b), adding a new factor for adjustment allowing increases or decreases in the cost of the ship that are attributable to the shipboard test program; and (3) changing the heading of the subsection to reflect that the name of the program has changed from CVN–21 to CVN–78.

The provision would require a quarterly report providing the CVN–79 program manager's cost estimate for CVN–79. The provision would require the Navy to halt payment of fee on any cost-type or incentive fee contract associated with CVN–79 until such time that the variance between the total program cost estimate and the mandated cost cap has been corrected.

The changes in the CVN–78 cost cap are related to three major areas:

(1) reflecting allowable changes in the original cost cap due to economic inflation, changes in federal, state, or local laws, changes in nonrecurring design and engineering costs attributable to achieving compliance with the cost limitation, and changes to correct deficiencies that may affect the safety of the ship and personnel;

(2) cost increases from the shipyard, resulting from increases in labor costs, material costs, and design costs, offset by a reduction in shipyard's fee; and

(3) cost increases in government-furnished equipment.

The cost increases in the latter two categories are changes outside the original, allowable changes in the cost cap, and are troublesome. The Navy had envisioned the CVN–78 and CVN–79 (then called "CVNX–1" and "CVNX–2") as evolutionary ships that would implement new technologies gradually as they matured. However, the Department of Defense determined that planned incremental improvements for CVNX–1 did not justify the significant investments nor match the pace of technology, given the length of time needed to build the carrier. Instead, the CVNX–1 and CVNX–2 designs were combined into a single, transformational ship design, called "CVN–21," with the intent to skip a generation of technology, while meeting operational timelines for delivery.

This has resulted in cost increases in the shipyard, and costs increases in the new technologies developed and designed to be installed as government-furnished equipment. The shipyard has not been as efficient as it could be, but combining these two ships and maintaining the original construction schedule for operational reasons has resulted in reduced productivity and inefficiencies in the shipyard's effort. All told, this has resulted in roughly 40 percent of the reason to raise the cost cap.

There have also been cost increases in the equipment beyond the control of the shipyard. These include the "transformational" technologies of the electromagnetic aircraft launch system (EMALS), the dual-band radar (DBR), and advanced arresting gear (AAG). While each of these technologies represents an improvement in capability and promise substantial reductions in life cycle costs, collectively, these technologies resulted in roughly one third of the increase to the total construction costs of CVN–78.

As a result of the scrutiny of the CVN–78 program, the Navy believes that they and the shipyard can deliver the CVN–79 within the cost cap for the program recently adjusted by the Secretary of the Navy. This derives from a number of factors, including:

(1) CVN–79 construction will start with a complete design and a complete bill of material;

(2) CVN–79 construction will start with a firm set of stable requirements;

(3) CVN–79 construction will start with the development complete on a host of new technologies inserted on CVN 78 ranging from the EMALS and DBR, to key valves in systems throughout the ship; and

(4) CVN–79 construction will start with a revised construction plan that emphasizes the completion of work and ship outfitting as early as possible in the construction process to optimize cost and ultimately schedule performance.

The Administration and Congress chose to ignore the lessons repeatedly and painfully learned in previous shipbuilding programs that resulted in delays and cost increases. A decision to skip a generation of technology must be accompanied by an operational assessment of the need date for the operational capability and a plan to ensure new generations of technologies are developed, tested,

and ready for installation at the optimum time during the construction of the ship. Unfortunately, the decision on the construction cycle for CVN–78 construction was driven more by the need to replace the USS *Enterprise* at the end of her service life and the need to maintain workload and the industrial base of suppliers for the sole U.S. builder of aircraft carriers. The committee is committed to working with the Department of the Navy to ensure these lessons are not learned again in future Navy vessel construction.

Repeal of requirements relating to procurement of future surface combatants (sec. 123)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Under section 125, the Navy was prohibited from obligating or expending funds for construction of, or advance procurement of materials for, naval surface combatants to be constructed after fiscal year 2011 until the Secretary of the Navy had provided specific reports to Congress. The report submitted by the Secretary of the Navy to Congress of February 2010 provided the Department of the Navy's implementation plan to complete these reports.

Modification of requirements to sustain Navy airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities (sec. 124)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 112 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to require the Secretary of the Navy to maintain sufficient numbers of EP–3 Airborne Reconnaissance Integrated Electronic System II (ARIES II) Spiral 3 aircraft and Special Projects Aircraft (SPA) version P909 to support the wartime operational plans of U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM), and to maintain the capacity to support five EP–3s for allocation to the combatant commands under the Global Force Management Allocation Plan (GFMAP), until the Navy's multi-intelligence Broad-Area Maritime Surveillance System Triton aircraft with signals intelligence (SIGINT) capabilities reaches initial operational capability (IOC). The provision also would require the Secretary to upgrade the final (12th) EP–3 ARIES II aircraft to the Spiral 3 configuration, and to correct electronic intelligence (ELINT) obsolescence problems on both the EP–3 and the SPA aircraft. Finally, the provision would require the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council to coordinate with the Commanders of PACOM and the U.S. Special Operations Command to determine requirements for the special capabilities provided by the SPA aircraft, and would require the Secretary to sustain sufficient numbers of SPA aircraft to meet those requirements until the Navy achieves IOC of a system with capabilities greater than or equal to the SPA.

Section 112 of Public Law 111–383 was intended to prevent a trough in capabilities as the Navy developed replacements for the EP–3 and the SPA intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) systems. The committee is persuaded that the terms of that provision have not been effective in preventing such a trough. The

Navy is planning to remove a large number of personnel from the EP–3 and SPA programs and to use those billets to stand up an early version of the Triton program. However, this version of Triton is purely a complement to the P–8 Maritime Patrol aircraft, and does not have SIGINT capabilities. The personnel reductions in the EP–3 and SPA fleets will have the effect of substantially reducing the number of aircraft that can be supported for GFMAP allocation and wartime operations plans. The multi-intelligence version of Triton, with a capable SIGINT suite, is not planned to achieve IOC until very late in this decade. Clearly, there will be a trough in ISR support for the combatant commands for a number of years if these plans are implemented.

In addition, the ELINT systems on both the SPA and EP–3 aircraft are very old and pose serious obsolescence problems. Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends authorization of funding to address these obsolescence problems, as well as to upgrade the final (12th) EP–3 primary aircraft authorization to the Spiral 3 configuration.

Littoral Combat Ship (sec. 125)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO), in coordination with the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the current concept of operations and expected survivability attributes of each of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) sea frames when they would be employed according to the concept of operations.

When addressing survivability attributes, the committee expects the CNO's report to deal specifically with: (1) comparative assessments of the survivability of the LCS sea frames with the survivability of other Navy combatants and with the adversarial surface combatants; and (2) operational assessments of the core defensive capabilities of each of the LCS sea frames, especially when employed against air threats expected to face the LCS under the concept of operations.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Tactical airlift fleet of the Air Force (sec. 131)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to consider, as part of the recapitalization of the tactical airlift fleet of the Air Force: (1) upgrades to legacy C–130H aircraft designed to help such aircraft meet the fuel economy goals of the Air Force; and (2) retention of such upgraded aircraft in the tactical airlift fleet. It would also require that the Secretary ensure that upgrades to the C–130H fleet are made in a manner that is proportional to the number of C–130H aircraft in the force structure of the active Air Force, the Air Force Reserve, and the Air National Guard.

Modification of limitations on retirement of B–52 bomber aircraft (sec. 132)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 131(a)(1) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (P.L. 109–364) by striking the term "in a

common capability configuration." The lack of a definition raises concerns about whether it could also apply to the aircraft's nuclear capabilities or other modifications and upgrades on the fleet.

The committee notes that the President has yet to provide Congress the force reduction strategy to comply with the limits imposed by the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), despite a requirement to do so by section 1042(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112—81; 125 Stat. 1575). Without such strategic guidance, the committee is unable to fully perform its oversight role, as well as evaluate and prioritize resources designated to support U.S. strategic forces.

During a hearing on April 17, 2013, concerning Department of Defense nuclear force and policies, Senator Mark Udall, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Chairman asked Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs Madelyn Creedon whether the fiscal year 2014 budget request reflected the New START force structure changes. Secretary Creedon responded that "the way that the fiscal year 2014 budget request is structured is it allows both the Air Force and the Navy to continue their preparatory work that will support a decision that will be made in the context of fiscal year 2015 to implement either a reduction in the total number of deployed and total number of delivery systems. . . . The decision as to which of these options we choose has not been made yet, but the way that the '14 budget structure is designed is to preserve the option as we get closer in time, as we understand more about the pros and cons of each option, and frankly also as we get more into where the whole geopolitical situation is going, where we're going with further discussions with Russia, it allows us to maintain that flexibility for as long as possible before we make a decision."

With the approaching New START deadline, it is more likely that the committee will be asked to consider changes to U.S. strategic force structure when it meets next year to review the fiscal year 2015 budget request. The committee believes it is of great importance that the President provide this report, as well as other relevant documentation—such as the report required by section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239)—so that it may fully assess any proposed changes to U.S. strategic forces.

The committee supports the Air Force's request that it adjust the current requirements relative to maintaining certain nuclear-capable bombers. However, given that the relevant strategic planning remains incomplete, the committee notes that any reduction, conversion, or decommissioning of nuclear-certified strategic bombers must comply with the requirements of section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for the Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

Repeal of requirement for maintenance of certain retired KC—135E aircraft (sec. 133)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 135(b) of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Section 135(b) requires that the Secretary of the Air Force maintain at least 74 of the KC–135E aircraft retired after September 30, 2006 in a condition that

would allow recall of the aircraft to future service in the Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, or active forces aerial refueling force structure.

Under the Defense Department's revised strategic guidance, the existing force of KC–10 and KC–135R tankers, along with modernization under the KC–46A program, the Air Force has sufficient tanker assets now and throughout the future years defense program to meet requirements without the need to reactivate any of the KC–135E aircraft. Therefore, there is little need to incur the expense of maintaining these 74 KC–135E aircraft in a higher readiness status.

Prohibition of procurement of unnecessary C–27J aircraft by the Air Force (sec. 134)

The committee recommends a provision that would prevent the Secretary of the Air Force from obligating or expending any funds for the procurement of C–27J aircraft not already on contract as of June 1, 2013.

Subtitle E—Joint and Multiservice Matters

Multiyear procurement authority for C–130J aircraft (sec. 151)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to buy C–130J aircraft under a multiyear procurement contract for the Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Navy. The Air Force estimates that the Department of Defense stands to achieve a roughly 9.5 percent savings under the multiyear approach, as compared to annual procurement contracts.

Sense of Senate on the United States helicopter industrial base (sec. 152)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should take into consideration the health of the U.S. helicopter industrial base when building the Department's annual budget.

Budget Items

Army

Enhanced Medium Altitude Reconnaissance and Surveillance System

The budget request included $142.1 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army, to procure four Enhanced Medium Altitude Reconnaissance and Surveillance System (EMARSS) aircraft. In section 934, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to transfer Air Force C–12 Liberty aircraft to the Army and terminates the EMARSS procurement program. However, the Army will require funds to convert the Air Force C–12 Liberty aircraft to the EMARSS configuration to meet Army requirements. The committee directs that the EMARSS funds be utilized to convert the transferred Air Force C–12 Liberty aircraft to the EMARSS configuration to meet Army requirements. Any funds

remaining after all EMARSS conversions are complete may be used to recapitalize current Army MARSS aircraft.

UH–60M Black Hawk helicopter

The budget request included $1.0 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA), for the UH–60M Black Hawk helicopter. At the Army's request, the committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in APA for the UH–60M Black Hawk and an increase of $20.0 million in PE 23744A for aircraft modifications and product improvement programs.

Paladin Integrated Management

The budget request included $260.2 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV), Army, for the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM). At the Army's request, the committee recommends a decrease of $40.7 million in WTCV for PIM and an increase of $40.7 million in PE 64854A for artillery systems engineering manufacturing and demonstration.

XM25 counter defilade target engagement weapon system

The budget request included $69.1 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV), Army, for the XM25 counter defilade target engagement weapon system. The XM25 is a grenade launcher that fires a 25mm projectile selectively programmed to detonate in the air at a designated range. The XM25 is intended to provide infantry and other units with a more precise capability to engage targets fighting from behind terrain, walls, or other protections.

The committee understands that prototypes of this weapon were acquired, initially tested for safety, and deployed to Afghanistan for a forward operational assessment. A malfunction during this assessment has raised very serious questions about the safety and effectiveness of the weapon. The committee further understands that the Army is in the process of opening consideration of other available or developmental grenade launchers that are capable of firing programmable munitions.

Given the unreliable performance of the XM25 and the Army's review of alternative air burst weapon systems, the committee recommends a decrease of $69.1 million in WCTV for the XM25 counter defilade target engagement weapon system.

Carbine

The budget request included $70.8 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles (WTCV), Army, for the Army's small arms carbine program. The committee notes that $49.5 million of this would be for the procurement of a replacement carbine identified as the result of a competitive evaluation.

The committee understands that the Army has reached a decision not to continue with the individual carbine competitive evaluation program. Therefore, the committee concludes that funds to procure a replacement carbine are no longer needed and recommends a decrease of $49.5 million in WTCV. The committee supports procurement of M4Al carbines as requested in the budget.

Based on the Army's decision to terminate this effort, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or designee, to provide the congressional defense committees, not later than 90 days after termination, a briefing on the justification for this decision and a revised small arms modernization strategy. The committee believes that a stable small arms modernization program is essential and should be a key element of the Army's overarching modernization strategy moving forward. A revised small arms strategy should include a description of M4A1 procurements required annually to sustain the force until a next generation small arms program is established.

5.56mm, 7.62mm, .50 caliber, and 30mm reductions

The budget request included $1.5 billion in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), of which $112.1 million was for 5.56mm, $58.5 million was for 7.62mm, $80.0 million was for .50 caliber, and $69.5 million was for 30mm.

The Department of Defense has identified specific amounts in these ammunition accounts, in the fiscal year 2014 base budget request, for reduction as a result of competition, reduced unit costs, and/or reduced requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $74.5 million in PAA: $25.0 million in 5.56mm, $5.0 million in 7.62mm, $25.0 million in .50 caliber, and $19.5 million in 30mm.

25mm reduction

The budget request included $1.5 billion in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), of which $16.5 million was for 25mm.

The committee notes that per fiscal year 2014 Army budget documentation, the XM1083 high explosive air burst (HEAB) and the XM1081 target practice (TP) ammunition for the Individual Counter Defilade Weapon System are not approved for service use.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $10.3 million in PAA, 25mm: $8.8 million for XM1083 HEAB, and $1.5 million for XM1081 TP.

Navy

Sustaining capabilities of EP–3 and Special Projects Aircraft

The budget request included in Aircraft Procurement, Navy, $55.9 million for the EP–3 series aircraft, and $3.7 million for the Special Projects Aircraft (SPA). Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Navy to sustain these two aircraft fleets until the end of the decade, when replacement programs are scheduled to achieve initial operational capability.

To sustain the ability of these systems to support the combatant commands with the capacity and capabilities required, several actions are necessary. One, the Navy needs to complete the Spiral 3 upgrade to all 12 of the EP–3 primary aircraft authorization, rather than stopping at 11, as proposed in this budget request. Accordingly, the committee recommends an additional $8.0 million for EP–3 series procurement.

Two, due to the extreme ages of the electronics on certain sensors on these aircraft, the Navy faces serious obsolescence problems in the EP–3 and SPA fleets. The Navy's Multi-Intelligence Sensor Development project is developing sensors for the future MQ–4C Triton Broad Area Maritime Surveillance system that could correct the obsolescence problems for the EP–3 and SPA aircraft. The committee recommends authorization of $14.0 million for EP–3 series procurement, and $5.0 million for SPA procurement to procure and install these sensors, which will introduce new capabilities into the fleet before the Triton multi-intelligence version achieves operational status.

Three, the committee recommends authorization of an additional $5.0 million for the SPA program office in the SPA procurement line to sustain engineering, integration, and technical services support.

Close-in weapon system modifications

The budget request included $56.3 million to purchase and install various modifications for the close-in weapon system (CIWS), including $7.7 million for reliability, maintainability, and availability (RMA) kits. The CIWS is the primary, last ditch self defense system in the Navy fleet.

The Navy has begun experiencing reliability problems with the latest CIWS version, the Block 1B. To deal with these issues, the Navy has developed the RMA kit that will fix known reliability problems and also deal with issues of parts obsolescence. The Navy can install the RMA kits dockside, without having to send the CIWS or its modules to the depot. In addition, installing these kits will allow the Navy to extend time between major CIWS overhauls, while still maintaining an acceptable level of operational availability.

The committee believes that the Navy should move more expeditiously on fielding these kits to the fleet, and recommends an increase of $6.4 million to buy 24 additional RMA kits.

Afloat forward staging base

The budget request included $134.9 million in the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) for the third mobile landing platform (MLP–3) for which the bulk of the funding was provided in fiscal year 2012. The request also included $524.0 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN), to procure the fourth mobile landing platform (MLP–4).

The Navy planned to use NDSF funds to complete MLP–3 as the first afloat forward staging base (AFSB–1) platform and use the SCN funds to buy MLP–4 as the second afloat forward staging base (AFSB–2). As a result of reviewing requirements for the AFSB program, the Navy has decided that some funding in the request needs to be shifted from the NDSF account to the SCN account, that some funds in the NDSF budget request are now not required to execute the AFSB program in either account.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase to SCN of $55.3 million and a decrease to the NDSF of $112.2 million.

DDG–51

The budget request for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN), included $1,615.6 million to purchase one DDG–51 destroyer, and $388.6 million in advance procurement to buy DDG–51 destroyers in later years. This would be the second year of a multiyear contract for the DDG–51 program.

Congress added $1.0 billion to the fiscal year 2013 budget request to purchase an additional DDG–51 beyond the two DDG–51s in the budget request. After the implementation of sequestration earlier this year, the Navy found that sequestration left the Navy several hundred million dollars short of having enough funds to award the contract for the third ship.

The committee specifically recommended multiyear procurement authority last year that allowed for buying this extra ship and believes that the Navy should buy the extra ship to help meet force structure shortfalls.

The committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million in SCN for completion of prior year shipbuilding programs to help buy this additional DDG–51.

Air Force

MQ–9

The budget request included $272.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the MQ–9 program to buy 12 aircraft and to pay for various production support activities. According to program officials, the program has $30.0 million in fiscal year 2012 APAF funds that are excess to program needs, since some planned aircraft procurements for fiscal year 2012 were delayed until fiscal year 2013. These funds could be used to pay for other activities within the MQ–9 program.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $30.0 million in fiscal year 2014 for procurement of MQ–9, which the Air Force can offset with the available prior year funds.

Reaper synthetic aperture radar

The budget request included $35.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the procurement of upgrades to the Lynx synthetic aperture radar system for the Reaper unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV). This request would be the first year of retrofits for what is planned to be a procurement costing $125.0 million over the future-years defense program.

The committee recommends no funding for this program. There is insufficient justification for upgrading this system because field studies and Air Force subject matter experts acknowledge that the system is almost never used. Furthermore, the upgrade is intended to provide a rudimentary dismount moving target indication (MTI) capability, while the Air Force is separately funding a robust dismount MTI radar program for the Reaper UAV.

C–130 aircraft modifications

The fiscal year 2014 budget request did not request funding for the C–130 avionics modernization program (AMP), but included $9.9 million for communication, navigation, surveillance/air traffic

management (CNS/ATM) upgrades and $4.3 million for upgrading cockpit voice and digital data recorders (CVR/DVR) for legacy C–130 aircraft in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF). The program of record for modernizing the legacy C–130 aircraft until the fiscal year 2013 budget request was the C–130 AMP. When the Air Force announced a decision to cancel AMP, the program was already in low rate initial production and had delivered five aircraft, four additional kits, and training devices.

Section 143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) prevented the Secretary of the Air Force from canceling or modifying the avionics modernization program for C–130 aircraft until 90 days after he submits a cost-benefit analysis comparing the original C–130 AMP with a program that would upgrade and modernize the legacy C–130 airlift fleet using a reduced scope program for avionics and mission planning systems. Earlier this year, the Air Force contracted with the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) to conduct this study. The Air Force indicates that the study results should be available later in calendar year 2013.

The committee strongly supports modernization of the Nation's legacy C–130 fleet, and fears that the delay in the awarding the study contract will cause the Air Force to lose another year in modernizing the legacy C–130 fleet. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $47.3 million in APAF to fund modifications of legacy C–130 with either: (1) the original AMP upgrade; or (2) an alternative program that would upgrade and modernize the legacy C–130 airlift fleet using a reduced scope program for avionics and mission planning systems. The use of these funds and the use of the funds for CNS/ATM and CVR/DVR upgrades included in the budget should be informed by the results of the IDA study. The committee directs that none of these funds be obligated or expended until 90 days after the Secretary submits the IDA report. The committee also reminds the Air Force that the restrictions in section 143 continue to apply.

Defense-wide

MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle

The budget request included $1.89 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for the acquisition and support of special operations-unique mission kits for the MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV). U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) is responsible for the development and acquisition of special operations capabilities to, among other things, effectively carry out operations against terrorist networks while avoiding collateral damage.

The committee approved an above threshold reprogramming of funds requested by the Department of Defense in January 2013 to provide for the development, integration, and testing of additional capabilities to address identified technology gaps on USSOCOM UAVs. The committee understands that this reprogramming only partially addressed such technology gaps. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $13.0 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, to field additional capabilities for the MQ–9 UAV.

Items of Special Interest

Army air-to-ground rocket and missile programs

The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to find and take advantage of opportunities to develop joint programs that can reduce costs and meet service requirements. In this regard the committee notes that the Marine Corps has developed a weapon system that transforms the standard 2.75–inch Hydra-type rocket into laser-guided precision munitions. The advantages of a smaller precision-guided rocket are apparent, not just in terms of reduced cost but also operational effectiveness as the lower weight of each rocket allows an aircraft to carry more of them increasing the number of engagements possible per sortie. The committee recognizes, however, that a new smaller, precision-guided rocket must be a capability integrated with each services' other air-to-ground rocket and missile portfolios. The Air Force, for example, is in the process of qualifying this precision rocket on a variety of its multi-role combat aircraft.

Given efforts to date by the Marine Corps and the Air Force, and the potential for achieving a precision engagement capability at a significantly reduced cost, the committee is interested to know the Army's analysis of this capability as part of its portfolio of armed helicopter rocket and missile munitions. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or designee, to brief the congressional defense committees, not later than December 1, 2013, on the Army's assessment of its current and future requirements and capabilities for air-to-ground precision-guided rocket and missile munitions.

Additionally, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office to provide the congressional defense committees, not later than December 1, 2013, with an assessment of each of the services' ground-attack rocket and missile programs. This assessment shall examine where there are potential redundancies in service air-to-ground rocket and missile programs; make recommendations where the services could benefit from a consolidation of these requirements and capabilities; and identify the savings, if any, associated with the consolidation of such programs.

Army and Marine Corps initiatives to improve armored vehicle fuel efficiency

The committee notes the commitment of the Army and Marine Corps to reduce the operational fuel consumption of their current and future armored vehicles. The benefits of lower fuel consumption without sacrificing performance include not only reduced cost, but also reduced vulnerability of theater logistics storage and resupply activity, and increased operational flexibility. This is consistent with congressional intent found in section 2911 of title 10, United States Code, requiring consideration of fuel logistics support requirements in planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes.

The committee is aware of efforts on the part of the Army and Marine Corps to implement consideration of the fully burdened cost of fuel into its plans for reset, upgrade, and modernization of their

armored vehicle fleets as well as in the requirements determination and development of their next generation armored vehicles. In this regard the committee is interested to learn more about Army and Marine Corps efforts to reduce fuel consumption that could result in near-term savings.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, or their designees, to provide the congressional defense committees with briefings on their plans and efforts to achieve improved fuel efficiency in their current armored vehicle fleets. These briefings, by armored vehicle type, shall include, but not be limited to, the Army and Marine Corps priorities and objectives, plans and schedules for research and development, investments to date and planned over the future-years defense program, government and commercial research and development efforts including testing results that illustrate technological challenges and potential, and an assessment of the competitive environment for development and production of capable and affordable technologies to achieve greater fuel efficiency. The Secretaries shall provide these briefings not later than 60 days after enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Close air support requirements

The Joint Strike Fighter is designed to replace the F–16 and A–10 in the Air Force inventory. The A–10 has served as the Air Force's primary close air support asset, having been designed for that specific mission with characteristics that permit it to operate and maneuver at low altitude and slow speeds. The aircraft is also heavily armored to ensure the highest survivability for the pilot and vital aircraft systems.

To ensure that the Department of Defense is not heading toward a situation where there may be gaps in capability to meet close air support requirements when the A–10 is retired, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, to conduct a study to determine whether there will be any shortfalls in capability that will be incurred when the Air Force transitions from a fleet having A–10 aircraft to a fleet consisting entirely of F–22 and F–35 aircraft. If there are any gaps between capabilities and requirements, the Secretary of the Air Force should present alternatives for meeting those requirements. The Secretary shall submit this study with the fiscal year 2015 budget submission.

Comptroller General review of the Ford-class aircraft carrier program

The Navy is developing the Ford-class nuclear powered aircraft carrier (CVN–78) to serve as the future centerpiece of the carrier strike group. Ford-class carriers will introduce several advanced technologies that are intended to create operational efficiencies while enabling higher sortie rates with reduced manpower compared to current carriers. As discussed elsewhere in this report, however, these new technologies have led to cost and schedule problems in constructing the first ship of the class.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has recently reported on significant technology delays, construction inefficiencies, testing shortfalls, and cost and schedule pressures currently facing CVN–78. The committee remains concerned that these issues could delay and limit demonstration of eventual CVN–78 capabilities and potentially affect cost, schedule, and performance outcomes for the next ship, CVN–79.

Section 124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required the Secretary of the Navy to report what program management and cost control measures the Navy will employ in constructing the second Ford-class aircraft carrier. The Secretary of the Navy's report in response to that requirement identified a number of changes in the way CVN–79 will be built that will help improve on the performance on CVN–78.

In light of these concerns, the committee directs the GAO to undertake a follow-on review of Ford-class carrier acquisition program. Specifically, the committee directs the Comptroller General to review:

(1) program management and cost control measures the Navy plans to employ in constructing the CVN–79 ship, as identified in its May 2013 report to Congress, in order to determine the extent to which these may be effective in controlling costs. As part of this analysis, the Comptroller General should evaluate the Navy's plans for executing the detail design and construction contract for CVN–79, and should pay particular attention to components of the Navy's plan intended to accommodate remaining schedule risk in the CVN–78 building program;

(2) sufficiency of the Navy's post-delivery test plans for CVN–78 in facilitating timely demonstration of ship capabilities. As part of this analysis, the Comptroller General should evaluate the extent to which land-based testing delays for critical ship technologies have complicated the Navy's planned post-delivery testing activities and schedule;

(3) Department of Defense (DOD) analysis underpinning the Navy's current capability estimates for CVN–78, progress made in meeting the ship's capability requirements, and gaps that may exist between the likely performance of the ship and its major capability requirements; and

(4) maturity and implementation of plans by the shipbuilder to manage the workforce during concurrent construction of CVN–78 and CVN–79.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to submit a report on his review to the congressional defense committees by April 30, 2014.

Comptroller General review of the Littoral Combat Ship program

The Navy's Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program is intended to be a relatively smaller, more affordable vessel than cruisers or destroyers that carries modular payloads supporting the anti-surface warfare, mine countermeasures, and anti-submarine warfare mission area.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has recently reported to the committee on significant concerns about the LCS program.

In light of these concerns, the committee directs GAO to undertake a follow-on review of LCS acquisition program. Specifically, the committee directs the Comptroller General to review:

(1) seaframe production and testing, including:

(a) seaframe developmental test activities and changes made to correct deficiencies identified during testing to date;

(b) weight management for both variants of the seaframe;

(c) Navy plans for verifying survivability, including the use of surrogate aluminum structures; and

(d) plans for achieving greater commonality between the variants, and progress made in executing such plans;

(2) mission module development and testing, including developmental test activities and changes the Navy plans to correct deficiencies identified during testing to date;

(3) lessons the Navy may be learning from the deployment of LCS–1 to Singapore;

(4) results of Navy studies on LCS requirements and technical capabilities, and any recommendations for changes to the design and/or capabilities of either the current LCS configurations or potential future LCS configurations;

(5) role of the LCS Council in overseeing LCS acquisition and fleet introduction.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to submit a report on his review to the congressional defense committees by April 30, 2014.

Defense ground radar programs

The Senate report accompanying S. 1390 (S. Rept. 111–35) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) raised concerns regarding the requirements, capabilities, and affordability of the Marine Corps TPS–80 Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar (G/ATOR). While the TPS–80 G/ATOR program has made progress recently, the committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report of March 2013 titled "Defense Acquisitions: Assessments of Selected Weapon Programs" (GAO–13–294SP) found that the G/ATOR program has more than doubled in unit cost, total program costs, and research and development costs since the program began in 2005.

The Senate report also noted that the Marine Corps was at that time reviewing the G/ATOR mobile ground multi-mode radar program for possible joint development with the Army.

Now, each of the military departments is pursuing separate ground radar programs, including the Army TPQ–53, the Marine Corps TPS–80, and the Air Force TPS–78 and TPS–703. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has failed to find a material solution to meet common requirements for a mobile ground multi-mode radar capability and may be missing an opportunity to develop a joint program that meets the majority of service requirements while reducing unit costs and saving money. The

committee believes that the fiscal realities demand that the services look for every opportunity to develop joint programs, reduce costs, and meet valid service requirements.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or designee, to provide the congressional defense committees a classified or unclassified briefing, not later than December 1, 2013, on the analysis, evaluation, and decision-making process of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council with respect to the validation and approval of separate requirements and acquisition programs for the Army TPQ–53, the Marine Corps TPS–80, and the Air Force TPS–78 and TPS–703.

Additionally, the committee directs the Comptroller General to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than December 1, 2013, an assessment of each of the services' ground radar programs. This assessment shall include a review of requirements and capabilities identifying redundancies, if any, and the degree of redundancy among the programs. The Comptroller General shall also include an assessment of the feasibility and acceptability of establishing a joint ground radar program and an estimate of program cost increases or decreases should such a joint program be established.

Department of the Navy strike fighter inventories

Throughout the past several years, the committee has expressed concern that the Navy is facing a sizeable gap in aircraft inventory as older F/A–18A–D retire before the aircraft carrier variant (F–35C) of the Joint Strike Fighter is available to replace them. In any case, the F/A–18E/F will be a critical part of the Navy's fleet for the next 25 years, complementing the Navy's F–35C. The F–35C is expected to reach initial operational capability in late 2018.

Additionally, the Navy now intends to inspect legacy F/A–18A–D aircraft periodically above 8,000 flight hours, in combination with executing a service life extension program (SLEP) on 150 of those aircraft, in an effort to extend a portion of the inventory to 10,000 hours. As yet, the Navy does not have sufficient data to predict the failure rate for aircraft being inducted into the SLEP. The current SLEP engineering analysis has not been completed. In addition, the costs and schedules associated with the Navy's plans remain unknown. As a result, executing the Navy's plan could negatively impact the tactical aviation shortfall, as there are already reports of aircraft backed up at Navy depots awaiting parts and maintenance. The committee understands that more than 42 percent of the legacy F/A–18A–D aircraft, approximately 260 aircraft, are currently out of service awaiting some form of maintenance, inspection, or repair.

The committee believes a strong carrier-based fleet is vital as part of the increased emphasis on the Pacific region. This emphasis requires the Navy to have a viable fleet of both F/A–18E/F and F–35C aircraft to avoid creating a risk for the Navy's future strike fighter force structure.

Ejection seats

The committee understands that aging and heavy operating tempo have caused metal fatigue and corrosion in legacy ejection

seats. Moreover, the incorporation of helmet-mounted displays and devices creates a situation for pilots that the legacy seats were never intended to accommodate during an ejection event. This leads to increased risks for pilot survival during high speed ejections.

The committee understands that newer ejection seats can effectively address these issues, while at the same time providing simplified maintenance and increasing aircraft availability. Furthermore, recent seat safety enhancement features provide for greatly improved safety for aircrew using current operational helmet-mounted displays, thereby reducing the possibility of head, neck, and spinal cord injuries.

For these reasons, the committee encourages the Air Force to evaluate a program or programs to replace the 1970s-designed ejection seats currently equipping most legacy fighter and bomber aircraft, paying particular attention to improving crew safety and reducing operation and support costs.

Enhanced performance round versus special operations science and technology round

The committee notes that the Army has developed and begun to field a 5.56mm enhanced performance round (EPR) which has the potential to demonstrate improved performance against hard and soft targets, in addition to other small caliber ammunition. The committee notes that the Marine Corps has begun testing on the use of the special operations science and technology (SOST) round which also has an opportunity to demonstrate similar effects. The committee understands the Marine Corps is conducting a review and comparison of the EPR versus the SOST round.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Marine Corps to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee on the status and progress of the EPR versus SOST round review no later than September 1, 2013.

F–35 production rate

The committee believes that the continued development and funding of all three variants of the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter is critical to maintaining U.S. air dominance. The committee supported restructuring the program to keep production remaining flat for the past 4 years to reduce concurrency risk and allow the program to make additional progress in the testing program before ramping up production.

The committee notes that the program has been executing close to the planned testing and development schedule. The Marine Corps will declare initial operational capability (IOC) in 2015 with the Block 2B software capability. The Air Force will declare IOC in 2016 with the Block 2B/3I software capability, rather than waiting for the Block 3F capability as previously planned. The Navy will declare IOC in late 2018 with the Block 3F software capability. Achieving these IOC dates depend in part on increasing production according to the current plan.

With the program now achieving most testing milestones, the committee believes that the Department of Defense should seri-

ously consider continuing with the current plan to increase production in fiscal year 2015 and beyond.

F–35 technical issues

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Airland of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, the F–35 Program Executive Officer (PEO) discussed the development issues which present the greatest technical risks to the program.

Regarding the software, the committee notes that a critical design review (CDR) is planned which will shed more light on progress of the Block 3F software against the requirements and delivery timeline. Block 3F software provides the capability that will allow all three services to declare full operational capability. The committee directs the PEO to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the results of the CDR within 30 days of its conclusion.

In addition to software, the PEO also highlighted other known technical risks to the F–35 program, to include the helmet mounted display system, the tailhook, the fuel dumping system, and the autonomic logistics information system. The committee directs the F–35 PEO to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the status of the risk and cost reduction efforts to these four systems within 30 days from the completion of any major test objective or risk reduction effort involving these four programs.

Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance

In January 2012, the Air Force proposed the retirement of its RQ–4 Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft. The Secretary of the Air Force stated the reason for this decision was based on the operational capability and cost to operate and maintain the Global Hawk Block 30. Section 154 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required the Air Force to maintain the operational capability of each RQ–4 Block 30 Global Hawk unmanned aircraft system through December 31, 2014.

This committee understands the strategic importance of high-altitude surveillance and increasing demands for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) by the commanders of combatant commands (COCOM) around the world, both in permissive and non-permissive environments. The Senate report (S. Rept. 112–173) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (S. 3254) required the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to identify enduring requirements for persistent ISR, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to provide a long-term investment strategy for meeting that requirement to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees no later than May 2, 2013. The committee understands that the Department has had some difficulty in defining the terms of reference for the analytical effort that has resulted in delaying the report, but believes the Department of Defense should move expeditiously to complete these tasks.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Under Secretary

of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to provide an update on the congressionally directed report immediately to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees, and the final report on COCOM peacetime and wartime requirements, and the long-term investment strategy for meeting those requirements, no later than February 1, 2014.

Joint high speed vessel

The Navy is procuring the Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV) to serve as an intra-theater lift asset. In a prepared statement to the committee earlier this year, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, United States Navy, talked about the new deployments of JHSVs and Littoral Combat Ships and said, "[w]e will use these deployments to integrate these new, highly adaptable platforms into the fleet and evaluate the ways we can employ their combination of persistent forward presence and flexible payload capacity."

To better understand the Navy's plans for the JHSV fleet, the committee believes that the Secretary of the Navy should identify: (1) the Navy's intent for allocating JHSVs among the combatant commanders; and (2) any overseas basing plan to support that allocation.

Further, the committee believes the Navy should consider additional functions or capabilities that the JHSV fleet might provide. Some of these could include support to counterdrug or counter piracy operations, command and control for joint task force operations, to intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance operations.

The committee directs the Secretary to provide a report on these issues with the submission of the fiscal year 2015 budget request.

Joint surveillance/target attack radar system modernization

The committee is concerned about the continued long-term sustainment of the capability provided by the Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) E–8 aircraft. The aircraft and sensors may need costly upgrades to keep the system relevant to the operational environment. The Air Force has completed an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) to evaluate potential replacement platforms to perform the battle management command and control and ground moving target indicator (BMCC/GMTI) missions. These missions that support ground and naval forces are critical.

The AoA recommends as the preferred option a combined solution of modern business jets, using a fourth generation sensor system already in development by the Navy and Global Hawk Block 40 remotely piloted vehicle. The analysis indicates that this option would offer the potential of significant lifecycle cost savings and improved sensor capabilities, if the Air Force could afford the upfront investment costs. Although the Air Force acknowledges the need for a JSTARS mission area replacement aircraft, the fiscal year 2014 budget request does not include a request for funding such an option.

This committee is concerned that delays in commencing a program to replace and modernize the JSTARS capability could result in unfulfilled intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance require-

ments and higher risk to operational forces. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report that would provide a detailed description of the Department of Defense plan to modernize the capability to satisfy the BMCC/GMTI missions. The Secretary is directed to submit that report no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

Joint Tactical Radio System handheld, manpack, and small form fit competition and contracting

The committee has long supported and encouraged Army plans for a full and open competition at full rate production for the handheld and manpack radios of the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) program. The advantages to the Army and the taxpayers of a communications system built upon non-proprietary, open-architecture technologies acquired through competition are apparent. The potential savings and technological performance improvements associated with competition among several tactical radio manufacturers could be significant over time.

The committee is concerned, however, that a potential plan to award a 5-year contract to a single vendor will result in an uncompetitive and smaller tactical radio industrial base. This, in turn, could lead to the Army becoming entrapped in subsequent sole-source procurements that forfeit greater savings and improved technical performance that come with frequent competition.

Accordingly, the committees directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to review the Army's handheld and manpack radio competition and contracting plans and provide to the congressional defense committees an assessment of how they will achieve the objectives of increased savings and performance through competition among several vendors over the life of the JTRS program. The Under Secretary shall submit this assessment not later than 60 days after enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Long Range Strike Bomber

The committee is aware that the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force Chief of Staff have called for the development of a new stealth bomber as our nation's military posture transitions and focuses on emerging threats in both the Middle East and the Asia-Pacific region. A new stealth bomber is essential to deterrence and anti-access strategies in these regions. A new stealth bomber will continue to ensure that deterrence remains a viable tool of our foreign policy by providing the President and combatant commanders with the ability to hold targets at risk with a versatile platform that combines range, persistence, payload, and survivability. A new stealth bomber will be an indispensable foundation of future U.S. power projection. As the only new aircraft development program planned for the next decade, continued development of the new bomber is essential to maintain U.S. teleological superiority and a highly specialized workforce.

Modernization of B–1 bomber

The Secretary of the Air Force is directed to report to the congressional defense committees on efforts to modernize the B–1 bomber over the life of the airframe. The report shall be due to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2014.

Modernization of the B–52 Strategic Radar System

The current B–52H Strategic Radar System (SRS) is approaching the end of its useful life. The Air Force conducted an Analysis of Alternatives to evaluate potential replacements for this system. The Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives expressed concern in their reports accompanying the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Year 2013 regarding funding for the Strategic Radar Replacement (SR2) program. This committee remains concerned about lack of funding in the fiscal year 2014 budget, which would allow critical capability gaps, and directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a detailed plan with timeline on how it will replace the SRS on all B–52Hs.

Paladin integrated management program

The budget request included $260.2 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles and $80.6 million in PE 64854A for the Paladin Integrated Management (PIM) self-propelled howitzer program. The committee notes the PIM program will soon be entering low rate initial production (LRIP). Over the past several months, the committee notes that the Army has taken several fact-of-life reductions to the program. The Army explains that these reductions are due to the extraordinary fiscal constraints of sequestration and overseas contingency operations funding shortfalls. The committee further notes that the Army intends to hold to the program's current schedule including the procurement of the full complement of the initial LRIP vehicles while still able to reduce LRIP procurement in the out-years. The committee fully supports the PIM program and expects the Army to continue to review the development schedule for other ways to accelerate the program while retaining cost and schedule.

Report on the results of the Army voluntary flight demonstration

The committee is aware that the Army is continuing its evaluation and consideration of the feasibility, affordability, and advisability of acquiring a new light armed scout helicopter to replace the current OH–58D Kiowa Warrior. Since the cancellation in 2011 of the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter, the Army has been methodically working through an assessment of its light armed scout helicopter requirements and an analysis of alternatives across a wide range of operating concepts including manned helicopters, unmanned aerial systems, and manned-unmanned teaming. As part of a broader consideration of alternatives for what has become the Armed Aerial Scout (AAS), the Army conducted a voluntary flight demonstration of commercially available aircraft to refine its requirements determination process and explore how closely aircraft flying today compare to the capability of the Kiowa Warrior and

could approach meeting the capabilities the Army has in mind for a light armed scout replacement. The committee is interested to learn more about the results of the Army voluntary flight demonstration and its contribution to the ongoing analysis of the feasibility, affordability, and advisability of replacing the OH–58D Kiowa Warrior.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or designee, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2014 that details the performance metrics demonstrated by each participant. The report shall also provide an estimate of the costs associated with the development and testing of each participant's aircraft for modifications and upgrades necessary to convert such aircraft to a fully militarized AAS. Finally, the report shall include the estimated schedule for competition, development, testing, and qualification of each aircraft overlaid on current timelines for Kiowa Warrior service life extension, safety upgrades, and modernization programs.

The committee is aware that information regarding the performance of participants' aircraft is competition sensitive and directs that the report shall not disclose their identities and shall, where appropriate, protect their intellectual property. The committee will work with the Army to ensure that such information is adequately protected.

The committee further understands that Kiowa Warrior service-life, safety, and capability upgrades are necessary under any potential replacement scenario in order to address critical near-term operational performance and safety requirements. The committee supports these Kiowa Warrior modification efforts to ensure that the Army's current light armed scout helicopter, that has been proven in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan, is ready and available for the 10–20 years it may take to field a replacement should an alternative prove feasible and affordable.

Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund

Section 8105 of the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 113–6) established the Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund, and appropriated more than $2.4 billion to the Fund. The Fund was intended to prevent the premature retirement of seven cruisers and two dock landing ships during fiscal years 2013 and 2014. This reflected a concern with the proposed retirement plan that the plan: (1) was disconnected from the defense strategy; (2) created future unaffordable shipbuilding requirements; and (3) would exacerbate force structure shortfalls that negatively impact the Department's ability to meet combatant commander (COCOM) requirements.

The Report to Congress on the Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels for fiscal year 2014, date May 10, 2013, proposes to retire these cruisers and amphibious ships during fiscal year 2015, resulting in a fleet of 270 ships, the smallest fleet since 1917. The Navy is taking this action despite the fact that keeping these vessels operating until the end of 2014 will cost, according to the Navy, $931.1 million. The committee believes that the Navy should use the remaining resources in the Fund to sustain all of these ships. Available funds would permit the Navy to operate the

ships during most of the period future-years defense program and would permit the Navy and Congress to continue evaluating options for modernizing and retaining these vessels until the end of their expected service lives.

Small diameter bomb

The Small Diameter Bomb (SDB) program fields a 250-pound bomb that provides low-cost, precision strike capability and is designed to increase weapon's loads of fighters, bombers, and unmanned aerial systems.

The first version of SDB, SDB–I, is an all-weather munition for which the requirements are defeating stationary targets. SDB–1 uses global positioning system (GPS) and inertial navigation system (INS) data to achieve the required precision. This munition achieved initial operating capability in late 2006.

The second version of SDB, SDB–II, would add a tri-mode seeker (radar, infrared, and semi-active laser) to the INS and GPS guidance of the original SDB–I. These sensors are intended to provide automatic target recognition features for striking mobile targets, such as tanks, vehicles, and mobile command posts.

The Air Force plans to start low rate initial production of SDB–II in 2014. Earlier this year, SDB–II flight test program was temporarily suspended due to a flight test failure, but has since resumed. Any further delays could affect the timing of Milestone C, currently scheduled for August 2013, and could cause a delay in having required assets available to outfit an F–15E squadron in late 2016.

The committee is aware that there is a possible modification to the SDB–I that would add a semi-active laser (SAL) sensor. This might provide some, but not all, of the potential SDB–II capability against mobile targets. The Air Force may want to consider this or other options if there were additional flight testing difficulties that would cast doubt on the success of the SDB–II program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to brief the congressional defense committees on the status of the entire SDB program no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act. The briefing should include current status of SDB–II test program, potential gaps in capabilities if SDB–II testing were to be delayed, examination of the mix of SDB–1 and SDB–II weapon capabilities and costs, and recommended way ahead for SDB procurement.

UH–1N replacement strategy

The committee is aware that the Air Force has a long-standing need to replace its aging UH–1N helicopter fleet. The current UH–1N fleet provides the Air Force with a capability to provide security for Global Strike Command operations and to ensure continuity of government and continuity of operations in the National Capital Region. The committee acknowledges that the Air Force has had to make difficult decisions on a replacement utility helicopter, but believes that the Air Force should articulate a strategy for modernizing the capability provided by these helicopters.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide the congressional defense committees a report, not later than Feb-

ruary 1, 2014, that assesses and categorizes the Air Force's utility helicopter capabilities to meet the full range of nuclear security and continuity of government requirements and describes the Air Force's strategy towards meeting such requirements.

UH–72 light utility helicopter

The budget request included $96.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA), for the procurement of 10 UH–72 light utility helicopters. According to the Army this is the final year of UH–72 purchases, truncating the total program buy at 315 aircraft instead of the originally planned 346. The committee notes that even though this ends production short of the original plan, the final buy fully meets the documented UH–72 requirements of the Army National Guard.

The committee is concerned that the Army's decision may have an impact on the UH–72 industrial base that increases risks over time for the support of its fielded fleet of 315 aircraft. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology to provide the congressional defense committees with an assessment of the impact of production termination on the UH–72 industrial base and support for the fielded fleet. The Secretary's assessment should address, but not be limited to, the potential impacts on the parts supply chain including mission modules, the availability of maintenance services, and how the replacement of aircraft will be managed in the event of any future losses. The Secretary shall submit this assessment not later than 60 days after enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Uninterruptable power supply

The committee is aware of a funding shortfall associated with procurement of the Uninterruptable Power Supply (UPS) required for the new United States Strategic Command Replacement Facility. The committee also notes the UPS must be delivered no later than July 2014 to avoid significant construction delays and/or contract penalties.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2013, identifying specific actions the Air Force is taking to ensure the UPS is delivered by the construction need date.

Use of commercially available systems to support certain Navy requirements

The Navy faces growing anti-access and area denial threats around the world, specifically including Iranian small boat swarm threats in the Arabian Gulf and in the Strait of Hormuz. In addition to this reality of increasing threats, the Navy faces tightening resources from implementation of the Budget Control Act (Public Law 112–25). The committee believes that the Navy, whenever possible, should seek to make maximum use of commercially available systems to fill capability gaps in the most affordable manner. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees with the submission of the fiscal year 2015 budget request, including a classi-

fied annex as necessary, that would identify: (1) any gaps in Department of the Navy's capability to deal with anti-access and area denial threats; (2) if there are gaps, whether those gaps are covered by other Department of Defense forces or systems; (3) if there are gaps, to what extent there may be commercially available systems to fill the capability gaps; (4) whether fielding commercially available systems could potentially avoid lengthy and costly research and development programs; and (5) whether commercially available systems are free from cyber threats.

War readiness engine shortfall

The committee understands that the Air Force faces a shortfall of useable engines for the F–15 and F–16 fleets as compared to the war readiness engine objective. Given that the Air Force will continue to rely on the F–15 and F–16 well into the foreseeable future, maintaining the readiness of these fleets is imperative. The committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force to include sufficient resources in future budgets for engines to avoid degrading readiness.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation activities at the levels identified in section 4201 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Conventional Prompt Global Strike program (sec. 211)

The committee is supportive of the Conventional Prompt Global Strike (CPGS) program and realizes that efforts in developing intermediate- and long-range hypersonic boost-glide systems have the potential to provide significant military capability. However, the committee is concerned that the strategic policy issues regarding submarine-launched systems have not been considered adequately. The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense (DOD) from executing any funds in PE 64165D8Z related to the development of a submarine-launched CPGS capability until 60 days after the Department delivers to the congressional defense committees a report that addresses the policy considerations concerning the ambiguity problems regarding the launch of CPGS missiles from submarine platforms.

The CPGS program is currently an event-driven technology development and demonstration program, and the committee recognizes that in the current budget environment, DOD needs to take a system-of-systems approach to develop an integrated strategic plan that addresses the cost-benefit analyses of various launch approaches. The Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) shall conduct a study, to include the costs and benefits of maritime and ground surface versus sub-surface launched CPGS systems. While the committee recognizes that significant technical development remains, it is not too early to begin considering the fiscal implications of the various launch mechanisms, including integration costs. The committee notes that Section 1071 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required a report on the ability of national test and evaluation capabilities to support the maturation of hypersonic technologies for future defense systems development. This earlier report effort is synergistic with the CAPE report. The CAPE report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology to report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days after the enactment of this Act on whether the CPGS activity should be managed under the Joint Technology Office on Hypersonics under the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering. The committee feels that the synergies and efficiencies under this office could benefit the broader boost-glide and air-breathing hypersonics community.

Modification of requirements on biennial strategic plan for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (sec. 212)

The committee recommends a provision that would make some modifications to the biennial strategic plan requirement for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The modifications seek to make the plan more useful and assign responsibility to the Director of DARPA versus the Secretary of Defense.

Extension of authority for program to award prizes for advanced technology achievements (sec. 213)

The committee recommends a provision, based upon a Department of Defense legislative proposal, that would extend through September 30, 2017, the authority for the Secretary of Defense to carry out programs to award cash prizes in recognition of outstanding achievements in scientific and technical research and development.

Five-year extension of pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of certain defense systems (sec. 214)

The committee recommends a provision, based upon a Department of Defense legislative proposal, that would extend for an additional 5 years, to October 1, 2020, the pilot program addressing Defense Exportability Features to be incorporated in export versions of major defense equipment.

Extension of mechanisms to provide funds for defense laboratories for research and development of technologies for military missions (sec. 215)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of section 219(c) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law (110–417) until September 30, 2020. Section 219 allows the Department of Defense laboratories to use up to 3 percent of their funds for internal competitive research and development, workforce development, and limited laboratory revitalization activities.

Sustainment or replacement of Blue Devil Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance System (sec. 216)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to procure the currently deployed Blue Devil intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) aircraft or to develop a plan to replace that system with a comparable or improved one.

The leases for the existing Blue Devil system aircraft, deployed in Afghanistan, will expire in the second quarter of fiscal year 2014. These manned aircraft are equipped with wide-area motion-imagery (WAMI) cameras, which work in conjunction with a ground-based signals intelligence (SIGINT) network that detects and locates specific targets with high precision. These SIGINT identifications and locations are used to cue analysts to spot and track the targets through the motion imagery sensor. Assessments of the performance of this system in theater have been outstanding, and an operations research study conducted by the Air Force demonstrated that a system based on a longer-endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) that carries both the imagery and SIGINT capabilities would be even more flexible and effective.

U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM), through the Air Force Big Safari program office, has already fielded a so-called near vertical direction finding (NVDF) SIGINT sensor on an airborne platform that replicates the capabilities of the ground-based SIGINT system used in Blue Devil. SOCOM is procuring a podded version of this sensor for deployment on Reaper UAVs. SOCOM has also already paired this NVDF system with a motion imagery camera, but that camera is a traditional full-motion video (FMV) camera with a narrow field of view rather than a WAMI system. NVDF systems can simultaneously detect and locate a very large number of emitters in its field of view. An FMV camera, however, can only track one target at a time because of its limited area coverage. A WAMI camera, in contrast, could track many targets simultaneously, which matches the capability of NVDF sensors.

SOCOM is in discussions with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) on partnering to transition DARPA's Wide Area Network Detection (WAND) technology, which combines NVDF and WAMI and provides technology to track targets automatically.

The Air Force has already fielded the DARPA-developed WAMI system on the Reaper UAV called Gorgon Stare Increment 2, and has funded the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Lincoln Laboratory to develop NVDF technology under the name Blue Moon. The Gorgon Stare pods are very large and weigh 1,500 pounds. However, the Blue Moon system has not been integrated with Gorgon Stare or the Reaper and has performance limitations compared to the SOCOM-fielded NVDF system.

The provision the committee recommends would require the Department of Defense to integrate and rationalize all these disparate activities to create an important capability for a recognized requirement.

The Air Force must work with SOCOM and DARPA to realize these objectives. The Air Force can procure more of the mature NVDF capability it has fielded for SOCOM, and integrate that with its fielded Gorgon Stare WAMI systems on the Reaper. DARPA's WAND technology can enhance the performance of this integrated capability. Likewise, the Blue Moon NVDF technology has important capabilities that are lacking in the SOCOM-fielded NVDF system that should be incorporated as soon as possible. This technology needs to be transitioned to industry broadly for future competitions to improve NVDF performance. For the future, NVDF

technology must be improved to deal with encryption-related target identification limitations and next-generation signal types. Likewise, WAMI systems need to be dramatically reduced in size, weight, and power requirements; industry has already developed multiple competitive solutions.

To implement this direction, the committee recommends an increase of $15.0 million to the budget request of $37.8 million in PE 35206F for Airborne Reconnaissance Systems. This increase is partially offset by a reduction of $2.5 million to the request, which reflects the difference between the amount reflected in the budget tables provided to Congress and the amount contained in the Military Intelligence Program justification volume.

Subtitle C—Missile Defense Programs

Homeland ballistic missile defense (sec. 231)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress concerning homeland ballistic missile defense, and require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of a range of potential future options for enhancing homeland ballistic missile defense, including the possible deployment of a missile defense interceptor site on the East Coast, and the possible deployment of an additional sensor on the East Coast. The provision would require the Secretary to submit a report on the evaluation, including such findings, conclusions, and recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate, for potential future options for homeland ballistic missile defense.

The United States currently has an operational homeland ballistic missile defense system, the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system, with 30 Ground-based Interceptors (GBIs) deployed in Alaska and California. In appearances before the committee during 2013, numerous senior military leaders testified that they are confident in the ability of the current GMD system to protect the entire United States, including the East Coast, from limited ballistic missile attacks from North Korea and Iran. The committee agrees with the Department of Defense that this homeland missile defense capability can and should be improved.

The committee notes that, on March 15, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel announced a series of steps planned to enhance homeland ballistic missile defense, as part of the homeland missile defense hedge strategy, to stay ahead of the evolving long-range missile threat from North Korea and Iran. These steps include: the deployment of an additional 14 GBIs at Fort Greely, Alaska—a nearly 50 percent increase—by 2017; the deployment of a second AN/TPY–2 missile defense radar in Japan; the evaluation of potential sites in the United States for possible future deployment of a missile defense interceptor site; and the establishment of a new common kill vehicle technology development program.

One element of the decision announced by Secretary Hagel was the cancelation of the previous plan to develop the Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) Block IIB interceptor missile for Phase 4 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach to missile defense. Twenty-four SM–3 IIB missiles had originally been intended for deployment at an Aegis Ashore interceptor site in Poland in 2020, to augment the

GMD system in defending the United States from possible future long-range Iranian missiles. However, congressional funding reductions and technical challenges had delayed the program beyond 2022, with significant uncertainties about its ability to accomplish the intended mission. Secretary Hagel made clear that the U.S. commitment to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) missile defense "remains ironclad," including the planned Aegis Ashore interceptor site deployments in Romania in 2015 and Poland in 2018. According to Secretary Hagel, these deployments "will still be able to provide coverage of all European NATO territory as planned by 2018."

As Secretary Hagel and other Department of Defense officials explained, deploying the additional 14 GBIs in Alaska would provide additional homeland defense at least 5 years sooner against both North Korea and Iran, and at far less cost than the SM–3 IIB program. Funds from the canceled SM–3 IIB program were redirected for the deployment of the additional 14 GBIs and for the new common kill vehicle technology development program. They also explained that, before the 14 additional GBIs are deployed, the GMD system would have to be tested and demonstrated successfully in an intercept test, to provide confidence that the system would work as intended.

This "fly before you buy" commitment is needed to demonstrate the successful correction of the problem that caused a GMD flight test failure in December 2010 with the Capability Enhancement-II (CE–II) kill vehicle. The Government Accountability Office estimates that correcting this problem and demonstrating its success in flight tests will cost more than $1.2 billion and has caused program delays of several years. The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has halted all assembly, integration, manufacture, and refurbishment of GBIs with CE–II kill vehicles until the CE–II correction is successfully demonstrated in flight testing, including an intercept flight test planned for early 2014. The committee commends MDA for this "fly before you buy" approach, and notes that further procurement of GBIs, planned to replace the 14 GBIs that will be deployed by 2017, would also depend upon successful demonstration that the CE–II kill vehicle will work as intended. The committee expects the GBI industry team to show the same level of commitment to demonstrating success in correcting the CE–II problems.

In testimony before the committee, Vice Admiral James Syring, the Director of MDA, explained that improvements to the GMD "kill chain," particularly in sensors, discrimination, and kill assessment, would provide an "absolutely needed benefit" that would be "equally important to interceptors" in staying ahead of the evolving threat from North Korea and Iran. The committee strongly supports Admiral Syring's priority to improving the overall performance and effectiveness of the GMD system, and notes that these enhancements are intended to be cost-effective, timely, and affordable. Consequently, the committee directs the Director of MDA to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2014, explaining the specific GMD kill chain enhancements that would be most beneficial to overall GMD effectiveness, including any improvements in GBI reliability and perform-

ance, and how and when MDA proposes to achieve those enhancements.

Regional ballistic missile defense (sec. 232)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress concerning the importance of regional ballistic missile defense and would require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a report on the status and progress of efforts to enhance regional ballistic missile defense capabilities.

The committee notes that regional ballistic missile defenses provide a critical force protection capability for forward deployed U.S. forces, as well as for allies and partners, against missile threats from countries such as North Korea and Iran. North Korea's public threats in the spring of 2013 to use ballistic missiles against South Korea, Japan, and Guam served as a stark reminder of the importance of regional missile defenses and the need to expand and improve U.S. regional missile defense capabilities.

Regional missile defenses are a high priority for geographic combatant commanders. Lieutenant General Richard P. Formica, USA, Commander of U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, and Commander of the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense, under U.S. Strategic Command, testified in May 2013 that the Global Ballistic Missile Defense Assessment for 2012 concluded that the operational risk for regional missile defenses is higher than the homeland missile defense risk. The Department of Defense is pursuing increased regional missile defense capabilities, such as the European Phased Adaptive Approach and similar approaches tailored to other regions, including cooperation with allies and partners.

The committee supports the continued development, testing, and deployment of regional missile defense capabilities such as the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense system and its associated Standard Missile-3 interceptors, and the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense systems. The committee notes that missile defense tests over the last year have demonstrated increasing capability for these systems, including the capability to launch on remote sensor data.

Missile defense cooperation with Russia (sec. 233)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that it is in the national security interest of the United States to pursue efforts at missile defense cooperation with Russia that would enhance the security of the United States, its North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, and Russia, particularly against missile threats from Iran.

The provision states that such cooperation should not "in any way limit United States" or NATO's missile defense capabilities," and that the United States should not provide Russia with sensitive information that would compromise United States national security, including hit-to-kill technology and interceptor telemetry. It also states that such cooperation should be pursued in a manner that ensures that classified U.S. information is appropriately safeguarded and protected from unauthorized disclosure.

In testimony to the committee on May 9, 2013, Madelyn Creedon, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs,

stated that the United States "continues to seek cooperation with Russia on missile defense, both bilaterally and with our allies, through the NATO-Russia Council. We are pursuing this cooperation because it would be in the security interest of all parties and could strengthen the defensive capabilities of both NATO and Russia." She also testified that the "United States has pursued missile defense cooperation with Russia with the clear understanding that we will not accept constraints on our missile defense systems, we will implement the EPAA [European Phased Adaptive Approach], and Russia will not have command and control over NATO ballistic missile defense efforts."

The committee notes that the NATO Chicago Summit statement of May 20, 2012, reiterates NATO's commitment to missile defense cooperation with Russia, "such as the recent [NATO-Russia Council] Theatre Missile Defense Exercise," in order to "enhance European security." The statement also says, "we look forward to establishing the proposed joint NATO-Russia Missile Data Fusion Centre and the joint Planning Operations Centre to cooperate on missile defense. We propose to develop a transparency regime based upon a regular exchange of information about current respective missile defense capabilities of NATO and Russia."

Additional missile defense radar for the protection of the United States homeland (sec. 234)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Missile Defense Agency to deploy an X-band radar, or comparable sensor, at a location optimized to support the defense of the United States homeland against long-range ballistic missile threats. The provision would also authorize $30.0 million for the Missile Defense Agency for the initial costs toward deployment of the radar.

The committee notes that the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Commander of the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense have indicated that their highest future investment priority for homeland ballistic missile defense is the enhancement of sensor capabilities that will improve threat discrimination and kill assessment, and thus permit more effective defense. This provision would address that future investment priority.

The committee understands that the Missile Defense Agency has expressed the importance of enhanced sensor capabilities relative to both North Korea and Iran.

The committee believes that the additional sensor capability required by this provision should optimize the defense of the entire United States homeland against long-range ballistic missile threats from both North Korea and Iran.

Evaluation of options for future ballistic missile defense sensor architectures (sec. 235)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an evaluation of options and alternatives for future ballistic missile defense sensor architectures in order to enhance U.S. ballistic missile defense capabilities in a cost-effective, operationally effective, timely, and affordable manner. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit a report

to Congress with the results of the evaluation, including such findings, conclusions, and recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) terminated the program to develop the Precision Tracking Space System (PTSS) because it concluded the acquisition risk and the cost were too high and that it would not be affordable. PTSS was intended to provide persistent space-based tracking of regional and long-range ballistic missiles from nations such as North Korea and Iran, particularly to permit enhanced defense against large regional missile raids. The committee notes that the military still has a need for improved tracking and targeting of ballistic missiles. It is not yet clear how DOD intends to meet the need for enhanced sensor coverage in the absence of PTSS. The committee expects DOD to take advantage of the lessons learned from PTSS in its evaluation of options for future sensor architectures.

In testimony before this committee, a number of witnesses, including Vice Admiral James Syring, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, testified that enhancing our missile defense sensor system is a key near-term priority for improving our homeland and regional missile defense capability, particularly for improving discrimination and kill assessment of missile threats.

Prohibition on the use of funds for the MEADS program (sec. 236)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of fiscal year 2014 Department of Defense funds for the Medium Extended Air Defense System.

Subtitle D—Reports and Other Matters

Annual Comptroller General of the United States report on the acquisition program for the VXX Presidential Helicopter (sec. 251)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General to produce an annual report on the VXX presidential helicopter program until the program enters full rate production or is cancelled, whichever comes first.

Budget Items

Army

Warrior Injury Assessment Manikin project

The budget request included $23.3 million across a number of program elements for the development of a new blast test manikin that would respond in a biofidelic manner when exposed to underbody blast conditions experienced by mounted soldiers.

The committee notes that the development of such a test manikin would significantly improve the Department's ability to measure the projected injuries that could be caused by various blast events caused by improvised explosive devices. Such information would lead to improved survivability of ground combat vehicles. Due to various programmatic issues, the program is facing a budget shortfall that would lead to a schedule slip that would adversely

impact the timeliness of critical design data for ground combat vehicles.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to PE 62618A for the Warrior Injury Assessment Manikin project.

Long endurance multi-intelligence vehicle

The budget request included $29.0 million in PE 35205A for contract close-out for the now-terminated long endurance multi-intelligence vehicle. The committee notes that the amount required for termination costs has not been determined and should be covered by prior years' appropriations. The committee recommends no funding for this activity in fiscal year 2014.

General Fund Enterprise Business Systems

The budget request included $17.3 million in PE 64882A for General Fund Enterprise Business Systems (GFEBS). The committee notes that funds for the development of a classified module for GFEBS were provided in a prior year. The committee recommends a decrease of $17.1 million in PE 64882A for GFEBS.

Internet mapping

The budget request included $33.9 million in PE 65803A for Technical Information Activities. Cyberspace is a vast new operational domain that has extensive and varied topography. As the committee emphasized in its report (S. Rept. 112–173) accompanying S. 3254, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), charting this new terrain is as fundamental to operations in cyberspace as maps of physical terrain have always been to military campaigns.

Despite the obvious need, attempts to map the Internet so far have been very modest. The Internet has appeared to be too complex, too large in scale, and experiencing changes too rapidly. However, the committee is persuaded that commercial technology and data sources are now available to capture the necessary detail at the required speed and volume.

The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence understands the need for a dynamic, comprehensive Internet mapping capability, and is working with the Air Force Research Laboratory to fund pilot projects to demonstrate the potential of commercial technology and data sources. The Army's Geospatial Center under the Engineer Research and Development Center has also initiated research and development to map this 21st century terrain.

The committee recommends authorization of an increase of $5.0 million in PE 65803A for the Army Geospatial Enterprise project to enhance and expand its Internet mapping research.

Navy

Offensive anti-surface warfare weapon development

The budget request included $136.0 million in PE 64786N for developing an offensive anti-surface warfare (OASuW) weapon. This follows on an enacted funding level of $86.8 million in fiscal year 2013. The Navy hopes to use these funds to develop an OASuW weapon system or systems solution that can be launched from the

air or from surface vessels against hostile surface targets. These efforts were largely in response to an urgent operational need statement (UONS) seeking immediate capability.

In fiscal year 2013, the Navy had planned to release a request for proposal, award one or more competitive prototyping contracts, and establish a government program office team. The Navy also had planned to issue a contract for $31.5 million for an accelerated development effort to field an interim OASuW capability in April 2013. That contract effort has since been suspended due to changing priorities within the Navy, and some disagreement about the validity of the UONS that initiated the effort. The budget exhibits indicate that the funds instead would be used to mature technologies applicable to an OASuW program.

In fiscal year 2014, the Navy planned to spend the year preparing for a milestone A acquisition decision that would not occur until at least the first quarter of fiscal year 2015. In fiscal year 2015, the Navy budget exhibits indicate that the Navy will be conducting competitive prototyping if required under new technology development contracts awarded in fiscal year 2015. It is clear to the committee that the Navy intends to conduct no such competitive prototyping, but will instead try to transition a developmental effort from the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) into a program of record.

The committee fails to see the need to invest so much in a program for which the urgency of the UONS is now in doubt, and certainly not to down select prematurely to a single program responding to a near-term requirement that would not deliver capability in the near term.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $100.0 million in PE 64786N. The committee believes it would be prudent to continue government support activities anticipating a successful milestone A graduation in fiscal year 2015, but that the Navy should be able to do this with $36.0 million in fiscal year 2014, an increase of roughly 39 percent above the fiscal year 2013 effort that was not related to the cancelled accelerated development program.

The committee further expects the Navy to present a plan that: (1) pursues a more competitive approach; and (2) yields a program proceeding to a technology readiness level 6 before deciding on a particular technical solution.

LHA–8 design effort

The budget request included $155.3 million in PE 64567N for various ship design and research and development efforts, including $30.8 million for the next amphibious assault ship, LHA–8. Within the $30.8 million, $14.5 million is for LHA–8 ship design. Navy LHA–8 program development and design activities have involved two shipyards, among other contractors. The Navy intends to begin procurement funding for LHA–8 in fiscal year 2015.

Repeated Navy shipbuilding programs have shown that failing to complete a ship's design before starting construction inevitably leads to cost growth and schedule delays. The committee believes that the Navy should invest more than it is currently planning to invest in maturing the design of LHA–8 before starting construction activities.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 64567N for maturing the LHA–8 design.

Marine personnel carrier

The budget request included $20.9 million in PE 26623M for the Marine Personnel Carrier (MPC). The committee notes that the Marine Corps has deferred acquisition of the MPC until after it meets more urgent requirements for a new amphibious combat vehicle and the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle. The committee further notes that there are prior-year funds available to continue any MPC-related requirements analysis and determination or technology studies until a decision is made regarding the sequencing and availability of resources for this capability. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $20.9 million in PE 26623M for the MPC.

Air Force

Operationally Responsive Space

The fiscal year 2014 budget requested no funding for the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) rejected the proposed termination of the ORS Office and required its location be separate and distinct from the headquarters of the Air Force Space and Missile System Center while reporting to the Director of the Center. Congress awaits the reports required from the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) on how the Department of Defense (DOD) will implement the legislation and move ORS concepts into space acquisition programs. Most if not all of the concepts championed by the ORS office such as low cost launch, disaggregation, and common bus structures are now being embraced by DOD in times of fiscal constraint. The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million to PE 64857F to continue the operations of the ORS office and work on a low cost weather satellite as was briefed to the congressional defense committees.

Tactical data networks enterprise

The budget request for tactical data networks enterprise included $51.5 million in PE 64281F, including $21.4 million for airborne networking enterprise.

Only $6.2 million of the amount for airborne networking enterprise is explained anywhere in the unclassified or classified budget documentation. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $15.2 million in PE 64281F.

Tactical exploitation of national capabilities

The budget request included $89.8 million in PE 27247F for the tactical exploitation of national capabilities (TENCAP) program. Included within this amount is $48.0 million to develop a communications pod for F–15 fighters to enable 5th generation and 4th generation fighters to communicate with one another. The total also includes $28.8 million to procure advanced sensors and components for installation on these communications pods.

The committee appreciates the fact that elements of the Air Force are finally responding to the serious and embarrassing problem that the 5th generation fighters (the F–22 and the F–35) cannot communicate with one another or with the 4th generation fighters. However, there are now multiple initiatives underway in the Air Force that are not coordinated or well-planned. In addition, there is no justification for pursuing fighter data link developments in the TENCAP program, especially since this initiative will not address the problem of relaying national-level intelligence information to the fighters or relaying tactical information from the fighters to national-level systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $76.8 million.

Joint surveillance/target attack radar system

The budget request included $57.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the E–8 modifications program and $13.2 million in PE 27581F within Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E), Air Force, for Joint Surveillance/Target Attack Radar Systems (JSTARS). The level of the RDT&E request reflects a reduction of $11.0 million from the enacted level of $24.2 million in fiscal year 2013, largely due to the planned retirement of the T–3 aircraft that has been a dedicated testing and development platform for the JSTARS program.

Although there have certainly been reductions in current development activities, that does not mean that all development and integration activities are over. Losing the dedicated testing platform is also troublesome because the Air Force has decided it cannot afford to modernize the JSTARS capability by fielding a new platform. That means that the Air Force will be relying on the 16 operational JSTARS aircraft and 11 Global Hawk Block 40 aircraft to provide all of the synthetic aperture radar (SAR) and ground moving target indicator (GMTI) support for ground force operations for the foreseeable future. Since the peacetime demand for these SAR and GMTI services is so high, retiring the T–3 aircraft will mean that operational aircraft would have to be diverted from other important tasks to support testing.

Therefore, to avoid this situation, the committee recommends an increase of $9.9 million in PE 27581F for RDT&E to sustain T–3 operations during fiscal year 2014.

Air Force Applications Software Assurance Center of Excellence

The budget request included $90.2 million in PE 33140F for the Information Systems Security Program.

The committee has stressed for several years that the cybersecurity problem is largely due to vulnerabilities in the software controlling computing devices. The Air Force established the Application Software Assurance Center of Excellence (ASACOE) in 2007 in response to a serious breach that illuminated the software vulnerability problem in the Air Force and across the whole Department of Defense (DOD). Despite the seriousness of the problem, however, the Air Force has failed to provide the ASACOE with adequate funding. While funding for the ASACOE's government personnel is

included in annual budget requests, funds for contractor support, bulk licenses for code analysis tools, and other expenses necessary to carry out the Center's mission are not budgeted, forcing the Center to live precariously on periodic fund transfers from other sources.

Nonetheless, despite this handicap, the ASACOE has earned a reputation for effectiveness and lasting impacts in improving the security of many applications and acquisition programs, in the Air Force and across DOD. In a report to Congress in July 2011, the Secretary of the Air Force stated that "the capabilities demonstrated by ASACOE are integral to the technical tool box" that DOD will use to implement its Supply Chain Risk Management strategy.

A report to Congress in October 2011 from the Secretary of Defense on a strategy for assuring the security of DOD software and software-based applications listed the ASACOE and the National Security Agency's Center for Assured Software as organizations that would be leveraged to implement DOD's Trusted Systems and Networks strategy. The report further stated that an internal DOD study concluded that software vulnerability detection should be "organized centrally" to assure "a consistent response, coherent direction, and comprehensive coverage" at least until software assurance expertise and resources are developed and diffused across the Department. The committee believes that the ASACOE could significantly contribute to the implementation of section 933 of the National Defense Authorization of Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

The mission of ASACOE is to educate, train, equip, and assist program management offices to achieve security in software developments and acquisitions. It provides these services through its expertise in software assurance requirements, design, standards, best practices, technology and tools for code analysis, penetration testing, training, and remediation.

The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million in PE 33140F to enable the ASACOE to fulfill this mission. These funds will allow ASACOE to exercise the option year on its current contract. The committee urges the Air Force to establish a regular funding line in future budget requests for contractor support and bulk license procurement, and a plan for assessment and remediation of critical software systems.

Defense-wide

National Defense Education Program

The budget request included $84.3 million in PE 61120D8Z for the National Defense Education Program (NDEP) that funds three activities related to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education: (1) Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) scholarship program; (2) National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowship (NSSEFF); and (3) pre-kindergarten through 12th grade (PK–12) STEM.

In the fiscal year 2014 President's budget request, the administration consolidated most STEM programs across the government, including the Department of Defense (DOD), to the Department of

Education, the National Science Foundation, and the Smithsonian Institution. While the consolidation was well-intended to eliminate unnecessary duplication of activities in this area across hundreds of programs, little analytical effort appeared to be expended to determine which exact programs should be transferred. In the case of DOD, the PK–12 program was terminated with much of the funding transferred to NSSEFF. Given that DOD has a vested interest in building a foundation with PK–12 activities to motivate and encourage children to pursue STEM careers for national security purposes, the committee directs that $10.0 million in this PE be transferred from NSSEFF back to PK–12 activities that have participation by DOD laboratories and directly benefit the children of DOD families.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees on DOD execution of the NDEP no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act. The report will include an overall assessment of the outcomes of the NDEP program; a historic and projected examination of SMART, NSSEFF, and PK–12 STEM funding levels; a comparison of NDEP to other federal government funded STEM education programs; and any recommendations on improving program execution.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Lincoln Laboratory

The budget request included $46.9 million in PE 62234D8Z for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Lincoln Laboratory, an increase of $10.0 million from the fiscal year 2013 budget request.

The committee believes the increase is unjustified and recommends a decrease of $5.0 million.

Applied research for the advancement of science and technology priorities

The budget request included $45.0 million in PE 62251D8Z for applied research for the advancement of science and technology (S&T) priorities. This program element was newly established to fund key research opportunities identified by the S&T Priority Steering Councils.

The committee believes that this funding is more appropriate in the services' S&T budgets and recommends a decrease of $15.0 million.

Automated software code analysis tool development

The budget request included $18.9 million in PE 62668D8Z for Cyber Security Research, and $19.7 million in PE 63668D8Z for Cyber Security Advanced Research.

The Assuring Effective Missions projects in these two program elements duplicate research that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency is conducting under the Plan X program. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease to the request of $2.0 million and $3.0 million in PE 62668D8Z and PE 63668D8Z, respectively.

In two National Defense Authorization Acts, the committee included provisions requiring the Department of Defense (DOD) to take concrete steps to improve the security of the software that is the target of the cyber attacks that DOD suffers relentlessly. In the

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), Congress established mandatory requirements for the use of automated code analysis tools in the development and testing of software for DOD systems. The committee's understanding was that DOD officials agreed that the use of such tools is critically important to cybersecurity.

The most capable tools currently available are built by commercial companies with little to no government investment. These tools have progressed in performance, but the committee believes that DOD should be investing in improved tools to achieve fewer false positives and negatives in identifying defects and vulnerabilities. The committee also believes that DOD should be investing in so-called smart fuzzing tools to identify exploitable vulnerabilities in software. Such tools are used routinely and very effectively in the intelligence community, but not so far by the DOD acquisition community.

The committee recommends authorization of $2.0 million and $3.0 million in PE 62668D8Z and PE 63668D8Z, respectively, to develop automated code analysis tools, including fuzzing tools. The committee urges the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to include funds for this purpose in future budget requests.

Counter terrorism, counter-insurgency, and the exploitation of human terrain in conflict

The budget request terminated the Human Social Culture Behavior (HSCB) program. The fiscal year 2013 budget request had $6.8 million in PE 62670D8Z (HSCB Modeling Applied Research), $8.2 million in PE 63670D8Z (HSCB Advanced Development), and $5.1 million in PE 64670D8Z (HSCB Modeling Research and Engineering).

The committee notes that the list of priority missions of the U.S. armed forces released in the fiscal year 2014 budget request had counter terrorism and irregular warfare as the first mission. During the course of the last 12 years of conflicts, one key lesson that has emerged is the need for the Department of Defense (DOD) to develop a rigorous comprehensive understanding of the human terrain in which it is operating. A deep understanding of the cultural, social, religious, and ethnic factors on the ground are vital to successful operations. While the Department claims that each of the services are increasing their investments in these areas, eliminating the need for defense-wide funding, the committee has not seen any evidence to suggest that this is the case.

In 2008, DOD created the HSCB program to rapidly transition basic research to tools for military personnel to increase intelligence collection and integration, and provide our warfighters better situational awareness and capabilities on the battlefield. Since its establishment, the HSCB program has developed and transitioned operational tools to U.S. Special Operations Command, U.S. Africa Command, U.S. Pacific Command, U.S. Southern Command, the Army's Training and Doctrine Command Analysis Center, and International Security Agency Forces Joint Command Headquarters in Afghanistan. HBSC fielded tools include: data ingestion, analysis and modeling capabilities; behavioral modeling ca-

pabilities; geospatial and social network analysis tools; and automated techniques to rapidly extract persons, events and sentiments.

In 2009, the Defense Science Board, in its report "Understanding Human Dynamics", identified a number of key gaps in the DOD's knowledge of human dynamics. The HSCB program addresses a majority of these gaps to include: multi-domain, multi-speaker spoken conversation, transcription and translation; technologies for extracting knowledge from both structured and unstructured human networks; automated assessments of the human terrain with an emphasis on attitudes, influence networks, and the effects of strategic communication; gaming for virtual training and mission rehearsal; automated sentiment, intention, and deception detection; and dynamic network analysis to understand influence, attitudes, and beliefs.

Given the overall importance of this area, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million for each of the above program elements, for a total of $15.0 million. Furthermore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to report to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act on the Department's overall investment strategy in the field of human, social, cultural, and behavior research and engineering, an assessment of the operational utility of fielded HSCB tools, and a plan for transitioning funding for this area from defense-wide activities to those funded by the services.

Combating Terrorism Technology Support

The budget request included $77.8 million in PE 63122D8Z for the Combating Terrorism Technical Support (CTTS) program, a modest increase from $77.1 million in fiscal year 2013.

The committee supports the mission of the CTTS program to rapidly develop and transition a wide range of technologies to the joint, interagency, and international communities focused on combating terrorism. However, in the current budgetary environment, the committee observes—based upon an analysis of CTTS programs completed in fiscal year 2012 and ongoing in fiscal year 2013—that there is a significant amount of work conducted by this program that is more suited to be funded by the Special Operations Command and its associated components, as well as by the services. Hence, the committee recommends a decrease of $17.0 million to PE 63122D8Z.

Ballistic missile defense technology programs

The budget request included $309.2 million in PE 63175C for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) for development of ballistic missile defense technology, including $229.9 million for advanced technology development, and $70.0 million for the Common Kill Vehicle technology development program, which is a new program described elsewhere in this report.

The committee notes that MDA has placed a number of previous technology development programs, which had been in separate program elements, into a single technology development program element. The committee is concerned that this consolidation of all

technology development projects into a single program element may degrade transparency and oversight, which would be contrary to the interests of the committee and to the MDA efforts to improve transparency and oversight.

The committee also notes that advanced technology development funding for fiscal year 2014, in addition to the $70.0 million for the common kill vehicle technology development program, spikes at $230.0 million, from a level of $76.0 million in fiscal year 2013, and is planned to come down in fiscal year 2015 and beyond to a level of about $138.0 million per year. The committee observes that a 1–year spike in technology development funding will not create sustainable progress, and is likely to lead to significant program management and execution challenges, as well as starting work that would not be continued in future years.

One of the previous MDA program elements that has been moved into the technology development program element in the budget request is the directed energy program within the Weapons Technology project, for which $83.5 million is requested. The committee notes that the MDA-directed energy research and development program, along with other Department of Defense-directed energy programs, do not have an adequate level of common metrics for oversight and program evaluation, as described elsewhere in this report. Furthermore, one of MDA's directed energy projects, the Diode-Pumped Alkalai Laser System (DPALS) project, does not have the same level of coordination and oversight from an array of directed energy experts as the fiber-combining laser project, which includes the involvement of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. Furthermore, the committee believes that MDA continues to place too much focus on high-energy laser lethality work for future boost-phase intercept missions, years before it is known whether the technology will ever permit such applications. Consequently, the committee recommends a reduction of $5.0 million to the DPALS project in the directed energy portion of the weapons technology component of PE 633175C for Advanced Technology, and an undistributed reduction of $25.0 million across other portions of PE 633175C for Advanced Technology as unsustainable growth. The committee also directs MDA to brief the congressional defense committees within 90 days of the enactment of this Act on a strategy for broadening the DPALS effort to encourage effective peer review, competition, and increased involvement of the high-energy laser expert community.

The committee notes that the new Common Kill Vehicle Technology research and development program is planned for consistent levels of funding across the future-years defense program, which will allow for a sustained research and development effort. The committee believes this stable funding approach program will permit sustainable efforts and results.

Rapid Fielding

The budget request included $315.0 million in Rapid Fielding programs spread between Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations ($174.4 million in PE 63648D8Z), Emerging Capabilities Technology Development ($62.0 million in 63699D8Z), and Quick Reaction Special Projects ($78.5 million in 63826D8Z).

The committee is pleased that the Department of Defense is shifting its Rapid Fielding operational model from primarily near-term gaps to a renewed look at longer-term interest areas that are more strategic in nature. In addition, the committee supports the Department's move to fund more conceptual, developmental, and operational prototyping. The committee urges the Rapid Fielding program to spearhead efforts to find innovative integrated design teams that can develop capabilities at far less cost than traditional defense contractors. The committee notes the design of the 5th Generation Aerial Target as one example where such a design and management philosophy can potentially lead to significant gains in affordability for the Department.

To encourage greater quality versus quantity of its projects, the committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in PE 63648D8Z and $20.0 million in PE 63826D8Z from the Quick Reaction Fund and Rapid Reaction Fund.

Networked Communications Capability Program

The budget request included $20.0 million for the Networked Communications Capability Program, PE 63662D8Z.

The committee understands the importance of the Department of Defense's needs in accelerating its wireless mobile networking capabilities through both greater leveraging of commercial capabilities, as well as pursuing solutions to defense unique requirements. However, the committee observes that there is significant investment across all the services and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) in this area, and questions the value of this program at the defense-wide level. Hence, the committee recommends a decrease of $15.0 million and directs this activity to focus on coordinating wireless mobile networking capabilities across the services and DARPA, in coordination with the Defense Information Systems Agency and the Department's Chief Information Officer.

Defense industrial capacity innovation and sustainment

The budget request included $34.0 million in PE 63680D8Z for defense-wide manufacturing science and technology and $14.0 million in PE 67210D8Z for industrial base analysis and sustainment. The committee, along with other congressional defense committees, has been a strong supporter of programs that advance innovation in manufacturing and that sustain targeted sectors and capabilities of the defense industrial base. This view has also been expressed by prior studies of the Defense Science Board (DSB), as well as the most recent Quadrennial Defense Review. In the current budgetary environment with an increased focus on affordability, investments in advancing manufacturing technologies have shown significant overall reductions in production and life cycle costs.

Despite the critical importance of manufacturing technology, the Department of Defense's (DOD) overall manufacturing investment is only 0.3 percent of overall funding for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation—well short of the 1 percent goal recommended by the DSB. Last year, Congress provided an additional $30.0 million to the Industrial Base Innovation Fund (IBIF) program for advanced manufacturing technologies. Recent examples of

IBIF projects include improved producibility of the electro-optical targeting system on the Joint Strike Fighter, improved transparent armor for soldier protection in ground combat vehicles, advanced high-energy batteries, and light weight cables and wires for weight reduction on aerospace systems. The new manufacturing techniques for the electro-optical targeting system have led to a return on investment in excess of a factor of 20. Given the demonstrated return on investment in innovative manufacturing technologies, the committee recommends an additional $25.0 million to continue the IBIF program in the 63680D8Z program element line.

The committee directs the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy to continue to make competitive, merit-based investments in manufacturing research and development that address defense industrial base shortfalls, especially those related to more urgent production requirements and diminishing defense manufacturing sources and material shortages, and a sustainable defense design team base. Other areas of emphasis encouraged are those related to the emerging fields of model-based engineering and integrated computational materials engineering, as highlighted in a recent National Research Council report, and new innovative technologies being developed through public-private partnerships such as the national Advanced Manufacturing Partnership, Connecting American Manufacturing, the National Digital Engineering and Manufacturing Consortium, and the Metal Affordability Initiative.

Furthermore, the committee strongly urges DOD to institutionalize this program with adequate resources in future years and consider it as an important component of its wider manufacturing and industrial base strategy, in part, informed by its ongoing "Sector-by-Sector, Tier-by-Tier" analyses.

CWMD Systems

Section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 established a "Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise." No funding was requested in the fiscal year 2014 budget request for the advisory panel. The panel ends on June 1, 2014. The committee recommends an increase of $3.0 million to PE 0303310D8Z to carry out the functions of the advisory panel under a transfer to PE 0902198D8Z.

Advanced sensor applications program

The budget request included $17.2 million in PE 63714D8Z for the Advanced Sensor Applications Program (ASAP). This represents a reduction from the level funded in fiscal year 2013 of $19.0 million. This reduction reflects a general reduction applied to a number of budget line items in an across-the-board manner. The committee believes that this reduction, while modest by some standards, will cause the program to postpone important testing and experiments. The committee believes that these efforts are too important to postpone or cancel, and therefore, recommends an increase of $2.0 million for ASAP.

U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs

The budget request included $95.8 million in PE 63913C for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) for U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, including: $10.7 million to improve the existing Arrow Weapon System; $52.6 million for continued development of the Arrow-3 upper-tier interceptor missile; and $32.5 million for co-development of a short-range missile defense system called David's Sling. These systems are part of Israel's layered defenses against missiles and rockets of varying ranges, from longer-range missiles from Iran or Syria, to short-range missiles and large caliber rockets fired from Lebanese territory in the summer of 2006, to the very short-range rockets and artillery fired from Gaza. The United States is co-managing and jointly developing these systems to ensure that they are compatible and interoperable with U.S. missile defense systems.

The committee recognizes that the threat to Israel from missiles and rockets of varying ranges is extremely serious and growing, particularly with the crisis in Syria, and that effective missile defenses are an essential component of Israel's security and regional stability. The committee supports efforts to enhance and accelerate these systems, in a manner that is consistent with the terms and conditions of the joint Project Agreements governing the management and execution of these cooperative projects.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $150.0 million in PE 63913C for U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, including: $30.0 million to improve the Arrow Weapon System; $20.0 million for the Arrow-3 upper-tier interceptor development program; and $100.0 million for the David's Sling short-range missile defense system.

The budget request also included $220.3 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, for MDA for Israel to procure additional Iron Dome batteries and missiles. This is the first year that funding for Iron Dome has been included in the budget request, and the committee commends the Department of Defense for making it part of the regular budget process.

The Iron Dome system, which was developed by Israel, was used to great effect to defend against short-range rocket attacks from Gaza in 2012, and had a reported operational success rate of 85 percent. The committee recognizes that the current situation in Syria has added to the risk of rocket and missile attacks against Israel, and that Iron Dome is an important component of Israel's ability to protect its population against such attacks.

Advanced Innovative Technologies

The budget request included $130.0 million in PE 64250D8Z for Advanced Innovative Technologies.

The committee is concerned that this significant level of funding will not be able to be executed in fiscal year 2014 and recommends a decrease of $30.0 million to this program element.

Defense research and development Rapid Innovation Program focus areas

The Rapid Innovation Program (RIP) is a competitive, merit-based program established by section 1073 of the Ike Skelton Na-

tional Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) that is designed to fund innovative technologies, reduce acquisition or life cycle costs, address technical risks, improve the timeliness of test and evaluation outcomes, and rapidly insert technologies needed to meet critical national security needs. The committee notes that $250.0 million was appropriated for the RIP in the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 113–6); however, no funds were requested in fiscal year 2014.

The RIP was first authorized and funded in 2011. Over 170 programs were selected by the Department of Defense (DOD) in 2011 to include: automated engine part inspection tools, compact anti-jam Global Positioning System antennas, enhanced ground vehicle protection, lightweight ground fire detection systems for combat outposts, ceramic based explosive ordnance detection tool kits, and improvements to mine roller wheel assemblies. All these programs are scheduled to be completed in November 2013. The overall response from the Services has been positive for the program, in particular, the fact that it has opened up more collaborative efforts with small businesses and non-traditional suppliers to DOD.

The committee recommends an increase of $150.0 million in funding for the RIP to PE 64775D8Z focusing primarily on the following three broad areas:

(1) delivering nearer-term emerging technologies to current military operations to enhance capabilities in areas such as: electronic warfare; cybersecurity tools; robotics and autonomous systems; spectrum management; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities; reducing soldier load; improving fixed, mobile, and dismounted force protection; and detecting and defeating all forms of improvised explosive devices;

(2) contributing to breakthrough technologies for future military capabilities in areas such as: countering weapons of mass destruction; space systems; hypersonics; highly autonomous systems; large-scale data management and manipulation for command and control; and enhancing human performance; and

(3) improving the affordability of defense operations in areas such as: advanced manufacturing; reducing the cost and footprint of energy and other logistical items; interoperability across platforms and systems; and innovative prototyping approaches for new platforms and systems.

The committee reaffirms the requirement by law that all such funding be allocated on the basis of a merit-based selection, pursuant to a broad agency announcement or similar competitive process. To ensure the integrity of this competitive process, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to report on the execution of RIP. The report will include but not be limited to: an assessment of the RIP contract solicitation and award process; an assessment of RIP execution and monitoring of contracts; an overall assessment of how the RIP is meeting its goals and guidelines; and a complete list of all RIP awards since program inception to include funding organization, project, contractor, location, award amount, award date, description of project, confirmation that the contract award was competitive and merit-based, a

description of what Joint Urgent Operational Needs or other critical national security need each RIP award addressed, and the current status of each RIP award.

Developmental test and evaluation

The budget request included $15.5 million in PE 65804D8Z for developmental test and evaluation and $44.2 million in PE 605142D8Z for systems engineering.

The committee notes the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) required the Department of Defense (DOD) to rebuild its systems engineering and developmental testing organizations to ensure that design problems are understood and addressed early in the acquisition process.

While DOD has taken great strides in improving its acquisition process, the committee notes that the Fiscal Year 2012 Annual Report by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation—dated December 2012—provided a list of 17 major defense acquisition programs—the same number as in 2011—that had discoveries of significant problems during operational test and evaluation that should have been detected and corrected during developmental test and evaluation.

Furthermore, the committee notes that the Department's defense-wide systems engineering budget request is almost three times greater than the developmental test and evaluation budget request. In fiscal year 2013, the committee recommended an increase of $5.0 million to developmental test and evaluation. The committee believes that DOD is continuing to underfund its developmental test and evaluation activities, as evidenced by the unacceptable number of problems being discovered in operational test and evaluation.

To bring more parity between the systems engineering and developmental test and evaluation activities, the committee recommends a transfer of $5.0 million from PE 65142D8Z to PE 65804D8Z.

Defense Technical Information Center

The budget request included $56.0 million in PE 65801KA for the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC), a modest increase from $55.5 million in fiscal year 2013.

The committee supports the innovation of DTIC to improve information technologies that enhance collaboration and research support and data repository services. However, the committee questions the role of all the web services and site hosting activities that DTIC provides as well as whether the size of the organization is commensurate with its mission. Hence, the committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million.

Conflict Records Research Center

The budget request included $3.2 million in PE 35186D8Z for Policy Research and Development programs.

The committee notes that the Conflict Records Research Center (CRRC) was established to address the Secretary of Defense's intent to enable research into captured records with complete openness and rigid adherence to academic freedom and integrity. The

mission of the CRRC is to facilitate the use of captured records to support research, both within and outside the government.

The CRRC has made significant contributions in translating and facilitating the analysis of important documents in its Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda collections. However, the CRRC is not funded in fiscal year 2014 and there appears to not be any plans for a transition of the CRRC's expertise or access to the documents. Hence, the committee recommends $1.0 million to the above PE for the CRRC and directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to report to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act on a plan to sustain the CRRC's capabilities.

MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle

The budget request included $1.3 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for the development, integration, and testing of special operations-unique mission kits for the MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV). U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) is responsible for the development and acquisition of special operations capabilities to, among other things, effectively carry out operations against terrorist networks while avoiding collateral damage.

The committee approved an above threshold reprogramming of funds requested by the Department of Defense in January 2013 to provide for the development, integration, and testing of additional capabilities to address identified technology gaps on USSOCOM UAVs. The committee understands that this reprogramming only partially addressed such technology gaps. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $12.0 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for the MQ–9 UAV.

Combatant Craft Forward Looking Infrared Radar

The budget request included $1.2 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for Combatant Craft Forward Looking Infrared Radar (CCFLIR). Due to parts obsolescence issues with the current CCFLIR systems, U.S. Special Operations Command has requested a transfer of this funding to Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, for design, development, and testing of the next-generation CCFLIR system. The committee recommends this transfer.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency programs

The budget request included $2.87 billion for the research and management activities of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). Taking into account the current fiscal environment, and given some lingering questions about the agency's ability to fully execute all its funding in a timely fashion, as well as concerns over certain programs, the committee recommends a decrease of $100.0 million from DARPA's overall budget.

The committee is pleased that DARPA has conducted an independent review of its Adaptive Vehicle Make ground vehicle manufacturing program, is refocusing the program, and is paying attention to how survivability considerations will be realistically taken into account.

DARPA is pursuing a Vertical Take-off and Landing (VTOL) X-Plane technology program to design, develop, and demonstrate improvements in speed, hover performance, cruise efficiency, and payload. While the committee notes that the program has identified challenging speed goals that are significant improvements over rotorcraft performance today, the committee believes that the target size of a vehicle in the 10,000 to 12,000 pounds class is too small to be of useful military utility. Furthermore, the committee strongly urges DARPA to anticipate more than a single performer to be selected for flight tests. Competition in this program is vital, and there should be at least two performers carried through flight testing. As one source for increased funding for this program, the committee recommends terminating the Transformer (X) Vehicle program due to questions about its military utility.

The committee expresses deep concern for how the Plan-X cybersecurity program was given a disproportionate reduction due to sequestration in fiscal year 2013. Given the potential for significant contributions by this program to the Department's greater cyber-security efforts, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million to PE 62303E for this program. The committee will continue to monitor this program to see how its schedule will be impacted.

Items of Special Interest

Army Occupant-Centric Survivability Program

The committee acknowledges the report that the Army provided to the congressional defense committees earlier this year about its Occupant-Centric Platform Technology Enabled Capability Demonstration research program and supports its objectives to produce military standards that inform future ground vehicle development to ensure that vehicle designs mitigate injuries due to underbody blasts and subsequent crash/rollover events. Noting that the program will take until the end of fiscal year 2015 to produce these standards, the committee encourages the Army to move as expeditiously on this program as possible and to leverage emerging technologies in the commercial sector, especially those related to vehicle restraints.

Chemical and biological defense medical countermeasures strategy

The Department of Defense (DOD) is pursuing an enhanced strategy for rapid and cost-effective development, approval, and manufacturing of medical countermeasures (MCM) against chemical and biological threats, both known and validated threats, and emerging threats. This strategy is part of an integrated national bio-defense MCM strategy to produce vaccines and therapeutics against such high-risk threats as Ebola and Marburg hemorrhagic fever viruses and pandemic disease outbreaks. Given the need to deploy U.S. forces in many parts of the world with endemic diseases and potential bio-threats, and the need to ensure our military can operate successfully in a chemically or biologically contaminated environment, the Department has a number of unique MCM requirements that cannot be met outside of the Department's programs.

The committee notes that this strategy is a coordinated and collaborative interagency effort, guided by updated national strategy and guidance documents, and involves particularly close cooperation between DOD, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA). This coordination permits each agency to perform its assigned tasks in a complementary fashion, reduce costs, and avoid duplication of effort.

One key aspect of this DOD strategy is the development of an Advanced Development and Manufacturing (ADM) capability, formerly known as the Medical Countermeasures Initiative, which is intended to provide DOD an agile and flexible facility for rapid and affordable development and production of MCMs to protect military personnel, particularly prior to exposure to chemical and biological threats. This is a significant change from the traditional MCM development process, which is characterized by long development schedules, high risks, and high costs for single drugs for each validated threat.

In contrast to the previous "one-bug, one-drug" approach, the Department is emphasizing the rapid development and FDA approval of broad-spectrum vaccines and anti-viral products that are intended to protect against a range of bio threats. The committee commends this more cost-effective approach and encourages the Department to continue with accelerated efforts to develop and seek FDA approval of broad-spectrum medical countermeasures, including anti-viral products that would provide improved capability against such threats as existing filoviruses that pose a current threat to forward-deployed U.S. military forces, and which could be weaponized by terrorist groups.

The committee notes that the Department awarded a contract for the ADM facility in late 2012 and anticipates achieving full operational capability in 2015. The committee expects to be kept informed of progress with the ADM effort, including its results in meeting DOD objectives for cost reduction, flexibility, and agility in developing and producing MCMs against known and evolving threats, including emerging infectious diseases.

The committee notes that section 1601 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136) directed the Secretary of Defense to "carry out a program of biomedical countermeasures, including but not limited to therapeutics and vaccines, for the protection of the Armed Forces. . .". The committee believes the Department's enhanced MCM strategy, particularly its development of an ADM capability and its focus on cost reduction and affordability, is an important step to meet this requirement.

Combat casualty care research

In February 2013, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report titled, "Actions Needed to Help Ensure Combat Casualty Care Research Achieves Goals." The GAO recommended that "the Secretary of Defense direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to communicate to DOD's nonmedical research organizations the importance of coordination with the JPC–6 chair on combat casualty care issues, and require this coordination early in the research process when these

organizations conduct research with implications for combat casualty care." Furthermore, the GAO recommended that "the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs develop and implement a plan to assess the extent to which combat casualty care research and development fills gaps in DOD's capability to provide combat casualty care and achieves DOD's other goals for this portfolio of research."

The committee notes that DOD concurred with GAO's recommendations and has taken positive steps to address them. The committee directs the Department to provide a comprehensive briefing to the committee, within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, on its progress in implementing GAO's recommendations and any additional actions it plans to take to achieve combat casualty care research goals.

Common kill vehicle technology program

On March 15, 2013, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel announced a series of steps planned to enhance homeland ballistic missile defense, to stay ahead of the evolving long-range missile threat from North Korea and Iran. One of the steps announced is the creation of a new program proposed in the President's budget request to develop advanced and common kill vehicle technologies for the Ground-Based Interceptor (GBI) and future variants of the Standard Missile–3 (SM–3) interceptor for the Navy's Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense program.

The objectives of the program are to develop common technologies, subsystems, or components that could be used in either kill vehicle, and to advance the state-of-the-art kill vehicle capability, including propulsion, electronics, navigation, seeker optics, discrimination, and communications. Advances in these kill vehicle technologies could provide significant improvements in the effectiveness of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) and Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense systems, and the overall Ballistic Missile Defense System, which are high priority objectives for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and the combatant commands that rely on these systems.

Given that the program was first announced in mid-March, the committee understands it is still at the beginning stage of program concept development, and does not yet have a well-defined long-term plan in place. This is understandable for a new research and development program, but the committee expects MDA to provide more definition and clarity on the long-term plan for the Common Kill Vehicle Technology Development program.

Section 225 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) requires the Director of MDA to develop a long-term plan to modify and upgrade the current GBI Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle, and the competitive development of a next-generation kill vehicle for the GBI. The provision also requires the Director to report to Congress on the plan by July 2013. The committee expects that the new Common Kill Vehicle Technology Development program will be compatible and consistent with the intent of Section 225.

One key element of any future kill vehicle program will be advanced propulsion for the Divert and Attitude Control System

(DACS) that steer the kill vehicle into the target warhead, including solid-fueled DACS that are currently used on all SM–3 variants. The committee notes that MDA plans to rely on the industrial base for innovation and competition for this Common Kill Vehicle Technology Development program. However, with the termination of the SM–3 IIB program, one of the two industry contractors with solid DACS expertise is at risk of ending their work and their ability to contribute to this program.

With these concerns in mind, the committee directs MDA to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than March 1, 2014, setting forth the long-term plan and objectives for the Common Kill Vehicle Technology Development program, including an explanation of how it intends to maintain a competitive industrial base to implement the program.

The committee supports the efforts of MDA to develop technology for a next generation high performance, high reliability, and highly producible kill vehicle, which MDA says could be ready before the end of the decade. A next generation kill vehicle would have enhanced discrimination capabilities and the potential for volume kill capability. The committee encourages the MDA to move the program as expeditiously as possible from research and development into product development, based on demonstrated technical progress and consistent with sound acquisition practices, and to transfer this effort from the Ballistic Missile Defense Technology Development program element into a new program element dedicated to the development of a next generation kill vehicle for the Ground-Based Interceptor and future variants of the Standard Missile-3 interceptor. The committee expects MDA to fully incorporate the lessons learned from the previously terminated Multiple Kill Vehicle program to avoid the problems encountered in that program.

High energy laser weapons

The committee notes that in the fiscal year 2014 budget request, the Department requested $364.0 million for high energy laser research and development. One of the key challenges in comparing the performance and maturity levels of the various laser systems across the services, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), and the Missile Defense Agency, is the lack of common performance metrics and the criteria that can be used for down-selection, further development, and eventual deployment. To address this deficiency, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall develop a set of common high energy laser metrics that characterize the operational performance of a high energy laser to include a measurement of power deposited on a given area over a given amount of time at a given distance, dependent upon atmospheric conditions, as a function of the size, weight, and power of the complete laser weapon system, including power and thermal management sub-systems, the laser source, the beam control and optical sub-systems, and the command and control sub-systems. These metrics, as well as an evaluation according to these metrics that will be used for decisions on further development and eventual deployment of all current high energy laser systems the Department is currently developing, shall be reported to

the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

Furthermore, the committee notes that the Department is pursuing multiple programs with solid state fiber lasers and strongly urges the Department to develop an integrated strategy that will lead to a rational down-selection process towards those systems that are most effective and mature in order to accelerate their testing in relevant operational environments and ultimately deployment.

Lastly, the committee notes that the majority of DOD's laser directed energy programs are focused on the development and demonstration of high-average-power continuous wave lasers, which have the goal of delivering sufficient thermal energy to damage or destroy targets. Insufficient attention is being given to ultra-short-pulse very-high-peak-power lasers which can produce unique non-thermal effects on materials, components, and systems—effects which cannot be produced by deposition of thermal energy. The committee notes that other countries are exploring the applications for these non-thermal effects, and are advancing the development of ultra-short-pulse high-peak power lasers and associated technologies. The committee directs the Department, in particular DARPA, to begin considering these systems to determine what military utility they can provide.

Future Ground-Based Interceptor acquisition

The committee notes that on March 15, 2013, Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel announced plans to deploy 14 additional operational Ground-Based Interceptors (GBIs) at Fort Greely Alaska by 2017, and to procure 14 GBIs in the future to replace the deployed ones. The budget request, which was submitted less than one month after Secretary Hagel's announcement, indicates that the Department of Defense intends to procure the 14 replacement GBIs at a rate of 2 per year for seven years, with funding starting in fiscal year 2016 and deliveries continuing until at least 2024.

The committee observes that there are a number of issues facing the Department with respect to future acquisition of GBIs stretching more than a decade into the future. These issues include: (1) the need to correct and demonstrate the problems experienced with the Capability Enhancement-II exo-atmospheric kill vehicle (EKV), and to have alternative options available in case the correction is not successfully demonstrated in an intercept flight test in 2014; (2) planned development efforts for significant EKV upgrades and new capabilities and designs, some of which may be available for deployment before 2020; (3) planned GBI reliability improvements and upgrades, some of which may be available for deployment before 2020; (4) procurement of 2 interceptors per year does not appear to be the most cost-effective acquisition approach; and (5) the possibility of producing a mix of 3-stage and 2-stage GBIs as part of the 14 additional GBIs to be procured. The committee notes that, given current plans, the GBI production line will remain operational for at least the next decade, thus enabling the option of procuring additional GBIs in the future, if needed. However, it is not yet clear what the best acquisition options are for procuring the 14 additional GBIs.

Given these issues, the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, describing the issues and options under consideration for future GBI acquisition, including a cost-benefit assessment of multi-year procurement authority. The report should include any recommendations for congressional action to support future GBI acquisition.

Hybrid Airships

Over the last several years, the Department of Defense (DOD) has pursued a number of airship vehicles to span a range of missions from long duration Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) to heavy lift. Many of these programs have been terminated or concluded due to either budgetary issues, technical challenges, changed requirements, or declining interest. Nevertheless, in testimony before the committee, General William M. Fraser, III, USAF, the Commander of U.S. Transportation Command said, "hybrid airships represent a transformational capability, bridging the longstanding gap between high-speed, lower-capacity airlift, and low-speed, higher-capacity sealift. Across the range of military operations, this capability can be leveraged from strategic to tactical distances... We encourage development of commercial technologies that may lead to enhanced mobility capabilities in the future."

One class of airships—hybrid airships—has been investigated under DOD's Pelican program and the Army's Long Endurance Multi-intelligence Vehicle (LEMV). The Pelican airship uses a system to control its buoyancy, while the LEMV is a standard hybrid airship with fixed buoyancy. While the Pelican program recently demonstrated a limited capability of the underlying technology for controlled variable buoyancy, there are still significant advances that are needed to be made in order to develop a robust flight vehicle that would have a cargo capacity with any military utility. The committee understands that there is some degree of interest in the commercial sector for the transportation capabilities of a heavy-lift hybrid airship. If such a capability were developed in the private sector, there is the potential opportunity for DOD to leverage this capability for its needs. The committee directs U.S. Transportation Command and the Air Force Mobility Command to monitor progress in this area and report to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act on the status of developments in the commercial sector regarding hybrid airships that could be used to provide the capability identified by General Fraser, and to what extent the DOD could benefit from them.

Implementation of Air Force Strategic Weather Modernization Plan Recommendations

The December 2012 U.S. Air Force Report to Congress titled, "Air Force Strategic Weather Modernization Plan" states, "Air Force Weather Agency products, processes, and organizations must continue to improve while using technology and training as enablers to assist Airmen to achieve increased efficiency and effectiveness. To accomplish this goal, Air Force Weather must remain

at the cutting edge of science and technology. At the same time, to successfully operate in the current high-technology, yet fiscally constrained environment, it is imperative to partner with other Department of Defense (DOD), civil, research and development, and international agencies to develop, access, and transition needed capabilities to operations. Air Force Weather will focus modernization efforts on those capabilities required to collect, analyze, predict, tailor, and integrate accurate, timely, and relevant weather data for the warfighter."

The committee is concerned that the Air Force currently lacks a comprehensive meteorological and weather analysis training program that relies on the most up to date technology. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Air Force brief this committee on its plan to implement the recommendations of its weather modernization report to include an incremental improvement strategy that ultimately creates a meteorological and weather analysis training program for the Air Force in coordination and cooperation with other DOD, civil, research and development, and international agencies.

Importance of preserving and maintaining mission critical information technology services

The committee supports the Air Force's ongoing efforts to acquire information technology (IT) products and services at lower costs and increased efficiencies. These efforts include standardizing configurations, maintaining strict adherence to Air Force and Department of Defense technical standards, leveraging $24.0 billion in IT buying power, and maximizing small business participation. The committee also supports additional efforts being taken by the Air Force to achieve cost-savings and improved efficiencies by instituting better business practices.

However, the committee is concerned about a potential disconnect between broader IT modernization efforts and those efforts focused on the Air Force's mission critical, high consequence networks, such as those related to its nuclear and space missions. Hence, the committee directs the Air Force to take all steps required to preserve and sustain the high consequence, mission critical IT services to ensure there are no adverse mission impacts.

Improved turbine engine program

The committee supports research and development for the Improved Turbine Engine Program that would increase the operational capability and fuel efficiency of Army helicopters. The committee is aware that the Army has achieved a Material Development Decision and that under the current acquisition strategy will fund competitive prototyping through Milestone-B.

The committee encourages the Army to take competitive prototyping as far as resources will permit to mitigate technical risk and prove out performance. For example, there may be an opportunity to continue competition into and through a preliminary flight rating test milestone, or through a flight demonstration of each competing engine. This investment in continuing competition could help control costs, reduce programmatic risk, and mitigate modeling and simulation shortfalls. Selecting the appropriate point at

which to down select to a single engine contractor is a crucial step to ensure the taxpayers and Department of Defense get the best value in investment and performance.

Independent assessment of Army Distributed Common Ground System analyst tool integration

The budget request included $27.6 in PE 35208A for development of the Army's Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS). The committee directs the Deputy Secretary of Defense to task the National Assessment Group (NAG) to conduct the following activities with respect to the Army's DCGS:

(1) Identify the software tools and capabilities in DCGS that provide the human-machine interface for manipulating DCGS, querying data stores, and displaying results.

(2) Characterize the Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) and other technical interface specifications used by DCGS human-machine interface tools and capabilities.

(3) Determine whether DCGS interfaces are adequate to support successful integration of existing DCGS human-machine interface tools and capabilities or similar tools that perform the same or similar functions.

(4) Create an inventory of such tools and capabilities within DCGS and identify which of them are licensed products developed by a private corporation, were developed with government funding, or are open source products, and at what cost.

(5) For each tool and capability, determine whether it was integrated into DCGS by government or private sector funding, by government or contractor personnel, and where data is available, at what cost.

(6) Select a representative sample of advanced commercially licensed analyst tools that perform the same or similar functions as tools currently used in DCGS.

(7) With the permission of the owners of those tools, characterize the technical interface specifications that would have to be satisfied for the tools to be successfully integrated into DCGS.

(8) Compare the interface specifications necessary for successful integration of commercial tools to DCGS existing specification and identify any obstacles to the successful integration of commercially licensed analyst tools.

The committee directs the NAG, in characterizing the tool integration interfaces within DCGS and commercial products, to assume that the tools would need to be able to ingest and manipulate data created or acquired locally as well as data already resident in the DCGS system. The NAG shall evaluate the DCGS Release 1, 2, and 3 versions.

The committee directs the NAG to provide the results of this analysis to the Secretary of the Army and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, and the USD(AT&L) to forward the NAG assessment, together with any comments and recommendations, to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees within 210 days of the enactment of this Act. The committee directs that not more than 65 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Army DCGS de-

velopment in fiscal year 2014 may be obligated or expended prior to delivery of the required report.

Joint Land-Attack Cruise Missile Elevated Netted Sensor (JLENS) system

The Joint Land-Attack Cruise Missile Elevated Netted Sensor (JLENS) system is a paired aerostat system intended to provide persistent elevated sensor data needed to detect, track, and defeat airborne threats, including cruise missiles, manned and unmanned aircraft, and surface moving targets, including swarming boats. Based on a recently restructured engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program, JLENS is nearing the completion of the EMD phase of the acquisition cycle, and is planned to demonstrate its potential capability and assess future options. As a joint system managed by the Army, it has demonstrated interoperability with a number of Army and Navy weapon systems. The Army plans to conduct an operational exercise with JLENS at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, to demonstrate its capabilities in support of the North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Northern Command for their National Capital Region homeland defense mission, starting in October 2014.

The committee supports the planned JLENS demonstration in this operational exercise and believes it will provide critical information for the Department of Defense to assess the ability of JLENS to support other combatant commander sensor requirements in the future. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 90 days after the initiation of the JLENS demonstration, identifying the data and analyses that it plans to use from the demonstration to guide future acquisition decisions for JLENS. The report shall also include a discussion of how the Department intends to support validated requirements of combatant commanders for persistent elevated surveillance of cruise missile and surface moving threats.

Metrics for evaluating Commercial Solutions for Classified

The budget request included $181.6 million in PE 33140G for the Information Systems Security Program at the National Security Agency (NSA). NSA's Commercial Solutions for Classified (CSfC) program aims to shift the protection of classified information from reliance on government-engineered solutions toward publicly available commercial technologies. The program's technical approach is to layer commercial devices into a system for the protection of classified information, relying on the redundancy and mutual support of multiple commercial products to mitigate the risk of security flaws in any one layer. The committee strongly supports NSA's initiative to provide rapid and affordable security solutions for commercial products to enable the Department of Defense (DOD) to exploit advanced commercial technology.

However, the committee is concerned that the program's metrics of success focus on breadth and speed of deployment and user acceptance, not actual measurements of the level of security achieved. Commercial technologies potentially offer lower cost and advanced

capability, but NSA must ensure that it detects any degradation in security should it arise due to the use of CSfC architectures.

Therefore, the committee directs that NSA develop a plan to collect data on deployments of CSfC solutions and products and compare their security performance to systems engineered by traditional methods. In building the plan, NSA should consider options from the full range of potential sources of data on security, such as security analyses, testing, blue- and red-team events, cyber exercises, and field performance, such as intrusion rates, speed with which intrusions are detected, and effort required for remediation. The committee further directs that the DOD Chief Information Officer review and approve the plan and transmit the plan to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees within 120 days of enactment of this Act.

The committee also directs the program manager for the CSfC program to examine the problem of detecting and remediating vulnerabilities in the software that controls the power conditioning for mobile devices that could allow attackers to rapidly deplete limited power sources. In today's mobile communications world, power sources are the key limiting factor for mission success and optimization of battery performance and longevity are largely software controlled.

Military Scientists and Engineers

The committee has been a strong supporter of the Department of Defense's (DOD) science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education and outreach programs. The DOD needs to be able to attract and retain the best and brightest scientists and engineers for both its civilian and military personnel. The committee acknowledges that there has been greater emphasis on the civilian STEM sector and that the number of military STEM officers has experienced a steeper decline than the total number of officers over the last two-plus decades. The broader question that needs to be addressed is how well DOD is managing its uniformed STEM workforce to ensure that it will keep pace with its own evolving needs and high technology developments around the world.

Hence, to better understand the current situation with DOD uniformed STEM personnel, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, in coordination with the services, to report to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act on the following:

(1) the current and future requirements for uniformed STEM personnel, including requirements for types of degrees and scientific and technical fields;

(2) how uniformed STEM personnel are used and integrated into the total force (by service), including how the balance between officer leadership and technical competence is addressed;

(3) what differences, if any, exist between the data DOD collects on its civilian workforce and uniformed personnel in STEM fields to include:

(a) the educational degree discipline;

(b) the granting school of all baccalaureate, graduate, and professional degrees; and

(c) the non-military occupation of Reserve component members; and

(4) how the Defense Manpower Data Center is used for managing both civilian and military STEM personnel.

Scientific and technical conferences

As a result of some unfortunate recent events in other government agencies, the Office of Management and Budget released Memorandum M–12–12 last year that provided guidance to departments and agencies on government travel and conference attendance. The Department of Defense (DOD) issued further implementing guidance later in the year that established a tiered approval structure for conference oversight responsibilities. The committee understands that the implementing guidance has led to the oversight and approval of science and technology (S&T)-funded travel and conference sponsoring and attendance by very senior service and department levels that requires additional time and resources.

An unintended consequence of this guidance has been a significant reduction in the DOD's participation in S&T-funded travel to major scientific facilities or experimental sites for research projects, grantee and contractor site visits, program reviews and technical evaluations, science board and advisory group meetings, international S&T engagements, standards-setting committees, scientific society-sponsored conferences, and events and competitions authorized under section 2192 of Title 10, United States Code, for educational outreach initiatives. Reductions in travel and conferences pose a special threat to science and engineering activities because of the collaborative nature of the work and the importance of extensive interchange among researchers to remain cognizant of and extend the current state of knowledge. The committee is concerned that decreased participation may be jeopardizing the ability of DOD S&T to successfully complete their S&T missions.

In order to quantify the impact that these policies are having on the DOD S&T enterprise, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office to undertake a study of the impact of the above mentioned policies on the DOD S&T enterprise, including the National Nuclear Security Administration, and report to the congressional defense committees its findings no later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act. Furthermore, in order to streamline approval timelines and reduce attendant delays, the committee directs the Office of the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to establish procedures to allow the services and agency heads to exercise more local control and decision making authority over travel and conference oversight and approval, consistent with applicable laws and regulations and the need to ensure the appropriate use of taxpayer funds.

Tactical power grids

The committee is aware that the U.S. Army Research, Development, and Engineering Command and the Office of Naval Research are each pursuing the development of tactical power grids and advanced mobile electric power distribution systems to assist the

Army and Marine Corps respectively, to meet the need for the efficient distribution of mobile electric power in a stable tactical grid environment. While the committee encourages these efforts to improve safety, reliability, reduce fuel consumption, and maximize energy efficiency, the committee urges the services to closely coordinate to avoid unnecessary duplication and to continue these efforts to determine whether these objectives can be met.

Trusted microelectronics

The committee recognizes the vital importance of supply chain risk management for Department of Defense (DOD) systems, especially for microelectronics components and software, in order to maintain mission assurance of its weapons systems. A key component of microelectronics manufacturing for critical DOD systems is the Trusted Foundry program as well as the Defense Microelectronics Activity (DMEA). Given the rapid pace of microelectronics obsolescence, the committee supports the continued improvement of DMEA's capabilities as a foundry of last resort when commercial entities in the Trusted Foundry program are not able to manufacture a given component.

In addition to supporting the Trusted Foundry program and DMEA, the committee urges DOD to ensure that an enterprise-wide approach to microelectronics trust is taken, to include the security of photomask design and inspection tools given their criticality in the integrated circuit manufacturing process. The committee urges DOD to continue to work with the private sector in ongoing partnership programs to reduce supply chain vulnerabilities and to ensure that technologies and products developed are transitioned to the manufacturing processes used for DOD microelectronics components.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Operation and maintenance funding (sec. 301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for operation and maintenance activities at the levels identified in section 4301 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—Logistics and Sustainment

Sustainment of critical manufacturing capabilities within Army arsenals (sec. 311)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the military services and defense agencies, to review current and expected manufacturing requirements for which there is no or limited domestic commercial source and which are appropriate for manufacturing within an arsenal owned by the United States in order to support critical manufacturing capabilities.

Strategic policy for prepositioned materiel and equipment (sec. 312)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop an overarching strategy, along with an implementation plan, to integrate and synchronize at a Department-wide level, the services' prepositioning program. The strategy and implementation plan would ensure that the Department of Defense's (DOD) prepositioning programs, both ground and afloat, align with national defense strategies, new DOD priorities, and emphasize joint oversight to maximize effectiveness and efficiencies in prepositioned materiel and equipment across the DOD.

The committee continues to believe in the strategic importance of the effective prepositioning of material and equipment in locations around the world, both ground and afloat, to facilitate and speed our response to crises or contingencies. Fiscal challenges require the DOD to carefully balance the investment in prepositioned materiel and equipment to achieve both national military objectives and other DOD priorities.

The committee understands that the DOD is committed to reconstituting prepositioned materiel and equipment but must balance these efforts with the Department's other priorities, such as restructuring capabilities within its prepositioned materiel and equipment and changes in its overseas military presence.

The committee is concerned that the DOD has not implemented an overarching strategy and joint service oversight framework for its prepositioning programs. As the DOD and the nation face fiscal constraints in the coming years, overarching strategic guidance

that emphasizes joint oversight of the DOD's prepositioning program is essential to reduce any unnecessary overlap, duplication, and inefficiencies among the services and to maximize cost savings while minimizing risks.

As far back as 2005, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has reported that each of the services and the Defense Logistics Agency were planning the future of their prepositioning programs without the benefit of an integrated DOD-wide plan or joint doctrine to coordinate their efforts. The GAO has made several recommendations over the years for the DOD to develop overarching strategic guidance and improve the joint service oversight of its prepositioning programs. While the DOD has agreed with the need to develop department-wide strategic guidance, efforts to do so have not materialized.

Moreover, the committee is concerned that the DOD may be moving away from such efforts. For example, the DOD had previously stated that its Comprehensive Materiel Response Plan would provide the strategic guidance and that the Department would pursue opportunities for joint oversight as the GAO recommended. However, when the plan was approved in January 2013, it specifically excluded prepositioning. The committee believes that an increased emphasis on joint program management and oversight of prepositioned materiel and equipment would unify the DOD's prepositioning efforts in support of defense priorities, reduce unnecessary duplication, and achieve cost savings and efficiencies.

Extension and modification of authority for airlift transportation at Department of Defense rates for non-Department of Defense Federal cargoes (sec. 313)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2642(a) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to provide to other Federal agencies airlift transportation at the same rate the Department of Defense (DOD) charges its own units for similar transportation and to expand the authority to include all means of transportation, not just airlift. The Department currently uses this authority to: (1) provide transportation support to other departments and agencies to increase peacetime business; and (2) promote the improved use of airlift by filling excess capacity with paying cargo.

The proposal also would expand the authority to allow the use of extra capacity on strategic transportation assets of the military, to include aircraft and vessels, for transportation provided in support of foreign military sales. During peacetime operations, utilization of aircraft and vessels to meet training and readiness requirements is typically greater than actual cargo transportation requirements. Therefore, DOD can transport extra cargo at little or no increase in operating costs, making utilization of excess capacity by other federal agencies prudent. Additionally, use of such capacity for the shipment of items for other departments or agencies complements the training needs of DOD.

The provision would also extend the sunset date for this authority from October 28, 2014, until September 30, 2019.

Subtitle C—Readiness

Modification of authorities on prioritization of funds for equipment readiness and strategic capability (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would cancel the requirement for an annual report on the Army's transition to modular force structure. The provision would also cancel the review of the Army's modularity report by the Government Accountability Office.

Strategic policy for the retrograde, reconstitution, and replacement of operating forces used to support overseas contingency operations (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a policy setting forth the programs and priorities of the Department of Defense (DOD) for the retrograde, reconstitution, and replacement of units and materiel used to support overseas contingency operations. The provision would direct that the policy shall take into account national security threats, the requirements of the combatant commands, the current readiness of the operating forces of the military departments, and risk associated with the strategic depth and the time necessary to reestablish required personnel, equipment, and training readiness in such operating forces.

The provision would further direct that the required DOD implementation plan, and the annual updates to the initial plan for the following three years, shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees no later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The provision would also directs the Comptroller General to review the DOD implementation plan and policy and report to the congressional defense committees no later than 60 days after submission of the report or updates from the Secretary of Defense.

Lastly, the provision would encourage DOD to submit a classified annex to accompany the implementation plan and policy, where appropriate.

Subtitle D—Reports

Strategy for improving asset visibility and in-transit visibility (sec. 331)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to complete a comprehensive strategy and implementation plan for improving asset visibility tracking and in-transit visibility across the Department of Defense.

Changes to quarterly reports on personnel and unit readiness (sec. 332)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 482 of title 10, United States Code, to update and streamline the quarterly readiness report to Congress. The committee notes that in striking the term "borrowed personnel" the committee is referring to personnel assigned to a unit that may not have the rank,

school completed, or specialized training to be able to carry out the responsibilities for the assigned position.

Revision to requirement for annual submission of information regarding information technology capital assets (sec. 333)

The committee recommends a provision that would align Department of Defense high-threshold Information Technology Capital Asset reporting with the Department's Major Automated Information Systems reporting and its Exhibit 300 reporting to the Office of Management and Budget.

Modification of annual corrosion control and prevention reporting requirements (sec. 334)

The committee notes that the military departments' corrosion control and prevention executives coordinate with the Department of Defense's (DOD) Corrosion Policy and Oversight Office on their respective strategic plans. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has found that linking the military departments' strategic goals to those of the DOD should improve corrosion control and prevention efforts. However, the committee notes that the GAO also found that the military departments varied in the extent that their strategic plans show clear linkage to the 10 goals and objectives included in the DOD corrosion prevention and mitigation strategic plan. The committee notes the Army's strategic plan showed clear linkage to all 10 of the goals and objectives. Additionally, the committee notes that the GAO found no inconsistencies with DOD Instruction 5000.67, which establishes policy, assigns responsibilities, and provides guidance for managing programs to prevent or mitigate corrosion.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that would modify section 903(b)(5) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (P.L. 110–417; 10 U.S.C. 2228 note) to update the military departments' strategic plans with performance measures and show clear linkage to the DOD's overarching goals and objectives as described in the DOD's strategic plan for corrosion control and prevention.

Subtitle E—Limitations and Extension of Authority

Limitation on funding for United States Special Operations Command National Capital Region (sec. 341)

The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) testified before the committee that "USSOCOM is placing greater emphasis on its presence in the National Capital Region (NCR) to better support coordination and decision making with interagency partners. Thus, USSOCOM began to consolidate its presence in the NCR in early 2012. This is not a duplication of effort. We are focused instead on consolidating USSOCOM elements in the Washington, DC region under the leadership of the USSOCOM Vice-Commander—who resides in Washington." To support this effort, the budget request includes $10.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, to support the USSOCOM–NCR.

The committee supports efforts by USSOCOM to better coordinate its activities with interagency and multinational partners, most of whom are physically located in the NCR. However, the committee believes that current fiscal constraints dictate that the goals of the USSOCOM–NCR be achieved in a resource and manpower neutral manner. While this is the first year USSOCOM has requested funding for the USSOCOM–NCR in its budget request, USSOCOM–NCR activities have been underway for more than a year resulting in significant expenditures for leased facilities and contract support. To date, the committee has not received sufficient detail on the implementation plan for the USSOCOM–NCR and its associated costs, particularly in future years.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the expenditure of any funds for the USSOCOM–NCR until 30 days after the Secretary of Defense provides the congressional defense committees a report which describes, at a minimum: (1) the purpose of the USSOCOM–NCR; (2) the activities to be performed by the USSOCOM—NCR; (3) an explanation of the impact of the USSOCOM–NCR on existing activities at USSOCOM headquarters; (4) a detailed breakout, by fiscal year, of the staffing and other costs associated with the USSOCOM–NCR over the future years defense program; (5) a description of the relationship between the USSOCOM–NCR and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict (ASD SOLIC); (6) the role of the ASD SOLIC in providing oversight of USSOCOM–NCR activities; and (7) any other matters the Secretary deems appropriate.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends a budget item related to the use of contractors to support the USSOCOM–NCR.

Limitation on funding for Regional Special Operations Coordination Centers (sec. 342)

The budget request included $14.7 million for the establishment of Regional Special Operations Coordination Centers (RSCC) in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide. The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the expenditure of any funds for the RSCCs in fiscal year 2014 and direct the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, in coordination with the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command, not later than September 30, 2013, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees outlining, at a minimum: (1) the requirement and justification for the establishment of RSCCs; (2) the number and locations of planned RSCCs; (3) the projected cost to establish and maintain the proposed RSCCs in future years; (4) the relevance to and coordination with other multilateral engagement activities and academic institutes supported by the geographic combatant commanders and State Department; and (5) any legislative authorities that may be needed to establish RSCCs.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends no funding for the RSCCs in fiscal year 2014.

Limitation on availability of funds for Trans Regional Web Initiative (TRWI) (sec. 343)

The budget request included $19.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Trans Regional Web Initiative (TRWI), a contractor operated and U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) funded strategic level military information support operations program. Under the TRWI, USSOCOM establishes and maintains news and information websites in support of certain geographic combatant command's (GCC) countering violent extremism objectives.

The committee supports the efforts of USSOCOM and the GCCs to conduct phase zero operations to counter violent extremism, but believes that the costs to operate the websites developed under the TRWI are excessive. The effectiveness of the websites is questionable and the performance metrics do not justify the expense. The committee believes USSOCOM resources are better used to support tactical and operational military information support activities. The committee acknowledges the utility of strategic level information operations activities, but believes they would be more appropriately funded and managed by the State Department and other relevant U.S. Government agencies, with support from USSOCOM, as necessary.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from expending any funds in OMDW to continue the TRWI and the associated websites.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Revised policy on ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms (sec. 351)

Section 352 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (P.L. 111–84) required the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the performance, interoperability, costs, logistics, and patents involved in the services' combat camouflage and utility uniforms. In April 2010, the GAO reported that since 2002, the services continued to develop unique combat and utility uniforms. The committee notes that prior to 2002, the services wore the same pattern and family of combat camouflage and utility uniforms. The GAO found no performance standards for specific combat environments, no criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of camouflage patterns, and no requirements for the services to test interoperability between their uniforms and other tactical gear, despite the DOD establishing a Joint Clothing and Textiles Governance Board in 2008.

The committee remains concerned that until this year, the Department of the Navy chose to equip its sailors and marines with different types of combat uniforms, providing significantly different levels of protection in combat environments.

The GAO recently identified that the DOD's fragmented approach to developing and acquiring combat uniforms could be more efficient, better protect service members, and result in up to $82.0 million in development and acquisition cost savings through increased collaboration among the military services.

The committee continues to strongly urge the secretaries of the military departments to explore additional methods for sharing uniform technology across the services as they develop their combat and utility uniforms. The committee continues to believe that combat and utility uniforms should incorporate the most advanced levels of protection and should be available to all men and women in uniform, regardless of the military service in which they serve.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to reduce the separate development and fielding of service-specific combat and camouflage utility uniforms in order to collectively adopt and field the same combat and camouflage utility uniforms for use by all members of the armed forces. The committee notes that the recommended provision would also restrict any military service from preventing another military service from authorizing the use of any combat or camouflage utility uniform. Additionally, after the date of enactment of this Act, each military service would be prohibited from adopting new designs for combat and camouflage utility uniforms, including uniforms reflecting changes to the fabric and camouflage patterns used in current combat and camouflage utility uniforms, unless the services adopt a uniform currently in use, all services adopt the same combat or camouflage utility uniform, or the Secretary of Defense determines that unique circumstances or requirements justify an exception to the policy.

Authorization to institute a centralized, automated mail redirection system to improve the delivery of absentee ballots to military personnel serving outside the United States (sec. 352)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to $4.5 million from defense-wide operation and maintenance to the Postal Service Fund for purposes of implementing the modernization of the United States Postal Service's mail delivery system to improve the delivery of absentee ballots to military personnel serving outside the United States.

Budget Items

Army readiness funding increases

The budget request included $35.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), of which $888.1 million was for maneuver units, $1.2 billion was for aviation assets, $3.5 billion was for force readiness operations support, and $1.4 billion was for land forces depot maintenance. The budget request also included $7.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), of which $712.1 million was for facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization (FSRM). The budget request also included $3.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR), of which $294.1 million was for FSRM.

The Army has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could help offset cuts as a result of sequestration. The committee notes that these recommended increases will improve the Army's fiscal year 2014 flying hour program and ground operations tempo requirements and enable units to conduct additional

training to restore readiness lost in fiscal year 2013. The committee also notes that the recommended increase in land forces depot maintenance will allow additional maintenance to occur on aviation assets, ground vehicles, missiles, electronics, and post-production software support. Additionally, the recommended increases for FSRM will increase funding to 90 percent of the fiscal year 2014 requirement for the Army National Guard and Army Reserve.

Accordingly, the committee recommends increases of $195.9 million in OMA for maneuver units, $15.8 million in OMA for aviation assets, $209.9 million in OMA for force readiness operations support, $200.0 million in OMA for land forces depot maintenance, $74.2 million in OMARNG for FSRM, and $36.4 million in OMAR for FSRM.

U.S. European Command funding decrease

The budget request included $35.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), of which $185.0 million was for combatant commanders core operations.

The committee is concerned that the funding increase in the fiscal year 2014 budget request for U.S. European Command's (EUCOM) information operations campaign is unjustified growth.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million in OMA (subactivity 138) for EUCOM.

Navy readiness funding increases

The budget request included $39.9 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), of which $4.9 billion was for mission and other flight operations, $1.8 billion was for fleet air training, $35.8 million was for aircraft depot operations support, $3.8 billion was for mission and other ship operations, $734.8 million was for ship operations support and training, $5.1 billion was for ship depot maintenance, $1.3 billion was for ship depot operations support, $2.6 million was for depot operations support, and $1.9 billion was for facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization (FSRM). The budget request also included $1.1 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (OMNR), of which $586.6 million was for mission and other flight operations and $100.6 million was for aircraft depot maintenance.

The Navy has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could help offset cuts as a result of sequestration. The committee notes that these recommended increases in funding will improve the Navy's fiscal year 2014 flying hour program, steaming days, depot maintenance, training, and FSRM to restore readiness lost in fiscal year 2013.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following increases in OMN: $32.5 million for mission and other flight operations, $11.2 million in fleet air training, $608,000 in aircraft depot operations support, $99.5 million in mission and other ship operations, $61.4 million in ship operations support and training, $5.7 million in ship depot maintenance, $126.2 million in ship depot operations support, $660,000 in depot operations support, $100.0 million in FSRM. The committee also recommends the following increases in OMNR: $1.9 million in mission and other flight operations and $8.9 million in aircraft depot maintenance.

Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support

The budget request included $199.1 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) for Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support. Of this amount, $3.0 million is for a classified U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) program.

The committee recommends a decrease of $3.0 million in OMN for the development of the program at PACOM.

Marine Corps readiness funding increases

The budget request included $6.2 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), of which $223.3 million was for depot maintenance.

The Marine Corps has identified specific amounts in this readiness account that could help offset cuts as a result of sequestration. The committee notes that the recommended increase will improve the Marine Corp's critical depot maintenance requirement to 100 percent in order to restore readiness lost in fiscal year 2013.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $56.0 million in OMMC for depot maintenance.

Air Force readiness funding increases

The budget request included $37.2 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which $3.2 billion was for primary combat forces, $1.5 billion was for air operations training, $5.9 billion was for depot maintenance, and $1.8 billion was for facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization (FSRM). The budget request also included $3.1 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (OMAFR), of which $89.7 million was for FSRM. The budget request also included $6.5 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG), of which $296.9 million was for FSRM.

The Air Force has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could help offset fiscal year 2013 cuts as a result of sequestration. The committee notes that these recommended increases in amounts will improve the Air Force's fiscal year 2014 flying hour program, weapons systems sustainment, training ranges, and FSRM.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase in OMAF: $220.0 million in primary combat forces, $30.0 million in air operations training, $210.0 million for depot maintenance, and $75.0 million for FSRM. The committee also recommends an increase of $8.7 million in OMAFR for FSRM and an increase of $28.2 million in OMANG for FSRM.

Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support

The budget request included $1.1 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support. Of this amount, $22.4 million is for a U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) classified program.

The committee recommends a decrease of $22.4 million in OMAF for this classified CENTCOM program.

Regional Special Operations Coordination Centers

The budget request included $14.7 million for the establishment of Regional Special Operations Coordination Centers (RSCC) in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW).

According to U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), the RSCCs would be partner-led multinational organizations designed to "promote partner-nation SOF [Special Operations Forces] capacity building through coordination, education, and information sharing." These RSCCs would function as "regional operational-level hubs of the larger global SOF network to facilitate cooperation and interoperability among partner-nation SOF and SOF-like organizations."

To date, the committee has not received appropriate justification and a plan for the establishment of the proposed RSCCs, particularly the costs to sustain RSCC operations in future years. The committee is concerned that the RSCCs may duplicate other efforts by the geographic combatant commanders (GCC), their subordinate component commands, existing GCC regional centers, and complicate diplomatic activities by the State Department and relevant chiefs of mission. In addition, the committee is concerned that the RSCCs as proposed by USSOCOM would be heavily reliant on contractors for planning, study, and engagement activities with funding for such contractors making up nearly the entire budget request for RSCCs in fiscal year 2014.

USSOCOM indicates that the RSCCs would be modeled, at least in-part, on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Operations Headquarters (NSHQ). The committee has been strongly supportive of the NSHQ and its efforts to enhance the capabilities and interoperability of NATO SOF. The efforts of the NSHQ have been especially evident in the increased participation and success of allied SOF in operations in Afghanistan. While the committee agrees there are important lessons to be learned from the NSHQ that can be applied in other regions, the committee believes the NSHQ is a flawed model for the proposed RSCCs. The NATO alliance is unique in the world and the NSHQ has been built on a foundation of longstanding multilateral agreements that underpin its activities.

Given the concerns outlined above, the committee recommends no funding in OMDW for the establishment of RSCCs by USSOCOM.

U.S. Special Operations Command—National Capital Region

The budget request included $10.0 million for the establishment of a U.S. Special Operations Command—National Capital Region (USSOCOM–NCR) office in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide.

The committee supports efforts by USSOCOM to better coordinate its activities with interagency and multinational partners, most of whom are physically located in the NCR. However, the committee believes that current fiscal constraints dictate that the goals of the USSOCOM–NCR be achieved in a resource and manpower neutral manner. The committee is concerned that two-thirds of the requested funding for the USSOCOM–NCR in fiscal year 2014 would pay for contractor support. The committee believes

such a heavy reliance on contractors to implement the USSOCOM–NCR is inconsistent with the purpose of this effort.

Therefore, the committee recommends $2.9 million for the USSOCOM–NCR, a reduction of $7.1 million. The committee recommends a provision elsewhere in this title that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees prior to the expenditure of any fiscal year 2014 funds for the USSOCOM–NCR.

Department of Defense STARBASE program

The budget request included no funding for the Department of Defense (DOD) STARBASE program. The purpose of STARBASE is to improve the knowledge and skills of students in kindergarten through 12th grade in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) subjects, and to motivate them to explore STEM as they continue their education. STARBASE currently operates at 76 locations in 40 states and the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, primarily on military installations. To date, nearly 750,000 students have participated in the program. STARBASE is a highly effective program run by our dedicated service members and strengthens the relationships between the military, communities, and local school districts.

The committee notes that the budget request eliminated funding for this successful program due to a reorganization of STEM programs throughout the Federal Government, and believes that STARBASE should continue to be operated by DOD.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $21.7 million for the DOD STARBASE program.

Defense Security Cooperation Agency

The budget request included $788.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), of which $85.9 million is to support the operation and maintenance budgets of the five regional centers for security studies. The five centers serve as a forum for bilateral and multilateral communication within a region. Their activities range from extended academic programs to conferences on topics such as regional security issues, defense planning, and civilian-military relations. The committee notes that the regional centers serve an important role in supporting the Secretary of Defense and the geographic combatant commanders, but the committee also notes that the budgets of these centers continue to grow—even after the Secretary of Defense's efficiency initiative explicitly sought to reduce their budgets.

In addition, the DSCA budget also included $34.8 million for the Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP). While the committee remains supportive of this program, the committee is concerned about the expanding activities and increased operating costs of the CTFP at a time of fiscal challenges. The committee encourages the CTFP to focus its activities on: its core counterterrorism training and education; a limited number of regions where the threat posed by terrorism is the most significant; and efforts to offset rising costs such as increased use of virtual education opportunities and programs.

As such, the committee recommends an undistributed decrease of $12.0 million to OMDW for the DSCA's budget request to support the five regional centers and a decrease of $7.0 million for the CTFP.

The committee also directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD(P)), the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the geographic combatant commanders to conduct a review of the mission, mandate, curriculum, and other activities of the five regional centers to ensure that their ongoing and planned activities continue to directly support the theater security cooperation campaigns of their respective combatant commanders. The review shall also assess whether the current organizational construct and chain of command associated with the five regional centers is appropriate given the recent presidential guidance on security assistance. As part of the review, the committee urges the USD(P) to focus particular attention on the need to enhance engagement in areas of emerging security interests (e.g. the area of responsibility in U.S. Africa Command, U.S. Pacific Command, and U.S. Central Command) and promoting continued interoperability among International Security Assistance Force partners and capturing the lessons learned from coalition operations in Afghanistan.

Following the completion of this review—and no later than 90 days after enactment of this Act—the committee directs the USD(P) to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The committee is aware that the Department has taken steps to establish a governance board to enhance its ability to oversee the centers and has set broad programmatic priorities, but has not yet fully developed an approach for measuring the centers' progress in meeting these priorities, including establishing measurable goals, related performance metrics, and a methodology for assessing performance of the centers. Therefore, as part of the aforementioned briefing, the committee directs the USD(P) to also provide information on the status of its efforts to measure the centers' progress.

Funding for impact aid

The amount authorized to be appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, includes the following changes from the budget request. The provisions underlying these changes in funding levels are discussed in greater detail in title V of this committee report.

[Changes in millions of dollars]

Impact aid for schools with military dependent students	25.0
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities	5.0
Total	30.0

Defense-wide funding decrease for ahead of need request

The budget request included $371.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), of which $273.3 million was for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements related to the relocation of marines to Guam.

Given the reevaluation of the relocation of marines to Guam, the committee remains concerned that the funds requested for the OEA

are ahead of need. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $273.3 million in OMDW for the OEA.

Under Secretary of Defense for Policy funding decrease

The budget request included $32.9 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), of which $66.0 million was for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (OUSD(P)).

In light of sequestration reductions and readiness concerns faced by the Department, the committee is concerned by the growth of the OUSD(P) budget request. The committee notes that nearly 50 percent of the OUSD(P) budget is dedicated to contractor support, which in the committee's view, is based on past staffing paradigms and is far too great. As the Department considers areas to make reductions within OUSD(P) to adjust for this cut, the committee expects that the first reductions should target the size and/or cost of the contractor workforce.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $7.0 million in OMDW for the OUSD(P).

Continuing support for Operation Observant Compass

The budget request included $32.9 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, of which $14.2 billion is for classified programs. Within that amount for classified programs, the request includes classified amounts to sustain intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) support to U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM).

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) included funds to enhance the ISR support to AFRICOM's Operation Observant Compass, an operation to support the efforts of Ugandan and other regional militaries to remove Joseph Kony and other senior leaders of the Lord's Resistance Army from the battlefield in Central Africa.

The budget request included funds for commercial aircraft with full motion video sensors. The committee notes that this capability is of limited utility in regions where there is dense canopy, and believes that the Department is paying more than it should for this capability.

The committee recommends a reduction of $15.0 million to the request for full motion video surveillance and recommends $40.0 million to sustain the congressionally mandated initiative.

Items of Special Interest

Additive manufacturing

The committee notes that the introduction of additive manufacturing, also known as third dimensional (3–D) printing, has the potential to contribute to Department of Defense (DOD) missions and capabilities with the effective and efficient use of lightweight materials, rapid production, and design innovation. The committee remains concerned that the long lead time often associated with spare parts can in some instances take multiple years to arrive at various DOD depots.

The committee notes that the potential to use ceramic composite materials could offer enhanced aircraft performance over metal alloys with higher temperatures ranges, less weight, and greater fuel efficiency. Similarly, a deployable 3–D printing capability could enable a forward operating base with an adaptive and onsite manufacturing capability with a reduced logistical burden. Furthermore, the DOD is providing funding to the recently established National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute (NAMII).

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee no later than February 1, 2014 on the potential benefits and constraints of additive manufacturing, how the process could or could not contribute to DOD missions, and what technologies being developed at NAMII are being transitioned for DOD use.

Advanced situational awareness training

The committee understands that the Army has successfully introduced a program to train deploying units to detect changes in human behavior through the Advanced Situational Awareness Training module. The committee commends the Army for continuing to broaden and adapt its training efforts to best enable soldiers to react to the vast array of complex and asymmetrical threats often faced in a combat environment. The committee notes that training to increase situational awareness imparts enduring and important skills for individual soldiers and units, and encourages the Secretary of the Army to consider expanding this type of training to additional deploying units and at the appropriate advanced leadership courses.

Air show support by the Department of Defense

The Department of Defense issued guidance in early April 2013 prohibiting all aerial demonstrations, including flyovers, jump team demonstrations, and participation in civilian air shows and military open houses.

Many believe that this lack of community engagement may have negative consequences on military recruiting and local economies. The committee recognizes that the Department had to take serious steps in order to deal with the effects of sequestration in fiscal year 2013.

However, the committee has been informed that there are certain circumstances where an exception to this general policy could provide some level of community engagement as a no-cost addition to activities that are required for training or readiness.

Therefore, the committee recommends that the Department of Defense reconsider whether this policy should be enforced on a blanket basis or whether the policy should allow for community engagement if that engagement can be completed as a no-cost adjunct to missions fulfilling other required operational or training activities.

Coal-to-liquid fuel technology developments

The Department of Defense (DOD), Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–6) provided $20.0 million in Air Force Re-

search, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) only for research that will improve emissions of coal-to-liquid (CTL) fuel to enable this technology to be a competitive alternative energy resource.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a detailed spending plan to the committee for the CTL RDT&E program no later than July 31, 2013. Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to report to the committee on the feasibility of potential technologies that could enable coal-based fuels to meet the requirements of the DOD consistent with section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007 (Public Law 110–140). The report shall also include a proposal for joint research on those technologies that are most promising for the capture of carbon, reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, and other approaches that could enable coal-based fuels to be procured under section 526 of the EISA 2007. The DOD shall submit this report to the committee no later than February 1, 2014.

Combatant command support agent accounting

The committee notes the Operation and Maintenance budget justification material within the Air Force's Combatant Commander Direct Mission Support and Combatant Commander Core Operations (lines 130 and 140) accounts are a consolidation of multiple combatant commands' budgets under the purview of the Air Force as Combatant Commander Support Agent. The committee is concerned that due to this consolidation, the justification material lacks the level of detail necessary for this committee to make informed budget decisions.

Accordingly, the committee directs the services to annually deliver independent, detailed budget justification for each combatant command they are assigned Combatant Command Support Agent responsibility.

Comptroller General of the United States review of United States Central Command

Since fiscal year 2001, the resources provided to U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) and its supporting military service components have grown dramatically to conduct and manage wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. According to Department of Defense (DOD) reports provided to Congress, the military and civilian manpower at CENTCOM has more than doubled since fiscal year 2001 and this does not include the contractors that support the headquarters. With the drawdown of operational forces from Iraq and ongoing drawdown from Afghanistan, it will be important to examine levels of headquarters manpower and mission support costs needed by CENTCOM and its respective service component commands to manage steady state operations.

As such, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to undertake a review of CENTCOM to include the following items: (1) what have been the trends in manpower and mission support costs devoted to the headquarters of CENTCOM, subordinate commands, joint task forces, and service component commands since 2001; (2) what steps has DOD taken to reexamine

the size and structure of the headquarters of CENTCOM, subordinate commands, joint task forces, and service component commands in light of the significant drawdown of forces and operations in its area of responsibility and changing U.S. military strategy; (3) what are the future plans for CENTCOM and its service component commands, including any plans to maintain headquarters in forward locations such as Kuwait and Qatar; (4) what changes, if any, should be made to intelligence and other defense functions that support CENTCOM combat operations; (5) what personnel adjustments are recommended at senior levels to right size the command structure; and (6) any other items the Comptroller General determines to be appropriate while conducting this review, including relevant plans regarding right-sizing and properly posturing manpower at headquarters for steady state post–2014.

The Comptroller General shall provide the preliminary results of the study to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2013, with a final report to follow as soon as practicable thereafter.

Consolidated guidance on equipment retrograde

The committee notes that the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff J–4, the military services, and other entities are developing consolidated guidance on equipment retrograde and disposition for equipment currently deployed for use in Operation Enduring Freedom and elsewhere throughout the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility. The committee notes that the consolidated guidance includes a process outline for transferring excess defense articles (EDA) to coalition partners via the existing Letter of Request/Letter of Acceptance process.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Office of the Secretary of Defense to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee on the progress of the consolidated guidance for equipment retrograde and EDA process no later than January 1, 2014.

Contingency basing

The committee notes the Department of Defense (DOD) issued a directive on January 10, 2013 which established a policy and assigned responsibility for DOD contingency basing outside the United States. The committee is encouraged by the DOD's intent to pursue increased effectiveness and efficiency in contingency basing to better assist the warfighter. The committee believes that contingency basing while often executed in an expedient fashion, should also take into account the sustainment cost of materials and seek opportunities to reduce the logistical and operational burden of the warfighter.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees of the decision to designate a senior official to be responsible for the oversight of all aspects of contingency basing policy, no later than March 1, 2014. Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee no later than March 1, 2014 on the resourcing decisions and progress made regarding the action items published in enclosure 2 of the DOD Directive 3000.10.

Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management

The committee notes that the Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management (DISAM) is the only dedicated institution of the Department of Defense (DOD) for the education and training of U.S. and foreign nation personnel involved in the planning, management, and assessment of security cooperation and partner capacity-building programs conducted under the authorities of the Departments of Defense and State. DISAM is primarily funded via the Department of State authorities, and only in recent years has DISAM been resourced to support training and education on the planning, management, and assessment of DOD security cooperation efforts, including many title 10 programs (e.g., section 1206 train-and-equip authorities, DOD counternarcotics authorities, Joint Combined Exchange Training, and Latin America and African Cooperation authorities). As stated in the budget request, these title 10 programs are of particular importance to DOD in meeting the emergent needs of the geographic combatant commanders in support of theater security campaign plans and contingency operations.

However, the committee notes that despite the additional funding to incorporate title 10 authorities into the curriculum at DISAM, security assistance officers deployed overseas remain less informed of the flexible building partnership capacity programs that Congress has provided to DOD over the last decade.

As such, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to jointly conduct a full review of the security assistance curriculum at DISAM to ensure that DOD's title 10 programs, particularly DOD's counternarcotics authorities, are incorporated in the curriculum fully. Not later than 30 days following completion of this review, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a briefing to the committee on their findings and recommendations.

Department of Defense and Department of Energy memorandum of understanding to enhance energy security

The committee remains encouraged by the memorandum of understanding (MOU) signed on July 22, 2010 by the Department of Defense (DOD) and Department of Energy concerning cooperation in a strategic partnership to enhance energy security. The committee notes that the MOU was to cover, but not limited to, efforts in the areas of energy efficiency, renewable energy, water efficiency, fossil fuels, alternative fuels, efficient transportation technologies and fueling infrastructure, grid security, smart grid, energy storage, waste-to-energy, basic science research, mobile/deployable power, small modular reactor nuclear energy, and related areas.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee no later than January 1, 2014 on the progress made to date regarding the MOU signed on July 22, 2010 to enhance energy security.

Energy metering

The committee notes that section 2828 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (P.L. 112–81) required the Secretary of the Navy to meter Navy piers so that the energy consumption of naval vessels while in port can be accurately measured and captured. The committee is encouraged by the utilities meter policy signed on April 16, 2013 which established a Department of Defense (DOD) policy to install advanced meters on individual DOD-owned facilities and directs the services to develop a meter data management plan. The committee is encouraged by the DOD's intent to improve the management of energy and water consumption, improve mission assurance, and increase reliability. The committee recognizes that energy metering alone does not independently save energy or water, which is why the committee strongly encourages the DOD to ensure energy metering data is not only captured but used to implement greater efficiencies, inform decisions, optimize installation performance, and achieve results through better practices.

Accordingly, the committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee with finalized meter data management plans with proposed practices to achieve greater efficiencies no later than March 1, 2014.

Energy security assessments in the Quadrennial Defense Review

The Secretary of Defense is required every 4 years to conduct a Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), pursuant to section 118 of title 10, United States Code. The QDR is intended to provide a national defense strategy necessary to successfully execute the full range of missions called for in the national security strategy.

The committee believes a defense strategy should consider assured access to energy resources as essential to the Department of Defense's ability to project power and provide combat capability for operations. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), energy security was defined as "having assured access to reliable supplies of energy and the ability to protect and deliver sufficient energy to meet mission essential requirements."

The committee notes a forecast by the International Energy Agency (IEA) predicts that "by around 2020, the United States is projected to become the largest global oil producer (overtaking Saudi Arabia until the mid–2020s) and starts to see the impact of new fuel-efficiency measures in transport. The result is a continued fall in U.S. oil imports, to the extent that North America becomes a net oil exporter around 2030." The IEA forecast goes on to say for all types of fuels: "But there is no immunity from global markets. No country is an energy 'island' and the interactions between different fuels, markets, and prices are intensifying."

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the 2013 QDR assessment includes a review of the extent of defense resources and budgets that would be required to successfully carry out an energy security strategy.

Foreign exchange program for Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets and critical military language training

The committee is encouraged by the Army's efforts to establish a Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) cadet foreign exchange program that seeks to enhance cultural understanding, foster regional expertise, and improve foreign language training among cadets in the ROTC. The committee is also encouraged by similar efforts to provide overseas professional development training and education, including opportunities for training in the joint, interagency, intergovernmental, and multinational environment with partner military service members at accredited universities. The committee recognizes the importance of short-term overseas training events in regions and cultures of strategic importance to the nation that could better prepare ROTC cadets to meet the future requirements of our combatant commanders' theater campaign plans.

Additionally, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Army to provide greater oversight and coordination to ensure the goals of these programs are in concert with the security cooperation strategy and national security objectives.

Full spectrum operations

The committee is encouraged by the Army and Marine Corps' proposal to plan for training for a full spectrum of operations in the fiscal year 2014 budget request. The committee notes that for more than a decade the services have been consumed with preparing and deploying forces for counterinsurgency operations in combat, leaving little time and resources to train for other contingencies. As combat operations decline, the committee encourages the secretaries of the military departments to ensure that sufficient training resources are dedicated to full spectrum operations when preparing the fiscal year 2015 budget request.

Government Accountability Office readiness analysis

The committee notes that the drawdown of forces first from Iraq and now from Afghanistan presents the Department of Defense (DOD) with a new set of challenges as it plans for an uncertain future with fewer resources. In its January 2012 strategic guidance, Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense and related documents, DOD called for a smaller, lighter, and flexible joint force able to conduct a full range of activities but no longer sized to conduct large and protracted stability operations. The guidance also called for a rebalancing of forces to the Asia-Pacific region along with the Middle East and several other changes. In March 2013, the Secretary of Defense directed the Deputy Secretary of Defense to work with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a strategic choices and management review to examine the opportunities and challenges that underlie the defense strategy, posture, and investments, including all past assumptions and systems. The committee notes that shifts in strategy or assumptions can have a material impact on the way DOD portrays its readiness and the risks it faces.

Accordingly, to help inform the committee's oversight and its consideration of the Department's budget request, the committee di-

rects the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department's readiness and the risks DOD faces and to report the results of this review to the congressional defense committees. The review should specifically address, but not be limited to:

(1) the current and historical readiness status of each of the military services including any trends in reported readiness;

(2) the current and historical readiness status of each of the current geographic and functional combatant commands, including any trends in reported readiness;

(3) the key factors that impact readiness, and how these factors contributed to any reported changes in readiness between March 1, 2013, when sequestration went into effect, and the December 2013 readiness reports; and

(4) changes in strategic and military risk levels between 2011 and 2014, including any changes in the way the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff evaluates and reports strategic and military risks.

The committee notes that in reporting on these four elements, the Comptroller General may take a phased approach, reporting on elements (1), (2), and (3) by March 15, 2014, and reporting on element (4) 45 days after DOD delivers the annual Chairman's Risk Assessment, as required by section 153 of title 10, United States Code, to the congressional defense committees.

Intergovernmental support agreements with state and local governments

The committee notes that section 331 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) provided expanded authorities to the Secretary of Defense to enter into intergovernmental service agreements with state and local governments in order to provide, receive, or share installation-support services if the Secretary determines that the agreement will serve the best interests of the Department of Defense (DOD) by enhancing mission effectiveness or creating efficiencies or economies of scale, including by reducing costs.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the committee not later than February 1, 2014, regarding the status of the use of this authority to enter into such agreements. The report shall include:

(1) a review of the policy adopted by DOD to guide the development of proposals to share installation support services;

(2) a description of the structure and components of intergovernmental agreements, including the adherence to Federal Acquisition Regulations;

(3) guidance for delegating authority to enter into such agreements to the installation level;

(4) a list of any proposed locations and types of services that are being considered for the use of this authority; and

(5) any other matters the Secretary deems appropriate.

Light-weight ammunition project under the Defense Production Act, Title III authority

The committee notes that under the Defense Production Act, Title III authority, one current project is developing a domestic pro-

duction capability for light-weight polymer-based ammunition. The committee believes that light-weight ammunition has the potential to decrease the individual load of the warfighter, increase mobility, decrease logistical burden, and reduce fuel consumption in military operations. The committee notes that traditional ammunition cartridges are produced using metallic-based materials such as steel, copper, aluminum, or brass. The committee understands that any new ammunition must meet all specifications for pressure, velocity, accuracy, and must be a drop-in replacement in terms of training, weapon function, lethality, storage, and transportation.

Accordingly, the committee directs the secretaries of the military departments to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee no later than February 1, 2014 on the pursuit of additional small arms and ammunition projects which could enhance combat capability, reduce logistical burdens, and improve efficiencies.

Marine Corps core depot maintenance policy

The committee understands that the Marine Corps policy on core depot maintenance workload is currently under revision. Accordingly, the committee directs the Marine Corps to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee on the status and progress of a finalized core depot maintenance policy no later than January 1, 2014.

Meals ready to eat war reserve

The committee is concerned that the Defense Logistics Agency's (DLA) potential reduction of its Meals Ready to Eat (MRE) war reserve may lower production in a manner that may negatively affect the industrial base which could threaten the DLA's ability to respond to contingency operation capabilities commensurate with service end strength. Therefore, the committee directs the DLA in consultation with the services, to develop a comprehensive strategic plan that ensures an adequate MRE inventory for each of the services that meets both DLA and service-specific requirements, maintains the appropriate levels of MRE war reserves, and provides for a surge capability to support unforeseen contingencies. The DLA shall report to the committee on this plan no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

Mission compatibility reviews

The committee is concerned about the implementation of section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) and the Department of Defense's (DOD) collaboration with other involved agencies to ensure that the development of energy sources and the increased resiliency of the commercial electric grid may continue to move forward while protecting the missions of military test and training ranges and installations in the United States. The committee urges DOD to use a consistent standard and process pursuant to Federal Rule 32 CFR Part 211 for all mission compatibility reviews on public or private land and to review offshore energy projects using the same process. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the committee with a report that details the status of its review process on each of its applicants within 90 days of enactment of this Act.

Open pit burning of waste in Afghanistan

The committee notes with concern the recently released report by the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) titled, "Forward Operating Base Salerno: Inadequate Planning Resulted in $5 Million Spent for Unused Incinerators and the Continued Use of Potentially Hazardous Open-Air Burn Pit Operations," dated April 2013. In the report the SIGAR concluded, among other things, that Forward Operating Base (FOB) Salerno in Afghanistan constructed two waste incinerators that it has not and will not use. As a result, the FOB Salerno continues to use open pit burning to dispose of waste at the base.

Over the past several years, the committee has been concerned about the use of open pit burning to dispose of trash during contingency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan because of the potential effects the smoke from these pits can have on the health of personnel in the vicinity. As the SIGAR report sets forth, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) regulation 200–2, CENTCOM Contingency Environmental Guidance, dated January 3, 2011, requires that when a base exceeds 100 U.S. personnel for 90 days, it must develop a plan for installing waste disposal technologies, such as incinerators, so that open pit burning operations can cease. The SIGAR report shows that, despite efforts to eliminate open pit burning in favor of incinerators and other methods, some of those efforts have failed and open pit burning continues at some locations.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives by September 30, 2013, on the efforts to reduce reliance on open pit burning of waste at operating bases in Afghanistan. The report shall include:

(1) a list of bases that have functioning incinerators installed and in use;

(2) for those bases that do not have functioning incinerators in place, an explanation for each as to why incinerators are not in use;

(3) a list of all bases or camps in Afghanistan at which the U.S. armed forces use open pit burning as the primary means of disposing of waste;

(4) a plan for how the Secretary intends to bring operating bases in Afghanistan into full compliance with Department of Defense regulations and CENTCOM regulations regarding waste disposal; and

(5) an assessment of incinerator technologies that are available to the Department of Defense for use in Afghanistan, including any such incinerator technologies that could also contribute to energy production, and any other waste-to-energy strategies.

Organizational clothing and equipment

The committee notes that a Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) report dated February 22, 2013 found that over the last six years inadequate tracking and recovery procedures resulted in a loss of approximately $20.0 million in unreturned organizational clothing and equipment (OCIE) for redeploying civilians

and contractors. The committee notes that this is the second report since 2010 regarding a lack of control over the tracking and recovery of OCIE.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee no later than February 1, 2014 on the corrective action taken, including a time-phased plan with measurable goals and metrics, to address the recommendations in report number DODIG–2013–050 regarding OCIE recovery from civilians and contractor employees.

Policies and procedures in handling of hazardous material shipments

The committee notes that the Comptroller General of the United States is in the process of conducting a comprehensive review of the policies and procedures by the Department of Defense in the handling of hazardous material shipments pursuant to section 363 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), including the review of Transportation Protective Services (TPS) safety standards for commercial surface carriers transporting dangerous or sensitive cargo on public highways within the United States. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that commercial TPS carrier safety performance standards measured by the Compliance, Safety, Accountability (CSA) Safety Measurement System (SMS) are not altered to less stringent safety standards during the duration of the Comptroller General review.

Readiness concerns under sequestration

The committee recognizes that the implementation of sequestration cuts to the Department of Defense (DOD) as a result of the Budget Control Act of 2011 poses significant risk to the readiness, training, and operational capability of our military forces. The committee remains concerned that the sequestration in fiscal year 2013, and the threat of sequestration in fiscal year 2014 and beyond forces the DOD to cutback combat training exercises, flying hours, steaming hours, and other military training. Other impacts include cancelling and delaying contracts, civilian employee furloughs, civilian hiring freezes, reductions or eliminations of temporary and term employees, deferred facilities maintenance, and the cancelling or postponing of maintenance for ships, aircraft, ground vehicles, and facilities. Additionally, many investment, acquisition, and research and development programs will be negatively impacted if sequestration remains in place. The committee understands from testimony by Department witnesses that the services have already reduced, canceled, or deferred a number of training exercises and scheduled maintenance activities as a result of the sequestration cuts.

The Chief of Staff of the Army testified that the Army has "curtailed training for 80 percent of the force, canceled six brigade combat training center rotations, and cut 37,000 flying hours, initiated termination of 3,100 temporary employees, canceled third and fourth quarter depot maintenance, and are planning to furlough its valued civilian work force." The committee understands that along with a higher-than-expected operating tempo in Afghanistan, the

Army has an $8.3 billion shortfall for the last 6 months of fiscal year 2013 in the base budget and a $7.8 billion shortfall to overseas contingency operations. The committee notes that by the end of September 2013, only one-third of the Army's Active Duty units are expected to have acceptable readiness ratings.

The Chief of Naval Operations testified that the Navy plans to "reduce intermediate-level ship maintenance, defer an additional 84 aircraft and 184 engines for depot maintenance, and defer eight of 33 planned depot-level surface ship maintenance availabilities" and that "by the end of fiscal year 2013, a majority of our non-deployed ships and aviation squadrons—nearly two thirds of the fleet—will be less than fully mission capable and not certified for major combat operations." The committee understands the Navy faces a $4.1 billion operation and maintenance (O&M) shortfall and has deferred $1.2 billion in facilities maintenance.

The committee understands that the Marine Corps face a $775.0 million shortfall in O&M during fiscal year 2013 as a result of sequestration. The Commandant of the Marine Corps testified that, "sequestration in fiscal year 2014 will mean that more than half of our non-forward-deployed ground and aviation units will have readiness ratings of C3 or below." The Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps testified that, "44 scheduled aircraft depot inductions across all types, models, and series . . . will not occur as a result of sequestration reduction to the fiscal year 2013 budget." Additionally, the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps predicted that a year from now, air squadrons will have only about half of their aircraft ready.

The Secretary of the Air Force testified that sequestration, "required approximately $10.0 billion in reductions to be taken in the last seven months of fiscal year 2013" and "impacts include reductions in weapons systems sustainment that will delay necessary maintenance, increase costs, and take perhaps 2 to 3 years to recover from repair backlogs." The Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force testified that the Air Force has, "already ceased operations for one-third of our fighter and bomber force" and "will force us to induct 60 less airplanes and 35 less engines into depots" and "forced us to reduce approximately 200,000 flying hours in the last 6 months of the year" and to cut "220 energy projects in facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization" due to sequestration.

The committee believes that sequestration cuts to the DOD are arbitrary and irrational. The committee notes that continued budget uncertainty further jeopardizes the DOD's ability to defend our Nation. Sequestration cuts increase operational and strategic risk by deferring vital maintenance and cancelling necessary training, and will cost the Nation more over time to recover from this damage.

Report by Installation Command on Kwajalein Atoll

The U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command recently signed a Memorandum of Understanding to have U.S. Army Installation Command maintain certain infrastructure at the Kwajalein Atoll. The committee is pleased with bringing the expertise of the Installation Command to help manage certain aspects of the Atoll's infrastructure. However, given the unique and important nature of

test facilities at the Atoll and its remoteness, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report on the Installation Command's long-term management plan for the Atoll. The report shall be due not later than April 30, 2014.

Report on the identification of a hollow force

The committee recognizes that the implementation of sequestration cuts to the Department of Defense (DOD) as a result of the Budget Control Act of 2011, poses significant risk to the readiness, training, and operational capability of our military forces and the potential of a hollow force.

Accordingly, not later than February 1, 2014, the Secretary of Defense shall, in consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, submit to the committee a report on criteria and means for identifying the existence of a so-called "hollow force". The report shall include a definition of what constitutes a hollow force for each branch of the Armed Forces and a description of the criteria and metrics used to assess the existence and extent of a hollow force. The report shall also include for each military department, an assessment whether, and if so to what extent, its operating forces are hollow as determined using the above-cited criteria and metrics, and if such operating forces are hollow, a mitigation plan to restore those forces to an acceptable level of readiness such that they no longer meet the definition of a hollow force. The report shall also explain how the Department will use the Defense Readiness Reporting System and other readiness assessment and reporting systems to monitor and manage risk related to the hollowing of operating forces.

The committee notes that each Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress, as required by section 482 of title 10, United States Code, shall include a description and explanation for each service with respect to evidence and management of risk of operating forces becoming or having become hollow.

The committee also directs the Comptroller General to review the report required above and not later than March 15, 2014, provide the congressional defense committee as assessment of the elements of the report as established above.

Lastly, the committee notes that the report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

Review of defense headquarters and combatant command resources

The committee notes the significant growth in the geographic combatant commands over the past decade and is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) should take steps to ensure adequate oversight of those commands. In its May 2013 report titled "Defense Headquarters: DOD Needs to Periodically Review and Improve Visibility of Combatant Command Resources" (GAO–13–293), the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found significant growth in the resources being devoted to the geographic combatant commands and weaknesses in the processes used by DOD to periodically evaluate the size and structure of the geographic combatant commands, as well as limitations in the information used to oversee the commands. The report also brought into focus a longstanding concern of the committee about DOD's reporting to Con-

gress; specifically, the report found that congressional oversight may be hampered because current budget justification documents do not specify the personnel and budget resources being devoted to each combatant command, among other limitations.

The trends reported by the Comptroller General are concerning in light of DOD's recent efforts to reduce headquarters and other overhead. Over the past decade (excluding U.S. Central Command due to the large-scale operations in that area of responsibility over the period), the geographic combatant commands authorized positions grew by nearly 50 percent and included more than 10,000 military and civilian positions in fiscal year 2012, plus an unknown number of supporting contractors and temporary personnel. Since 2008, their supporting service component commands grew by about 30 percent to about 7,800 authorized positions in fiscal year 2012. The cost to operate and support the commands has also ballooned. After adjusting for inflation, the costs to operate and support the headquarters of the combatant commands more than doubled since 2007 and now totaled more than $1.1 billion annually. Costs to operate and support the headquarters of the service component commands also increased substantially since 2007 and totaled more than $600.0 million annually.

GAO made four recommendations to improve processes for evaluating requirements and provide better visibility of personnel and resources. The committee was pleased to see that DOD concurred with three of the four recommendations, including providing region-by-region resource breakdowns in future budget justification documents. However, the Joint Staff non-concurred with a key recommendation that it take an active role in overseeing the size and structure of the combatant commands, including periodic reviews to ensure that the resources being devoted to the commands are commensurate with their assigned missions and priorities.

The committee urges the DOD to take steps to implement all of the recommendations of GAO and looks forward to reviewing the future budget justifications provided by DOD. If the Department concludes that the Joint Staff is the wrong entity to undertake periodic reviews and ensure that staffing and resource levels are appropriate, the committee directs the Secretary to establish alternative mechanisms for providing such oversight on a periodic basis.

Small modular reaction study

The committee continues to be concerned about the survivability, sustainability, and significant logistical costs of fuel and water associated with the support of deployed personnel at remote forward operating bases. The availability of deployable, cost-effective, regulated, and secure small modular reactors with a modest output electrical power (less than 10 megawatts) could improve combat capability and improve deployed conditions for the Department of Defense (DOD).

The committee understands the pursuit of such an endeavor invites ample concerns, not limited to: technical feasibility, policy oversight and regulation, robust safety and secure design features, logistics and resources, proliferation concerns, life cycle costs, deployment policies and transportability, personnel costs, and lessons learned from recent combat operations.

Therefore, the committee directs the DOD to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the challenges, operational requirements, constraints, cost, and life cycle analysis for a small modular reactor of less than 10 megawatts no later than January 1, 2015.

Tungsten rhenium wire for Department of Defense requirements

The committee is aware that the manufacturing of tungsten and molybdenum powders, including tungsten rhenium (WRe) wire, is used in a variety of Department of Defense (DOD) applications. The committee is aware that currently there are not suitable substitutes available for WRe wire.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2014, with a determination as to whether DOD has a sufficient supply of WRe wire to support DOD requirements. If not, the Secretary shall also submit a mitigation plan to ensure that DOD has a sufficient supply of WRe wire to support its requirements.

Unfunded requirements from the service chiefs

The committee remains concerned, particularly in light of sequestration, that after more than a dozen years of combat operations and high operations tempo, backlogs of deferred depot maintenance remain unexecuted. The committee understands that the Department of Defense (DOD) continues to face significant challenges with respect to competing budget priorities. The committee notes that a continued failure to address the depot maintenance backlog will jeopardize and erode materiel readiness, further reduce the expected service life of DOD equipment, increase long-term sustainment costs, and further increase strategic risk for the Nation.

Despite this depot maintenance backlog, DOD continues to underfund critical readiness accounts. In past years, the committee has been able to provide additional support and funding for DOD through unfunded requirements lists submitted by the service chiefs.

The committee continues to strongly urge DOD to identify and provide a list of service-specific unfunded requirements with each fiscal year's budget request.

United States Africa Command

United States Africa Command (AFRICOM) is the smallest of the Department of Defense's regionally-focused combatant commands with fewer than 5,000 service members on the continent of Africa, 54 countries and over 12 million square miles. The United States no longer has the luxury of ignoring Africa; and AFRICOM, while still a relatively new combatant command, has been thrust to the forefront of our Nation's security interests. Terrorist groups, including some affiliated with al Qaeda, are growing in numbers and capability, and have expanded their areas of operation. Many of our partners in the region, however, still lack the capacity to effectively combat these organizations and require further support. AFRICOM will be a vital component to this effort.

Despite the challenges within its area of responsibility and its massive size, AFRICOM suffers from persistent resource shortfalls. It has no assigned forces, lacks sufficient intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, and mobility support to meet theater requirements, and must rely on manpower from United States Central Command and United States European Command. This committee understands the need to properly resource AFRICOM and supports its efforts to build partnerships and combat the terrorist threat posed by violent extremists filtering down to Africa in response to successful U.S. and multilateral operations in other regions.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active-duty end strengths for fiscal year 2014, as shown below:

Service	FY 2013 authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2014 request	FY 2013 authorized
Army	552,100	520,000	520,000	0	−32,100
Navy	322,700	323,600	323,600	0	900
Marine Corps	197,300	190,200	190,200	0	−7,100
Air Force	329,460	327,600	327,600	0	−1,860
DOD Total	1,401,560	1,361,400	1,361,400	0	−40,160

The committee supports the Department of Defense (DOD) fiscal year 2014 end strength request for active forces, but remains concerned about the impact the drawdown is having on service members and their families. The committee urges the services to use involuntary measures sparingly, especially for those with significant years of service but who are not yet eligible for retirement. The committee recognizes that the services must balance the need to reduce overall end strength while ensuring the proper force mix, and avoiding grade and occupational disparities where possible, which have long-term effects that can take years to correct. In recent years, Congress has provided authorities requested by DOD that allow it to execute the drawdown in a measured, responsible way. The committee expects DOD to manage the drawdown accordingly.

The committee also remains concerned about the impact that sequestration would have in 2014 and beyond on end strength levels for both the active and reserve components. The Army Chief of Staff has testified that the Army would reduce total force end strength by an additional 100,000 soldiers should sequestration continue beyond 2013. The committee expects that the other services may make reductions in end strength to meet Budget Control Act targets. The committee expects DOD to begin planning now for how it would address end strength in 2014 and beyond should sequestration continue in order to mitigate the effects such potential reductions in force would have on morale, recruiting, and retention.

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2014, as shown below:

Service	FY 2013 authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2014 request	FY 2013 authorized
Army National Guard	358,200	354,200	354,200	0	−4,000
Army Reserve	205,000	205,000	205,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	62,500	59,100	59,100	0	−3,400
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,600	39,600	0	0
Air National Guard	105,700	105,400	105,400	0	−300
Air Force Reserve	70,880	70,400	70,400	0	−480
DOD Total	841,880	833,700	833,700	0	−8,180
Coast Guard Reserve	9,000	9,000	9,000	0	0

End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2014, as shown below:

FY 2014 Change from Service FY 2013 authorized Request Recommendation FY 2014 FY 2013 request authorized

Service	FY 2013 authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2014 request	FY 2013 authorized
Army National Guard	32,060	32,060	32,060	0	0
Army Reserve	16,277	16,261	16,261	0	−16
Navy Reserve	10,114	10,159	10,159	0	45
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	14,765	14,734	14,734	0	−31
Air Force Reserve	2,888	2,911	2,911	0	23
DOD Total	78,365	78,386	78,386	0	21

End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the minimum number of military technicians (dual status) for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force for fiscal year 2014, as shown below:

Service	FY 2013 authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2014 request	FY 2013 authorized
Army National Guard	27,210	27,210	27,210	0	0
Army Reserve	8,395	8,395	8,395	0	0
Air National Guard	22,180	21,875	21,875	0	−305
Air Force Reserve	10,400	10,429	10,429	0	29
DOD Total	68,185	67,909	67,909	0	−276

Fiscal year 2014 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2014, as shown below:

Service	FY 2013 authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2014 request	FY 2013 authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, for fiscal year 2014, as shown below:

Service	FY 2013 authorized	FY 2014		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2014 request	FY 2013 authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

Subtitle C—Authorizations of Appropriations

Military personnel (sec. 421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4401 of division D of this Act.

Budget Item

Military personnel funding changes

The amount authorized to be appropriated for military personnel programs in section 421 of this Act includes the following changes from the budget request:

[Changes in millions of dollars]

Permanent Change of Station travel funding	−150.0
Undistributed reduction related to pace of drawdown	−120.0
Total	−270.0

The committee recommends a decrease of $150.0 million in Military Personnel funding to reflect the recent trend of the services underexecuting their Permanent Change of Station (PCS) travel funding due to efficiencies resulting from longer tour lengths, fewer moves, and lower disbursement rates. The committee expects the services to continue to achieve efficiencies in their PCS travel programs, particularly as the Department fully implements the consolidated travel reform enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

The committee also recommends a decrease of $120.0 million in Military Personnel funding to reflect the services' underexecution in various accounts relating to the drawdown and the redeployment of forces from Afghanistan, including lower officer and enlisted average strengths, subsistence costs, and lower than budgeted deployment costs.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy Generally

Service credit for cyberspace experience or advanced education upon original appointment as a commissioned officer (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 533 of title 10, United Sates Code, to authorize service secretaries to award constructive service credit upon original appointment as a commissioned officer for special experience or training in certain cyberspace-related fields and for periods of advanced education in certain cyberspace-related fields beyond the baccalaureate degree level. Constructive service credited under this provision is limited to 1 year for each year of special experience, training, or advanced education, and 3 years total of constructive service credit.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management

Information to be provided to boards considering officers for selective early removal from the reserve active-status list (sec. 506)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 14704(a) of title 10, United States Code, to require service secretaries to specify the number of officers that a selection board may recommend for removal from the reserve active-status list, and to require the secretary to submit a list of officers to the selection board that includes each officer on the reserve active-status list in the same grade and competitive category in the zone of consideration except for officers who have been approved for voluntary retirement or who will be involuntarily retired. This would align the statutory procedures for a board convened to consider officers with sufficient qualifying service for early removal from the reserve active-status list with the procedures required for an active-duty selective early retirement board.

Removal of restrictions on the transfer of officers between the active and inactive National Guard (sec. 507)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of officers of the Army and Air National Guard from the Selected Reserve to the inactive National Guard and from the inactive National Guard to the Selected Reserve during the period ending on December 31, 2016. This authority currently exists for enlisted members of the Army and Air National Guard.

Limitation on certain cancellations of deployment of reserve component units within 180 days of scheduled date of deployment (sec. 508)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to personally approve of any decision to cancel the deployment of a reserve component unit within 180 days of its scheduled deployment date when an active-duty unit would be sent instead to perform the same mission, and to notify the congressional defense committees and Governors concerned whenever such a decision is made.

The committee notes with displeasure the decision of the Army in March 2013 to cancel the deployment of four National Guard units from Indiana for missions in the Horn of Africa and the Sinai Peninsula and replace them with active component forces for the purpose of addressing a fiscal year 2013 budget shortfall. Two of these units, approximately 500 people, were within 6 weeks of departure, and the remaining two units were within 90 days of departure. All units had been mobilized in October 2012 and had been preparing for the mission since that time.

The Army described this as a "short fuse decision," but its impact has been wide ranging on the National Guard in Indiana and the communities that support these service members. Over 1,000 families lost access to TRICARE benefits, after all had been enrolled in the TRICARE Early Eligibility Program 180 days ahead of their scheduled deployment date. Additionally, many service members made financial decisions and commitments based on the projected pay and benefits that accompany a year-long deployment. Students missed deadlines to apply for financial aid because they expected to be deployed. Some service members had already terminated leases. Moreover, these units will be placed at the bottom of rotation for future deployments, and will have lost a year of eligibility for deployment.

The committee is concerned that this type of decision indicates a disregard for the preparation of reserve component forces for deployment and the impact that a last-minute cancellation of deployment, for reasons other than a change in mission requirements, can have on morale, retention, and training. This provision is not intended to limit the flexibility of the Army to cancel the deployment of reserve component forces for the purpose of replacing them with active component units, but rather to ensure that strategic thought is given to reserve component mobilization and the determination to cancel a deployment.

National Guard Youth Challenge Program (sec. 509)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 509 of title 32, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to use the National Guard to conduct the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; and require the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to conduct the program in such states as the Chief considers appropriate, to prescribe the standards and procedures for selecting program participants, and to submit a report to Congress annually on the program.

Subtitle C—General Service Authorities

Expansion and enhancement of authorities relating to protected communications of members of the Armed Forces and prohibited retaliatory actions (sec. 511)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, to enhance protections for military whistleblowers.

Enhancement of protection of rights of conscience of members of the Armed Forces and chaplains of such members (sec. 512)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to require the armed forces to accommodate individual expressions of belief of service members unless such expressions could have an adverse impact on military readiness, unit cohesion, and good order and discipline.

Department of Defense Inspector General reports on compliance with requirements for the protection of rights of conscience of members of the Armed Forces and their chaplains (sec. 513)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) to assess and report to Congress on the compliance of the Department of Defense with regulations promulgated under section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), within 180 days of promulgation. The provision would also require the DOD IG to investigate the Department's and the services' compliance with those regulations with respect to adverse personnel actions within 18 months of promulgating the regulations.

Subtitle D—Member Education and Training

Authority for joint professional military education Phase II instruction and credit to be offered and awarded through senior-level course of School of Advanced Military Studies of the United States Army Command and General Staff College (sec. 521)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2151(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the School of Advanced Military Studies senior-level course at the Army Command and General Staff College to offer joint professional military education Phase II instruction and credit.

Authority for Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences to support undergraduate and other medical education and training programs for military medical personnel (sec. 522)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2112(a) and 2113 of title 10, United States Code, to provide greater flexibility to the Secretary of Defense, through the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS), to ac-

cess existing federal resources outside of the National Capital Region and to enable the USUHS to grant undergraduate degrees, certificates, and certifications in addition to advanced degrees.

Expansion of eligibility for associate degree programs under the Community College of the Air Force (sec. 523)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 9315(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Community College of the Air Force to award associate degrees to enlisted members of services other than the Air Force who participate in joint-service medical training and education or instructors in such joint-service medical training and education.

Additional requirements for approval of educational programs for purposes of certain educational assistance under laws administered by the Secretary of Defense (sec. 524)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a new section 2006a of title 10, United States Code, to require that educational institutions participating in certain Department of Defense education assistance programs enter into and comply with program participation agreements under title IV of the Higher Education Act, and to meet certain other standards. The provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive these requirements in certain cases.

Enhancement of mechanisms to correlate skills and training for military occupational specialties with skills and training required for civilian certifications and licenses (sec. 525)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the service secretaries to make information on civilian credentialing opportunities available to members of the armed forces during all stages of their military occupational specialty training. The provision would also require the service secretaries to provide information on military course training curricula, syllabi, and materials, levels of military advancement attained, and professional skills developed by service members, to civilian credentialing agencies and entities approved by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, or by state approving agencies, for the purposes of the administration of education benefits under the purview of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Coverage of military occupational specialties relating to military information technology under pilot program on receipt of civilian credentials for skills required for military occupational specialties (sec. 526)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the military occupational specialties designated for the purposes of the pilot program on receipt of civilian credentials authorized by section 558 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) include those specialties relating to the military information technology workforce.

Sense of Senate on the Troops-to-Teachers Program (sec. 527)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate to strongly urge the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Troops-to-Teachers Program is a priority of the Nation's commitment to the higher education of members of the armed forces, and to provide funds to the Troops-to-Teacher Program in order to help separating members of the armed forces and veterans who wish to transition into a teaching career.

Conforming amendment relating to renaming of North Georgia College and State University as University of North Georgia (sec. 528)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend paragraph (6) of section 2111a(f) of title 10, United States Code, to change the name of North Georgia College and State University to University of North Georgia to reflect the name change of this institution.

Subtitle E—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response and Military Justice Matters

Part I—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

Prohibition on service in the Armed Forces by individuals who have been convicted of certain sexual offenses (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 37 of title 10, United States Code to prohibit the commissioning or enlistment in the armed forces of individuals who have been convicted of felony offenses of rape or sexual assault, forcible sodomy, incest, or of an attempt to commit these offenses.

Temporary administrative reassignment or removal of a member of the Armed Forces on active duty who is accused of committing a sexual assault or related offense (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 39 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to provide guidance for commanders regarding their authority to make a timely determination and to take action regarding whether a service member serving on active duty who is alleged to have committed specified sexual offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice should be temporarily reassigned or removed from a position of authority or from an assignment, not as a punitive measure, but solely for the purpose of maintaining good order and discipline within the unit.

Issuance of regulations applicable to the Coast Guard regarding consideration of request for permanent change of station or unit transfer by victim of sexual assault (sec. 533)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 673(b) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the re-

quirement for timely determination and action on an application by a victim of certain sexual offenses for a change of station or unit transfer applies to the Coast Guard.

Inclusion and command review of information on sexual-related offenses in personnel service records of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 534)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that substantiated complaints of a sexual-related offense resulting in a court-martial conviction, non-judicial punishment, or administrative action be noted in the service record of the service member, regardless of the member's grade. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations requiring commanders to review the history of substantiated sexual offenses of service members permanently assigned to the commander's facility, installation, or unit.

Enhanced responsibilities of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office for Department of Defense sexual assault prevention and response program (sec. 535)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1611(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (10 U.S.C. 1561 note) to require the Director of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (the Director) to: (1) oversee development and implementation of the comprehensive policy for the Department of Defense (DOD) sexual assault prevention and response program; (2) serve as the single point of authority, accountability, and oversight for the sexual assault prevention and response program; (3) undertake responsibility for the oversight of the implementation of the sexual assault prevention and response program by the armed forces; (4) collect and maintain data of the military departments on sexual assault; (5) provide oversight to ensure that the military departments maintain documents relating to allegations and complaints of sexual assault involving service members and courts-martial or trials of service members for sexual assault offenses; (6) act as a liaison between DOD and other federal and state agencies on programs and efforts relating to sexual assault prevention and response; (7) oversee development of strategic program guidance and joint planning objectives for resources in support of the sexual assault prevention and response program, and make recommendations on modifications to policy, law, and regulations needed to ensure the continuing availability of such resources; and (8) provide the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) any records or documents on sexual assault in the armed forces, including restricted reports with the approval of the individuals who filed such reports, that are required for the purposes of the administration of the laws administered by the Secretary of the VA.

The provision would amend subtitle A of title XVI of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (10 U.S.C. 1561 note) to require the Director to collect and maintain data from the services on sexual assaults involving service members and to develop metrics to measure the effectiveness of,

and compliance with, the training and awareness objectives on sexual assault and prevention.

The provision would also amend section 1631(f) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (10 U.S.C. 1561 note) to require the service secretaries to include in the case synopsis portion of the annual report regarding sexual assaults involving members of the armed forces the unit of each service member accused of committing a sexual assault and the unit of each service member who is a victim of a sexual assault.

Comprehensive review of adequacy of training for members of the Armed Forces on sexual assault prevention and response (sec. 536)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to review the adequacy of: (1) the training provided to service members on sexual assault prevention and response, and (2) the training, qualifications, and experience of each service member and Department of Defense civilian employee assigned to a position that includes responsibility for sexual assault prevention and response. The provision would require the Secretary to take appropriate corrective action to address any deficiencies identified during these reviews and to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the findings and responsive action, including recommendations for legislative action, on the adequacy of the training, qualifications, and experience of each service member and Department of Defense civilian employee assigned to a position that includes responsibility for sexual assault prevention and response.

Availability of Sexual Assault Response Coordinators for members of the National Guard and the Reserves (sec. 537)

The committee recommends a provision that would require service secretaries to ensure that each member of the National Guard or Reserve who is the victim of a sexual assault either during the performance of duties as a member of the National Guard or Reserve, or is a victim of a sexual assault by another member of the Guard or Reserve, has access to a Sexual Assault Response Coordinator not later than 2 business days following a request for such assistance.

Retention of certain forms in connection with Restricted Reports and Unrestricted Reports on sexual assault involving members of the Armed Forces (sec. 538)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 577(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that copies of Department of Defense Forms 2910 and 2911 filed in connection with Restricted Reports and Unrestricted Reports of sexual assault are retained for the longer of 50 years or the period that such forms are required to be retained pursuant to Department of Defense Directives.

Special Victims' Counsel for victims of sexual assault committed by members of the Armed Forces (sec. 539)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the service secretaries to implement a program to provide a Special Victims' Counsel to service members who are victims of a sexual assault committed by a member of the armed forces. The Special Victims' Counsel would provide legal advice and assistance to the victim in connection with criminal and civil legal matters related to the sexual assault.

Sense of Congress on commanding officer responsibility for command climate free of retaliation (sec. 540)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that: (1) commanding officers are responsible for establishing a command climate in which sexual assault allegations are properly managed and fairly evaluated and a victim can report criminal activity, including sexual assault, without fear of retaliation, including ostracism and group pressure from other members of the command; (2) the failure of commanding officers to maintain such a command climate is an appropriate basis for relief from their command positions; and (3) senior officers should evaluate subordinate commanding officers on their performance in establishing a command climate free of retaliation.

Commanding officer action on reports on sexual offenses involving members of the Armed Forces (sec. 541)

The committee recommends a provision that would require commanding officers to immediately refer to the appropriate military criminal investigation organization reports of sexual-related offenses involving service members in the commander's chain of command.

Department of Defense Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault (sec. 542)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1034(c)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Inspector General to review and investigate allegations of retaliatory personnel actions for making a protected communication regarding violations of law or regulation that prohibit rape, sexual assault, or other sexual misconduct.

Advancement of submittal deadline for report of independent panel on assessment of military response systems to sexual assault (sec. 543)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 576(c)(1)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to provide that the panel established to conduct an independent review and assessment of the systems used to investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate crimes involving sexual assault and related offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice would terminate no later than one year after the first meeting of the panel.

Assessment of clemency in the military justice system and of database of alleged offenders of sexual assault as additional duties of independent panel on review and assessment of systems to respond to sexual assault cases (sec. 544)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 576(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to require the panel established to conduct an independent review and assessment of the systems used to investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate crimes involving adult sexual assault and related offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to also include an assessment of: (1) the opportunities for clemency provided in the military and civilian systems, the appropriateness of clemency proceedings in the military system, the manner in which clemency is used in the military system, and whether clemency in the military justice system could be reserved until the end of the military appeals process; and (2) the means by which the name, if known, and other necessary identifying information of an alleged offender that is collected as part of a restricted report of a sexual assault could be compiled into a protected, searchable database accessible only to military criminal investigators, Sexual Assault Response Coordinators, or other appropriate personnel for the purpose of identifying subjects of multiple accusations of sexual assault and encouraging victims to make an unrestricted report to facilitate increased prosecution of serial offenders.

Assessment of provisions and proposed provisions of law on sexual assault prevention and response as additional duties of independent panels for review and assessment of Uniform Code of Military Justice and judicial proceedings of sexual assault cases (sec. 545)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 576(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to require the panel established to conduct an independent review and assessment of the systems used to investigate, prosecute, and adjudicate crimes involving adult sexual assault and related offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to assess: (1) the effectiveness of the provisions of law on sexual assault prevention and response in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014; and (2) the potential effectiveness of the provisions of law on sexual assault prevention and response that were offered but not adopted during the markup by the Senate Committee on Armed Services of the bill to enact the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

The provision would also require the panel established to conduct an independent review and assessment of judicial proceedings conducted under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) involving adult sexual assault and related offenses to: (1) monitor and assess the implementation of the provisions of law on judicial proceedings in connection with sexual assault in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014; and (2) assess the potential effectiveness of provisions of law on judicial proceedings that were offered but not adopted during the markup by the Senate Com-

mittee on Armed Services of the bill to enact the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

Assessment of compensation and restitution of victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice as additional duty of independent panel on review and assessment of judicial proceedings of sexual assault cases (sec. 546)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 576(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to require the panel established to conduct an independent review and assessment of judicial proceedings conducted under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) involving adult sexual assault and related offenses to assess the adequacy of the provision of compensation and restitution for victims of offenses under the UCMJ and to develop recommendations on expanding such compensation and restitution.

Part II—Related Military Justice Matters

Elimination of five-year statute of limitations on trial by court-martial for additional offenses involving sex-related crimes (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 43 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 843 of title 10, United States Code) to eliminate the 5–year statute of limitations on trial by court-martial for sexual assault and sexual assault of a child.

Review of decisions not to refer charges of certain sexual offenses to trial by court-martial (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision that would require review of decisions not to refer charges of rape or sexual assault, forcible sodomy, or attempts to commit these offenses to trial by court-martial. In any case in which the staff judge advocate recommends that the charges be referred to trial by court-martial and the convening authority decides not to refer the charges to trial by court-martial, the convening authority would be required to forward the case file to the service secretary for review. In cases where the staff judge advocate recommends that the charges not be referred to trial by court-martial and the convening authority agrees, the convening authority would be required to forward the case file to a superior commander authorized to exercise general court-martial convening authority for review.

Defense counsel interview of complaining witnesses in presence of trial counsel or outside counsel (sec. 553)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 46 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 846 of title 10, United States Code) to require that, upon notice by trial counsel to defense counsel that trial counsel intends to call a complaining witness to testify at an investigation under Article 32, Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 842 of title 10, United States Code) or court-martial, the defense counsel must make all

requests to interview the complaining witness through the trial counsel, and, if requested by the complaining witness, the defense counsel interview shall take place only in the presence of the trial counsel, counsel for the witness, or outside counsel.

Mandatory discharge or dismissal for certain sex-related offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice and trial of such offenses by general courts-martial (sec. 554)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 56 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (section 856 of title 10, United States Code) to require that the punishment for convictions of violations of Articles 120, 120b, or 125 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sections 920, 920b, or 925 of title 10, United States Code), include, at a minimum, a dismissal or dishonorable discharge. The provision would also amend Article 18 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 818 of title 10, United States Code) to provide that only general courts-martial have jurisdiction over charges of violations of articles 120, 120b, or 125 of the UCMJ.

Limitation on authority of convening authority to modify findings of a court-martial (sec. 555)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend article 60 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 860 of title 10, United States Code) to limit the authority of a convening authority to modify the findings of a court-martial to qualified offenses for which the maximum sentence of confinement that could be adjudged does not exceed 1 year and the sentence adjudged by the court-martial does not include a punitive discharge or confinement for more than 6 months. Qualified offenses do not include offenses under Articles 120, 120a, 120b, and 120c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sections 920, 920a, 920b, and 920c of title 10, United States Code).

The provision would also require the convening authority to explain, in writing, any action to modify the findings or sentence of a court-martial and require the written explanation to be made a part of the record of trial.

Participation by complaining witnesses in clemency phase of courts-martial process (sec. 556)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 60(b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 860(b) of title 10, United States Code) to: (1) afford a complaining witness an opportunity to respond to any clemency matters submitted by an accused to the convening authority that refer to the complaining witness; (2) afford a complaining witness an opportunity to submit matters to the convening authority in any case in which findings and sentence have been adjudged for an offense involving the complaining witness; and (3) prohibit the convening authority from considering matters that go to the character of a complaining witness unless the matters were presented at the court-martial.

Secretary of Defense report on modifications to the Uniform Code of Military Justice to prohibit sexual acts and contacts between military instructors and trainees (sec. 557)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on whether legislative action is required to modify the Uniform Code of Military Justice (chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code) to prohibit sexual acts and contacts between military instructors and their trainees.

Sense of Senate on disposition of charges involving certain sexual misconduct offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice through courts-martial (sec. 558)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that charges of rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, or attempts to commit these offenses should be disposed of by court-martial rather than by non-judicial punishment or administrative action, and that the disposition authority should include in the case file a justification in any case where these charges are disposed of by non-judicial punishment or administrative action.

Sense of Senate on the discharge in lieu of court-martial of members of the Armed Forces who commit sexual-related offenses (sec. 559)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that: (1) the armed forces should be sparing in discharging in lieu of court-martial service members who have committed rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, or attempts to commit such offenses, and should do so only when the facts of the case clearly warrant such discharge; (2) whenever possible, victims of these offenses should be consulted about the discharge of the service member; (3) commanding officers should consider the views of these victims when determining whether to discharge service members in lieu of court-martial; and (4) discharges of service members in lieu of court-martial for the specified offenses should be characterized as Other Than Honorable.

Part III—Other Military Justice and Legal Matters

Modification of eligibility for appointment as Judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 142 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 942 of title 10, United States Code) to authorize appointment of former commissioned officers of a regular component of an armed force as judges on the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. However, these former officers may not be appointed as a judge of the court within seven years after relief from active duty.

Repeal of the offense of consensual sodomy under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 562)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 125 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (section 925 of title 10, United States Code) to prohibit forcible sodomy and bestiality.

Prohibition of retaliation against members of the Armed Forces for reporting a criminal offense (sec. 563)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, that prohibit retaliation against an alleged victim or other member of the armed forces who reports a criminal offense. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, setting forth recommendations as to whether the Uniform Code of Military Justice should be amended to prohibit retaliation against an alleged victim or other member of the armed forces who reports a criminal offense.

Extension of crime victims' rights to victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 564)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to recommend modifications to the Manual for Courts-Martial and to promulgate regulations to ensure compliance by responsible members of the armed forces and personnel of the Department of Defense with the obligation to enforce specified rights of victims of military crimes, including mechanisms for ensuring that victims of military crimes are afforded the rights in all applicable proceedings.

Modification of Manual for Courts-Martial to eliminate factor relating to character and military service of the accused in rule on initial disposition of offenses (sec. 565)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the discussion pertaining to Rule 306 of the Manual for Courts-Martial be amended, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to strike the character and military service of the accused from the factors a commander should consider in deciding how to dispose of an offense.

Subtitle F—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters

Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 571)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $25.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for continuation of the Department of Defense (DOD) assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by enrollment of dependent children of military members and civilian employees of the DOD.

Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 572)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), using the formula set forth in section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), for continuation of Department of Defense assistance to local educational agencies that benefit eligible dependents with severe disabilities.

Subtitle G—Decorations and Awards

Matters relating to Medals of Honor and other medals of high precedence for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 581)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 3744, 6247, and 8744 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of more than one Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, or Distinguished Service Medal to a person whose subsequent acts justify an additional award.

The provision would also amend sections 3744 and 8744 of title 10, United States Code, to require that recommendations for the award of the Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Air Force Cross, or Distinguished Service Medal for members of the Army and Air Force be made within 3 years and that the award be made within 5 years after the date of the act justifying the award. These timelines are consistent with the timelines for comparable awards in the Navy and Marine Corps.

Recodification and revision of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard Medal of Honor Roll (sec. 582)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 57 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a roll designated as the "Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard Medal of Honor Roll" and require the service secretaries to record on this roll the name of each person who has been awarded a Medal of Honor. The provision would also amend section 1562 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the automatic enrollment and payment of the special pension to living Medal of Honor recipients.

Authority for award of the Distinguished Service Cross to Robert F. Keiser for valor during the Korean War (sec. 583)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Distinguished Service Cross under Section 3742 of title 10, United States Code, to Robert F. Keiser for acts of valor during the Korean War.

Authority for award of the Distinguished Service Cross to Sergeant First Class Patrick N. Watkins, Jr., for acts of valor during the Vietnam War (sec. 584)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Distinguished Service Cross

under section 3742 of title 10, United States Code, to Patrick N. Watkins, Jr., for acts of valor during the Vietnam War.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

Additional requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing (sec. 591)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1501 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel Affairs to conduct periodic briefings for families of missing persons on Department activities to account for those persons.

Expansion of privileged information authorities to debriefing reports of certain recovered persons who were never placed in a missing status (sec. 592)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1506 and 1513 of title 10, United States Code, to include as privileged information, for the purposes of personnel files maintained under the system for accounting for missing persons, any survival, evasion, resistance, and escape debriefing reports by certain persons returned to United States control under a promise of confidentiality.

Items of Special Interest

Availability of Assaultive Offender's Group Treatment program

The United States Disciplinary Barracks (USDB) at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, offers Assaultive Offender's Group Treatment (AO) to inmates that are confined for violent offenses. It is part of a comprehensive behavioral health program developed to meet the unique needs of military inmates confined at the USDB, and is tailored to address the needs of each inmate. The AO program consists of 30 group treatment sessions which normally meet weekly with 8–10 inmates per group. The USDB reports that they have only been able to run one AO group per year due to staffing limitations. There are currently over 60 inmates on the waitlist for the program, resulting in a wait for over two years for some inmates who may desire to complete this program as part of their program of rehabilitation to be considered by a service clemency and parole board.

The committee is concerned about the long wait time for inmates to participate in the AO program and directs the Commandant of the USDB to assess courses of action to reduce wait times and to provide the defense committees a report on his assessment no later than 180 days after passage of this act.

Combat injured military technician (dual status) retention under Wounded Warrior Act authority

Section 10216(g) of title 10, United States Code, enacted by section 511 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), authorizes the services to retain mili-

tary technicians (dual status) as non-dual status technicians when losing their military membership due to combat-related injuries. The provision was intended to ensure that no dual status technician, required by statute to maintain military membership in a reserve component as a condition of their civilian employment, was unfairly treated due to injuries sustained in combat. The committee is aware of reports that this authority has rarely, if ever, been used despite many military technicians having been separated or retired since then with combat-related injuries.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2013, the following: (1) the number of dual status technicians who have been retained as non-dual status technicians under the authority of section 10216(g); (2) the number of dual status technicians separated or retired with combat-related injuries since January 28, 2008; and (3) the number of technicians so separated or retired who qualified, or should have qualified, for retention under section 10216(g).

Command knowledge of civilian convictions of service members for sexual assault

The committee notes that it is possible for a service member to commit and be convicted of sexual assault at an off-post location without the command knowing of the conviction. The Department of Defense primarily relies on local police or blotter reports, periodic security clearance initiations and renewals, and self-reporting to monitor off-post criminal actions of service members. As a general rule, service members are not subject to periodic criminal record checks during their period of service unless they require a security clearance review or initiation, or are accepted into programs where background checks are required. This process could create a loophole for a sexual predator to serve in the military without the knowledge of the chain of command.

General Odierno, the Chief of Staff of the Army, addressed these loopholes for felony or serious offenders in the a Senate Committee on Armed Services hearing on sexual assault on June 4, 2013, stating: "Background checks are done, but the ability to identify sexual offenders is certainly not 100 percent right now, and we have to do a better job of doing that. We need help with having a better database, but also making sure we're scrutinizing those as we go forward." Accordingly, as the military contends with the serious issue of identifying and prosecuting sexual predators, the committee expresses concern that service members with sexual assault convictions could continue to serve because these convictions are undetected by the chain of command.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report by no later than December 31, 2013, examining: (1) the scope and prevalence of the problem and whether there are existing loopholes and shortcomings in the current system; (2) the frequency and methods by which the military conducts criminal record checks after enlistment or swearing-in to the armed forces; (3) policies that direct members of the armed forces to self-report criminal arrests and convictions to the chain of command, and any penalties associated with failure to do so; and

(4) procedures for submitting names of service members convicted of sexual offenses to the National Sex Offender Public Registry.

Comprehensive Review of Department of Defense coordination and incorporation of civilian law enforcement best practices in sexual assault prevention and response

The civilian law enforcement community has invested significant time and resources in developing proven strategies to effectively respond to sexual crimes. The Department of Justice regularly publishes established best practices incorporating the experience of thousands of federal, state, and local officers as well as academic experts.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the Department of Defense's current policies and procedures regarding sexual assault prevention and response to identify ways to better incorporate civilian law enforcement best practices, particularly regarding training, investigation, and prosecution of sexual crimes.

Department of Defense child development center personnel

The committee commends the Secretary of Defense, following troublesome allegations of abuse at two Army Child Development Centers, for directing a Department-wide audit of all Department of Defense (DOD) providers who have regular contact with children in DOD child development, school age care, and youth programs, and a comprehensive review and evaluation by each of the military services of the actual background check documentation on file for each individual, employee, and volunteer for compliance by the appropriate authorities in accordance with applicable DOD and service policies. However, the committee has yet to see the results of that review.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report by no later than October 1, 2013, examining:

(1) any changes to DOD child development center hiring or personnel practices the Secretary determines are necessary based on the review;

(2) steps DOD is taking to implement any necessary changes;

(3) a description of the hiring practices at DOD child development centers, to include criminal background checks, credential verification procedures, and interview processes; and

(4) an assessment of the contract with Child Care Aware of America (formerly known as the National Association of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies) regarding hiring and termination procedures and referrals.

Department of Defense reports on sexual assault

The committee is concerned with the use of the imprecise terms "sexual assault" and "unwanted sexual contact" to present statistics on the number of incidences of rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, and other unwanted sexual acts perpetrated against members of the military that are reported in both the annual Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO) report on sexual assaults in the military and the Armed Forces Workplace and Gender

Relations Survey (WGRS). The 2012 SAPRO report notes that there were 3,374 reports of sexual assault in fiscal year 2012, but defines the term "sexual assault" as "a range of crimes, including rape, sexual assault, aggravated sexual contact, abusive sexual contact, nonconsensual sodomy, and attempts to commit these offenses." In the Uniform Code of Military Justice, sexual assault is a specific serious offense that carries a possible sentence of up to 30 years confinement, but the annual SAPRO report uses the term sexual assault to refer to the range of sexual offenses.

Similarly, the WGRS measured the incidences of "unwanted sexual contact", defined as "intentional sexual contact that was against a person's will or which occurred when the person did not or could not consent", finding that 6.1 percent of female respondents and 1.2 percent of male respondents experienced unwanted sexual contact in 2012. The Department then used these figures to estimate that 26,000 incidences of unwanted sexual contact occurred in 2012, but provided no numbers on the estimated number of rapes, sexual assaults, and other unwanted sexual acts that occurred.

Using the imprecise terms "sexual assault" and "unwanted sexual contact" to refer to a range of sexual offenses creates confusion about the types of unwanted sexual acts that are being perpetrated against members of the military. To address this issue, the committee directs the Department to modify the language used in the annual SAPRO report and the WGRS to clearly report the number of instances of each type of unwanted sexual act, to include rape, sexual assault, forcible sodomy, and attempts to commit those acts.

General and flag officer billets

The committee recommends that, in concert with any plans to streamline the Department of Defense command, management, and headquarters support staff organizations, the Secretary of Defense develop a plan to ensure that the number of general and flag officer billets are adjusted appropriately to achieve a proper ratio relative to end strength and complies with guidance in section 525, title 10, United States Code.

Medical management of sexual assault cases

The committee notes that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, in a memorandum dated April 15, 2013, provided Department of Defense (DOD) guidance to each of the services on medical management of sexual assault cases based on the revision to DOD Instruction 6495.02, "Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures," to include provision of standardized, timely, and comprehensive medical care. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than February 1, 2014 outlining the Department's plan to ensure that health care providers are appropriately trained to manage the acute and long-term health needs of victims of sexual assault, accredited as necessary to properly handle evidence collected from victims of sexual assault, and to ensure that these trained health care providers are located in military treatment facilities based on the Department's projection of needs.

Military dependent suicides

The committee remains extremely troubled by the numbers of suicides in each of the services in both the active duty and the reserve components, and has recently been informed by the National Military Family Association and other military family advocacy groups that anecdotal reports indicate the number of suicides committed by dependents of service members is increasing. However, the committee notes that the Department of Defense does not currently track the suicides of military family members.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report no later than February 1, 2014, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the Department's current capabilities to track the suicides of military dependents of both active duty and reserve component members, the feasibility and advisability of tracking such suicides, a description of any impediments to the ability to track suicides by military family members, and a description of current resiliency programs provided to family members by each of the services.

Prohibition of sale of sexually explicit material

The committee notes that section 2495b(a) of title 10, United States Code, prohibits the sale or rental of sexually explicit material on Department of Defense property. The committee has been made aware that despite this prohibition, sexually explicit material remains available for sale on certain Department of Defense premises. The committee is concerned about the impact this material may have on the health and wellness of military service members and their families. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the service chiefs, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, that outlines the Department's efforts to comply with the statutory prohibition.

Report to Congress on the implementation of the recommendations made by the Military Leadership Diversity Commission

The Military Leadership Diversity Commission established in section 596 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) made recommendations for improving diversity within the armed forces after conducting a comprehensive evaluation and assessment of policies that provide opportunities for the promotion and advancement of minority members of the armed forces.

It has been 2 years since the Commission made these recommendations. The committee continues to be interested in increasing diversity in the armed forces and the services' progress in implementing the Commission's recommendations.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the services' progress in implementing the Commission's recommendations and to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on that assessment by December 31, 2013.

Report on whereabouts of Army Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl

Not later than September 30, 2013, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees an unclassified report, with a classified annex, regarding the status of the search for U.S. Army Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl who was captured by the Taliban on June 30, 2009, in Paktika Province in eastern Afghanistan. The report should include Sergeant Bergdahl's suspected whereabouts, his likely captors, and what efforts are being made to find and recover him.

Retention, career progression, and promotion opportunities for female members of the Armed Forces

The committee notes and is encouraged by the efforts of the Department of Defense to expand service opportunities for women in the military. In February, the Secretary of Defense rescinded the ground-combat exclusion policy and required that the services open all positions to service by women by January 1, 2016, or request an exception to policy by that date to keep certain positions closed, an exception that must be approved by the Secretary and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Department is moving toward an assignment system that is gender-neutral and performance-based, and the committee supports that effort and encourages the Department to continue to work toward full integration of women in all military occupations to the maximum extent practicable, consistent with military capabilities required for our Nation's defense.

Even with the increasing service opportunities for women, however, the committee remains concerned that women may not always be afforded the maximum opportunity to serve a full career. The committee is particularly interested in addressing the balance between career and personal goals of all service members—both men and women—and how the ability of a service member to meet his or her personal goals may impact a decision to remain in military service, while being mindful of the military mission and the core need for all service members to be fully trained, ready, and available for deployment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report by no later than December 31, 2013, examining:

(1) retention rates and career progression opportunities for female service members;

(2) causes of voluntary mid-career separations, especially those related to childbirth, to include disparities in service policies on postpartum leave, deferral from deployment, and service member accommodation for infant nursing; and

(3) how the Department might better accommodate service members in a manner consistent with military necessity and without degrading unit readiness, to include consideration of wider use of temporary assignments to the reserve components or other career intermission programs as a way to allow service members to pursue personal or family goals while maintaining a commitment to a full military career.

Sexual assault first responder training

The committee continues to be concerned with sexual assaults in the military. The effect on good order and discipline of a unit is immeasurable. It ruins the trust that individuals have in the institution. One of the aspects that is vital in order to hold confidence in the reporting system for sexual assaults is to ensure that the sexual assault response coordinators, victim advocates, health care personnel, law enforcement personnel, judge advocates, and chaplains are trained on topics to include available medical and mental health treatment options. A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report from January 2013 indicates that some first responders interviewed were unsure of the health care services available to sexual assault victims at their respective locations.

The GAO also reported that sexual assault response coordinators, victim advocates, and health care personnel differed in their understanding of where to take sexual assault victims for forensic examinations. Given that the quality of this evidence diminishes as the period of time from the actual assault increases, this could become a serious issue.

The committee understands and appreciates that the Department is focusing additional resources to increase the numbers of first responders. This is a positive step. However, it is also important that first responders thoroughly understand the options available in general as well as at their specific duty location.

Therefore, the committee directs the secretaries of each of the military departments to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of enactment of this Act with details on how each service will ensure that first responders are adequately trained to be able to deal with sexual assault victims. The report should also indicate how each service will keep track and enforce service specific refresher training requirements.

By December 1, 2013, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the congressional defense committees indicating the number of first responders who should have had either initial or refresher training during the fiscal year and how many actually completed this required training. The statistics should be broken out by service.

Suicide prevention screening

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense (DOD) and each of the military services have made suicide prevention a priority. In addition, Congress has attempted to enhance DOD efforts to address military suicides. Even though military suicide rates are lower than comparable civilian suicide rates, work must be done in the area of early detection of mental health conditions and suicide risk. The committee notes that many of the existing programs designed for suicide prevention and screening of service members for mental health issues are linked to the deployment cycle. Yet, DOD Suicide Event Reports from recent years indicate that less than half of the service members who have committed suicide had deployed, and only a small number were involved with direct combat.

The committee remains committed to exploring new means to identify mental health concerns and prevent suicides, and expects

the Department to continually monitor best practices in other government agencies, academia, and the private sector in order to recognize when a service member may need psychological help. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with each of the military services and the reserve component, to assess the feasibility and advisability of utilizing innovative tools to screen service members for mental health conditions and risk of suicide, and to submit a report not later than February 1, 2014, that includes the following elements:

(1) current ways in which each of the services and reserve components screen service members for mental health conditions;

(2) an assessment of utilizing a computerized adaptive test during a service member's annual physical health assessment;

(3) an assessment of incorporating input through a computerized survey from a service member's first-line supervisor with regard to any behavioral changes observed in the service member;

(4) an assessment of analyzing the wellness of a service member utilizing publicly available data to develop predictive analytical models that may identify individuals that could be more susceptible to suicide;

(5) a description of how a pilot program to evaluate these new screening tools could be designed in a manner consistent with medical testing procedures and ethical and privacy requirements; and

(6) a description of any other innovative methods to enable early identification of mental health conditions or risk of suicide that the Department has recently considered and the reasons why the Department decided not to utilize those methods.

U.S. Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force and Families Initiatives

The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) testified before the committee that "USSOCOM must ensure our SOF [Special Operations Force] warriors and their families are properly cared for and that we work to help them reduce the stress they face related to high operation tempos. Difficulty also occurs as forces reconnect and reintegrate into garrison and family activities. The Department of Defense provides preventive and responsive counseling, medical, psychological, and rehabilitative care to institutionalize the resiliency of our SOF warriors and their families."

The committee applauds USSOCOM for its focus on the support and resiliency of SOF and their families through various initiatives, including human performance, personnel tempo, and family programs. The committee also supports the decision of the Commander of USSOCOM to use special operations-peculiar, or Major Force Program–11, funds to augment family support programs provided by the services to meet the unique needs of the SOF families when there is a "clear and demonstrable connection between the services provided and the combat readiness of the service member."

According to USSOCOM, "while the services offer a host of excellent family support programs, there are aspects of SOF that neces-

sitate innovations and the expansion of programs that are not common to the general purpose forces . . . Currently, many of the family programs sponsored by the services are limited in scope, and are centric to the sponsoring service. Despite a recent emphasis by the services to bolster family support programs, we still find that there is limited access to some services and a dearth of programs that adequately account for the unique needs of the SOF community." The committee believes the services have a responsibility to provide appropriate family readiness support to all service members and their families, including the SOF community.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, in coordination with the Commander of USSOCOM, to submit a report not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act that, at a minimum: (1) describes any family support requirements that are unique to the SOF community; (2) offers an analysis of support provided by the services to address these unique requirements; (3) identifies any gaps in family support provided by the services to the SOF community; (4) provides recommended actions for addressing identified gaps; and (5) relates any other matters deemed appropriate by the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness or the Commander of USSOCOM.

Veteran unemployment

The committee is concerned about the high rate of unemployment that persists for our youngest veterans. The unemployment rate also impacts the Department of Defense budget. Over the past 10 years, the Department of Defense expended more than $6.0 billion in unemployment compensation for veterans.

The Departments of Defense and Labor should review and place emphasis on improving the management and oversight associated with the veteran unemployment compensation program and payments.

In addition to the unemployment compensation issue, both veterans and prospective employers have brought to our attention that there is no single portal for veterans to find jobs, and employers to post jobs. There are numerous redundant websites and portals managed by federal agencies to provide employment services to veterans.

As such, the committee strongly urges the Departments of Labor, Defense, and Veterans Affairs to continue the process of streamlining existing employment portals into a consolidated portal.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Fiscal year 2014 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize an across-the-board pay raise for members of the uniformed services of 1 percent effective January 1, 2014.

Repeal of authority relating to commencement of basic pay for members of the National Guard called into Federal service for less than 30 days (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal subsection (c) of section 204 of title 37, United States Code, to remove the existing limitation on when members of the National Guard are entitled to receive basic pay when called into federal service for a period of 30 days or less.

Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing under certain circumstances (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the rate of basic allowance for housing in areas impacted by natural disasters or experiencing a sudden influx of personnel.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, and income replacement for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service.

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus, education loan repayment for certain health professionals

who serve in the Selected Reserve, accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers, and special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions. The provision would also extend for 1 year the authority to pay hazardous duty pay, assignment or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between armed forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates.

Correction of citation for extension of reimbursement authority for travel expenses for inactive-duty training outside of normal commuting distance and additional one-year extension (sec. 616)

The committee recommends a provision that would correct an erroneous citation in section 611(7) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) that extended authority to pay travel expenses for certain inactive-duty training outside of normal commuting distances. The provision would further extend the authority to December 31, 2014.

Expansion to all reserve components of stipend for registered nurses in critical specialties under health professions stipend program (sec. 617)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 16201(d) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize payment of the health professions stipend to a nurse enrolled in an accredited program of nursing in a specialty designated as critical by the Secretary of Defense who is eligible for appointment as a Reserve officer in any of the reserve components.

Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances

Technical and standardizing amendments to Department of Defense travel and transportation authorities in connection with reform of such authorities (sec. 631)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1040, 1074i, 1482, and 1491 of title 10, United States Code, and sections 451 and 453 of title 37, United States Code, to make technical changes to those sections to conform with the travel consolidation reform enacted in sections 631 and 632 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The provision would also repeal sections 1036, 1053a, and 2634 of title 10, United States Code, as superseded.

Subtitle D—Disability, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits

Clarification of prevention of retired pay inversion in the case of members whose retired pay is computed using high-three (sec. 641)

The committee recommends a provision that would make a technical amendment to section 1401a of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that certain provisions of subsection (f) of that section do not apply to the computation of retired pay of members who first entered active duty on or after September 8, 1980.

Effect on division of retired pay of election to receive combat-related special compensation after previous election to receive concurrent retirement and disability compensation (sec. 642)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the effect on prior payments of an election to receive combat-related special compensation after a previous election to receive concurrent retirement and disability compensation was made relative to the division of retired pay under section 1408 of title 10, United States Code.

Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for special needs trusts established for the benefit of dependent children incapable of self-support (sec. 643)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1450 and 1455 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the payment of the Survivor Benefit Plan annuity to a special needs trust created under subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 1396p(d)(4) of title 42, United States Code, for the sole benefit of

a disabled dependent child incapable of self-support because of mental or physical incapacity.

Periodic notice to members of the Ready Reserve on early retirement credit earned for significant periods of active Federal status or active duty (sec. 644)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12731 of title 10, United States Code, to require the service secretaries to provide periodic notice to reserve component members of any early retirement credit they have earned for service described in that section by such means as the secretary concerned considers appropriate.

Preservation of retiree dependent status for certain dependents upon death or permanent incapacitation of the retired member on whom dependent status is based (sec. 645)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1060b of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that no further certification of a dependent for financial support shall be required or carried out in the case of a dependent who has been granted a permanent identification card by reason of permanent disability when the member or retiree providing the basis for dependency dies or becomes permanently incapacitated.

Subtitle E—Military Lending Matters

Enhanced role for the Department of Justice under the Military Lending Act (sec. 661)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 987 of title 10, United States Code, to provide civil enforcement authority over the Military Lending Act to the Department of Justice.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Authority to provide certain expenses for care and disposition of human remains that were retained by the Department of Defense for forensic pathology investigation (sec. 671)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the payment of certain expenses for the care and disposition of human remains retained by a service secretary pursuant to a forensic pathology investigation by the Armed Forces Medical Examiner under section 1471 of title 10, United States Code.

Extension of ongoing pilot programs under temporary Army incentive to provide additional recruitment incentives (sec. 672)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 681 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to continue through December 31, 2015, any pilot program carried out under that section that was ongoing as of December 31, 2012.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

Pilot program on increased collection of third-party reimbursements for health care services provided in military medical treatment facilities (sec. 711)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the service secretaries, to carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of using commercially available enhanced recovery practices for medical payment collection at military treatment facilities. The provision would also require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the pilot program not later than 180 days after completion of the program.

The committee is concerned that the lack of an effective collection process in each of the services has resulted in lost reimbursement to the government for medical services rendered. While the committee understands that the Department of Defense is currently exploring options to outsource third party collections, the committee believes that such action has been delayed.

Sense of Senate on implementation of integrated electronic health records for the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs (sec. 712)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that: despite years of effort and the expenditure of significant resources, full electronic interoperability between the health record systems of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs has not yet been achieved; the Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, should fully staff the Interagency Program Office and establish challenging, but achievable, deadlines for development and implementation of measures and goals for electronic health record interoperability; and the Interagency Program Office should establish a secure, remote, network-accessible computer storage system.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

Report on provision of advanced prosthetics and orthotics to members of the Armed Forces and veterans (sec. 721)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to report, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the plans of the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to ensure that the most clinically appropriate prosthetics and orthotics are made available to injured serv-

ice members and veterans using technological advances as appropriate.

Items of Special Interest

Autism spectrum disorder services

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its continued efforts to ensure that military families have access to appropriate autism spectrum disorder diagnosis, intervention, and treatment services. The committee expects the Department to continue to assist eligible autistic beneficiaries to receive effective, evidence-based intervention and treatment approaches, and to ensure the provision of such services for autistic dependents of service members living in rural or underserved communities.

Education and training of the acquisition workforce of the TRICARE Management Activity

The Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) released a report on May 1, 2013, titled, "TRICARE Management Activity Needs to Improve Oversight of Acquisition Workforce." The DOD IG audit found that acquisition personnel of the TRICARE Management Activity (TMA) "did not have required certifications for their functional areas, accurate position descriptions for their assigned duties, or proper training." Additionally, the DOD IG discovered that the Component Acquisition Executive "did not have procedures to adequately monitor the acquisition workforce and did not place the required emphasis on the identification, development, training, and assignment of acquisition workforce personnel." The committee notes that in the DOD IG's view, these deficiencies placed the TMA at "increased risk for fraud, waste and abuse." While the TMA has agreed with and worked to address the DOD IG's findings and recommendations, the committee remains extremely concerned about the findings in the DOD IG's report.

The committee believes that with the significant number of high value contracts awarded by the TMA—over $11.0 billion in fiscal year 2012 alone—the Department of Defense must ensure that the TMA's acquisition management process meets workforce training and certification requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on the actions the Department is taking to correct the education and training challenges facing the TRICARE acquisition workforce.

Hyperbaric oxygen therapy for mild traumatic brain injury

The committee remains extremely concerned about the effects of traumatic brain injury (TBI) on our service members and veterans, as TBI is a signature wound of Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) reports that there were over 266,000 TBI cases in service members, both active and reserve component, from 2000 through 2012. The committee applauds DOD for its significant investment in TBI research with a focus on development of diagnostic tools and evidence-based care protocols, and understands that DOD

is currently conducting three randomized, placebo-controlled pilot studies to determine the effectiveness of hyperbaric oxygen therapy for alleviating symptoms following mild TBI in military personnel. The committee expects that these pilot studies will inform the Department about the efficacy of hyperbaric oxygen therapy for mild TBI.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 180 days of completion of the pilot studies that describes the methodology, results, and conclusions of the studies. If hyperbaric oxygen therapy is determined to be effective, the report should address any changes in policy or legislation that may be needed regarding the provision of hyperbaric oxygen services to patients with mild TBI.

Mental health counselors for service members, veterans, and their families

The committee recognizes that many years of combat operations have caused service members in both the active and reserve components to experience increased exposure to unique and significant stressors. Additionally, service members and their families face daily stress in every phase of military life and as they transition to veteran status. The committee believes that mental health counseling needs of service members, veterans, and their families will continue to increase for the foreseeable future.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide a joint report within 270 days of the enactment of this Act that describes a coordinated, unified plan to ensure adequate mental health counseling resources to address the long-term needs of all members of the armed forces, veterans, and their families. In developing the plan and report, the committee expects the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to consider all available types of trained counseling providers, including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, chaplains, and other counseling professionals, as appropriate. The report shall also include a comprehensive staffing plan to ensure an appropriate alignment of mental health resources and needs.

Ribonucleic acid research

The committee notes with concern that service members are hospitalized more often for infectious diseases than service members who are wounded in combat, and commends the Department of Defense for its ongoing efforts to address these diseases. Therefore, the committee supports Department of Defense investment to further improve prevention, diagnosis, and treatment for service members from rare and infectious viral, bacterial, immune, and neurological diseases through research initiatives such as ribonucleic acid-based research addressing proteins.

TRICARE appeals process

The committee believes that a fundamental right of TRICARE beneficiaries is a fair and efficient process for resolving disputes with the TRICARE program. The committee notes that the

TRICARE appeals process is a multi-level sequential process that allows beneficiaries to request reconsideration from the managed care support contractor, file an appeal with the TRICARE Management Activity (TMA), and finally, request an independent hearing if they dispute either a medical necessity determination or a factual determination made in their case. If a case dispute moves to the final stage of the appeals process, a hearing officer examines the available evidence and issues a recommended decision on the case.

The committee has learned that the Director of the TMA or their designee, after consideration of a hearing officer's recommended decision, may unilaterally issue a final decision that overturns the independent hearing officer's recommendation. Advocacy groups have informed the committee that beneficiaries who have pursued the full range of options in the appeals process and received a favorable recommendation from the independent hearing officer perceive the process as unfair when the TMA summarily overturns the hearing officer's recommended decision.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, that: (1) describes the current TRICARE appeals process; (2) provides summary data showing the numbers and types of cases submitted by beneficiaries for appeals and hearings over the previous 5 fiscal years; (3) provides data to show both the favorable and unfavorable beneficiary outcomes of all independent hearing cases over the previous 5 fiscal years; (4) describes the average length of time for beneficiaries to obtain a decision from the TMA either from an appeal or a hearing; and (5) provides data on the number of cases in which the Director of the TMA makes a determination different than the recommended decision of the hearing officer to grant a beneficiary appeal.

TRICARE emergency department utilization

The committee is concerned about the rate of emergency department utilization by TRICARE beneficiaries. The committee understands that families often seek 24-hour emergency department care rather than urgent care clinics to manage after-hours health concerns, and that active-duty family members in transition are a population with a particularly high incidence of emergency room usage.

The committee notes that current regulations require that TRICARE Prime beneficiaries seeking care from a provider other than their primary care manager, to include visits to urgent care clinics or facilities, must first obtain a referral. In addition, the average cost of a private sector emergency department visit under TRICARE is $541 per visit, while the average cost for a visit at a private sector urgent care clinic is only $88 per visit.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) is currently conducting a demonstration program that allows TRICARE Prime and TRICARE Prime Remote U.S. Coast Guard beneficiaries in the southern region four unmanaged urgent care visits per fiscal year without point-of-service charges, and that thus far, the demonstration has shown promising results in reducing

emergency room utilization. The committee commends DOD for conducting this demonstration and requests to be kept apprised of its results.

In addition, the committee has learned that DOD plans to implement a nurse advice line across the military health system to provide around-the-clock medical information and advice to TRICARE beneficiaries through registered nurses who would guide them to the most appropriate level of care required and assist them with appointment scheduling for conditions that can be treated during routine hours. The committee has been informed that implementation of this advice line has been delayed until at least the fall.

The committee believes that current TRICARE policy may incentivize emergency department use by requiring TRICARE Prime beneficiaries to obtain pre-authorizations for urgent care visits, and that this requirement places an administrative burden on families and discourages utilization of less costly urgent care options. While the committee does not want to discourage emergency department use when a true emergency exists, the committee strongly urges the Secretary of Defense to revise existing policy to encourage beneficiaries to use urgent care, when appropriate, rather than more expensive emergency department care, and to field its nurse advice line without further delay.

Use of simulation technology in medical training

The committee appreciates the Department of Defense's work to reduce the use of live animals in combat training courses when appropriate as detailed in the April 2013 "Report to Congress on the Strategy to Transition to Use of Human-Based Methods for Certain Medical Training." The committee commends the Department's interest in the development of simulation technology and shares its commitment to improve and modernize the training of military medical personnel without degradation to combat trauma care. The Department's 2009 "Final Report on the Use of Live Animals in Medical Education and Training Joint Analysis Team" projected that validated simulators for many "high volume/high value" medical procedures could be developed by 2014. The 2013 report provides an updated timeline indicating that a more realistic timeline for the development and procurement of simulation products would be in 2017 and beyond. In light of this, the committee encourages the Department to expedite wherever practicable the transition to human-based medical training methods and replacement of live animals in combat trauma training courses when appropriate and where modern validated simulators can provide equally effective training that achieves established combat casualty survival rates.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

Restatement and revision of requirements applicable to multiyear defense acquisitions to be specifically authorized by law (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify and reorganize the reporting and certification requirements of the Department of Defense when requesting specific authorization for multiyear contract authority.

Section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary of Defense, in the case of a contract equal to or greater than $500.0 million, to certify that certain requirements will be met by the proposed contract no later than March 1st of the year in which the legislative authority to enter into such contract is requested. The Secretary must send a notification of the findings regarding the same requirements 30 days before award of the contract.

The committee finds value in both the certification and the notification, but, believes that the timing is reversed. The recommended provision would reorganize the timeline so the Secretary provides the initial findings of the enumerated requirements when requesting multiyear contract authority and then certifies the completed findings prior to contract award.

The committee believes this will provide more reasonable and complete information.

Extension of authority to acquire products and services produced in countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through December 31, 2015, the authority under section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2399), as amended, to acquire goods and services on a non-competitive basis in certain countries along the Northern Distribution Network transit routes that support U.S. and coalition forces in Afghanistan.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense is seeking to extend this authority in part because it anticipates that retrograde operations for U.S. equipment coming out of Afghanistan will extend beyond the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization International Security Assistance Force mission at the end of 2014.

Report on program manager training and experience (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an updated version of the 2009 Department of Defense report titled: "OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense] Study of Program Manager Training and Experience" not later than 120 days from enactment of this Act.

Subtitle B—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

Synchronization of cryptographic systems for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 821)

The committee recommends a provision that as part of a milestone B decision for a major defense acquisition program, would require that there be a plan in place to mitigate and account for costs in connection with decertification of cryptographic equipment during production and procurement of the system. The provision includes a waiver based on national security needs. The provision is based on prior experience with the Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellite System which has had to re-engineer a new cryptographic unit as it was decertified during the production of the satellite system.

Assessment of dedicated control system before Milestone B approval of major defense acquisition programs constituting a space program (sec. 822)

The committee recommends a provision that would implement a recommendation from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, "Satellite Control Operations," GAO–13–315, concerning the use of dedicated satellite control systems. The provision requires the Department of Defense, as part of its Milestone B decision, to perform a business case analysis on the use of a dedicated control system instead of a shared system. The Department should adhere to the report's recommendation on page 28, that "[t]he analysis should include a comparison of total dedicated network costs to the incremental cost of integrating onto a shared network."

Additional responsibility for product support managers for major weapon systems (sec. 823)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2337 of Title 10, United States Code, and section 823 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to provide an assurance that all product support arrangements explicitly state how the arrangement will maximize use of government owned inventory before obtaining inventory from commercial sources.

The committee notes that this provision is a result of the recommendations of the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) report dated April 25, 2013, that found the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) did not cost-effectively manage 118 high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) parts valued at $11.1 million while purchasing these parts from AM General, LLC for $17.6 million.

The committee notes this occurred because the DLA did not review DLA-owned inventory at key contract decision points to maximize use of its own stock. As a result, the DOD IG identified $9.7 million of excess inventory that could have been used for HMMWV maintenance requirements.

The committee notes that this particular DOD IG investigation and report only focused on one particular weapon system at one particular depot. The committee believes there could be an opportunity for greater and similar inventory efficiency across all Department of Defense weapon systems.

Comptroller General of the United States review of Department of Defense processes for the acquisition of weapons systems (sec. 824)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out a comprehensive review of the processes and procedures of the Department of Defense for the acquisition of major weapons systems and report upon this review to the congressional defense committees.

Subtitle C—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Maximum amount of allowable costs of compensation of contractor employees (sec. 841)

The committee recommends a provision that would reduce the cap on allowable costs of compensation of contractor employees to an amount consistent with the original legislative cap, adjusted for inflation, and provide for future annual adjustments by reflecting the change in the Employment Cost Index (ECI) for all workers, as calculated by the Bureau of Labor and Statistics.

Section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) limited the amount of contractor executive compensation allowable for reimbursement under federal contracts to a benchmark based on the median amount of compensation provided to senior executives in large U.S. corporations, as calculated by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP)—then $340,650.

Since that time the cap has more than doubled to $763,029 for 2011 and 2012, and is expected to increase to more than $950,000 in 2013. By contrast, if the original cap had been adjusted for inflation it would now be only $487,325. The committee concludes that the growth of the cap by almost $300,000 more than the rate of inflation cannot be justified.

At a time when most Americans are seeing little or no increase in their paychecks and budget constraints require the Department of Defense to find efficiencies in all areas, the committee concludes that increases of this magnitude are unsupportable.

Implementation by Department of Defense of certain recommendations of the Comptroller General of the United States on oversight of pensions offered by Department contractors (sec. 842)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to assign responsibility within the Department for oversight of the reasonableness of the pension plans offered by Department contractors and issue certain guidance on pension benefits.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Extension of prohibition on contracting with the enemy in the United States Central Command theater of operations (sec. 861)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (P.L. 112–81) by striking "the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act" and inserting "December 31, 2016".

Section 841 allowed the Secretary of Defense to void a contract being performed in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility upon a determination that a foreign entity or individual performing on the contract is directly engaged in hostilities or is substantially supporting forces that are engaged in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners.

Prohibition on contracting with the enemy (sec. 862)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (P.L. 112–81).

Section 841 allows the Secretary of Defense to void a contract being performed in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility upon a determination that a foreign entity or individual performing on the contract is directly engaged in hostilities or is substantially supporting forces that are engaged in hostilities against the United States or its coalition partners.

The committee recommends expansion of this provision to all combatant commanders. Upon receiving findings that a person or entity is providing funds to a person or entity who is engaged in hostilities against the United States, the combatant commander would, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the relevant U.S. embassy, determine an appropriate plan of action to mitigate the flow of funds to that person or entity.

When that plan of action includes contract actions, the head of contracting activity may terminate or void the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement, and restrict future awards to such person or entity.

The individual or entity would be provided with post-deprivation due process within 30 days of the receipt of notification.

Report on the elimination of improper payments (sec. 863)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report on the Department's plan to implement the recommendations of the Comptroller General regarding the elimination of improper payments.

Items of Special Interest

Application of the Berry Amendment to the acquisition of athletic footwear in the Department of Defense

Congress passed the Berry Amendment in 1941 to ensure that American soldiers trained and operated, to the greatest extent practicable, in American-made materials. The Berry Amendment specifically covers footwear listed in Federal Supply Class 8430 or 8435.

The Army, in 2001, and the Air Force, in 2008, have moved away from issuing athletic footwear to new recruits. Instead, new recruits are given an allowance to acquire athletic footwear from the service exchange.

During this period of time, no athletic footwear was available that could have met the requirements of the Berry Amendment without a waiver. It is the committee's understanding that at least one domestic contractor is now producing such footwear.

Therefore, the committee directs U.S. Army Natick Soldier Research, Development, and Engineering Center to undergo a study, to be completed no later than January 1, 2014, of currently available Berry compliant athletic footwear to ascertain whether the Department's needs could be satisfied for new recruits. The committee believes this study should review the various sizes and fit of athletic shoes required, the cost and capacity of products available in sufficient quantity and quality to meet the needs of the Department of Defense (DOD), and whether such footwear could be made.

During roughly the last decade, certain procurement incidents and policy changes have created some level of unease with respect to the Berry Amendment's application to not only athletic footwear but also textiles and clothing. As such, the committee directs DOD to submit a publicly releasable report to the congressional defense committees that includes, but not be limited to, any audits or auditing policy, investigations and enforcement, incentives, procurement officer training, and regulatory interpretation guidelines relating to the Department's contracting for textiles and clothing contained in Federal Supply Codes 83 and 84, and athletic footwear listed in Federal Supply Class 8430 and 8435.

Clarification pertaining to small business contracting requiring a written justification and approval

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) included a requirement for a written justification and approval (J&A) when awarding applicable federal sole-source contracts in excess of $20.0 million.

Ensuring competition in the federal acquisition process is of vital importance to U.S. taxpayers. Section 811 was intended to further this objective; however, the committee understands government contracting officers may inadvertently be deterred from awarding

Small Business 8(a) contracts over $20.0 million as a result of confusion over the proper interpretation of section 811.

Section 811 does not prohibit the award of sole source contracts of over $20.0 million to those businesses which qualify for the Small Business 8(a) program; however, those contracts do require a J&A.

Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the actions taken and guidance issued regarding the proper use and implementation of section 811 as it regards Small Business 8(a) contracts.

Competition in the development and procurement of training systems

Section 202(d) of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111—23) requires the Secretary of Defense to take actions to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable and consistent with statutory requirements, contracts for the procurement of major weapon systems are awarded on a competitive basis that gives full consideration to all potential sources.

This provision reflects the committee's view that competition, where it is feasible, results in reduced costs and improved contractor performance.

The committee believes that competition can have a similar beneficial impact in the area of training systems related to major programs. The committee urges the military departments to actively explore the expanded use of competition as a tool to drive down costs and improve performance in the acquisition of training systems for major programs.

Comptroller General of the United States report on best value competitive source selection techniques

The Federal Acquisition Regulation Part 15 allows the use of several best value competitive source selection techniques to meet agency needs. An agency can obtain best value in negotiated acquisitions by using any one of a number of source selection approaches. Within this best value continuum, the contracting officer (CO) should choose an approach that is most advantageous to the government.

The CO may elect to use the lowest price technically acceptable process in acquisitions where the requirement is clearly definable and the risk of unsuccessful contract performance is minimal. By contrast, the CO may elect to use a trade-off process in acquisitions when it may be in the best interest of the government to consider award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror. In these instances, non-cost evaluation factors, such as technical capabilities, can play an important role in the source selection and trade-offs among price and non-cost factors and allow the Department to accept other than the lowest priced proposal.

The committee has concerns that the appropriate acquisition process is not always being utilized and therefore directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the sufficiency of the training of the acquisition workforce in the selection

of the appropriate acquisition process, and review guidance and directives on the appropriate use of the various acquisition processes.

Comptroller General of the United States report on in-line management process for the acquisition process

Not later than April 15, 2014, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the chain of command for acquisition-related functions of the Department of Defense (DOD) and potential changes to that chain of command.

The committee understands that the current system is intended to avoid fragmentation, as recommended by the Packard Commission report in 1986, by ensuring that program managers report only to program executive officers, who report only to service acquisition executives, who are in turn subject to the management and supervision of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to consider alternate approaches that would increase the role of the service secretaries and/or the service chiefs in that process, including the "in-line management process" recommended by the independent panel assessment accompanying the 2009 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), to determine whether or not such changes would be likely to enhance performance and accountability in the acquisition of major defense acquisition programs.

The Comptroller General's review should, at a minimum, consider: (1) whether adding the service secretaries and/or chiefs of staff to the acquisition chain of command would be likely to increase or reduce fragmentation of authority and accountability in the acquisition system; and (2) whether adding the service secretaries and/or chiefs of staff to the acquisition chain of command would or would not be likely to help address the underlying causes of cost, schedule, and performance problems in the acquisition process.

In conducting this review, the Comptroller General should also consider the requirements of section 853 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) regarding program manager empowerment and accountability and assess whether adding the service secretaries and/or chiefs of staff to the acquisition chain of command would be likely to contribute to or detract from the objectives of that provision.

Comptroller General report on process and procedures for identifying duplicative and/or inefficient major development and procurement programs

The committee requires the Comptroller General of the United States to review the various processes and procedures for identifying duplicative and/or inefficient major development and procurement programs, report upon their efficiency, and make any recommendations for improvement to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

Report on the configuration steering boards

The committee supports the work of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) that has identified mechanisms to en-

sure "appropriate trade-offs are made among the life-cycle cost, schedule, and performance objectives, and procurement quantity objectives, in the establishment and approval of military requirements." Specifically, the JROC has issued guidance that "encourages Program Managers, Program Executive Officers and Component Acquisition Executives, in coordination with the requirements sponsor, to officially require requirements relief, through the appropriate requirements validation authority, where Key Performance Parameters appear out of line with an appropriate cost-benefit analysis."

The committee, however, continues to have concerns with the growth and change of requirements during a program's life-cycle and believes that such requirements creep can occur at lower levels of the requirements chain.

The committee attempted to address this issue in the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (P.L. 110–417) with a provision, section 814, creating Configuration Steering Boards for cost control under major defense acquisition programs.

Configuration Steering Boards are responsible for reviewing any proposed changes to program requirements or system configuration that could have the potential to adversely impact program cost or schedule and for recommending changes that have the potential to improve program cost or schedule in a manner consistent with program objectives.

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study of the implementation of section 814 and the extent to which the services have convened Configuration Steering Boards, and the extent to which requirements creep has been successfully addressed.

Required goals for future Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness reports

The Department of Defense (DOD) is required to achieve audit readiness for its Statement of Business Resources by September 30, 2014 and audit readiness for its full financial statements by September 30, 2017. In order to assist in achieving these legal requirements, DOD has published a Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Guidance.

The FIAR Guidance outlines a process of four waves for achieving audit readiness. Each wave has objectives that must be achieved before progressing to the next wave. DOD provides quarterly reports on their progress in meeting their objectives.

The committee notes that progress is being made toward these goals; however, the committee also notes that the most recent quarterly report did not contain a specific deadline for completion of the third wave. Therefore, the committee directs the Department to include a deadline for completion of each wave in the next quarterly report, including specific metrics tracking progress on their completion.

The committee notes that substantial progress has been made toward meeting these statutory goals; however, the committee remains concerned with the Department's ability to actually achieve them. The Department's financial and related business manage-

ment systems and control weaknesses have adversely affected its ability to control costs and ensure basic accountability.

As the most recent FIAR Guidance points out, "each of the military departments is larger than most American companies. The Department's annual budget is 56 percent of the Federal Government's discretionary budget and it holds 86 percent of the Federal Government's assets, as reported on the Federal Government's Consolidated Financial Statements. With over $1.0 trillion in combined budgetary resources, producing auditable financial statements requires a strategic, long-term plan that addresses issues in an organized, prioritized, and incremental manner."

The committee strongly believes, therefore, that producing auditable financial statements is crucial to providing efficient and effective use of limited budgetary resources.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

Under Secretary of Defense for Management (sec. 901)

The committee recommends a provision that would convert the position of Deputy Chief Management Officer to Under Secretary of Defense for Management (USD(M)) and to designate that position as the Chief Information Officer (CIO) of the Department of Defense (DOD).

Section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) designated the Deputy Secretary of Defense as the DOD Chief Management Officer (DCMO), established an Under Secretary of Defense-level Deputy Chief Management Officer to assist the Deputy Secretary, and named the under secretaries of the military departments as their organizations' Chief Management Officers.

This legislation was intended to strengthen the management of DOD's business operations and was the result of a series of recommendations from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and several think-tanks that argued the need for a senior official at DOD with significant authority and experience to focus attention on enterprise-wide business transformation and sustain progress at the highest levels of DOD.

The framework enacted into law was a compromise between those such as then-Comptroller General David Walker who advocated creation of a second Deputy Secretary of Defense focused solely on management, and those who asserted that no reorganization was necessary to address DOD's persistent business challenges.

Following enactment of the legislation, DOD moved quickly to implement the new office of the DCMO with the mission of integrating, synchronizing, and coordinating DOD's business operations. On July 1, 2010, the first DCMO was confirmed by the Senate and sworn in. At that time, DOD believed that the new management structure put in place by the FY08 NDAA was properly scoped and defined to enable DOD to make significant progress in breaking down its functional stovepipes.

The committee believes that while significant progress has been made, it has become increasingly clear that additional changes to the structure of the DCMO position are needed to position DOD for success in its business mission.

Specifically, change is required to make the DCMO a co-equal of the other Under Secretaries of Defense with the independent statutory authorities necessary to introduce and drive implementation of

transformational change and improvement in the Department's business operations.

The provision also would designate the USD(M) as the Department's CIO and would mandate that the USD(M) exercise authority, direction, and control over the Information Assurance Directorate (IAD) of the National Security Agency (NSA). Since the elimination of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration (ASD(NII)), the DOD CIO has not been a Senate-confirmed position. In addition, in creating the DCMO position, Congress assigned multiple roles and responsibilities to the DCMO that had been performed by the CIO, which further diluted the clout of the CIO. Also, the bifurcation of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence into the ASD(NII) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) led to the USD(I) supervising the NSA IAD, despite the fact that the CIO, not the USD(I), is responsible for information systems security, which is the mission of the IAD.

The current provision would unify roles and functions traditionally performed by the CIO and strengthen the office by making it a Senate-confirmed position again, but without creating an additional position. A strengthened CIO will provide better management and oversight of information technology, systems, and operations within DOD, including over the U.S. Cyber Command. Combining these offices also should produce some savings in overhead.

The recommended provision would also amend section 137a(d) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the order of precedence for the Principal Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense would be immediately following the officials serving in the positions of the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the military departments, the Under Secretaries of Defense, and the officials serving in positions specified in section 131(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

Supervision of Command Acquisition Executive of the United States Special Operations Command by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (sec. 902)

The budget request for U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) included approximately $1.6 billion for procurement and $372.7 million for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDTE). The committee notes that this total represents an increase of more than double in USSOCOM's investment accounts since fiscal year 2001.

The Commander of USSOCOM is unique within the Department of Defense as the only combatant commander empowered with authorities for the development and acquisition of special operations-peculiar equipment. Furthermore, the staff of the Commander of USSOCOM includes an acquisition executive that reports solely to the Commander. This is unlike the service acquisition executives of the military departments who are subject to the direction of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) in addition to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the military department concerned.

The committee is supportive of USSOCOM's unique acquisition authorities to provide for the special operations-peculiar requirements of its forces, including rapid acquisition of urgently needed capabilities for deployed or deploying special operations forces. Further, the committee notes that the flexibility inherent in these authorities is enormously important to ensuring that our special operations forces can adapt to the rapidly evolving nature of global threats. However, given the significant growth in USSOCOM's budget in recent years and current fiscal pressures, the committee believes additional civilian oversight of USSOCOM investment programs is prudent, particularly the development and acquisition of special operations-peculiar platforms.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would make the USSOCOM Acquisition Executive subject to the direction of the USD(AT&L) for certain acquisition programs. The provision would also require the USD(AT&L) to designate an appropriate official within the Office of the USD(AT&L) to provide such oversight and direction for those programs. The provision would not alter the relationship between the USSOCOM Acquisition Executive and the Commander of USSOCOM and it is not the intent of the committee to delay, unnecessarily impede, or undermine the flexibility of USSOCOM development and acquisition efforts.

Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System (sec. 903)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a council to coordinate activities related to national leadership command, control, and communications systems, including the nuclear command, control, and communications system.

Transfer of administration of Ocean Research Advisory Panel from Department of the Navy to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (sec. 904)

The committee recommends a provision, based upon a Department of Defense legislative proposal, that would transfer responsibility for administration of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel (ORAP) from the Department of the Navy to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce. This change would allow the functions of the ORAP to be aligned more appropriately to address the full range of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes policy issues.

Streamlining of Department of Defense management headquarters (sec. 905)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for streamlining Department of Defense management headquarters by reducing the size of staffs, eliminating tiers of management, cutting functions that provide little or no added value, and consolidating overlapping and duplicative program offices.

The objective of the required plan is to reduce aggregate spending for management headquarters by not less than $100.0 billion over a 10 fiscal-year period beginning with fiscal year 2015.

Update of statutory statement of functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relating to doctrine, training, and education (sec. 906)

The committee recommends a provision, as requested by the Department of Defense, that would codify the responsibility of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) by amending section 153 of title 10, United States Code, to reflect the current joint training, doctrine, education, and force development functions that are overseen by the CJCS.

Modification of reference to major Department of Defense headquarters activities instruction (sec. 907)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 194(f) of title 10, United States Code, to update the reference to Department of Defense Instruction 5100.73, titled "Major DOD Headquarters Activities."

Subtitle B—Space Activities

Limitation on use of funds for Space Protection Program (sec. 921)

The committee has expressed concern with the failure of the Department of Defense (DOD) to keep Congress apprised of its counter space strategy. DOD states that they have developed an integrated effort but the committee remains concerned by the lack of details and resources. Of note, the Air Force's fiscal year 2014 budget provides no funding for counter space programs after fiscal year 2016 in the base budget. The committee recognizes that the establishment of the Space Protection Program is meant to provide a central focus for mission assurance of national space capabilities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a strategy identifying the near-term and long-term threat to critical national security space systems and the Department's plan for addressing that threat as well as the resources requested in the 5–year budget plan to address those threats. The strategy should also include an assessment of the capabilities and resources other countries have allocated and plan to allocate towards their own offensive counter space capabilities. The strategy shall be due no later than March 1, 2014.

On numerous occasions over the past year, the committee has requested that the Department provide a complete copy of the study directed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense which led to a significant revision of the Department's counter space strategy. A copy of the study has not yet been provided to the committee, therefore, the committee restricts $10.0 million of the funds appropriated for the Space Protection Program until a copy of the study is provided.

Subtitle C—Intelligence-Related Matters

Personnel security (sec. 931)

The committee recommends a provision that would require major reform of the personnel security clearance investigation, adjudication, and transfer processes to improve security and reduce costs. Specifically, the provision would require:

(1) the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation to conduct a comprehensive, comparative analysis of the cost, schedule, and performance of personnel security investigations acquired through the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) and through components of the Department of Defense (DOD);

(2) the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan by October 1, 2014, to acquire investigations through the approach most advantageous to DOD and to determine whether investigations can be improved through the increased utilization of private entities to conduct or provide supporting information for security investigations;

(3) the Secretary and the Director of National Intelligence (DNI) to develop a joint strategy to continuously modernize all aspects of personnel security to lower costs and improve security, and to develop and report annually on metrics that will demonstrate progress in achieving those objectives;

(4) the Secretary and the DNI to consider, and allow them to adopt, a series of innovations in security investigation methods and data sources that have been shown to be effective through analysis and/or demonstrations;

(5) the Secretary and the DNI to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, reciprocal acceptance of clearances; and

(6) development of benchmarks by which to measure the current level of reciprocity in clearance transfers and the costs imposed by delays.

DOD transferred the bulk of its security investigations in 2004 to OPM because DOD had accumulated a large backlog of clearance applications and investigations were taking an enormous amount of time which imposed high indirect costs through productivity losses, and (rightly) DOD did not consider security investigations to be a core mission.

OPM successfully eliminated the backlog that it inherited and substantially reduced the time it takes to complete investigations.

However, personnel security costs have steadily risen and DOD has had little visibility into OPM's cost structure to determine what has been driving those increases. A recent Government Accountability Office report documented OPM's lack of cost transparency and rapidly rising costs. DOD is spending three-quarters of a billion dollars annually on security investigations, and costs have been rising at a rate of 10 percent a year. Multiple intelligence agencies that conduct their own investigations using the same contractors as OPM have achieved savings of up to 50 percent compared to the prices charged by OPM. The pressure on budgets has become severe, while new federal investigative standards that mandate a periodic reinvestigation every 5 years could increase the cost of personnel security dramatically in coming years.

In addition, DOD and DNI have been eager to modernize the security investigation process, believing that doing so would actually improve security, reduce the time needed for investigations, and reduce costs. OPM has been slow to address these cost and reform issues.

The Army and the National Reconnaissance Office successfully demonstrated, through a pilot program, the gains that can be

achieved in efficiency, time, security, and cost by applying modern information technology and exploiting non-traditional information sources.

Some intelligence agencies have effectively stopped performing periodic reinvestigations, which has led to a huge new investigatory backlog, and because the government and contract employees of these agencies are past due for reinvestigations, other agencies may refuse to accept their clearances, limiting their employment opportunities through no fault of their own. Finally, industry has expressed concerns about a thicket of bureaucratic obstacles that still make the transfer of clearances between government agencies and departments, and from one contract to another, difficult and time-consuming, ultimately costing taxpayers substantial amounts of money as workers are idled, with their time charged to overhead.

The committee believes that the time has come to issue a legislative mandate to force an action that all stakeholders seem to agree is necessary.

Reports on clandestine human intelligence collection (sec. 932)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation (CAPE), and in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence (DNI), acting through the Cost Analysis Improvement Group (CAIG), and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), to assess the potential cost savings and effectiveness improvements from consolidating clandestine human intelligence (HUMINT) collection in the National Clandestine Service managed by the CIA. In conducting the assessment, the Secretary and the DNI should assume that a consolidated HUMINT organization would include a military division supervised by a general or flag officer.

In conducting the assessment, CAPE and CAIG would also be required to develop a methodology for comparing the effectiveness of the ratios of support personnel to case officers utilized by the Defense Intelligence Agency and CIA, respectively, and recommend an optimum ratio. The Secretary of Defense and the DNI also would be required to assess whether institutional and procedural safeguards are available to ensure that a consolidated HUMINT organization under the CIA could be relied upon to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense.

The provision also would require CAPE separately to assess the performance of the military services in providing, and managing the careers of, qualified case officers for the Defense Clandestine Service (DCS), the effectiveness of DCS in providing cover and other support services to its deployed case officers, and whether the locations to which DCS case officers are deployed provide the opportunity to collect the information required by the Department.

Navy Broad-Area Maritime Surveillance aircraft (sec. 933)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to direct the modification of the radar system that will be deployed on the Navy's Broad-Area Maritime Surveillance (BAMS) Triton aircraft to provide a ground moving target in-

dicator (GMTI) capability that is comparable to the performance of the Air Force Global Hawk Block 40 Multi-Platform Radar Technology Insertion Program (MP-RTIP). The provision also would require the Secretary to designate the Triton as a joint asset available to support the operational requirements of the unified combatant commands for radar and signals intelligence (SIGINT) collection.

The committee understands that the Triton radar could be modified through software additions at a very modest cost to achieve GMTI performance of the same level of quality and capacity as the Block 40 Global Hawk. The Navy plans to procure, over the life of the program, approximately 70 Triton aircraft. The committee believes it would be a serious mistake for the Department of Defense to pass on the opportunity to equip this fleet to support, when needed, the ground forces of the Marine Corps, the Army, and Special Forces with GMTI radar.

Similarly, the Navy plans to equip approximately 60 Triton aircraft with a very capable SIGINT suite as a replacement for the EP–3 towards the end of the decade. The EP–3 is a joint asset that is allocated under the Global Force Management Allocation Plan process. The committee believes this capability should be available to support joint requirements.

The budget request included $375.2 million in PE 35220N for development of the Triton program. To support the development of the software modifications to the Triton radar mandated in the committee provision, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million.

Plan for transfer of Air Force C–12 Liberty Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance aircraft (sec. 934)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop and carry out a plan to conduct the orderly transfer of the Air Force C–12 Liberty intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) aircraft to the Army and to the U.S. Special Operations Command or one of its components. The plan will ensure there is no impact to ongoing ISR operations in Afghanistan and around the world. The provision would also prohibit the Army from acquiring additional versions of its C–12 ISR system, the Enhanced Medium Altitude Reconnaissance and Surveillance System (EMARSS) in fiscal year 2014.

In another section of this report, the committee recommends no authorization for the procurement of four EMARSS aircraft, but authorizes the same amount to convert transferred Air Force C–12 Liberty aircraft to the EMARSS configuration.

The Air Force currently possesses 41 C–12 Liberty ISR aircraft. These aircraft are currently assigned to Air Combat Command and provide ISR and direct support to ground forces, including Special Operations Forces. The Army has been pursuing an Aerial ISR Strategy 2020 which includes a fleet of 24 manned aerial ISR aircraft based on the C–12 (Beechcraft 350)—procuring 12 new EMARSS aircraft and recapitalizing 12 existing Medium Altitude Multi-Intelligence aircraft. These aircraft will replace the legacy Guardrail systems resulting in the elimination or retirement of 58 manned ISR platforms.

In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), this committee recommended transferring Air Force C–12 Liberty ISR aircraft to the Army but relented at the insistence of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, and the leadership of the Air Force that the Air Force was committed to the mission of providing ISR support for ground forces. However, the attempted transfer of these aircraft by the Air Force to the National Guard prompted the Army to restart the EMARSS program.

The committee remains convinced that the Department of Defense requires only one fleet of C–12–based ISR aircraft to provide tactical support to ground forces in a permissive air defense environment and looks forward to reviewing the Secretary of Defense's plan on transfer and use of its C–12 ISR aircraft.

Subtitle D—Cyberspace-Related Matters

Authorities, capabilities, and oversight of United States Cyber Command (sec. 941)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to determine whether U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) requires signals intelligence (SIGINT) operational tasking authority (SOTA) as an inherent and essential aspect of its operational missions. If the Secretary determines that CYBERCOM needs SOTA to perform its missions, including military cyber operations such as maneuvering outside of national U.S. networks, operational preparation of the environment, development of targeting packages, and accessing databases held by the National Security Agency (NSA), the Secretary would delegate such authority to CYBERCOM in the Secretary's role as the President's Executive Agent for SIGINT under Executive Order 12333.

CYBERCOM, like elements of the intelligence community, requires the ability to access the global Internet for operational purposes without necessarily exposing those accesses to potential adversaries. In conflict situations, CYBERCOM may be called upon to take actions where it is not possible or necessary to act with stealth, and remain unnoticed and untraced. CYBERCOM, as a military organization, sometimes may be required to rapidly overwhelm military targets by massed action—the very antithesis of non-disruptive activity.

Similarly, CYBERCOM's offensive military forces may need to train and exercise capabilities to defeat targets not only by stealthy infiltration but by ensuring that they make use of a broad range of strategies, including by employing the cyber equivalent of sudden and overwhelming force. CYBERCOM's personnel and units may need capabilities, and training, to rapidly plan and execute potentially large-scale operations against new or unexpected targets where disruption or destruction is paramount, not stealth. Test ranges may be necessary, since CYBERCOM's forces cannot prepare for this type of operation out on the global Internet. The committee expects the Secretary to take these unique CYBERCOM requirements—many of which differ from the requirements of the intelligence community—into consideration in making the determination required by this section.

The provision recommended by the committee would require the Secretary to designate a Senate-confirmed official within the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy with the responsibility for oversight, and resource management of offensive cyber forces, including the national mission teams that will defend the nation by operating external to U.S. networks.

The committee is concerned that oversight of CYBERCOM and the cyber mission of the Department of Defense (DOD) is fragmented and weak. In part, this is unavoidable, inasmuch as cyber operations affect every segment of the Department, making clear lines of jurisdiction and responsibility impossible to draw. One organization is in charge of defensive cybersecurity, another for cyber intelligence missions, others for technology, architectures, and acquisition, and another for policy and operational considerations.

Oversight is further complicated by the varied organizational structures that the military services apply to cyber missions. In responding to the Secretary of Defense's direction to create a large number of cyber mission teams to conduct national cyber defense, support the combatant commands, and defend DOD networks, the services are struggling to classify the personnel who will man these teams. Some of the services are building offensive forces within existing service cryptologic organizations and commands, and intend to fund all such personnel under the Military Intelligence Program (MIP), while others fund and manage such personnel as they would any other warfighter. Personnel that will be assigned to teams that will "hunt" for adversaries in the defense of DOD networks are likely to be funded under the Information Systems Security Program.

Finally, the provision would require that the Secretary initiate the process of creating sophisticated training facilities and capabilities for cyber personnel in the military services and at CYBERCOM, independently of the intelligence community. The committee does not believe that offensive military cyber forces should be funded under the MIP. The committee is also concerned that the culture and outlook of signals intelligence collection, which is already overly dominant in this mission area, may be inappropriate to many cyber missions.

Joint software assurance center for the Department of Defense (sec. 942)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a joint software assurance center to serve as a resource for securing the software acquired, developed, maintained, and used in the Department of Defense (DOD). The provision would require the Secretary to consider whether an existing center could fulfill the purposes of the required center.

The provision would require the Secretary, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to issue a charter for the center that lays out: (1) the center's role in supporting program offices in implementing DOD's supply chain risk management strategy and policies; (2) the center's expertise and capabilities; (3) the center's management, in coordination with the Center for Assured Software (CAS) of the National Security Agency, of a research and development program to improve the capability of automated software

analysis tools; and (4) the center's management of the procurement and distribution of enterprise licenses for such analysis tools.

The provision also would require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, coincident with the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2016, on funding and management of the center, including a recommendation for the placement of the center organizationally within the Department.

A report to Congress in October 2011 from the Secretary of Defense on a strategy for assuring the security of DOD software and software-based applications indicated that a software assurance center would be useful to implement DOD's Trusted Systems and Networks strategy. The report further stated that an internal DOD study concluded that software vulnerability detection should be "organized centrally" to assure "a consistent response, coherent direction, and comprehensive coverage" at least until software assurance expertise and resources are developed and diffused across the Department. The committee believes that a software assurance center would best serve as the anchor point for that "centrally organized" effort, and the implementation of section 933 of the National Defense Authorization of Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

The mission of the center would be to educate, train, equip, and assist program management offices to achieve security in software developments and acquisitions. These services would require expertise in software assurance requirements, design, standards, best practices, technology and tools for code analysis, penetration testing, training, system certifications, and vulnerability remediation.

Section 933 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 mandated the use of automated vulnerability analysis tools during the entire lifecycle of critical DOD systems. A software assurance center would be a logical choice for managing the purchase and distribution of licenses for commercial automated code analysis tools, and for managing the development of improvements to code analysis tools.

Supervision of the acquisition of cloud computing capabilities for intelligence analysis (sec. 943)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense (DOD), and the Chairman of the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, to supervise the development and implementation of plans for the acquisition of cloud computing capabilities for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) data analysis in the military services and defense agencies.

The provision would specifically require plans for meeting requirements for interoperability and attribute-based access controls across the ISR cloud systems of DOD components, as well as for cross-domain enterprise-wide discovery and correlation of data stored in cloud and non-cloud databases, relational and non-relational databases, and any future hybrid or consolidated databases that have features and capabilities of both relational and non-relational databases. In addition, the provision would require these

plans to be integrated with the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise (DI2E), the Joint Information Environment (JIE), and the Intelligence Community Information Technology Enterprise (ICITE).

This provision is based in part on recommendations from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) report required by the House Report which accompanied H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). That report documented that DOD lacks guidance and standards governing the development of the services' cloud initiatives for analyzing ISR data and for integrating these activities with the DI2E, JIE, and ICITE. GAO also noted that, with the exception of the Army, the services have not yet developed strategies and implementation plans for their ISR clouds.

Cyber vulnerabilities of Department of Defense weapons systems and tactical communications systems (sec. 944)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, to report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees on the capability of each military service to operate in a hostile cyber environment. The report would be required to provide an assessment of the cyber threats to major weapons systems and tactical communications systems that could emerge within the next 5 years; an assessment of the cyber vulnerabilities of major weapons systems and tactical communications systems; a description of the current strategy to defend against battlefield cyber attacks; and an estimate of the costs to correct the vulnerabilities in the future.

The Department of Defense (DOD) has layered defenses for its desktop computers, laptops, servers, data centers, and backbone networks, including endpoint or host-based defensive systems, such as the Host-Based Security System (HBSS). Tactical networks, and the software elements of battlefield weapons systems, lack such protections. Such tactical systems are less readily accessible than the main DOD networks and computing equipment, and utilize more custom software, but in principle, they can be accessed and subverted through wireless communications means or through other wireless apertures, test equipment or other removable media, and through supply chain compromise. In important respects, battlefield cyber warfare is closely related to traditional electronic warfare. It is critically important for DOD to prepare for this type of conflict.

As highlighted in a January 2013 report by the Defense Science Board, DOD's dependence upon networked systems and components serves as "a magnet to U.S. opponents" and if left unaddressed, threatens our core warfighting capabilities. Every critical system from ground vehicle electronic systems and next generation aircraft to satellites and missile defense systems must be assessed to ensure that critical warfighting capabilities are not undermined and that the same level of emphasis placed on developmental and operational security in the physical domain be adequately addressed and applied in the cyber domain.

Strategy on use of the reserve components of the Armed Forces to support Department of Defense cyber missions (sec. 945)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy for using the reserve components of the armed forces to support the cyber missions of U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM), including in support of civil authorities, and to report to the congressional defense committees on this strategy within 180 days of the enactment of this Act.

CYBERCOM was established in 2009. While it has had large numbers of personnel assigned to execute its defensive mission to protect Department of Defense (DOD) networks, the number of qualified personnel available for offensive missions, including offensive operations in support of defensive missions, has been negligible.

CYBERCOM has now begun defining the numbers of positions and their associated specific skills, and the number of units into which those positions would be grouped, that are initially required to defend the Nation against major cyber attack, support the combatant commanders, and actively defend DOD networks.

The Secretary recently issued a directive to the services to undertake vigorous action to generate large numbers of such skilled cyber operators to meet these CYBERCOM manning requirements (over the next 4 years). The services are still in the early stages of responding to the Secretary's direction.

DOD is therefore only at the beginning stages of determining how the reserve components can and should be integrated into the process for providing a total force solution to CYBERCOM's manning requirements.

In developing the required strategy, the provision would require the Secretary to: (1) identify the DOD cyber mission requirements that could be discharged by members of the reserve components; (2) in consultation with state Governors, provide means for the states to provide their evaluation of state capabilities and the needs of their states for cyber capabilities that cannot be fulfilled by contracting through the private sector; (3) identify the existing capabilities of the reserve components and the current plans of the military services to utilize them to meet total force resource requirements; (4) assess whether the National Guard when activated in state status can operate under unique and useful authorities to support domestic cyber missions and CYBERCOM requirements; (5) evaluate the ability of the reserve components to attract, retain, manage the careers of, properly train, and organize personnel with substantial cyber technical expertise from the private sector; (6) develop an estimate of the costs of the personnel, infrastructure, training, and operations needed to integrate the reserve components into the total force solution to CYBERCOM's mission requirements; and (7) assess the appropriateness of hiring non-dual status technicians on a part-time basis, who possess appropriate cybersecurity expertise for purposes of assisting the National Guard in protecting critical infrastructure and carrying out cybersecurity missions in defense of the United States homeland.

The committee notes that there is a large and diverse array of companies and non-profit organizations in the private sector that

employ people with expertise in cybersecurity. These organizations not only can provide services to the states for day-to-day cybersecurity and for crisis and recovery support, but their employees could potentially provide a wealth of talent as members of the reserve components to support CYBERCOM's title 10 missions, including support to civil authorities. While it is not clear that DOD can attract these cyber experts to join the reserve components on a large scale, the potential payoff is so significant that it must be fully assessed.

The committee also notes, however, that these private sector resources are not evenly distributed across the country. Rather, they tend to be geographically concentrated. Furthermore, by the inherent virtual nature of cyberspace, the lack of physical proximity to a specific cyber event or network need not be a major barrier to the provision of support and collective effort. These factors may have a significant impact on how reserve component cyber personnel should be organized and situated.

Control of the proliferation of cyber weapons (sec. 946)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to establish an interagency process to develop policy to control the proliferation of cyber weapons through unilateral and cooperative export controls, law enforcement activities, financial means, diplomatic engagement, and other means that the President considers appropriate. The process should involve subject matter experts from across the government, including the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of State, and the intelligence community. The provision would require the interagency process to produce recommendations within 270 days of the enactment of this Act.

In testimony before the committee and in many other settings, executive branch civilian and military leaders have continually pointed to cyber threats as some of the most grave facing our country. Recent examples of such threats include the distributed denial of service attacks directed at U.S. financial institutions and the Shamoon malware cited by former Secretary of Defense Panetta that rendered 30,000 computers useless at Saudi Aramco, Saudi Arabia's state-owned oil company. The types of dangerous software used to perpetrate these malicious incidents are actively traded on a global black market, and they are also available in the so-called gray market, through unscrupulous companies. Through these illicit channels, it is possible to procure or even rent sophisticated tools and large-scale infrastructure (such as compromised computers) to subvert computer systems and networks. This thriving marketplace is driving research and development of more advanced cyber capabilities.

In order to address these challenges, the provision would require the President to determine the types of malicious software that can and should be controlled through existing export control schemes. This process will require developing definitions and categories for controlled cyber technologies and determining how to address dual-use, lawful intercept, and penetration testing technologies. After determining which types of cyber technologies should be controlled,

the process should identify the intelligence, law enforcement, and financial tools that can be applied to control and contain their development, proliferation, and use. However, the approaches developed must also take into account the needs of legitimate cybersecurity professionals to mitigate vulnerabilities, and not stifle innovation in tools and technology that are necessary for national security and the cybersecurity of the Nation.

Finally, the provision would require the President to develop a statement of principles regarding U.S. positions on controlling the proliferation of cyber weapons to create new opportunities for bilateral and multilateral cooperation to address this shared threat. Such principles could be leveraged for a multilateral cyber initiative that could build and operationalize a shared consensus on limiting the spread of malicious software, increasing accountability, and creating a foundation for collective action.

Integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyberspace (sec. 947)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to establish an interagency process to develop an integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyberspace. The provision would require the President to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on this policy within 270 days after the enactment of this Act.

The committee has been pressing for a strategy and doctrine for deterring adversaries from attacking the United States and our allies for years. The administration has made some progress in this area, producing some elements of such a strategy, but the depth and breadth of the analysis and explanation of the U.S. posture needs to be significantly improved.

Centers of Academic Excellence for Information Assurance matters (sec. 948)

The committee recommends a provision that would ensure that Centers of Academic Excellence (CAEs) in Information Assurance do not lose their certification as CAEs in fiscal year 2014 as a result of recent changes in the certification criteria developed by the National Security Agency (NSA). The provision also would require the President, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and with the advice of the National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity, to: (1) determine whether information assurance has matured to the point where the Federal Government should no longer serve as the accrediting authority for information assurance programs at institutions of higher education; and (2) based on that determination, reform the current practice of NSA developing the criteria to guide the curricula and certifying the status of the CAEs.

The first CAEs for Information Assurance were established more than a decade ago under the direction of officials on the National Security Council staff. There are now approximately 165 CAEs across the country, with partnerships extending to many community colleges. The Department of Defense funds a scholarship-for-service program at these CAEs, as does the National Science Foundation.

The guidelines for the curriculum and the criteria for certifying these CAEs were first developed by NSA under the direction of the Committee on National Security Systems. These guidelines and criteria have not been updated since.

In 2010, the administration established the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education (NICE), pursuant to which they assigned responsibility for Formal Cybersecurity Education to the Secretary of Education and the National Science Foundation. The widely held expectation was that modernization of the CAE guidelines and criteria would issue from the NICE initiative consistent with a Cybersecurity Workforce Framework developed by the National Institute for Standards and Technology.

Instead, NSA unilaterally revised the certification criteria by issuing new draft knowledge units and other criteria to which the CAEs would be required to align their curricula. Universities and colleges that were up for renewal of their certifications would have to realign their programs immediately.

Many of the CAEs are very concerned about NSA's actions, and perceive that the new knowledge units are unduly focused on the highly technical aspects of information assurance, which, while perhaps appropriate for the specific needs of NSA and the Department of Homeland Security for government employees, are not suited for the broad needs of government (at all levels) and the private sector for cybersecurity professionals. NSA officials maintain that almost all current CAEs will be able to qualify under the new guidelines without hardship or significant expense if they choose to do so. However, a significant number of the CAEs do not agree.

The committee's provision would provide time to step back and address fundamental issues. It would also require a determination whether information assurance programs are now sufficiently mature to be accredited in the same manner as other established academic disciplines. Accreditation is normally managed by the private sector in a peer-driven process involving institutions and constituencies that serve and are served by the discipline being taught. Since the CAEs were created over a decade ago, reliance on the Internet has become universal and the cyber threat is ubiquitous, affecting the entire Nation. There are now strong constituencies throughout government and industry, and peer institutions in academia and the private sector that have vital interests in the curriculum and educational capabilities in information assurance in the Nation's institutes of higher education. They not only deserve a seat at the table, but they have valuable knowledge and experience to impart.

The committee notes that a large number of federal departments have significant cybersecurity education initiatives underway, and all of government has a vital interest in cybersecurity. NSA has unique expertise, to be sure, but no longer a monopoly. At a minimum, a government-wide, coordinated process should be used to establish curricula and criteria for designation for the CAEs. It is also possible that, after reviewing the matter, the President and academia itself could decide that the time has come for information assurance to become a recognized academic discipline with an independent accreditation body and process.

While the President is making these decisions and establishing a broader and more peer- and constituency-driven accreditation process, the committee believes that the status quo for the CAEs should be maintained.

Items of Special Interest

Assessment of multi-year procurement of GPS III satellites

In an effort to reduce acquisition costs, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to assess the feasibility and advisability of multi-year procurement of the GPS III satellite system under existing authorities. The assessment shall be due by February 28, 2014.

Assessment of the costs, risks, and benefits of storage on produced satellites

For affordability and to ensure manufacturing and production lines are optimized, the Department of Defense (DOD) generally buys satellites in block quantities. However, over the last few decades, data shows that satellites are generally outliving their expected lifetimes. This often times means that fully produced satellites sit in storage for extended periods of time, sometimes more than 5 years. More importantly, it is not fully known to DOD or the development contractor what effect storage will have on the eventual operational lifetime of a satellite. In addition to risk, there are costs associated with extended storage to include battery replacement, additional functional testing, and the need to maintain standing armies of engineers to be on call in the event an anomaly may occur. Stored satellites have also been launched at longer intervals to strategically address the late deliveries of follow on satellite acquisitions. The committee directs the Comptroller General to assess the costs, risks, and benefits of storage on produced satellites. The assessment shall include:

(1) an assessment of DOD and contractor data, if any, on the effects that storage has on the operational lifetimes of satellites, to include correlations between years in storage and expected and eventual satellite lifetimes;

(2) an identification of the costs associated with satellite storage over the past 5 years as well as anticipated storage costs over the next 5 years;

(3) an explanation of the steps DOD has taken, if any, to strategically extend the lifetimes of satellite constellations, while incurring unanticipated storage costs; and

(4) the steps that DOD is taking to better understand storage and its overall effects on satellite operational lifetimes; and

(5) the strategic benefit of being able to rapidly reconstitute certain satellites, and if storage is the most cost effective means for doing so.

The assessment shall be due by April 30, 2014.

Core staff of the National Reconnaissance Office

The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), while a Department of Defense (DOD) agency, has long been considered a loose cadre of experts loaned from various defense and intelligence agencies.

This loaning of experts has positive and negative aspects. The positive aspect of this personnel rotation is the ability to bring new talent with fresh ideas to tackle some of the most challenging problems related to space systems. In fact, DOD personnel who return from a tour at NRO have developed synergies between these two organizations leading to a cadre of space professionals, which this committee believes should be sustained and nurtured by the DOD. Section 912 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) shows the committee's long-standing interest in maintaining a space cadre by requiring biennial reports on the Department's space professionals. The negative aspect of the personnel rotation program is a constantly changing workforce that is loaned to a large agency with no long-term core knowledge base of scientists, engineers, contracting specialists, and legal staff. Such a core group within the NRO can carry forward the corporate knowledge as the majority of the NRO staff rotates to and from their home agencies. Given that a significant portion of staff at the NRO is from DOD, the committee looks forward to exploring the parameters of such a core group of individuals within the NRO in the upcoming fiscal year.

Estimated cost to relocate spectrum

Testimony before this committee has suggested moving the Department of Defense (DOD) off spectrum below 3 GHz. The committee remains skeptical and concerned with the technical feasibility and risk in such a move. The committee directs DOD to assess the impact on mission and cost of such a proposed move and provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2014.

Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle

The Secretary of the Air Force has announced an acquisition strategy that involves the procurement of 36 rocket cores over the next 5 years with the availability of an additional 14 cores to be competed for by the incumbent as well as any launch providers that qualify under Air Force new entrant guidelines. The committee understands that as a result of the acquisition strategy, approximately $1.1 billion in cost savings will be achieved with the block buy of 36 cores and the Air Force is to be commended for these cost savings. Further, the committee understands that while the Air Force has completed its New Entrant Strategy, the other major user of the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV), the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), has not. The committee will want to compare the Air Force and the NRO strategies and to understand what differences there are and why, since both the Air Force and the NRO will use these 14 cores. Furthermore, the committee expects the Director of the NRO to consult with the Air Force on any differences in strategy that significantly deviate from the Air Force approach.

The committee's understanding from new entrants is that while they are generally pleased with the strategy, there are still concerns with the EELV Launch Capability (ELC) funding and whether it gives an unfair advantage to the incumbent. The committee will want to understand the nature of the ELC during competition

for the 14 cores in addition to the 36 core block buy. The committee will look carefully in the out-years as to the structure of future acquisition strategies and in particular how the ELC will be structured, assuming there are multiple launch providers.

Likewise, the committee expects that once a new entrant is certified it will have to establish the acquisition rigor that the current incumbent undergoes—business systems that substantially comply with Department of Defense data requirements and cost accounting standards, including certified cost or price data to protect taxpayers' interest that it is paying a reasonable and appropriate price and Defense Contracting Audit Agency audits to verify and validate contractors' systems and data. Certification by the Air Force must also be closely monitored to ensure technical standards are consistent with the risk level of the mission prior to contract award.

Joint Space Operations Center Mission System Program

The committee continues to believe that improvements to the space situational awareness and space command and control capabilities of the United States are critical, and the Department of Defense has the opportunity to achieve efficiency and cost effectiveness by utilizing, to the maximum extent possible, readily available commercial and government-developed capabilities. The committee fully expects the Air Force to pursue a tailored incremental information technology approach with priority given to transition from the legacy Space Defense Operations Center system by 2014.

The committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force to, when appropriate, fully incorporate existing, mature, commercial technology products in order to replace the legacy system on an accelerated basis and utilize efficient testing and validation methods. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than August 1, 2013, assessing the Air Force's plan of execution for the Increment 2 schedule, based upon available funding.

Mainframe computer security

The Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) operates a large number of mainframe computers to process and store critical Department of Defense (DOD) information. These mainframes are protected by some elements of DOD's layered cybersecurity defenses, but other layers are absent, in part because mainframes have unique features and attack vectors for which standard defense systems and architectures do not apply. However, DISA's position is that these mainframes do not require the same level of attention because they have inherently elevated security, achieved through the rigorous architecture, engineering, access procedures, and programming languages applied to mainframe computing.

The committee agrees that mainframe computers have better built-in security, but disagrees that these enhanced security features alone are sufficient to provide the level of protection needed. In addition, the importance of mainframes to DOD's information enterprise makes them an attractive target. According to General Keith Alexander, the Commander of U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) and the Director of the National Security Agency

(NSA), in testimony before the committee, "there's more work that needs to be done in protecting the mainframe computers and that portion of the total information infrastructure."

The committee directs that CYBERCOM and NSA jointly conduct a vulnerability assessment of DOD mainframe computers, and make recommendations to the Chief Information Officer and the Director of DISA for addressing vulnerabilities that may exist, within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act.

Modernization of Defense Support Program Mobile Ground System

The Secretary of the Air Force is directed to report to the congressional defense committees on efforts to modernize the Defense Support Program Mobile Ground System for integration into the Space Based Infrared System. The report shall be due to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2014.

Payload processing services

The committee understands that the Air Force has taken steps that may undermine competition for payload processing for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program. Given the Air Force's initiatives to instill competition in the EELV program, the committee is concerned that the Air Force has not taken all appropriate steps to encourage competition for payload processing services. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force within 90 days of the enactment of this Act to provide a plan to the congressional defense committees on how the Air Force intends to ensure competition in payload processing services.

Report on disaggregation and payload hosting

Much has been stated by the Department of Defense on the attributes of disaggregating sensors and hosting these payloads on other satellite systems to potentially reduce cost and increase survivability. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) is directed to assess the potential benefits and drawbacks of disaggregating key military space systems and examine whether disaggregation and payload hosting offers either decreased acquisition and life cycle cost and increased survivability of a constellation compared to more traditional approaches such as incremental technological improvements of the existing satellite architecture and the use of block buy or fixed price acquisition strategy. In particular, the GAO is directed to examine these concepts on three systems, the Space Based Infrared Satellite (SBIRS), the Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite system, and the follow-on defense weather satellite system. There is precedent with the use of SBIRS Highly Elliptical Orbit 1 and 2 on hosted payloads. The report for this effort shall be due by March 31, 2014.

Report on Family of Advanced Beyond Line of Sight Command Terminals for airborne platforms

There has been much re-scoping of the Family of Advanced Line of Sight Command Terminals (FAB–T). Originally intended for ground, command post (air and ground), as well as the B–2 and B–52 aircraft, the committee understands that the Air Force is now

considering only the ground and command post versions of the terminal. If a version of the terminal is proven feasible for the B–2 and B–52 aircraft, the committee directs the Air Force in coordination with U.S. Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM) to provide an assessment of whether the requirement for integrating these terminals into the airframes is still valid and if the Air Force intends to provide a follow-on FAB–T capability for these aircraft and by what timeframe. The assessment shall be due by February 28, 2014 and shall include the views of the Commander of USSTRATCOM.

Report on North Korea's ability to develop a functional nuclear-armed long-range ballistic missile

In April 2012, North Korea first displayed what appeared to be a mobile intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), referred to as the KN–08, which has not yet been flight tested. In December 2012, after more than a decade of efforts to launch a satellite with the Taepo Dong space-launch vehicle (SLV), North Korea succeeded for the first time in placing a satellite in orbit with the Taepo Dong-2 SLV, thus demonstrating success with the development of ballistic missile technology. On February 12, 2013, North Korea announced that it had successfully conducted its third nuclear test. As Madelyn Creedon, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs, testified to the committee, "North Korea's long-range ballistic missile capabilities have advanced rapidly during the last year. The increased pace of this emerging threat required the United States to adapt its homeland defense capabilities . . . . These programs demonstrate North Korea's commitment to develop long-range missile technology that could pose a direct threat to the United States."

These developments have caused concern that North Korea may be capable of deploying a nuclear-armed long-range ballistic missile. However, to the best of our knowledge, North Korea has never flight tested a full production representative long-range ballistic missile, and has not flight tested the reentry vehicle or associated nuclear warhead technologies. The Department of Defense issued a statement in April 2013 that, "it would be inaccurate to suggest that the North Korean regime has fully developed and tested" nuclear weapons capable of being delivered by ballistic missiles. According to the Director of National Intelligence, "North Korea has not yet demonstrated the full range of capabilities necessary for a nuclear-armed missile."

North Korea has clearly made substantial progress on long-range ballistic missile technology and on developing nuclear weapons. These are topics of intense interest to the U.S. Intelligence Community, elements of which have been assessing these two aspects of North Korea's capabilities separately. However, there has not yet been an assessment looking at both North Korea's long-range missile and nuclear warhead capabilities to provide an integrated assessment of its ability to produce a working nuclear-armed ICBM.

Consequently, the Director of National Intelligence is directed to assess the ability and time frame for North Korea to produce a fully functional long-range ballistic missile armed with a working nuclear warhead. The assessment shall consider the challenges of

successfully designing, engineering, and producing a nuclear explosives package that can fit into a re-entry body, capable of withstanding the full flight trajectory of a ballistic missile, with fusing that can arm and detonate the warhead on a target. The assessment should also identify what, if any, capabilities North Korea may have achieved.

As part of this assessment, the Director of National Intelligence is to consult with the Department of Energy on the physics and engineering of such a nuclear explosives package that can fit in the reentry body, survive flight trajectory, and the necessary fusing to arm the warhead. The Director's assessment shall reflect the views of the Department of Energy.

In the assessment, the Director of National Intelligence shall provide an estimate of North Korea's status on the critical technologies to be developed in the nuclear explosives package, the reentry body, the fuse system, and the estimated timeframe to assemble a complete and fully functional warhead on a long-range ballistic missile system. The assessment shall include any dissenting or minority intelligence community determinations and shall be completed and provided to the congressional defense committees and congressional intelligence committees no later than February 28, 2014.

Report on space situational awareness

The Secretary of the Air Force is directed to conduct a Gap Analysis on the systems of sensors used for space situational awareness (SSA), evaluating those: currently employed; in procurement; and not yet procured, or in the case of the Space Based Surveillance System, what a future replacement would be to deliver similar capability at a lower cost. For sensors not procured, the Secretary is directed to provide the estimated cost of procurement and the incremental improvement to the SSA architecture. The Secretary is directed to consider non-traditional sensors such as sea-based X-band radar integrated in a net-centric fashion to the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System. The report for this effort shall be due by February 28, 2014.

Satellite communications strategy

The Secretary of Defense is directed to provide a report detailing a 5-, 10-, and 25-year strategy for using an appropriate mix of Department of Defense (DOD) and commercial satellite bandwidth. The committee believes considerable savings can be achieved by purchasing commercial bandwidth in larger block quantities. However, to date, DOD has been unable to define the appropriate mix between government provided and commercially purchased satellite communications and has relied on more expensive spot market buys. For procuring commercial satellite bandwidth, the Secretary must recognize that long-term or capital leasing of commercial bandwidth typically results in the cost over the life of the lease being net-present valued by the Congressional Budget Office in year one of the lease. For multi-year procurement of satellite bandwidth, issues associated with termination liability will also present up-front costing challenges in year 1. Accordingly, as part of the strategy, the Secretary is directed to consider the use of a capital

working fund or other mechanisms for leasing or multi-year procurement of commercial bandwidth. These alternative procurement arrangements should only be used where the use of DOD or other government satellites are not available or is more costly than in the private sector. The report shall be due February 28, 2014.

The Government Accountability Office is directed to review the acquisition strategy of the report no later than 90 days after submittal of the report.

Satellite control system modernization plan

The committee directs the Air Force to develop a long-term plan for modernizing its Satellite Control Network and any future shared satellite control services and capabilities consistent with the second recommendation found on page 28 of the Government Accountability Office report "Satellite Control Operations", GAO–13–315. The plan shall be due by April 30, 2014.

Space Based Infrared Satellite, GEO 5 and 6

The committee understands that the Air Force intends to procure Space Based Infrared Satellites (SBIRS), GEO 5 and 6 using a block buy, fixed price strategy to reduce costs. Such an acquisition strategy is admirable. However, the committee understands that SBIRS GEO 5 and 6 is to use much the same technology as in earlier versions found in GEO 1 and 2. If such an approach is used, that means that GEO 5 and 6 when launched in the 2020 timeframe will be using, for instance, focal plane technology developed in the 1990s, which is 30 years old. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to assess the technology insertion path for GEO 5 and 6 and whether it is feasible to insert newer focal plane and other technologies into GEO 5 and 6 within a block buy acquisition strategy and the estimated cost. If not feasible, how does the Air force intend to break the ongoing cycle of technology insertion maturity versus risk where the cost to develop next generation satellites becomes cost prohibitive and high risk with long periods of non-recurring engineering. The assessment shall be due by February 28, 2014. The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to review the assessment performed by the Air Force within 90 days of submission to the committee.

Strategic solid rocket motor industrial base

The committee believes that a healthy industrial base for strategic solid rocket motors, including multiple providers, promotes competition, improves vendor performance, and reduces costs. The committee strongly encourages the Air Force to promote and maintain the health and competitiveness of this crucial sector of the industrial base and to make its viability a key consideration in future acquisition decisions involving Minuteman III sustainment and the post 2030 Ground Based Strategic Deterrent.

Trusted agent for spectrum

An important element of working with the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Commerce Spectrum Management Advisory Committee (CSMAC) is the use of trusted agents; technically trained individuals from industry with appropriate security clear-

ances that can work as an interface between industry and DOD in assessing the ability to share or clear spectrum that is currently in use by the Department. The committee understands that the Department has been reviewing the procedures for using trusted agents. However, the review process has taken an exceedingly long time, causing delays in the ability of DOD to effectively work with industry. The committee directs the Department to report back on the status of implementing procedures for using trusted agents as part of the CSMAC process by July 31, 2013.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

General transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to $4.0 billion of funds authorized in division A of this Act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. Transfers of funds between military personnel authorizations would not be counted toward the dollar limitation in this provision.

Department of Defense Readiness Restoration Fund (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a Department of Defense (DOD) Readiness Restoration Fund in order to provide the DOD with increased flexibility to transfer funds that may be available to high priority readiness accounts, where necessary to address significant shortfalls in funding otherwise available for the training activities of the armed forces (including flying hours and steaming days) and the maintenance of military equipment.

The committee directs the Department to notify Congress regarding the use of this authority using guidelines similar to that of notifications to Congress for the use of general transfer authorities.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

Extension of authority to support the unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, for 2 fiscal years, the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to support the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign of the Government of Colombia. The provision would also incorporate an updated notification to Congress to improve transparency of the Department of Defense's use of this authority.

The committee notes that the Government of Colombia has made and continues to make progress combating narcotics trafficking and designated foreign terrorist organizations. This type of flexible authority is still required to assist the Government of Colombia consolidate its hard-fought gains, but the committee expects to see reductions in the level of assistance provided to Colombia, as has been agreed to in our bilateral engagements with the Colombians.

Extension of authority for joint task forces to provide support to law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities (sec. 1012)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, by 2 fiscal years, the support by joint task forces under section 1022(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as most recently amended by section 1011 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

While the committee continues to be pleased with the Department's judicious use of this authority, the committee also believes there are additional activities that could potentially be conducted, most notably in additional investments in developing intelligence and supporting other departments' and agencies' efforts to develop additional intelligence on the nexus that exists between transnational criminal organizations and foreign terrorist organizations. The committee urges the Department to look closely at these matters in North Africa.

Extension and expansion of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments (sec. 1013)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, by 5 years, the authority to provide support for counterdrug activities of certain foreign governments under subsection (a)(2) of section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 1006 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). The provision would also expand the list of countries eligible to receive support to include the Governments of Chad, Libya, Mali, and Niger.

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

Modification of requirements for annual long-range plan for the construction of naval vessels (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 231 of title 10, Unites Sates Code, to include a requirement to report on the total cost of construction for each vessel used to determine estimated levels of annual funding in the report, and an assessment of the extent of the strategic and operational risk to national security whenever the number or capabilities of the naval vessels in the plan do not meet requirements.

Report on naval vessels and the Force Structure Assessment (sec. 1022)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 1, 2014, that would assess the current fleet capabilities compared to the threat and the likely situation over the next 30 years. The CNO should produce an unclassified report, and a classified annex to that report.

Section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required the Secretary of the Navy to provide a comprehensive description of the current requirements for combatant vessels of the Navy, including submarines. The Navy submitted that report which reflected that, while the previous requirement was for a fleet of 313 ships, originally identified in a 2005 Force Structure Assessment (FSA) and revalidated in 2010, the new requirements have declined to a total of 306 ships.

Within this seven-ship net decrease to 306 ships, actual combat power is reduced by six large surface combatants, three small surface combatants, and four cruise missile submarines, for a total reduction of 13 combatant ships, offset by an increase of six command and support ships. The reduction in cruise missile submarines reflects a Navy plan not to replace these ships when they retire in the late 2020s.

In congressional testimony this year about the 2012 FSA, representatives of the Department of the Navy asserted that the revised fleet size goal considered various factors, including the revised Defense Strategic Guidance in 2012, changed Navy mission requirements, different individual ship capabilities, fleet networking capabilities, and ship basing arrangements and operational cycles, as opposed to just platforms or numbers of ships.

The committee notes that the current fleet of 283 battle force ships provides combatant commanders (COCOM) with a greater array of fire power than did the Navy fleets of 500 or more ships of the Cold War era, with precision-guided air-delivered weapons, numbers of Tomahawk-capable ships, and the sophistication of command, control, communications, and computer systems; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) systems; and networking capabilities that did not exist during the Cold War.

The President's 2012 revised U.S. defense strategy calls for a rebalancing towards the Asia-Pacific region, a predominantly maritime and aerospace domain. This will most likely increase demands for Navy fleet resources and deployments in that region in competition with global demand. Regarding global demands for naval forces, Navy officials testified last year that fully satisfying COCOM requests for forward-deployed Navy forces in various regions would require more than 500 ships.

The Report to Congress on the Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels for FY 2014, dated May 10, 2013, proposes near-term retirements of cruisers and amphibious ships, resulting in 270 ships, the smallest fleet since 1917. The committee is concerned that the plan will not meet the goal of a 306-ship battle force inventory until 2037 and assumes risk over the 30-year period, with periodic shortages of aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, attack submarines, and amphibious ships. The committee notes that the Navy possesses only 28 amphibious ships, with an average of only 22 ships available for surge deployment, despite a Marine Corps requirement for 38 amphibious ships. As such, the committee is also concerned that the Navy's shortfall in amphibious ships adds risk to the Marine Corps' ability to meet current and future COCOM requests.

There are also risks with the Navy's plan beyond mere numbers of ships:

(1) within the plan, the Navy intends that the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) will comprise over one third of the Navy's total surface combatant fleet by 2028. This fact compounds risk, since the LCS to date has not completed operational testing or demonstrated adequate performance of assigned missions in critical areas of mine countermeasures, anti-surface warfare, or anti-submarine operations;

(2) with its decision in the fiscal year 2013 budget to delay the procurement of the first Ohio-class replacement ballistic missile submarine by 2 years, to fiscal year 2021, the Navy has consumed all schedule margin for replacing the existing Ohio-class boats on a timely basis, and increased the risk that an unforeseen event affecting a strategic missile submarine's operational availability would prevent the Navy from being able to fully satisfy U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) requirements; and

(3) the 2012 FSA and the shipbuilding plan do not account for the possible effects of further budget cuts under the Budget Control Act of 2011. Various representatives of the Navy have testified that, if Department of Defense budgets are reduced below levels shown in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2014, the Navy will have to reduce the size and capabilities of the fleet to reflect further changes in U.S. defense strategy and available Navy resources.

Given the risks inherent in the planned size of the Navy, the capabilities of the ships planned, the rate of Navy ship procurement, and the potential affordability of the Navy's shipbuilding plans at a time of significant uncertainty in defense budgets, the committee agrees that in order to adequately assess the ability of the fleet proposed by the 2012 FSA to meet national security requirements, there needs to be an objective set of standards to assess the ability of the Navy to meet national security objectives, as opposed to simply relying on numbers and types of platforms.

The committee also believes that a failure to recapitalize our sea-based strategic nuclear deterrent on time would have devastating impacts on deterrence and strategic stability. Accordingly, the committee directs the CNO to pay particular attention in producing the report to the Navy's ability to fully meet STRATCOM requirements.

Repeal of policy relating to propulsion systems of any new class of major combatant vessels of the strike forces of the United States Navy (sec. 1023)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). That section requires that the Navy build any new class of major surface combatant and amphibious assault ship with an integrated nuclear power system, unless the Secretary of the Navy notifies the congressional defense committees that, as a result of a cost-benefit analysis, it would not be practical for the Navy to design the class of ships with an integrated nuclear power system.

As a matter of acquisition management laws and regulations, the Navy must conduct an analysis of alternatives (AoA) for all such vessels to determine the ship characteristics, including the required propulsion and power generation mechanism. The AoA outcome for each surface combatant and amphibious assault ship should be based on an independent and objective systems engineering and business case analysis. Within that analysis, the Navy can evaluate the advisability of using an integrated nuclear propulsion system to determine the best value for the Federal Government.

Clarification of sole ownership resulting from ship donations at no cost to the Navy (sec. 1024)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend subsection (a) of section 7306 of title 10, United States Code. Section 7306, which governs disposition of vessels stricken from the Naval Vessel Register, authorizes the Department of the Navy to donate any vessel stricken from the Naval Vessel Register. The provision requires that, as a condition of a donation, donated naval vessels be maintained in a condition satisfactory to the Secretary of the Navy. The Navy has found that this statutory requirement presents numerous problems associated with ownership, maintenance costs, and historic preservation. The provision would eliminate the statutory requirement with regard to future donations, but would not affect prior donation contracts.

The provision clarifies the purpose of any such transfer would be to operate the vessel as a museum or memorial for public display in the United States. This additional language would provide the Navy with the flexibility to oversee a vessel donee's actions, without any implication that the Navy retains ownership of the vessel.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

Transfers to foreign countries of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1031)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer or release Guantanamo detainees to their country of origin or another country other than the United States if: (1) the Secretary of Defense has determined, based on the findings of the Periodic Review Board process, that the detainee no longer constitutes a threat to U.S. national security; (2) the transfer or release is required to effectuate a court order; or (3) the detainee has been tried in a court or competent tribunal on charges based on the same conduct that served as the basis for his designation as an enemy combatant and the detainee has been acquitted of such charges or has been convicted and served the sentence pursuant to the conviction.

The provision would also require that for other transfers of Guantanamo detainees to countries other than the United States, the Secretary of Defense must determine prior to any such transfer that actions have been or will be taken that will substantially mitigate the risk of the detainee re-engaging in terrorist or other hostile activity against the United States, and that the transfer is in the U.S. national security interest. The Secretary would be re-

quired to submit a notification to the appropriate congressional committees not less than 30 days in advance of the transfer or release, including a statement of the basis for the transfer or release.

The committee notes that the administration has raised concerns that the certification requirements Congress has enacted on the transfer of Guantanamo detainees to foreign countries have made it difficult, if not impossible, to carry out such transfers. At the same time, the administration has yet to attempt to transfer any Guantanamo detainee under the certification requirements or to use the national security waiver granted under section 1028 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) and section 1028 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). The committee emphasizes that the certification requirements for such transfers were never intended to constitute an absolute prohibition on the transfer of Guantanamo detainees to countries other than the United States, and believes the provisions of this section should help clarify the requirements applicable to such transfers.

Authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment (sec. 1032)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to authorize the temporary transfer of detainees at the Guantanamo detention facility (GTMO) to a Department of Defense (DOD) medical facility for the sole purpose of providing emergency or critical medical treatment that is not available at GTMO and is necessary to prevent death or imminent significant injury or harm to the individual's health. The detainee would not be admitted into the United States during the period of the medical treatment and must be returned to GTMO as soon as medically feasible.

The committee notes that the United States is obligated under domestic law and Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions to provide for the humane treatment of detainees in its custody. The authority granted the Secretary of Defense under this section would address concerns that have arisen regarding the standard of medical care for GTMO detainees, particularly as that population ages, and U.S. compliance with its obligations to provide humane treatment.

Limitation on the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1033)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 2014 the prohibition under section 1027 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1911) on the transfer or release of detainees held at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (GTMO) to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive this prohibition for the transfer of GTMO detainees to the United States for detention and trial if: (1) the Secretary deter-

mines that such a transfer is in the national security interest of the United States; (2) steps have been taken to address any risk to public safety; and (3) the appropriate congressional committees are notified not later than 30 days in advance of any such transfer to the United States.

Clarification of procedures for use of alternate members on military commissions (sec. 1034)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 47A of title 10, United States Code, on military commissions to clarify the authority and procedures by which the convening authority may detail alternate members to a military commission. The provision would also clarify the military judge's discretion to grant both parties additional peremptory challenges as may be required in the interests of justice.

Subtitle E—Nuclear Forces

Modification of responsibilities and reporting requirements of Nuclear Weapons Council (sec. 1041)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 179 of title 10, United States Code, by striking the responsibilities for nuclear command, control, and communications since other sections of this Act establishes a Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System. The provision adds a new responsibility to report on joint activities between the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy on nuclear security.

Modification of deadline for report on plan for nuclear weapons stockpile and nuclear weapons complex (sec. 1042)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), which provides for a report to the congressional defense committees with a 10-year funding profile for the Department of Energy's (DOE) and the Department of Defense's (DOD) strategic deterrent modernization program. Specifically, the provision would give both departments 60 days after budget submission to deliver the section 1043 report. If a delay is anticipated that is greater than 60 days, DOE and DOD must notify the congressional defense committees before the President's budget submission and provide a briefing no later than 30 days after budget submission. The committee expects the briefing to be detailed enough and consistent with section 1043 to enable the congressional defense committees to conduct their oversight duties.

Last year, the section 1043 report was submitted to the congressional defense committees on May 7, 2012, more than 60 days past the fiscal year 2013 budget submission and without the 10-year projection by DOE which Congress never received. This year, Congress received the 10-year DOE projection but has not received the 10-year DOD budget projection nor the section 1043 report.

The revised requirements recommended by the committee should be sufficient to accommodate the interagency coordination process

between DOD and DOE. If DOD and DOE fail to meet the standard of reasonableness laid out in this provision the committee will legislate with stronger measures.

Cost estimates and comparisons relating to interoperable warhead (sec. 1043)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of the Department of Defense Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation to estimate life extensions of the W–78 and W–88 warheads and compare that to the interoperable warhead that is to replace both systems. In addition the provision would direct a cost estimation of the W–87 warhead. No funds may be spent past phase 6.2A for the interoperable warhead until the cost comparison with straight life extensions of the W–88 and W–78 warheads has been completed and submitted to the congressional defense committees, which is to be no later than April 1, 2014.

Sense of Congress on ensuring the modernization of United States nuclear forces (sec. 1044)

The committee recommends a provision that states it is the policy of the United States to modernize or replace the nuclear triad and sustain the nuclear stockpile, its production facilities, and science base.

Readiness and flexibility of intercontinental ballistic missile force (sec. 1045)

The committee recommends a provision that states the Secretary of Defense may in a manner consistent with international obligations, retain missile launch facilities currently supporting up to 800 deployed and non-deployed strategic launchers, maintain intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) on alert or operationally deployed status, and preserve ICBM silos in operational or warm status. A report is required not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the feasibility and advisability of preserving ICBM silos in operational or warm status.

Subtitle F—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

National security spectrum strategy (sec. 1051)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a national security spectrum strategy to be performed at least once every 5 years. The strategy is to provide near-term (5 years), mid-term (10 years), and long-term (30 years) assessments of the need for national security spectrum.

Department of Defense representation in dispute resolution regarding surrender of Department of Defense bands of electromagnetic frequencies (sec. 1052)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1062(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (P.L. 106–65) to require that the Department of Defense be adequately represented to convey its views with the interagency process for spectrum allocation.

Sense of Senate on parental rights of members of the Armed Forces in child custody determinations (sec. 1053)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that State courts should not consider military deployment as the sole factor in determining child custody in a State court proceeding involving a parent who is a member of the armed forces. The best interest of the child should always prevail in custody cases, but members of the armed forces should not lose custody of their children based solely upon service to our country.

Subtitle G—Studies and Reports

Repeal and modification of reporting requirements (sec. 1061)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal or modify a number of reporting requirements that have been included in law in past years. The requirements recommended for repeal or modification in this provision are requirements identified by the committee as being no longer relevant or necessary and that can be repealed or modified without adversely affecting the committee's oversight responsibilities.

Report on plans for the disposition of the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle fleet (sec. 1062)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the Department's analysis and plans for the disposition and sustainment of its fleet of mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicles. The committee is aware that long-term plans for the distribution and sustainment of the fleet have been studied by the Department of Defense and each of the military departments. Given the significant investment in MRAP vehicles over the last 10 years, the committee wants to understand the Department's management and funding plans for MRAP disposal, retention, integration, and sustainment including modernization or upgrades, if any, necessary to meet current or future survivability and mobility requirements.

Report on foreign language support contracts for the Department of Defense (sec. 1063)

The committee recognizes that Department of Defense (DOD) operations require personnel with a range of foreign language skills and regional expertise, such as translation and interpretation capabilities. As evidenced in recent operational experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq, these capabilities can be critical factors to mission success. Further, the committee believes that changes to the size and location of DOD's overseas presence, such as forward-stationed or deployed military forces, and a renewed emphasis on developing partnerships, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region and Africa, indicate that DOD will likely need to continue its significant investments in acquiring foreign language-related support for the foreseeable future. However, in the face of current fiscal pressures and budgetary constraints, the committee also believes that DOD has a heightened need to maximize efficiencies and that one way to

achieve greater efficiencies is through more coordinated acquisition approaches.

Over the years, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) identified opportunities for DOD to improve its approach to contracting from a broad perspective as well as in areas related to foreign language support. For example, DOD contract management remains on the GAO's list of high-risk areas in the Federal Government and, in its 2013 annual report to Congress highlighting areas in the Federal Government where duplication, overlap, and fragmentation exist, and where programs may be able to achieve greater efficiencies in providing government services, GAO identified DOD's management of foreign language support contracts as one of 31 areas in the Federal Government where greater efficiencies might be achieved.

At that time, GAO reported that DOD had obligated over $6.8 billion from fiscal years 2008 through 2012 on contracts to acquire foreign language-related services and products for its forces. GAO also noted that DOD had centralized the contracting for certain foreign language-related services and products under an executive agent and had realized some efficiencies, but that the executive agent's focus had been exclusively on translation and interpretation services and that DOD had not taken steps to comprehensively assess whether additional opportunities existed to gain efficiencies in fragmented contracts for other types of foreign language support which are estimated to cost more than $1.0 billion annually. Other GAO work has found that agencies, including DOD, reported savings ranging between 5 and 20 percent by implementing more coordinated acquisition approaches rather than fragmented contracting. Therefore, on the basis of the level of DOD's considerable investment in contracts for foreign language support both now and in the future, the committee believes DOD may be able to achieve significant cost savings by comprehensively assessing whether additional opportunities exist to gain efficiencies in fragmented contracts for all types of foreign language support.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to assess the Department's current approach for managing foreign language support contracts. At a minimum, such an assessment should include an analysis of spending for all the types foreign language support services and products that have been acquired by DOD components and a reevaluation, based on the results of the analysis of spending, of the scope of the DOD executive agent's management of foreign language support contracts to determine whether any adjustments are needed.

Civil Air Patrol (sec. 1064)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to produce a report on the Civil Air Patrol (CAP) that would assess certain aspects of the current CAP aircraft program, including: (1) what is the requirement for the total fleet of CAP aircraft; (2) how are those requirements for CAP aircraft derived; and (3) how are CAP aircraft allocated among that various operating locations. The Secretary should submit this report with the fiscal year 2015 budget request. The committee understands that the Secretary of the Air Force is considering options

to reduce the size of the CAP, but believes that the Secretary should conduct a more thorough assessment of requirements before making any final decision on these options.

Eagle Vision system (sec. 1065)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, to submit to the congressional defense committees and intelligence committees a report on the Eagle Vision imagery ground station. The report elements would include a description and assessment of the Department of Defense organizations to which the Eagle Vision system could be transferred, as well as the actions that would need to be taken prior to a transfer, the potential schedule for a transfer, and the possible effects of a transfer on the capabilities or use of the system. The provision would prohibit the Air Force from making changes to the organization and management of the program until 90 days after the submission of the report to Congress.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

Extension of the Ministry of Defense Advisor Program (sec. 1081)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Defense for 5 fiscal years, to advise foreign defense ministries. The provision would also extend the requirement of the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and would provide the Comptroller General of the United States an additional year to conduct the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program under the original authority.

The committee supports the request of the Department of Defense (DOD) to extend this authority in order to ensure that they can effectively attract personnel to the program and determine whether this program and its associated activities could prove successful in implementing the priorities of the Secretary of Defense in high priority countries around the world. However, the committee is aware of concerns and recommendations raised by the DOD Inspector General about the financial management of a nearly identical program being conducted in Afghanistan pursuant to a different authority. The committee urges the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to ensure that the matters raised by the DOD Inspector General about the similar program in Afghanistan are addressed promptly and that those modifications are incorporated into the management processes of the program conducted pursuant to section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81).

Further, the committee notes that to date, DOD has not deployed any personnel under this authority and that the first planned deployment will be to Montenegro. The committee hopes the Department will review the prospective deployment of officials under this authority to ensure that each deployment will be to a nation where

the United States and the prospective partner have significant mutual security interests.

Items of Special Interest

Airborne Nuclear Command Post

The Secretaries of the Navy and Air Force are directed to report to the congressional defense committees on efforts to modernize the Airborne Nuclear Command Post and the Airborne Launch Control System, including system electronics and trainers. The report shall also outline how a modernization plan will provide for battle staff training. The report shall be due to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2014.

Air Force weapons storage areas

The committee strongly supports the Air Force decision to move forward with reconstituting nuclear Air Force bases with weapons storage areas (WSA). Reconstituting WSA will provide a second nuclear weapons storage capability for Air Force Global Strike Command and provide necessary survivability of the Nation's enduring strategic nuclear deterrents. Given the Air Force's 15-year proposal, the committee requests the Secretary of the Air Force to provide an up-to-date report detailing the reexamined plans, including requirements and costs, for reconstituting a second nuclear weapons storage capability for nuclear-armed air-launched cruise missiles, as well as the potential benefits of such a reconstitution and potential savings or benefits achieved through shortening the timeframe.

Army force structure and installation alignment

The committee is aware that beginning in January 2007, in response to the demands for the support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the active duty Army grew by 65,000 soldiers and five combat brigades. To accommodate this growth the Army initiated a variety of programs, including facilities improvements and military construction, necessary to house and train these additional forces.

As force requirements for Iraq have concluded and for Afghanistan have declined, in January 2012 the President announced the Defense Strategic Guidance (DSG) in which the active duty Army would decrease by 80,000 soldiers and inactivate up to eight combat brigades by the end fiscal year 2017. At the same time the Army is reducing end strength and combat brigade force structure, it is likely to change the structure of the remaining infantry and armor combat brigades by adding to some a third maneuver battalion.

The committee is concerned that end strength and force structure reductions and changes so soon after efforts to accommodate growth may result in the misalignment of remaining forces with installations and facilities to maximize the readiness and the quality of life of soldiers and their families. In this regard, the Subcommittee on Airland, in a March 2013 letter, requested a Government Accountability Office (GAO) assessment of the Army's anal-

ysis and decision-making processes associated with planned force structure reductions and their alignment with installations.

As a supplement to this work by the GAO, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or designee, to brief the congressional defense committees, not later than October 1, 2013, explaining how the Army is maximizing existing installation capacities and capabilities, including facilities related to combat brigade training and readiness, to meet future force requirements.

Counter threat finance efforts

Counter threat finance (CTF) leverages the capabilities of the interagency to help detect, deter, disrupt, and destroy terrorist organizations and those supporting terrorism by targeting the foundation of their operations, their financial resources. CTF is a critical component of the United States Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime, which was released on July 25, 2011. The Department of Defense (DOD) has played a significant role in interagency CTF efforts in both Iraq and Afghanistan, and continues to develop and expand its ability to disrupt our adversaries both on and off the battlefield. Pursuant to the DOD CTF Directive (DODD 5205.14) issued in August 2010, DOD has recognized the CTF discipline as an essential tool in combating criminal networks and terrorist organizations worldwide, and has outlined a plan to integrate this capability into its doctrine, strategy, and operational planning.

The committee recognizes DODD 5205.14 as a welcome step towards institutionalizing the successful efforts of the joint interagency CTF cells in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Iraq Threat Finance Cell (ITFC) under joint DOD-Department of Treasury leadership and the Afghan Threat Finance Cell (ATFC) under Drug Enforcement Agency leadership both led efforts to identify and disrupt funding sources supporting insurgent and terrorist organizations, aided in the identification of key insurgency members and enablers, and supported threat finance intelligence (TFI) collection and analysis. It is important for DOD to ensure that lessons learned from these initiatives are captured and institutionalized to build upon successes and mature DOD's capability to apply the CTF discipline to new problem sets. DOD must be able to integrate with, support, and enable other law enforcement and government agencies' CTF activities. Moreover, it is important that DOD, in accordance with DODD 5205.14, operationalize TFI and CTF efforts in a way that prevents duplication and maximizes effectiveness.

As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, a report outlining each CTF and TFI activity currently being planned or conducted by DOD. Each summary should include a detailed description of the activity, identification of lead and supporting agencies, both within and outside DOD, a description of each agency's role, the level and source of funding associated with each activity, a description of the desired outcomes from each activity, and a description of how this activity aligns with the goals of existing interagency strategies to find terrorism, corruption, crimes, narcotics, and other transnational threats, including United States Strategy to Combat Transnational

Organized Crime. The report should also include a summary of operational lessons, best practices, and tools employed in ITFC and ATFC efforts and how they can be replicated to advance other DOD CTF missions, as well as a description of the efforts, both within DOD and between DOD and other relevant agencies, to foster communication and ensure integrated support to interagency partners. Further, the report should contain the Secretary's assessment of the progress made to date in the implementation of DODD 5205.14, any current gaps in DOD's CTF capabilities and authorities, and any other information the Secretary deems appropriate. The report shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex, if warranted.

Department of Defense support to U.S. diplomatic facilities overseas

While the Department of Defense (DOD) does not have primary responsibility for the security of American diplomatic facilities around the globe, it does provide the State Department and other departments and agencies—on an as-requested basis—support to ensure they can fulfill its varying security requirements. The committee recognizes the value of these facilities—including facilities in high-risk/high-threat locations—in establishing a U.S. presence in such areas, not only for diplomatic objectives but also for essential national defense missions. For this reason, it is critical that DOD be both funded and postured to fulfill its commitments as a supporting agency.

One element of this support is the United States Marine Security Guard Program. Section 404 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the mission of the Marine Security Guard Program, and to report to Congress by October 1, 2013, on the results of this review. The provision also required the Secretary to develop a plan to increase the number of Marines in the Marine Security Guard Program by up to 1,000 personnel to improve security at our embassies, consulates, and other diplomatic facilities. The budget request for fiscal year 2014 begins implementation of that requirement.

In addition, the State Department's Accountability Review Board (ARB) recommended that the State Department and DOD identify additional flexible Marine Corps Security Guard structures and provide more capabilities and capacities at higher risk posts. DOD has already started to address this recommendation by: (1) forward deploying and adjusting the alert posture of security augmentation forces in the most volatile areas; (2) supporting the State Department's efforts to look at hardening facilities and reassessing diplomatic security; and (3) enhancing intelligence collection and ensuring that military forces in critical areas are prepared to respond to crisis, if necessary. The committee endorses these improvements and directs the Secretary to submit a report to the committee by no later than August 1, 2013, on DOD's implementation of these measures, as well as any additional steps that should be taken to ensure we are doing everything possible to protect our personnel and facilities abroad.

Fiscal priorities

The committee notes that on May 17, 2013 the Department of Defense (DOD) submitted two reprogramming actions to the congressional defense committees totaling $9.6 billion. Of this, $7.3 billion of the transfers seek to offset shortfalls in fiscal year 2013 Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding. These shortfalls have occurred because operating tempo exceeds the level anticipated in the fiscal year 2013 budget; transportation costs are higher due to unanticipated problems with the Ground Lines of Communication; and fuel costs are higher. The Department has informed the committee that even if the congressional defense committees approve all the items in these reprogramming actions that the services will still face a fiscal year 2013 OCO shortfall totaling $3.7 billion.

The committee notes that the pending reprogramming actions include $3.4 billion in DOD base budget to OCO transfers and will exhaust nearly all of the transfer authority available to the Department. The Department will not leave troops in combat without fuel or ammunition or any needed item. Without relief to these shortfalls, the Department will have to implement additional reductions to base operation and maintenance accounts to ensure the warfighter will have what they need on the front lines. The result will be to further exacerbate the already serious problems that face DOD as a result of sequestration.

DOD faces serious problems due to sequestration, affecting every individual in the Department. The Department has issued furlough notices to nearly 700,000 civilian employees—roughly 85 percent of its workforce—to begin furlough for one day per week beginning on July 8, 2013, and lasting through the end of the fiscal year. Civilian furloughs impact everything from DOD schools to military medical facilities to military family support programs.

Active duty, Reserve, and National Guard members are also feeling the brunt of sequestration. As we have heard from senior leader testimony this spring, the Army has already cancelled two-thirds of its training. As a result of sequestration cuts to flying hours, civilian furlough actions, and facilities sustainment, the Army will feel readiness impacts into fiscal year 2014 with many active component units untrained for immediate deployment, a backlog of aviation training, deferred reset of equipment, and cancelled training courses.

In fiscal year 2013, the Air Force has a $4.4 billion shortfall in its operations and maintenance accounts, impacting flying hours and readiness. As a result, the Air Force has already grounded one-third of fighter and bomber squadrons, and warns that it will be in a state of "tiered readiness," diminishing combat readiness to be able to respond to contingencies. As a result of shortfalls in its operation and maintenance accounts, the Navy had to make decisions to maintain its readiness, by deferring the deployment of the USS Truman to the Middle East, and deferring critical ship maintenance and repair in the third and fourth quarter. As a result, by the end fiscal year 2013, two-thirds of Navy non-deployed ships and aviation squadrons will be less than fully mission capable and not certified for combat operations. Sequestration impacts the DOD's ability to respond to contingencies, resource its defense

strategy, and plan for the future. It threatens stability in the defense industrial base, threatening a lost investment in a skilled workforce that is critical to national security.

Domestic agencies also face serious problems due to sequestration, including severe cuts to Head Start programs, both on the side of educators and children enrolled in the program. Head Start serves over a million disadvantaged children and their families each year. Crippling cuts in other domestic agencies are extremely counterproductive, at a time when the economy is still recovering. All domestic agencies are harmed by sequestration, and there are counterproductive impacts on students, our education system, small businesses, infrastructure, homeland security, and the general economy. These are all also fundamental underpinnings to our national security. Sequester threatens harm to all.

Therefore, the committee strongly encourages Congress and the Administration to work together to repeal sequestration and replace it with strategic and credible deficit reduction.

Ground Based Strategic Deterrent

The committee supports the Air Force's evaluation of possibilities for Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) to follow the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), but shares the concerns expressed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs, Madelyn R. Creedon, when she testified at a Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on April 17, 2013, that: "I know this has taken a lot longer than we anticipated. But, one of the things that we want to make sure that we fully examined is all the options," as well as the concerns expressed by Lieutenant General James M. Kowalski, USAF, Commander of the Air Force Global Strike Command, when he testified at the same hearing that: "we had some bureaucratic delays as the study plan went back and forth. The study is about to begin." The administration's 2010 Nuclear Posture Review stated that: "studies to inform that decision [on a follow-on ICBM] are needed now."

The committee believes it is important that the Air Force complete its review in 2014 and expeditiously brief the congressional defense committees on its results.

In the interim, the committee directs the Air Force to brief the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the Analysis of Alternatives for the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent, including its terms of reference.

Impact of B–61 program delay

Testimony before this committee by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) stated that the first production unit of the B–61 Mod 12 will be in 2019. However testimony this year to the committee by the Sandia Laboratory Director Paul Hommert has stated "From what I can tell now, as a result of sequestration in '13, and what we have seen in the '14 budget, we are going to slip off that plan . . . not dramatically . . . but in my view we will see schedule impact."

Given the uncertainty of sequestration and continuing resolutions and their possible impact on the 2019 date, the committee di-

rects the Department of Defense in consultation with the NNSA to develop a joint plan to mitigate the impact to the existing stockpile of fielded B–61 weapons in the event that the first production units fail to meet the 2019 date. The mitigation plan shall include technical mitigation details and estimated costs for each year of delay. The mitigation plan shall be due no later than February 28, 2014.

Reforming the security classification system

Multiple independent commissions over the last two decades have stressed the need for reform of the security classification system, noting that the system that has evolved since World War II is overly complex, and leads to over-classification, depriving citizens unnecessarily of information about their government's operations. In 2000, Congress established the Public Interest Declassification Board (PIDB), with distinguished members appointed by the President and the leadership of both parties in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In 2009, in his Implementing Memorandum for Executive Order 13526, the President directed the PIDB to work with the National Security Advisor to design a transformation of the security classification system. After a long period of study, in November 2012, the PIDB submitted its report to the President, which included a recommendation for the White House to establish a steering committee to implement the recommended reforms.

The PIDB report, titled "Transforming the Security Classification System," states that the current system, designed for manual processing in the pre-digital era, is breaking under the increasing pace and volume of data generated today. According to the PIDB report, a single intelligence agency classifies a petabyte of information every 18 months. One petabyte is equivalent to approximately 20 million filing cabinets filled with text or about 13.3 years of high definition video. The cost of managing and securing these records government-wide has doubled over the past decade from $4.7 billion in 2001 to $11.4 billion in 2011.

Reforming current practices will require active participation from stakeholders across the national security community. The committee expects the Department of Defense to be a meaningful participant in any future interagency effort to overhaul security classification processes and systems. The committee also directs the Deputy Secretary of Defense to review the PIDB report and provide an assessment of the PIDB recommendations to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees within 180 days of the enactment of this Act.

Report on reductions to the fiscal year 2014 defense budget to meet the savings requirement established by the Budget Control Act

The fiscal year 2014 budget request and the fiscal year 2014 budget resolutions passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives all assume that sequestration currently required by the Budget Control Act (Public Law 112–25) will be avoided in fiscal year 2014. To date, there has been virtually no sign of movement toward a bipartisan agreement that would vitiate sequestration in fiscal year 2014. In the absence of such an agreement the

Department of Defense (DOD) will face an across-the-board reduction of $52.0 billion early next year.

Virtually every DOD witness who has come before the Committee on Armed Services this year has testified that an additional round of sequestration in fiscal year 2014 would be devastating for the Department. Despite this testimony many members of Congress and the public seem to believe that sequestration is an effective way to cut government spending and can be made workable by providing the Department with additional flexibility of making minor adjustments.

The committee believes that there is an increasing risk that DOD and other federal agencies will face sequestration again in fiscal year 2014. Understanding the consequences of another sequestration is important to avoiding it. For this reason, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than July 1, 2013, that describes in detail a package of reductions to the fiscal year 2014 defense budget that the Secretary believes to be the most workable approach for meeting the $52.0 billion savings requirement established by the Budget Control Act. The report should also discuss the impact on the Department of Defense and on military readiness if the Secretary is required to implement sequestration cuts in fiscal year 2014.

Strategic Automated Command and Control System Modernization Plan

The Secretary of the Air Force is directed to report to the congressional defense committees on efforts to modernize the Strategic Automated Command and Control System, including system electronics and trainers as well as integration into the new United States Strategic Command Headquarters. The report shall be due to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2014.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

Extension of voluntary reduction-in-force authority for civilian employees of the Department of Defense (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3502(f)(5) of title 5, United States Code, to extend through September 30, 2018 the authority of the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of a military department to allow certain civilian employees to volunteer for reduction-in-force separations.

Extension of authority to make lump sum severance payments to Department of Defense employees (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5595(i)(4) of title 5, United States Code, to extend until October 1, 2018 the authority for the Secretary of Defense or the secretary of a military department to pay the total amount of severance pay to an eligible civilian employee in one lump sum.

Expansion of protection of employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities from reprisals (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1587(b) of title 10, United States Code, to align protections from reprisals for employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities with protections from reprisals for other Department of Defense civilian personnel.

Extension of enhanced appointment and compensation authority for civilian personnel for care and treatment of wounded and injured members of the Armed Forces (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1599c of title 10, United States Code, to extend through December 31, 2020, the existing authority of the Secretary of Defense to exercise any authority for the appointment and pay of health care personnel under chapter 74 of title 38, United States Code, for purposes of recruitment, employment, and retention of civilian health care professionals for the Department of Defense. The provision would repeal the now-obsolete section 1599c requirement for the service secretaries to develop and implement a strategy to disseminate the authorities and best practices for the recruitment of medical and health professionals.

Amount of educational assistance under Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation Defense Education Program (sec. 1105)

The committee recommends a provision, based upon a Department of Defense (DOD) legislative proposal, that would increase the flexibility of the Secretary of Defense to determine the amount of the financial assistance delivered by the Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) program.

The committee acknowledges the DOD's request to also allow this program to accept non-U.S. citizens, as SMART scholarship recipients. While the committee recognizes that DOD needs the flexibilities to attract the best and brightest scientists and engineers, it notes that DOD does not appear to have a strategy to hire these students into DOD laboratories—given that the SMART program requires one year of DOD employment for each year of financial assistance. Hence, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, working with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, to develop a strategy that would address how it would hire those non-U.S. citizens that would be funded by the SMART program and provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days of the enactment of this Act. With such a strategy in place, the committee would give additional consideration of this proposed authority.

Flexibility in employment and compensation of civilian faculty at certain additional Department of Defense schools (sec. 1106)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1595(c) of title 10, United States Code, to add the Defense Institute for Security Assistance Management and the Joint Special Operations University to the list of Department of Defense schools at which the Secretary of Defense may employ and compensate civilian faculty as the Secretary considers necessary.

Temporary authority for direct appointment to certain positions at Department of Defense research and engineering facilities (sec. 1107)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow Department of Defense laboratories direct hire authority for qualified candidates possessing a bachelor's degree as well as qualified veteran candidates. This authority would sunset on December 31, 2019.

Modernization of titles of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities for purposes of certain civil service laws (sec. 1108)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2105(c) of title 5, United States Code, to remove the reference to Army and Air Force Motion Picture Service and Navy Ship's Stores Ashore and replace it with the Navy Ships Stores Program in order to provide a more accurate and current definition of nonappropriated fund instrumentality employees.

Item of Special Interest

Department of Defense civilian leadership programs

The committee notes that section 1112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) required the Secretary of Defense to establish a Department of Defense (DOD) Civilian Leadership Program in order to recruit individuals with the academic merit, work experience, and demonstrated leadership skills needed for the Department's civilian employee workforce. The statute further mandates that program participants must include both entry-level and midcareer individuals.

The committee understands that DOD currently provides three programs for civilian leadership development: (1) the Defense Civilian Emerging Leader Program (DCELP) for entry-level employees; (2) the Executive Leadership Development Program (ELDP) for midcareer employees; and (3) the Defense Senior Leader Development Program for senior employees. The committee has learned that DOD has cancelled the remainder of the scheduled training for the ELDP as a result of implementing sequestration guidance on training and travel restrictions, and that DOD does not believe the ELDP is a leader development program required by law.

The committee believes that all three of these leadership development programs are important and that the ELDP fulfills the statutory mandate set forth by section 1112 in the same way as the DCELP. Therefore, the committee expects the Department to robustly pursue all three of these civilian leadership development programs in future years.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

Modification and extension of authorities relating to program to build the capacity of foreign military forces (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through September 30, 2018, the authority under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456), as amended, for the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to carry out a program to build the capacity of foreign military forces to conduct counterterrorism operations or to participate in or support military and stability operations in which the United States is a participant. The provision would require a report by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of State that delineates the scope of counterterrorism operations for which assistance is authorized to be provided under section 1206 of Public Law 109–163, to include purpose, activities, and measures of effectiveness. The report also requires a prioritized list of threats to be addressed in order to ensure that assistance is focused on the highest priority threats within a regional and global strategic framework.

Revisions to Global Security Contingency Fund authority (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that would make certain technical amendments to the authority for the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF) under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1625).

The GSCF is intended to provide the Department of State and the Department of Defense (DOD) a flexible authority to enable a timely response to security challenges that may arise outside the normal budget planning process. The committee is concerned, therefore, about the lengthy delays in standing up this program due to a range of bureaucratic issues, such as legal interpretations of GSCF authorities, which have contributed to the program's failure to date to initiate any projects under GSCF. The committee understands that concerns have arisen about how broadly to interpret the types of assistance authorized under the program. It is the committee's view that the GSCF's authority to provide training should be understood broadly to include educational activities, professional guidance, and ministerial-level institutional advice.

The committee understands that another issue that has contributed to delays in standing up the GSCF program is the need for

further clarification of the appropriate level of programmatic detail required in the congressional notification process. The committee believes that the notification processes that have been developed under other similar security assistance authorities, such as the Global Train and Equip program under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163; 119 Stat. 3456), as amended, have provided an appropriate level of congressional notification and should serve as a guide for the notification process under the GSCF program. The committee hopes that the Department of State and DOD will continue to consult closely with this committee should issues relating to the GSCF arise in the future.

Training of general purpose forces of the United States Armed Forces with military and other security forces of friendly foreign countries (sec. 1203)

The committee recommends a provision that would permit the Secretary of Defense to authorize training with the military forces or other security forces of a friendly foreign country in order to prepare the United States armed forces to train the military forces or other security forces of a friendly foreign country and enhance interoperability. Training with foreign military forces under this authority must be in the U.S. national interest and consistent with U.S. national security strategy as well as the recent Presidential guidance on security sector assistance.

United States counterterrorism assistance and cooperation in North Africa (sec. 1204)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategic framework for U.S. counterterrorism assistance and cooperation in North Africa, including but not limited to programs conducted under the Trans-Sahara Counter Terrorism Partnership, Operation Enduring Freedom–Trans Sahara (OEF–TS), and other related security assistance activities. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress on the details of this framework, as well as on lessons-learned from recent developments in Mali and the region.

The committee notes that the military-led coup against Mali's democratically elected government in 2012, the ensuing expansion of violent extremist organizations in Northern Mali, and the collapse of the Malian military raise concerns regarding the effectiveness of U.S. counterterrorism cooperation and assistance programs in the Sahel region. Most prominently, concerns were highlighted concerning the Trans-Sahara Counter Terrorism Partnership (TSCTP) and OEF–TS which were intended to be of benefit to Mali. In particular, units and individuals who had been targeted for U.S. training and assistance figured prominently in both the collapse of Mali's military in the North and in the coup in Bamako. Unquestionably, these developments constitute a setback for U.S. counterterrorism efforts in the region and they also lead to questions about the effectiveness of U.S. assistance in recent years, though some participating nations, most notably Chad, have played key roles in mounting a response to events in Mali. Unfortunately, the Mali ex-

perience is not unique. U.S. efforts to develop regional counterterrorism partnerships are being undertaken in a context in which coups, instability, and concerns about human rights abuses constitute historical and often ongoing risks.

Recent events on the ground underscore issues raised by outside evaluators regarding TSCTP, OEF–TS, and related programs. For example, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) in 2008 identified concerns about a lack of clearly identified objectives, challenges in interagency coordination at the regional level, and inadequate program evaluation. GAO recommended that the agencies involved develop a comprehensive strategy designed to clarify objectives, priorities, and milestones for use in program evaluation. While the Departments of Defense and State agreed with GAO's recommendations, 5 years have passed without strategy articulation.

Events in Mali have underscored the importance of continued focus on developing long-term regional counterterrorism capabilities instead of short-term tactical operations focused primarily on individual country conditions and outcomes. The committee is concerned that existing efforts, when assessed from a regional perspective, have been compromised by lack of clarity about objectives and priorities, incoherent planning, poor interagency coordination, and unclear metrics for evaluating success.

Assistance to the Government of Jordan for border security operations (sec. 1205)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense—upon a determination from the President that it is in the national security interests of the United States—to use up to $75.0 million of amounts authorized for the Coalition Support Fund account in fiscal years 2013 and 2014 to support the border security operations of the Jordanian Armed Forces.

Authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1206)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and in consultation with the Attorney General and the Secretary of Homeland Security, to provide assistance to the military and civilian first responders of a foreign country to enhance the capability of that country to respond effectively to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

The committee notes that the U.S. strategy and policy for reducing the risks from WMD includes the participation and cooperation of foreign countries. The provision would permit the Defense Department to enhance the ability of foreign countries to respond to and reduce the consequences of WMD incidents, thus assisting in meeting the goals of U.S. strategy and policy to reduce the risks of WMD.

Support of foreign forces participating in operations to disarm the Lord's Resistance Army (sec. 1207)

Pursuant to the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–172), the committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Department of Defense to obligate not more than $50.0 million in each fiscal year in operation and maintenance funding to provide logistical support, services and supplies, and intelligence support to: (1) the national military forces of Uganda participating in operations to mitigate or eliminate the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA); and (2) the national military forces of any other countries determined by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to be participating in operations to mitigate or eliminate the threat posed by the LRA. The Secretary's authority would expire upon the termination of Operation Observant Compass.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq

Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan (sec. 1211)

The committee recommends a provision that would make up to $60.0 million available during fiscal year 2014 for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) under section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1619), as amended by section 1221 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 1992). The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a report on the lessons learned and best practices regarding the implementation of the CERP in Iraq and Afghanistan. The report would include a review of: training requirements for CERP managers; project planning, management, sustainability, and transfer; the project approval process; CERP oversight by the Department of Defense and Congress; and recommendations for the use of CERP in future contingency operations.

The committee notes that with the drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan, responsibility for reconstruction efforts conducted by the U.S. military must continue to shift to other U.S. Government departments and agencies and to the Government of Afghanistan, which has a critical need to improve its governance capacity and delivery of services to the Afghan people. In addition, since one of the purposes of CERP is to provide force protection for U.S. combat forces by winning the support of local communities, the requirement for CERP should continue to decline as U.S. combat forces withdraw from Afghanistan. Therefore, the committee believes continuing reductions in CERP spending are appropriate and necessary as the December 2014 date nears for the end of combat operations in Afghanistan.

Extension and modification of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1212)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 2014 the authority under section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1631; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), as amended by section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), for the Secretary of Defense to support transition activities in Iraq by supporting the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC-I). The provision would authorize the use of up to $209.0 million in fiscal year 2014 to support OSC-I operations and activities.

The provision would also extend for 1 year the additional authority for the OSC-I to conduct non-operational training of Iraqi Ministry of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps and integrate certain processes within the Iraqi security forces. The provision would add a requirement that such training include elements to promote respect for human rights, military professionalism, and respect for legitimate civilian authority in Iraq.

The provision would also extend and modify the requirement to update the report required under section 1211 of Public Law 112–239 to provide additional information and evaluations of the activities of the OSC-I.

The committee encourages OSC-I to further reduce unnecessary overhead and support-function staffing in order to maximize the use of authorized funds for ensuring adequate force protection and supporting efforts to address capability gaps of the Iraqi security forces. The committee anticipates that colocation of OSC-I personnel within embassy facilities will improve interagency cooperation of this vital function.

One-year extension and modification of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan (sec. 1213)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a 1-year extension of the authority under section 1216 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4392), as amended, to use Department of Defense funds to support the reintegration of former insurgent fighters into Afghanistan society. For fiscal year 2014, up to $25.0 million may be used to support reintegration activities under this section.

The committee is concerned about the adequacy of procedures under the Afghanistan Reintegration Program for ensuring accountability of individuals who have reintegrated, due to the potential impact on the ability to track rates of recidivism and the integrity and viability of the reintegration program. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the strategy and mechanisms used by the Government of Afghanistan and the Department of Defense to ensure accountability of reintegrees, including through such means as documenting the pledge process, collecting the biometric data of reintegrating individuals, and other identi-

fication procedures. The Secretary is further directed to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives on the findings of this review not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

One-year extension and modification of authority for program to develop and carry out infrastructure projects in Afghanistan (sec. 1214)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority under section 1217 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4393) for the Secretary of Defense to use Department of Defense (DOD) funds to support the Afghanistan Infrastructure Program (AIP) which carries out large-scale infrastructure projects in support of the counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan. The provision would authorize up to $250.0 million for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) to support the AIP. In addition, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, to report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of the enactment of this Act on a plan for transitioning responsibility for the management of the AIP projects that are funded with AIF amounts authorized by this Act to the Government of Afghanistan by no later than December 31, 2014.

The committee believes that the AIP has made important contributions to the counterinsurgency effort in Afghanistan. By expanding the delivery of such key services as electricity, irrigation, and roads, the AIP provides local communities a powerful incentive to work with the Government of Afghanistan and coalition forces. At the same time, with the drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan and the transition of responsibility to the Afghan National Security Forces for security throughout Afghanistan by no later than the end of 2014, DOD's role in funding these large infrastructure projects becomes hard to justify. The committee expects that, with the possible exception of unanticipated project management costs, no additional AIF amounts will be required after fiscal year 2014. Responsible transition of program management to Afghan authorities will maintain the viability of AIP-funded efforts as a component of the counterinsurgency campaign of Afghan security forces. In addition, the committee urges DOD to undertake the necessary planning to expeditiously and responsibly transition project management of AIP projects to the Government of Afghanistan or the Afghan utility Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherkat.

Extension of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1215)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2014 the authority under section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 393), as amended, for the Secretary of Defense to use Department of Defense (DOD) funds ("Coalition Support Funds") to reimburse key nations for support they have provided to or in con-

nection with Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), or to use such funds to provide specialized training or loan specialized equipment to key nations participating in OEF. The provision would limit the amount of Coalition Support Funds that could be provided in fiscal year 2014 to $1.5 billion.

The provision would also extend for one year two requirements related to Coalition Support Funds for Pakistan.

The first would be the requirement under section 1232(b)(6) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended, to provide as part of the 15-day prior notification of a reimbursement to Pakistan, a detailed description of the logistical and other support being reimbursed.

The second would be the requirement under section 1227(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to make certain certifications regarding Pakistan's cooperation with U.S. counterterrorism and other efforts prior to any payment of Coalition Support Funds to Pakistan. The provision includes a national security waiver.

Extension of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations (sec. 1216)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to provide logistical support to coalition forces under section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1216(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

Extension and improvement of the Iraqi special immigrant visa program (sec. 1217)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend—for 1 fiscal year—and modify the Iraq Special Immigrant Visa program.

Extension and improvement of the Afghan special immigrant visa program (sec. 1218)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend—for 1 fiscal year—and modify the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program.

Sense of Congress on commencement of new long-term nation building or large-scale infrastructure development projects in Afghanistan (sec. 1219)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should seek not to commence any new long-term nation-building or large-scale infrastructure-development projects in Afghanistan after 2014.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

Two-year extension of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1231)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of the Department of Defense to establish, develop, and

maintain non-conventional assisted recovery (NAR) capabilities for 2 additional years.

The committee appreciates the Department's efforts to improve its reporting on activities conducted under the NAR authority, but believes additional details are necessary in the notifications and quarterly reports submitted to Congress. Specifically, the report should include more detailed descriptions of the requirement for NAR capabilities in a particular region or country, the number and types of NAR capabilities developed under the authority, and the extent to which established NAR capabilities are exercised to ensure they remain reliable. The report should also, where applicable, describe how NAR networks are augmented by other authorities available to combatant commanders. The committee also believes that, given the potential sensitivity of the presence of NAR capabilities in a particular region or country, the establishment of such capabilities should be limited to those countries and regions where U.S. personnel are at greatest risk.

Element on 5th generation fighter program in annual report on military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China (sec. 1232)

The committee recommends a provision that would add a requirement for the Department of Defense to include information on China's 5th generation fighter programs in the congressionally-mandated Annual Report on Military and Security Developments involving the People's Republic of China. Although recent versions of the report include information about China's 5th generation fighters, this provision make this aspect of China's military development a permanent part of the annual report.

Prohibition on use of funds to enter into contracts or agreements with Rosoboronexport (sec. 1233)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense from entering into a contract or providing a loan to the Russian state corporation, Rosoboronexport, after fiscal year 2013. The provision would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive this prohibition if he determines that doing so is in the U.S. national security interest. Should the Secretary of Defense invoke the waiver, the Secretary would be required to notify Congress of the obligation of funds pursuant to the waiver not later than 30 days before the funds are obligated.

The provision would also require, not later than 15 days after submitting the notification specified above, that the Secretary provide Congress certain information on Rosoboronexport's activities with Syria.

Modification of statutory references to former North Atlantic Treaty Organization support organizations and related agreements (sec. 1234)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical amendments to title 10 and title 22, United States Code, to replace certain statutory references to North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) organizations or agreements with appropriate references to successor organizations or agreements resulting from re-

cent organizational reforms within the NATO structure. The technical amendments would facilitate completion of the NATO reform process by ensuring that the amended authorities under title 10 and title 22, United States Code, apply to the new NATO agencies.

Technical correction relating to funding for NATO Special Operations Headquarters (sec. 1235)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical modifications to section 1244 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as amended, that authorized the Secretary of Defense to use up to $50.0 million from Operation and Maintenance, Army, in any fiscal year to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters (NSHQ). The technical modification is consistent with an agreement between the Army and U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and the April 2013 Resource Management Decision transferring resourcing responsibility from the Army to USSOCOM. The recommended provision would allow for the Secretary of Defense to provide up to $50.0 million in support to the NSHQ in any fiscal year from any Operation and Maintenance funds available to the Department of Defense.

Strategy to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and related materials in the Middle East and North Africa Region (sec. 1236)

The committee recommends a provision that directs the President to prepare a strategy and implementation plan for preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and related materials in the Middle East and North Africa not later than March 31, 2014.

The Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region represents a new generation of immediate and growing WMD-related proliferation challenges. Factors lending urgency to regional threat dynamics in this region include Syria's chemical weapons program, Iran's nuclear program and the influence of terrorist groups operating in the region. The Committee believes that it is critical that the United States develop a comprehensive, effective and efficient cooperative threat reduction (CTR) and nonproliferation strategy to address the challenge of WMD-related proliferation in the MENA region.

Items of Special Interest

Inter-American Defense College

The committee notes that the Inter-American Defense College (IADC) is an international educational institution operating under the sponsorship and funding of the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Defense Board. IADC serves as a senior-service, international, joint academic institution center for security and defense studies of military, national police, and government civilians from nations throughout the Western Hemisphere. Since it was established in 1962, the IADC has had over 2,500 graduates, including general and flag officers, ministers, and heads of state. The committee supports IADC's mission and man-

date and is pleased that the Department of Defense (DOD) continues to serve as the host to this important international academic institution, which in addition to providing a comprehensive education for civilian and military officials across the Western Hemisphere, provides officials with a better understanding of the importance of respect for human rights, rule of law, and civilian control of the military.

The committee is aware that the IADC Council of Delegates has directed its leadership to seek the authority to award advanced level degrees and the committee is also aware that DOD submitted a legislative proposal that would fulfill one element of a series of requirements established by the Department of Education for IADC to meet from its Council of Delegates. However, the committee is concerned that enacting just one element at this time will only serve to confuse IADC's authorities as an academic institution. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Secretary of Education, to conduct a review of IADC to determine what, if any, steps must be taken for the IADC to be considered a fully accredited degree granting institution in the United States. Should the Secretary find that legislative action is required, the committee expects the Secretary of Defense to submit any legislative proposals with the budget request for fiscal year 2015.

Military-to-military cooperation with Somalia

The establishment of the National Government of Somalia in August 2012 brings the promise of a new era for the people of Somalia, and follows the considerable and hard-fought successes of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) and Somali National Security Forces efforts to secure the country over the past 2 years. Recognizing the significance of Somalia's newly established government and improved but tenuous security environment, United Nations Security Council Resolution 2093 suspends the 21-year-old arms embargo to allow for "deliveries of weapons or military equipment or the provision of advice, assistance or training, intended solely for the development of the National Security Forces of the Federal Government of Somalia," and calls for the training, equipping, and capacity-building of Somalia National Security Forces, including both its armed forces and police.

The committee believes that U.S. national security interests in the region would be well-served by Somali National Security Forces that are capable of maintaining and expanding security within Somalia, confronting international security threats such as piracy and terrorism, and preventing human rights abuses. U.S. military-to-military cooperation offers an important opportunity to build critical capacities that are accountable to civilian authorities and adhere to the tenets of human rights within the Somali National Security Forces and to build relationships in order to promote a strong future partnership. Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to pursue military-to-military cooperation with the Somali National Security Forces through existing authorities as soon as practicable.

In pursuit of that objective, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to formulate a strategy for military-to-military coopera-

tion, including security assistance, professional military education, information sharing, and training between the U.S. armed forces and the Somali National Security Forces. The strategy should include, but not be limited to, the following elements:

(1) identification of specific U.S. national security objectives addressed through military-to-military cooperation activities;

(2) identification of mechanisms for coordinating U.S. security cooperation with other international donors, notably the European Union Training Mission;

(3) a strategy for ensuring that military-to-military cooperation serves to enhance integration and coherence of the Somali National Security Services, including improving multi-ethnic representation, strengthening unit coherence and chain of command, and bolstering civilian control of the Somali armed forces;

(4) an evaluation of unmet equipment and weaponry needs of the Somali armed forces, as well as an assessment of the ability of the Somali Armed Forces to maintain custody and accountability of its weapons inventory and of the benefits and risks of the provision of weaponry to the Somali armed forces by the United States;

(5) an assessment of the security risks to U.S. personnel conducting security cooperation activities within Somalia;

(6) an assessment of the ability of the Somali National Security Forces to maintain control of any equipment and deny violent extremists access to it;

(7) plans for integrating training to prevent human rights abuses into military-to-military cooperation activities;

(8) plans to assist the Somali National Security Forces in preventing infiltration and insider attacks, including through the application of lessons learned in U.S. military training efforts in Afghanistan; and

(9) any other matters the Secretary deems appropriate.

Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit the report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The report may take the form of a briefing, unclassified report, or unclassified report with a classified annex, as the Secretary deems appropriate.

Status of United States military engagements with Burma

The committee notes the developments in Burma over the past year or so that indicate the commitment by the Government of Burma toward democratization and to address human rights abuses, including abuses by the Burmese military. As a result of these developments, the Department of Defense has begun modest and measured military-to-military interactions with the Burmese military. While such military engagement activities can be positive reinforcement for meaningful reforms, the committee remains mindful of the history of human rights abuses within the Burmese military, concerns regarding continuing abuses, and the possibility that any well-intended U.S. military engagement could be misdirected toward a negative result.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide written updates

to the relevant congressional committees on the status of military-to-military engagement between the United States armed forces and the Burmese military. The first such update shall be provided by September 30, 2013, and the next update by March 31, 2014. These updates, which may be in the form of a written report or in the form of a briefing that includes a written description of activities, shall include at a minimum: (1) a written list of ongoing military-to-military activities with a description of each; (2) a written update on activities that were listed in previous reporting; (3) a written list of activities that are planned to occur over the upcoming months with a written description of each; and (4) the status of the Burmese military's cooperation with civilian authorities to investigate and resolve cases of military human rights violations.

For purposes of this requirement, the relevant congressional committees include the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Taiwan air power assessment

Section 1281 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) expressed the sense of Congress that the President should take steps to address Taiwan's shortfall in fighters, whether through the sale of F–16C/D fighters or the procurement of other aircraft. The conference report accompanying Public Law 112–239 also requires the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to ensure that a briefing is prepared and made available to congressional defense committees that sets forth the administration's plan for meeting the statutory requirements of the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96–8) as they relate to how the Taiwan Air Force can contribute appropriately to Taiwan's defense. This briefing has yet to be presented to the Congress. Accordingly, the committee directs the Department to brief the congressional defense committees no later than July 15, 2013.

In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a classified report assessing the capabilities and readiness of the Taiwanese Air Force no later than December 1, 2013. The classified report shall include: a qualitative assessment of the capabilities of each type of fixed wing tactical aircraft in the Taiwanese inventory; an assessment of the readiness of each type of fixed wing tactical aircraft in the Taiwanese inventory; and the expected timeframe of obsolescence of each category of aircraft in the Taiwanese inventory compared to the People's Liberation Army Air Force fixed-wing aircraft in both quantity and quality.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and funds (sec. 1301)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs, define the funds as authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this bill, and authorize CTR funds to be available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Funding allocations (sec. 1302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $528.5 million, the amount of the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. The provision accounts for the change in the umbrella agreement with Russia ending June 17, 2013, in which the following programs will be terminated (as compared to being funded as proposed in the fiscal year 2014 budget request): (1) SS–24 Missile Disassembly and storage, $4.3 million, (2) Chemical Weapons Technical Support—Russia, $21.3 million, (3) Nuclear Security Enhancements—Russia, $4.0 million, and (4) Nuclear Weapons Transportation—Russia, $49.7 million.

The resulting cancellation of funds ($79.3 million) transfers $62.3 million to the Proliferation Prevention Program for Middle East cooperative threat reduction activities to prevent and detect acquisition, proliferation, and use of Syria's chemical weapons, weapons-usable and related materials, equipment or means of delivery, and knowledge. This activity will continue partnerships with Jordan, Iraq, Turkey, and Lebanon. $13.0 million is transferred to Chemical Weapons Eliminations—Libya/Middle East to prepare for potential requirements in Syria if the U.S. Government has a Syrian partner with whom to work to potentially secure and destroy Syria's chemical weapons stockpile. $4.0 million is transferred to the Threat Reduction Engagement Program for exercises and bilateral workshops with Russia that does not require the expiring CTR umbrella agreement to carry out.

This provision authorizes specific amounts for each CTR program element, requires notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2014 funds for a purpose other than a purpose listed in the provision, and requires notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2014 funds in excess of the specific amount authorized for each CTR program element.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Military Programs

Working Capital Funds (sec. 1401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense, at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1404)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, defense-wide, at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Defense Inspector General (sec. 1405)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Defense Health Program (sec. 1406)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $67.8 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 2014 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Authority for transfer of funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois (sec. 1422)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer $143.1 million from the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund created by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) for the operations of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center.

Budget Items

Department of Defense Inspector General growth plan

The budget request for the Department of Defense Office of the Inspector General (DOD IG) included $311.1 million in Operation and Maintenance (O&M).

The committee recognizes that the independent audit and investigative functions of the DOD IG continues to play a valuable role in identifying waste, fraud, and abuse in Department of Defense programs and operations. In fiscal year 2012, DOD IG audits and investigations resulted in a $3.6 billion return on investment, which is an increase of $1.0 billion in returns compared to fiscal year 2011. A $3.6 billion return on investment equates to a return of $2.3 million per employee and $10.81 for every dollar appropriated. The 147 reports issued in fiscal year 2012 led to 149 arrests, 247 convictions, 126 suspensions, and 207 debarments.

The committee continues to believe that the DOD IG should focus on conducting oversight related to military operations in Afghanistan, review contract management and acquisitions, and support audits to identify potential waste, fraud, and abuse. The committee also believes that contractor oversight by the DOD IG should include detailed accounting of the number of personnel used and the capabilities provided by contractors. The committee notes that in the language of Senate Report 112–173, to accompany S. 3254, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112–239) the committee directed the DOD IG to reevaluate the 2008 growth plan and establish future staffing objectives on the basis of audit and investigation need and current budgetary realities. The committee received an updated growth plan on May 15, 2013, which calls for a fiscal year 2018 end state of 1,900 versus 2,061 full-time equivalents (FTE), 161 less than originally planned; a 7.8 percent downward adjustment. The committee notes this end state still represents an increase of 286 FTEs over the fiscal year 2013 authorized FTE level of 1,614, and will allow for substantive increases in the DOD IG's oversight capabilities. The committee also notes that the DOD IG budget request for fiscal year 2014 still falls $35.9 million short of their requirements for increased oversight capabilities.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $35.9 million in O&M for the DOD IG.

Defense Health Program funding

The amount authorized to be appropriated for the Defense Health Program includes the following change from the budget request. This addition would replace savings assumed by the Department of Defense (DOD) for proposed establishment of enrollment fees and increases to certain other TRICARE fees, which the committee did not adopt.

[Changes in millions of dollars]

Restore DOD assumed savings for TRICARE proposals	218.0
Total	218.0

Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities

The budget request included $816.0 million to support the Department of Defense's (DOD) Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities. Of those amounts, $19.9 million supported the Joint Interagency Task Force-West (JIATF–W, project code 3309); $1.6 million supported the United States European Command's (EUCOM) headquarters (project code 2346); and $1.2 million for special operations forces counternarcotics (CN) support to EUCOM (project code 6505).

The committee recommends a decrease of $5.8 million to DOD's Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities, which will decrease by $3.0 million funding for the JIATF–W, and provide no funding for the two aforementioned programs at EUCOM.

The committee understands the importance of interagency cooperation, particularly as it relates to CN and efforts to combat the related threats posed by transnational organized criminal organizations. However, the committee is concerned the JIATF–W and its associated activities are not fully integrated into the intelligence, and policy and planning directorates of United States Pacific Command (PACOM). As result, the committee believes that there is duplication in these two important areas. The committee urges the Commander of PACOM to review JIATF–W's activities and eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort within the PACOM's CN, intelligence, and capacity-building activities.

On the reductions to EUCOM, the committee has noted since 2012 its concern with DOD's efforts to maintain CN programs at EUCOM. The committee believes partner nations within the EUCOM area of responsibility are best positioned to fund both intelligence activities and capacity building on their own. As such, the committee is eliminating funding for EUCOM's CN programs and urges the Secretary to approve no funding for these programs in the next fiscal year.

Items of Special Interest

Army industrial operations activity group

The committee notes that recent analysis on the Army industrial operations activity group conducted by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) showed that the Army needs to improve the budgeting and management of carryover. The committee remains concerned that the Army underestimated industrial operations new orders every year during a 7-year period of review by the GAO, from a low of 11 percent to a high of 70 percent. For orders funded

with procurement appropriations, the Army underestimated new orders by 118 percent for the 7-year period. The committee is also concerned that the carryover grew to $5.8 billion in fiscal year 2011. The three primary causes for the carryover were: (1) the scope of work was not well defined, (2) parts needed to perform the work were not available, and (3) some orders were received late in the fiscal year which provided little time to resolve any scope of work or parts issues. The committee notes that the arrival of direct appropriation funding late in a fiscal year only exacerbates the ability to effectively manage carryover.

The committee has learned that the Army has recently formed a working group to resolve these budgeting and management issues. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Army to promptly finalize the working group results and implement the actions identified to improve the budgeting and management of carryover. The committee directs the Army to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee on their progress no later than September 15, 2013.

Concerns with working capital fund cash balances and fuel rate pricing

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) continues to struggle with the management of cash balances and carryover in working capital funds (WCF), resulting in increased risk and unnecessary negative impacts to Operation and Maintenance funding due to inadequate fuel rate determinations. For several years now the Government Accountability Office has documented the DOD's significant cash fluctuation in multiple reports. The committee notes that the effect of sequestration as a result of the Budget Control Act of 2011, the recent string of late-arriving annual appropriations, and the volatile global price of fossil fuels only exacerbate the issue.

The committee remains concerned that while the function of the WCF is designed to protect customer programs in the year of execution, the reality of the last several years is that frequently changing WCF rates and reprogramming requests have evolved from exceptions to common practice. For example, in 2009 the standard composite fuel price charged to DOD customers changed five times, and at least once per year since 2005. Additionally, in fiscal year 2012 the committee received a reprogramming request for $1.0 billion to offset a change in fuel rates. A similar reprogramming request occurred in fiscal year 2013 for $1.4 billion. The committee notes that the DOD bases its fuel rate charged to the services from the Office of Management and Budget's set price for a refined barrel of fuel based on an estimated future market price projection. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the 7–10 day window has not been effective in enabling the services to adapt and absorb WCF rate changes in fuel and transportation costs in the budget year of execution, resulting in negative impacts to readiness, specifically in the Operation and Maintenance accounts.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General to report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2014 with recommendations as to how the DOD can better deter-

mine and manage their WCF and fuel rates in the budget year of execution.

Joint Interagency Task Force—South

Sequestration and budget restrictions are having a negative impact not only on readiness and modernization accounts, but also on the ability of the Department of Defense (DOD) to carry out ongoing missions. While DOD's decision to allocate scarce budgetary resources to forces engaged with the enemy in Afghanistan is both understandable and justifiable, that decision has had a significant impact on the operations of other combatant commands.

For example, budgetary restrictions have drastically reduced the ability of DOD and partner agencies to allocate assets—particularly surface vessels and personnel to the Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF—South) mission of countering illicit drug trafficking and disruption of transnational criminal organizations in the United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) area of responsibility, thereby increasing the supply of narcotics hitting U.S. streets at the same time that state and local law enforcement are also seeing funding reductions. During his March 2013 testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, General John F. Kelly, Commander of SOUTHCOM, warned that sequestration could hinder the ability of SOUTHCOM to detect and monitor the flow of drugs to the United States, support the counterdrug efforts of partner nations, and curtail counternarcotics air and surface operations. He said, "[t]aken together, these limitations would undermine the significant gains we have made through the highly successful and ongoing Operation Martillo; the 152 metric tons of cocaine seized to date represents over $3.0 billion in revenue that will not go to fund powerful criminal groups, violence in Mexico, and the destabilization of our Central American partners. These 152 metric tons will also not reach the streets of America nor fuel costly crime and drug addiction."

The committee believes that the across-the-board sequestration cuts to the DOD budget are arbitrary and irrational and undermine the national security of the United States. In the absence of legislation removing the threat of continued sequestration, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to do as much as practicable to continue key operations of the geographic combatant commands, such as the counternarcotics mission of SOUTHCOM and JIATF—South.

National Guard Counterdrug Program

The committee notes that the Department of Defense requests funding annually to support the National Guard Counterdrug Program (CDP). The committee believes that the CDP plays an important role in providing military-specific capabilities and expertise resident within the National Guard to support the counterdrug activities of federal, state, and local authorities. This support includes the provision of linguists, intelligence, transportation, logistics, reconnaissance, training, education, and prevention outreach. The committee believes this support has proven effective in helping to meet national counterdrug objectives. The committee notes that over the last 2 fiscal years, budgetary pressures have led the De-

partment to decrease the budget request for the CDP. The committee understands that these cuts have caused a disruption or curtailment of CDP operations, including the activities of the five regional Counterdrug Training Centers. As such, the committee encourages the Department to continue its support for the CDP and provide adequate funding to ensure the sustainability of the program.

Additionally, the committee notes that beginning in 2008, the National Guard Bureau began development of a threat-based approach to its counterdrug activities. The committee supported this initiative and, in fiscal year 2011, DOD approved the Threat-Based Resource Model (TBRM) and began implementation of the new construct in fiscal year 2012, with plans to achieve full implementation by fiscal year 2015. The basis of the TBRM construct is to align funding in support of state counterdrug plans based on an analytical assessment of security threats associated with narcotics trafficking.

In prepared testimony submitted to Congress in 2012, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau stated: "the implementation of the [TBRM] budget will strengthen the National Guard's national security capability by allocating resources to all states and territories based on the severity of the narcotics threat faced by each state." As implementation of the TBRM continues, the committee urges the National Guard Bureau to ensure that the data, metrics, and analyses associated with the TBRM are reliable, clearly articulated, transparent, and reflect the changing nature of narcotics trafficking activities. In addition, the committee urges the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to cooperate and share information associated with the TBRM in a routine, systemic manner with relevant interagency partners, particularly the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the Drug Enforcement Agency.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations

Purpose (sec. 1501)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to overseas contingency operations.

Procurement (sec. 1502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for procurement at the levels identified in section 4102 of division D of this Act.

Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1503)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4202 of division D of this Act.

Operation and maintenance (sec. 1504)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for operation and maintenance at the levels identified in section 4302 of division D of this Act.

Military personnel (sec. 1505)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4402 of division D of this Act.

Working capital funds (sec. 1506)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1507)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1508)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for chemical agents and munitions destruc-

tion, defense, at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1509)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide, at the level identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Defense Inspector General (sec. 1510)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Defense Health program (sec. 1511)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—Financial Matters

Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1521)

The committee recommends a provision that would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

Special transfer authority (sec. 1522)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to an additional $4.0 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1531)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend until December 31, 2014, the authority for the Secretary of Defense to use funds to investigate, develop, and provide equipment, supplies, services, personnel, and funds to assist efforts to defeat improvised explosive devices (IED).

The committee continues to maintain that the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) is a temporary organization created by the Department of Defense (DOD), with the support of Congress, to respond rapidly to IED threats against our deployed forces. The committee believes it is now the appropriate time for DOD to assess the roles and missions of JIEDDO and DOD in maintaining a capability to counter the IED threat. The committee believes the military departments can absorb into their operations and doctrine the appropriate capabilities and training required to counter the threat posed by IED in current and future operations. JIEDDO, in its various iterations, has now been in existence for nearly a decade, and the military departments have had ample time to plan accordingly. As such, the committee has ex-

tended this authority until the end of calendar year 2014—when operations in Afghanistan will reach an inflection point. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to develop a clear strategy to ensure the military departments absorb the enduring capabilities and associated funding that JIEDDO has benefitted from over the past decade. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, on the disposition of JIEDDO as an organization and a strategy that identifies and transitions those enduring capabilities and associated funding to the military departments. Further, the report will also address what mechanisms will be put in place to ensure adequate coordination across the military departments and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in their science and technology activities related to defeating IEDs in order to focus on priority areas and avoid unnecessary duplication of effort.

Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1532)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that funds available for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund for fiscal year 2014 be used subject to the conditions specified in subsections (b) through (g) of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 428), as amended by section 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4424). The provision would also allow for equipment previously transferred to the Afghanistan security forces to be returned to the stocks of the Department of Defense (DOD) with congressional notification. The Secretary of Defense would be required to report to the congressional defense committees semi-annually on the equipment transferred to DOD stocks under this authority.

Extension of authority for Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan (sec. 1533)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of the Department of Defense Task Force for Business and Stability Operations (TFBSO) in Afghanistan to promote strategic business and economic development in support of the civil-military campaign in Afghanistan. For fiscal year 2014, up to $63.8 million would be authorized to fund TFBSO projects, which include mining sector development, industrial development, and facilitating private investment. The provision would restrict the availability of the fiscal year 2014 funds for developing the mining and oil and gas sectors until after the Secretary of Defense certifies that the Government of Afghanistan has agreed to reimburse the Government of the United States for the amount of any such funds, from royalties received from mining or oil and gas contracts awarded by the Government of Afghanistan. The amendment would also revise the period for providing an update on the implementation of the TFBSO Transition Action Plan that was submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives in May 2012 from every 90 days to every 180 days.

The TFBSO has contributed to the stability of Afghanistan's economy, particularly the development of its mining sector. How-

ever, the committee strongly believes that TFBSO funds for the development of Afghanistan's mining should not go towards subsidizing the ability of foreign companies, in particular the Chinese mineral extraction industry, to exploit the estimated $1.0 trillion worth of Afghanistan resources. The committee believes that companies who mine Afghanistan's rare earth minerals should be the ones investing in the mining infrastructure of Afghanistan.

Further, the committee expects that with the transition of full security responsibility to the Government of Afghanistan by the end of 2014, the activities of the TFBSO will transition, either to another U.S. Government department or agency or to the Government of Afghanistan, or be promptly concluded.

Budget Items

NATO Special Operations Headquarters

The budget request for overseas contingency operations included $7.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army, for support to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Operations Headquarters (NSHQ). As requested by the Department of Defense and consistent with the agreement between the Army and U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and the April 2013 Resource Management Decision transferring resourcing responsibility from the Army to USSOCOM, the committee recommends a transfer of this funding to Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide.

BuckEye

The budget request included $29.2 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA) for Overseas Contingency Operations, of which $1.3 billion was for forces readiness operations support.

The committee understands that the Army's funding request for the BuckEye system that provides high-resolution 3-dimensional terrain data (10 centimeter electro-optical color imagery, combined with 1-meter post spacing elevation data) was eliminated during budget reviews due to a misunderstanding about the enduring requirement for this data or about the availability of alternative sources of such data. The Department of Defense has assured the committee that U.S. Central Command's Joint Urgent Operational Needs Statement for five systems remains in effect through fiscal year 2014, and that no other available system can provide this data.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $56.3 million in OMA (subactivity 121) for BuckEye terrain data.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization

The budget request included $1.0 billion for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund, of which funding is distributed to four lines of operation (LOO): (1) $417.0 million for Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization's (JIEDDO) operations attacking the network; (2) $248.9 million for JIEDDO's operations to develop and procure capabilities to defeat improvised explosive devices (IED); (3) $106.0 million to fund efforts to train service members prior to deployment on counter-IED tactics, techniques,

and procedures; and (4) $227.4 million for JIEDDO's staff and infrastructure expenses.

The committee recommends the following modification's to JIEDDO's budget: (1) a decrease of $106.0 million for JIEDDO's training activities; (2) a decrease $45.0 million for JIEDDO's staff and infrastructure expenses; (3) an increase of $80.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army within the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) account to train soldiers prior to deployment on counter-IED tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTPs); and (4) an increase of $26.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps within the OCO account to train marines prior to deployment on counter-IED TTPs.

It is the committee's view that JIEDDO's train-the-force activities should be terminated. These activities are the responsibilities of the military departments and JIEDDO should no longer support them. As such, the committee's recommendation would eliminate funding for JIEDDO's train-the-force operations and redistribute the funding to Army and Marine Corps operation and maintenance accounts for counter-IED training activities.

The committee's second reduction to JIEDDO's budget would require the Director of JIEDDO to reduce the size of its overhead. As such, the committee recommendation would make a 20 percent reduction to JIEDDO's staff and infrastructure LOO. Many of JIEDDO's headquarters activities duplicate identical or similar processes that already exist within the various military departments or the Office of the Secretary of Defense. As such, the committee directs the Director of JIEDDO to identify elements of those organizations to assume these tasks.

Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund

The budget request included $62.8 billion in Operation and Maintenance (OM), Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO), of which $279.0 million was for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (AIF) in fiscal year 2014 to support a program to develop and construct large-scale infrastructure projects that support the counter-insurgency campaign in Afghanistan. The committee's concerns about the need to transition responsibility for large-scale infrastructure project management from the Department of Defense to the Government of Afghanistan or an Afghan Government-owned utility company are discussed in another title of this Act. In this regard, the committee understands that the Afghan power utility company, Da Afghanistan Breshna Sherkat (DABS), has begun planning to assume responsibility for the operation of the diesel generators supplying electricity to the Kandahar City area. The committee expects DABS to assume a portion of the costs of operating the Kandahar diesel generators in fiscal year 2014 and to assume the full costs associated with the operation of the generators in fiscal years 2015 and beyond.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $29.0 million for OM, OCO, for AIF, to a level of $250.0 million.

Item of Special Interest

Counter improvised explosive device training

The Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 2000.19E establishing the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) requires the Director of JIEDDO to "[d]evelop and manage, within the military service combat training centers, a distributed Joint Center of Excellence (CoE) for the development of new operational techniques and tactical procedures, and provide a venue for training, experimentation, and testing of new equipment and concepts." As the committee awaits the reports required pursuant to section 1535 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), the committee directs the Secretary to undertake as part of that assessment a review of DOD Directive 2000.19E to ensure that the synchronizing function across the military departments and defense agencies is preserved so that lessons-learned from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are not lost and that the investments made by DOD over the past decade, where appropriate, are preserved and maintained.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary and explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense (DOD). It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing as well as military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that fund military construction, environmental cleanup, and other activities required to implement the decisions in base closure rounds.

The tables contained in this Act provide the project-level authorizations for the military construction funding authorized in Division B of this Act and summarize that funding by account. Funding for base closure projects is summarized in title XXVII of this report and is explained in additional detail in the table included in title XLVI of this report.

The fiscal year 2014 budget requested $11.01 billion for military construction and housing programs. Of this amount, $8.65 billion was requested for military construction, $1.54 billion for the construction and operation of family housing, and $451.4 million for base closure activities.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction, housing programs, and base closure activities totaling $9.67 billion. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects the committee's continuing commitment to invest in the recapitalization of DOD facilities and infrastructure.

Short title (sec. 2001)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014".

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the expiration date for authorizations in this Act for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization infrastructure program as of October 1, 2016, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI— ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1.1 billion for military construction and $556.9 million for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.1 billion for military construction and $540.3 million for family housing for fiscal year 2014.

The committee understands the Department of Defense is currently conducting a European Infrastructure Consolidation Review designed to identify opportunities to close facilities and consolidate forces in locations better matched to mission requirements. The budget requests $16.6 million for construction of 29 new family housing units at Camp Vilseck, Germany. The committee believes authorization of this project would presume the outcome of the Department's European Infrastructure Consolidation Review and, therefore, recommends no funding for this project.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Army for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2014. This provision would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2014 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Army. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2104)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2101(a) of the Military Construc-

tion Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4437) for construction of a Regional Logistic Support Complex at Fort Lewis, Washington.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2010 project (sec. 2105)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2101(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2629) for construction of APS Warehouses at Camp Arifjan, Kuwait.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project (sec. 2106)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136; 117 Stat. 1697) for construction of an Explosives Research and Development Loading Facility at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects (sec. 2107)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for four projects until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2010 projects (sec. 2108)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2010 authorization for three projects until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

Limitation on construction of cadet barracks at United States Military Academy, New York (sec. 2109)

The budget request includes $42.0 million to fund the second increment of the cadet barracks at the U.S. Military Academy (USMA), New York. The committee remains concerned about the condition of the existing barracks at the USMA and believes that renovation of those barracks should be a high priority for the Secretary of the Army.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds for the second increment of USMA barracks construction, as requested, until the Secretary of the Army certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary has entered into a contract for the renovation of MacArthur Short Barracks at the USMA, consistent with the plan provided to the congressional defense committees in March 2013.

Items of Special Interest

Access Control Point Equipment Program

The committee notes that the Army has requested $30.3 million for its Access Control Point Equipment Program (ACPEP) which would be installed at five Army installations. The committee further notes that Recommendation 3.9 of the Fort Hood commission report states that the Department of Defense (DOD) needs to improve its ability to screen contractors coming onto military installations. Specifically, the report recommended that DOD "accelerate efforts to automate access control that will authenticate various identification media against authoritative databases" and "obtain sufficient access to appropriate threat databases and disseminate information to local commanders to enable screening at continental United States and overseas installation access control points."

The committee notes that the Navy has used U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) and DOD approved solutions to implement its access control requirements to military installations that provide electronic verification for enhanced security for contractors requiring access to military installations by sharing the cost of implementation with the contractors. The committee notes that the Army may save resources by adopting existing GSA-approved solutions for base access control.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review existing GSA-approved access control programs in use at DOD installations and report to the committee with a cost-benefit analysis of using current installation force protection practices versus further deployment of the ACPEP.

Comptroller General review of litigation costs incurred by the Military Housing Privatization Initiative

The committee notes that over the past 12 years, the Department of the Army has entered into a series of transactions with various partners to construct, renovate, maintain, and operate most of the Army's military family housing unit inventory in the United States.

While this military family housing privatization initiative (MHPI) has resulted in successful partnerships between the Army and the private sector to significantly improve the quality of housing offered to military members and their families over a relatively short period of time, the long-term success of this program depends on maintaining the quality of those homes in order to continue to attract and retain military occupants. The Army and their partners jointly manage a series of operations and investment accounts to fund maintenance, repairs, and the recapitalization of housing units for this purpose.

Section 2803 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) was intended to strengthen the oversight of MHPI by implementing a series of financial integrity and accountability measures. The provision also required the Secretary of Defense to submit expanded reports to Congress on expenditures and receipts related to MHPI.

It is the committee's expectation that funds generated from the original transactions are being appropriately reinvested in activities that directly benefit military members and their families living

in the privatized housing. The committee notes that the provision described above was also written to provide a greater degree of transparency on those withdrawals and expenditures that do not have a direct benefit to military families. The committee believes that the use of funds to pay for internal litigation costs associated with lawsuits between private entities involved with MHPI should be among those withdrawals and expenditures reported to Congress.

In addition, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States, not later than October 30, 2013, to carry out a complete review of the costs incurred to the various Army MHPI accounts as a result of unique litigation activities. The review should include, at a minimum, the following:

(1) a description of actions taken by the Department of the Army to minimize the use of MHPI funds for unique litigation;

(2) a description of documentation provided to the Army by its partners to justify legal expenses;

(3) a review of the internal Army and partner processes used to approve major withdrawals and expenses for litigation;

(4) an assessment of the applicable Army guidance or transactional documentation governing potential withdrawals or expenditures for litigation expenses;

(5) an assessment of the impact of litigation expenses associated with specific projects on the availability of funding for purposes directly beneficial to such projects;

(6) an estimate of the total costs to Army MHPI projects that have been incurred to date and the extent to which the Army has estimated any future litigation expenses;

(7) a review of plans to replenish MHPI asset management accounts impacted by withdrawals and expenses for litigation; and

(8) any other subject matter that the Comptroller General may deem appropriate on this subject.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1.7 billion for military construction and $463.2 million for family housing for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.61 billion for military construction and $463.2 million for family housing for fiscal year 2014.

The budget requested $85.7 million for an Aircraft Maintenance Hangar at the North Ramp of Andersen Air Force Base, Guam. Because of continuing concerns with the realignment of United States Marines from Okinawa to Guam, addressed later in a recommended provision in this title, the committee recommends no funding for this project.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Navy and Marine Corps military construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2014. This provision would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2014 to improve existing Navy family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Department of the Navy authorized for construction for fiscal year 2014 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty components of the Navy and the Marine Corps. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1666) for construction of Explosives Handling Wharf No. 2 at Kitsap, Washington.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2206)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2201(b) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383; 124 Stat. 4441), for construction of Navy Central Command ammunition magazines in Bahrain.

One-year extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2207)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for one project until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

Two-year extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2208)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for one project until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Item of Special Interest

Townsend Bombing Range land acquisition

The committee notes that the budget request includes $61.7 million to acquire real estate interests as the first phase of an expansion of the Townsend Bombing Range in Georgia in order to support the training of Navy and Marine Corps aviators in air-to-ground employment of precision guided munitions. Considering the fact that the first phase of the expansion will require the purchase of approximately 20,000 acres, the committee commends the Department of the Navy for its efforts to engage community representatives from Long County, Georgia and McIntosh County, Georgia and supports efforts for a mutually acceptable agreement regarding use of the real property to be acquired for the expansion of the Townsend Bombing Range that protects and supports the mission of the range.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1.2 billion for military construction and $464.9 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $964.2 million for military construction and $464.9 million for family housing for fiscal year 2014.

The budget requested $132.6 million for a hardened tanker aircraft maintenance hangar and $20.0 million for the construction of hardened structures around existing and new fuel systems buildings at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam. The committee believes that the authorization of these projects would presume the outcome of U.S. Pacific Command's completion of a comprehensive operational resiliency study and, therefore, recommends no funding for these projects.

The committee understands the Department of Defense is currently conducting a European Infrastructure Consolidation Review designed to identify opportunities to close facilities and consolidate forces in locations better matched to mission requirements. The budget requested $22.0 million for Guardian Angel Operations Facilities at Royal Air Force Station Lakenheath, United Kingdom, and $12.0 million for a Main Gate Complex at Royal Air Force Station Croughton, United Kingdom. The committee believes that the authorization of these projects would presume the outcome of the Department's European Infrastructure Consolidation Review and, therefore, recommends no funding for these projects.

The budget requested $192.7 million for KC–46A Main Operating Base (MOB) #1 facilities and $63.0 million for KC–46A Formal Training Unit (FTU) facilities at unspecified locations. On May 22, 2013, the Air Force announced McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, as its preferred alternative for the KC–46A MOB #1 and Altus Air Force Base, Oklahoma, as its preferred alternative for the KC–46A FTU. Concurrent with this announcement, the Air Force also requested an amendment to its budget request specifying location-specific requirements for KC–46A bed down, including $219.1 million for eight military construction projects at McConnell Air Force Base and $30.9 million for five military construction projects at Altus Air Force Base. The committee recommends these amounts.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Air Force military construction projects for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2014. This provision would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2014 to improve existing Air Force family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Air Force authorized for construction for fiscal year 2014 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Air Force. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2305)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for one project until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $4.0 billion for military construction for the defense agencies, $150.0 million for energy conservation projects, $122.5 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and $55.8 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2014.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $2.9 billion for military construction, $150.0 million for energy conservation projects, $122.5 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and $55.8 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2014.

The committee understands the Department of Defense (DOD) is currently conducting a European Infrastructure Consolidation Review designed to identify opportunities to close facilities and consolidate forces in locations better matched to mission requirements. The budget requested $17.7 million to replace fuel storage systems, $11.6 million for a squadron operations facility, $24.4 million for a hangar, $24.0 million for airfield improvements, and $6.8 million for storage facilities at Royal Air Force Station Mildenhall, United Kingdom. The budget also requested: $49.9 million for an elementary school at Kaiserslautern Military Community, Germany; $98.8 million for a high school at Ramstein Air Base, Germany; $58.9 million for an elementary school and $50.7 million for a middle school at Wiesbaden, Germany; and $69.6 million for a high school at Royal Air Force Station Lakenheath. The committee believes that the authorization of these projects would presume the outcome of the Department's European Infrastructure Consolidation Review and, therefore, recommends no funding for these projects.

The budget requested $431.0 million for the third increment of the High Performance Computing Center at Fort Meade, Maryland. The committee understands DOD would be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, recommends a $50.0 million reduction.

The budget requested $265.0 million for an Ambulatory Health Center at Fort Knox, Kentucky. The committee understands DOD would be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, recommends a $190.0 million reduction.

The budget requested $210.0 million for replacement of the Public Health Command Laboratory at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland. The committee understands DOD would be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, recommends a $135.0 million reduction.

The budget requested $76.2 million for the second increment of the Ambulatory Care Center at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland. The committee understands DOD would be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, recommends a $38.1 million reduction.

The budget requested $251.2 million for the fifth increment of the Hospital Replacement at Fort Bliss, Texas. The committee understands DOD would be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, recommends a $152.1 million reduction.

The budget requested $151.5 million for the third increment of the Medical Center Replacement at Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany. The committee understands DOD would be unable to obligate and expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, recommends a $75.0 million reduction.

The budget requested $1.8 million for a Tour Bus Drop Off at the Pentagon Reservation, Virginia. The committee believes this project is unjustified given the current fiscal pressures facing DOD and does little to improve the safety of visitors to the Pentagon and, therefore, recommends no funding for this project.

Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations

Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects.

Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the military construction and family housing projects of the defense agencies authorized for construction for fiscal year 2014 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the defense agencies. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations

Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, Defense-wide (sec. 2411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the chemical demilitarization program for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $239.7 million for military construction in fiscal year 2014 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization facilities.

The committee recommends a total of $239.7 million for military construction for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization facilities.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations of $239.7 million for the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2014.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $693.3 million for military construction in fiscal year 2014 for facilities for the guard and reserve components. The committee recommends this amount. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the state list table included in this report.

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations

Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2014. The authorized amounts are listed on a location-by-location basis.

Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the reserve component military construction projects authorized for construction for fiscal year 2014 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for each of the reserve components of the military departments. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2611)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2603 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2135), for construction of a Joint Reserve Center at Fort Des Moines, Iowa.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for one project until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for one project until October 1, 2014, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2015, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

Summary and explanation of tables

The budget request included $451.4 million for the ongoing cost of environmental remediation and other activities necessary to continue implementation of the 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005 Base Realignment and Closure rounds. The committee recommends this amount. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the state list table included in this report.

Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account (sec. 2701)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions of the 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005 Base Realignment and Closure rounds.

Precondition for any future base realignment and closure round (sec. 2702)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish, as a precondition for the authorization of a future Base Realignment and Closure round, a requirement for the Department of Defense to submit to Congress a formal review of overseas military facility structure.

Report on 2005 base closure and realignment joint basing initiative (sec. 2703)

The 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round created 12 joint bases from 26 service installations that were in close proximity or shared a boundary. While the Department of Defense (DOD) originally planned to save $2.3 billion over 20 years through these consolidations, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has found that the 20-year savings estimate has fallen by nearly 90 percent to approximately $249.0 million. GAO has further noted that: "it is unclear whether DOD has achieved any significant cost savings to date, in part due to its adoption of more costly common support standards, higher projected administrative costs, and weaknesses in its approach to tracking costs and estimated savings." However, GAO has suggested that DOD may still be able to achieve significant savings through the adoption of "a more rigorous and comprehensive department-wide approach to managing this initiative."

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment to submit a report to the congressional defense committees,

not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, on the 2005 BRAC joint basing initiative. At a minimum, the report should include: (1) an analysis and explanation of the costs necessary to implement the joint basing initiative; (2) an analysis and explanation of any savings achieved to date and planned in future years, including quantifiable goals and a timeline for meeting such goals; (3) a description of implementation challenges and other lessons learned; (4) an assessment of any additional savings that could be achieved through more rigorous management and streamlined administration of joint bases; and (5) any other matters the Under Secretary considers appropriate.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Modification of authorities to fund military construction through payments-in-kind and to use residual value payments-in-kind (sec. 2801)

The committee released a report on April 15, 2013, titled "Inquiry into U.S. Costs and Allied Contributions to Support the U.S. Military Presence Overseas." Among other things, the committee's inquiry found that in-kind payments from partner nations to support the overseas presence of U.S. military forces in Germany, South Korea, and Japan, have been used to fund questionable military construction projects. Given the current fiscal challenges facing the Department of Defense (DOD), it is critical that in-kind payments be utilized for identified U.S. priorities to offset costs that DOD would otherwise pay with appropriated funds.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would require that all future military construction projects funded using in-kind payments pursuant to bilateral agreements with partner nations be submitted for congressional authorization in the Military Construction Authorization Act. This provision would exclude projects funded using in-kind payments under the Facility Improvement Program in Japan, since it is a voluntary program, not a program conducted pursuant to a bilateral agreement. The provision would also exclude from the requirement for congressional authorization particular military construction projects identified in bilateral agreements entered into before the date of enactment. However, that exclusion would not extend to general references to replacement facilities such as those contained in the U.S.-Korea Land Partnership Plan.

Furthermore, the committee strongly encourages DOD, when using any future in-kind payments from partner nations, to first consider and prioritize operational expenses and facilities restoration, sustainment, and modernization improvements ahead of military construction. The recommended provision would also require that DOD include operational expenses funded through residual value payments in-kind in the budget justification documents submitted to Congress in connection with the annual budget request.

Extension and modification of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize contingency construction authority in certain areas outside the United States for an additional year and revise the list of countries in which such authority may be used in the United States Africa Command (AFRICOM) area of responsibility (AOR). If the Secretary of Defense determines that expansion of this authority to additional countries in the AFRICOM AOR is necessary, the committee asks that the Department submit a formal legislative proposal and justification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Authority for acceptance of funds to cover administrative expenses associated with real property leases and easements (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, to allow for the use of proceeds from leases and easements to be used to offset administrative costs incurred by the military departments in entering into and managing such leases and easements.

Application of cash payments received for utilities and services (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the secretaries of the military departments, beginning in fiscal year 2014, to credit cash payments received as compensation for utilities or services provided to eligible entities that operate family or military unaccompanied housing projects to the appropriation or working capital account currently available for the purpose of furnishing such utilities or services. This provision was requested by the Department of Defense to ensure that such reimbursements remain available in current appropriations to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense rather than being credited to an expired account, making them unusable.

Modification of authority to enter into long-term contracts for receipt of utility services as consideration for utility systems conveyances (sec. 2813)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2688(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, by requiring the Secretary of a military department, prior to conveying a utility system under this section, to obtain an independent estimate of the level of investment that should be required to maintain adequate operation of the utility system over the term of the conveyance.

Acquisition of real property at Naval Base Ventura County, California (sec. 2814)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire 300 units of military family hous-

ing constructed under section 801 of the Military Construction Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–115) at Naval Base Ventura County, California. The committee understands this housing would be acquired for the purposes of converting it to meet an enduring need for transient and unaccompanied housing.

Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment

Realignment of Marine Corps forces in Asia-Pacific Region (sec. 2821)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend a prohibition on funds for construction activities to implement the realignment of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa, Japan, with certain exceptions.

Modification of reporting requirements relating to Guam realignment (sec. 2822)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the reporting period for the annual Guam realignment report from calendar year to fiscal year.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

Land conveyance Joint Base Pearl Harbor Hickam, Hawaii (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey approximately 11 acres of Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii, to the Hale Keiki School in return for a cash payment, in-kind consideration, or a combination thereof, in an amount that is not less than the fair market value of the conveyed property, as determined pursuant to an appraisal acceptable to the Secretary.

Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial transfer (sec. 2832)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to sell or exchange the Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial in San Diego, California, to an eligible entity on the condition that it continues to be maintained as a veterans' memorial.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Redesignation of the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies as the Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (sec. 2841)

The committee recommends a provision that would name the Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies at Honolulu, Hawaii, as the "Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies" and make other conforming changes.

Items of Special Interest

Department of Defense policy for sustainable buildings

The committee supports the Department of Defense's (DOD) commitment to promote a policy for sensible and cost-effective sustain-

able designs for DOD facilities to reduce life cycle costs and provide for efficient and effective support of military missions.

However, the committee is concerned that the Department's revision of the Unified Facilities Code (UFC) issued in March 2013 regarding High Performance and Sustainable Building Requirements included direction to DOD components to design all new construction and major renovation projects to meet a specific third party certification. The committee is concerned that the UFC exclusively references a single certification to the exclusion of other green building certification systems.

The committee recommends that the Department's revised policy should provide for an equal consideration of other sustainable building certification systems which provide design standards for cost-effective facilities, incorporate life cycle assessments, and are created through a voluntary consensus process or through international sustainable building codes.

Homeowners Assistance Program

The committee notes that the Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP) was created in 1966 to provide monetary relief to eligible service members and federal employee homeowners who suffered financial loss on the sale of their primary residences when a base closure or realignment announcement created a decline in the residential real estate market and owners were not able to sell their homes under reasonable terms or conditions. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) expanded the HAP to provide assistance to: (1) wounded members of the Armed Forces, surviving spouses of fallen warriors, and wounded Department of Defense (DOD) civilian homeowners reassigned in furtherance of medical treatment or rehabilitation or due to medical retirement in connection with their disability; (2) Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 impacted homeowners relocating during the mortgage crisis; and (3) service member homeowners given Permanent Change of Station (PCS) orders by the Federal Government during the mortgage crisis.

The committee notes that as of June 2013, HAP benefits totaling $1.6 billion have been paid to 9,940 applicants. However, the committee also understands that payments were made in error to at least 240 applicants totaling more than $4.5 million in improperly paid HAP benefits. The DOD, as required by law, is currently in the process of recovering these improperly paid benefits.

The committee is concerned by the significant number of documented improper payments under HAP and questions the adequacy of the Department's process to vet and approve applications for such benefits. The committee is also concerned about the financial hardship for service members who received HAP payments in error and were subsequently directed to repay the Federal Government. In many cases, service members have made significant decisions with regard to selling a home based on their receipt of HAP benefits only to find out later that such benefits were provided in error and must be repaid.

The committee notes that the Department has established a multi-phase review process for service members to challenge a determination by the Department that HAP benefits were provided

improperly. The committee also notes that the Department may, in some cases, waive its right to collect repayment if the debt is a result of an erroneous payment and collection would be against equity and good conscience and not in the best interest of the United States. The committee expects the Department, when it deems appropriate, to exercise this waiver.

Military Construction Project Data Sheets

The committee notes that the President's budget request is accompanied by Military Construction Project Data Sheets, also known as DD Form 1391 forms, containing the justification, scope, and cost of each requested military construction project. The congressional defense committees use each DD Form 1391 as the basis for reviewing the Department's military construction requirements, proposed new construction to meet each requirement, and limits of cost and scope of the project. The committee is aware that the Department considers the authorization of the proposed military construction project to be contract authority and the DD Form 1391 is used by the contracting officer to define the limits of that contract authority.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense prepares DD Form 1391s with the intent of establishing flexibility within each congressional authorization of a military construction project in order for design agents, construction agents, and contracting officers to be able to make decisions about site adaptations, final scope, proposed methods of construction, and consideration of emerging requirements without the need for additional authorization from Congress. While the committee is aware of the need for some degree of flexibility in order to make efficient use of resources and to respond to unforeseen requirements that could not feasibly be discovered during preparation of the defense budget request, each military construction project should have a clearly defined primary scope and costs, an identified and characterized site, a clear estimate of the supporting utility and infrastructure scope and costs, and a mature plan for other considerations such as ancillary facilities and real property necessary to meet the requirement. To ensure this degree of certainty, Congress each year authorizes and appropriates funds to carry out planning and design activities without a congressional authorization for the construction of a project.

The committee is concerned that the justification data provided for many projects in the budget request and accompanying DD Form 1391s does not contain information that is critical to its oversight of the scope and construction of such projects. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that each DD Form 1391 clearly and concisely defines the proposed scope of both the primary and supporting facilities and infrastructure that will result in a complete and useable facility without the need for a congressional authorization of additional construction. The Secretary shall also ensure that the proposed use of each facility, as represented by a five or six digit category code, is included in each DD Form 1391 and is not allowed to be changed during construction or immediately following construction. Each DD Form 1391 shall also include a proposed method of construction and a specification of the proposed design life of the construction method in order for

Congress to be able to assess the Department's justification for the investment in comparison to the military requirement. Each DD Form 1391 shall also include information regarding the need for future phases, related construction, land acquisitions or leases, and other activities that will be required to be carried out as part of the military construction project.

The committee strongly believes that clear, complete, and concise DD Form 1391s are critical to both the Department of Defense's effort to manage resources effectively and the integrity of the congressional authorization of military construction projects.

Scope of work variations for military construction projects

A February 27, 2012, report by the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG), titled "Guidance Needed to Prevent Military Construction Projects from Exceeding the Approved Scope of Work," found several instances where military construction projects in Afghanistan significantly exceeded the scope authorized by Congress. According to the DOD IG, "DOD [Department of Defense] officials do not have assurance that military construction projects are built consistent with congressional intent and in accordance with legislative requirements." The DOD IG recommended: (1) the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment (DUSD(I&E)) issue clarification guidance to define the scope of work outlined in section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, that may not be exceeded; and (2) the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Director of the Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment develop and implement procedures to perform scope verifications to ensure compliance with the law. Therefore, the committee directs the DUSD(I&E), not later than September 30, 2013, to provide the congressional defense committees a report describing actions taken in response to the February 2012 DOD IG report.

Traffic safety

The committee has seen anecdotal evidence that the frequency and severity of traffic accidents at some military installations have increased significantly in recent years. For example, at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, traffic accidents have increased by more than 400 percent and injuries resulting from traffic accidents have increased by more than 200 percent since 2005. The committee is concerned that the increase in traffic accidents may be, at least partly, attributed to on-base transportation infrastructure projects not keeping pace with base population growth.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than September 30, 2013, regarding traffic accidents at installations with 25,000 or more permanently assigned service members, including: (1) an analysis of trends in on-base traffic accident data; (2) an assessment of whether transportation infrastructure projects have kept pace with growth in base populations at such installations; (3) an analysis of the factors contributing to traffic accidents on large military installations; (4) any recommendations for reducing the

number of traffic accidents on large military installations; and (5) any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

U.S. military posture and resiliency in the Asia-Pacific

The committee remains interested in the posture of U.S. forces in the Asia-Pacific region and the implications of the strategic rebalance announced as part of the Defense Strategic Guidance in January 2012. While this rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific encompasses more than just U.S. military presence and posture, the current and future U.S. military force posture in the Asia-Pacific region is a critical element of the overall geo-political security strategy in Asia.

The committee understands that U.S. Pacific Command is currently conducting a study of resiliency and developing an associated resiliency plan as one element of the force posture and supporting infrastructure. The committee is reluctant to support new investments in infrastructure until it has reviewed the study and the plan and better understands both the linkage between resiliency and strategy and the long term affordability and sustainability of the plan.

Accordingly, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to provide the results of the U.S. Pacific Command's study of resiliency, with an explanation of how the resiliency plan supports the overall theater strategic plan, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Overview

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy (DOE) for fiscal year 2014, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). This title authorizes appropriations in three categories: (1) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); (2) defense environmental cleanup; and (3) other defense activities.

The budget request for atomic energy defense activities at the Department (rounded up to the first significant decimal point) totaled $17.8 billion, a 3.2 percent increase above the fiscal year 2013 appropriated level. Of the total amount requested:

(1) $11.6 billion is for NNSA, of which:

(a) $7.9 billion is for weapons activities;

(b) $2.1 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;

(c) $1.3 billion is for naval reactors; and

(d) $397.8 million is for the Office of the Administrator;

(2) $5.3 billion is for defense environmental cleanup;

(3) $749.1 million is for other defense activities;

(4) $94.0 million for Idaho site-wide security; and

(5) $16.0 million for grid security in the Office of Electricity and Transmission.

The committee recommends $17.8 billion for atomic energy defense activities. Of the amounts authorized, the committee recommends:

(1) $11.7 billion for NNSA, of which:

(a) $7.9 billion is for weapons activities;

(b) $2.1 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;

(c) $1.3 billion is for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request; and

(d) $397.8 million is for the Office of the Administrator, the amount of the budget request;

(2) $5.3 billion is for defense environmental cleanup activities (based on not reauthorizing the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning fund);

(3) $749.1 million is for other defense activities, the amount of the budget request;

(4) $95.0 million is for Idaho site-wide security; and

(5) $0 is provided for grid reliability as this is a homeland security function.

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $11.7 billion for the Department of Energy (DOE) in fiscal year 2014 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to carry out programs necessary to national security.

Weapons activities

The committee recommends $7.9 billion for weapons activities, the amount of the budget request.

The committee recommends funding for these programs as follows: $2.4 billion for directed stockpile work; $1.7 billion for campaigns; $1.7 billion for site stewardship; $744.5 million for nuclear operations; $219.2 million for the secure transportation assets, the amount of the budget request; $256.0 million for nuclear counterterrorism incident response, the amount of the budget request; and $827.4 million for defense nuclear security and the Chief Information Officer.

The committee notes that notwithstanding the congressional support for further modernization of the nuclear weapons complex infrastructure and the life extension programs, the committee urges the NNSA to find efficiencies where and whenever possible. The ability to sustain these increases during a time of decreasing federal and defense budgets will be increasingly difficult as time goes on. Good stewardship of the funding, as well as the nuclear weapons and the nuclear weapons complex, is critical to the long-term support for and sustainment of the projected increases.

Directed stockpile work

The committee recommends $2.4 billion for directed stockpile work. The directed stockpile account supports work directly related to weapons in the stockpile, including day-to-day maintenance as well as research, development, engineering, and certification activities to support planned life extension programs. This account also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, feasibility studies, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment.

The committee understands that for fiscal year 2014, the W–76 program has been corrected to meet the Navy's need by 2019 and has a proposed budget of $235.4 million. The B–61 is undergoing a life extension (Mod 12) that will make one variant reducing the number overall needed for the air leg of the triad.

The funding for B–61 life extension program is proposed at $537.0 million. The committee understands the importance of the Mod 12 life extension but is concerned about meeting the 2019 deadline for the version deployed by the North Atlantic Treaty Or-

ganization allies and needs to know what backup plan, if any, the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy have to provide temporary lifetime extension of the existing weapons if the Mod 12 schedule slips, as it most likely will.

The committee remains concerned about overall workflow coordination between the design laboratories and the production facilities, Pantex, Y–12, and Kansas City. There could be up to five life extension programs underway; the B–61, the long-range stand off weapon, the W–88 fuse program, an interoperable warhead to replace the W–88 and W–87 systems, and the ongoing W–76 program. Concurrency, funding delays, or program slips in any one of these programs can impact the others given they all use the three production facilities. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee has asked the Government Accountability Office to examine this issue.

Finally, the committee has concern about the overall cost growth of the interoperable warhead which is to replace the W–88 and W–78 warheads. The total cost profile is not all clear nor is the balance of this cost profile with the risk of such a system, which will be certified primarily on computer models. The Navy's W–88 warhead is in relatively good condition and over $1.0 billion is being spent on a new fuse system for the warhead. Certain commonsense questions must be asked why this W–88 is being replaced by the interoperable system that is proposed.

Campaigns

The committee recommends $1.7 billion for campaigns. The campaigns focus on science and engineering efforts involving the three nuclear weapons laboratories, the Nevada National Security Site, and the weapons production plants. Each campaign is focused on a specific activity to support and maintain the nuclear stockpile without underground nuclear weapons testing. These efforts form the scientific underpinning of the Department of Energy's annual certification that the stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear weapons testing.

The committee remains concerned about the hurdles to ignition at the National Ignition Facility (NIF), as it is not at all clear what effect not achieving sustained burn or ignition will have on the stockpile stewardship program. NNSA needs to communicate clearly what the effects of this gap in knowledge will have on future computer calculations on the stockpile.

The committee notes that as life extension programs take on more importance in the future years, the campaigns, particularly those associated with science, must not be put under pressure to curtail ongoing work and budget. The stockpile stewardship program by all accounts has exceeded all expectations compared to what it was envisioned in the 1990s. More importantly, it is the seed corn to bring in the best and brightest young post-doctorate scientists to work with senior scientists. Testimony this year before the committee by the three weapons laboratory directors and the National Academy of Sciences has supported the success of this program.

Site Stewardship and Nuclear Operations

The committee recommends $2.4 billion for site stewardship and nuclear operations. These two programs comprised the former readiness in the technical base (RTBF). This account funds facilities and infrastructure in the nuclear weapons complex and includes construction funding for new facilities.

The committee remains concerned about the additional increase of over $500.0 million for the main building to replace building 9212, while pushing the scope out for the other two phases to replace buildings 9215 and 9204–2E. The original top line cost estimate of $6.5 billion included all three phases. That appears not to be the case. So, in addition to the $500.0 million cost increase, the scope has been reduced or effectively the total cost has increased to a number that will far exceed the $6.5 billion top line. The committee still remains concerned about the technology and manufacturing readiness levels of the processing equipment that must go into the facility while it is still under design, particularly the microwave processing equipment. These readiness level issues should have been fully resolved before design of the facility was undertaken. The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to continue quarterly reviews of this project to the congressional defense committees.

With the deferral of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement project, the committee continues to be concerned about the lack of a long-term strategy for plutonium sustainment. Testimony by Dr. Charles F. McMillan before this committee indicated that a modular approach to a smaller series of buildings holds promise for lower costs and greater flexibility. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Nuclear Weapons Council to examine the business case for such a concept and if proven feasible, to proceed with engineering design and cost estimation. If a detailed cost estimate past an initial business case analysis is performed for this modular building approach, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office to review the detailed cost estimate.

The committee is supportive of the High Explosives Pressing Facility at Pantex and encourages the NNSA to make this facility a center of excellence in the NNSA for high explosives pressing and manufacturing.

Secure transportation asset

The committee recommends $219.1 million for the secure transportation asset, the amount of the budget request. The secure transportation asset is responsible for the transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials and components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport.

Defense Nuclear Security and Chief Information Officer

The committee recommends $827.4 million for safeguards and security and the Chief Information Officer, the amount of the budget request.

Naval Reactors

The committee recommends $1.3 billion for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request. The committee recommends a decrease of $2.0 million to the Naval Reactors and Infrastructure to $453.7 million and an increase to project 13–D–904 KS Radiological Work and Storage Building of $2.6 million. The committee supports the Spent Fuel Handling Facility to be constructed at the Idaho National Laboratory.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs

The committee recommends $2.2 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program, an increase of $80.0 million to the budget request. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has management and oversight responsibility for the nuclear nonproliferation programs at the Department of Energy (DOE).

The committee recommends funding for these programs as follows: $388.3 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development; $141.7 million for nonproliferation and international security; $369.6 million for international nuclear materials production and cooperation, the amount of the budget request; $582.6 million for fissile materials disposition; and $424.5 million for the global threat reduction initiative, the amount of the budget request.

The committee notes that this year the NNSA moved the nuclear counterterrorism and incident response program ($256.0 million) to the Nonproliferation Account, which artificially inflates the top line for nonproliferation as compared to prior years. The result is that the nonproliferation account, excluding the counterterrorism line, decreases by $400.0 million, 17.2 percent compared to fiscal year 2013.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee directs the Administrator of the NNSA to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to critically review the status of the NNSA nonproliferation program and provide long-term direction to help stem any future possible decreases to the nonproliferation account, as there is clearly no shortage of nuclear nonproliferation work around the world.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development

The committee recommends $388.8 million for nonproliferation and verification research and development. The committee requests a 5–year road map for the nuclear detonation detection mission as integrated with the Department of Defense (DOD) no later than January 31, 2014.

The committee continues to support the valuable research and development work that is conducted under this program. The additional funding will support high-priority research requirements, including work to support the long-term ability of the United States to monitor and detect clandestine nuclear weapons development activity, and to attribute nuclear weapons, improvised nuclear devices, and radiological dispersal devices. Much of the work supported by NNSA is unique to the Federal Government and serves as the technical basis for work by many other agencies, including the Department of Homeland Security and DOD.

Nonproliferation and international security

The committee recommends $150.1 million for nonproliferation and international security. The committee authorized a program last year for scientific engagement in the area of non-proliferation and encourages NNSA to budget for it accordingly.

International nuclear materials protection and cooperation

The committee recommends $369.6 million for international nuclear materials protection and cooperation, the amount of the budget request, and awaits a review of the Second-Line-of-Defense program.

Fissile Materials Disposition program

The Fissile Materials Disposition program converts excess weapons grade plutonium to mixed oxide fuel (MOX) for use in commercial power reactors. The U.S. and Russia have signed the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement (PMDA) where each country has agreed to the disposition of 34 metric tons of excess weapons grade plutonium, thus removing the possibility that this plutonium could be reused for weapons or fall into the hands of terrorists. Russia has modified the agreement so that they will not produce MOX but instead burn the plutonium in fast reactors. After the U.S. considered more than 40 different options on how to disposition surplus plutonium, a 2010 amendment to the agreement eliminated immobilization as an option and selected MOX as the disposition path for the U.S. share of the plutonium. The U.S. has agreed to assist Russia in its effort with a contribution of $400.0 million.

For fiscal year 2014, the Fissile Materials Disposition program, which will blend surplus weapons plutonium with depleted uranium to be used as commercial reactor fuel—MOX—will slow down program and construction activities to conduct a strategic review. The committee is concerned that NNSA's decision to slow down construction and study alternatives to MOX could add considerable costs and uncertainty to the Fissile Materials Disposition Program, result in fines due to South Carolina of $100 million per year, strand surplus plutonium at Pantex and the Savannah River Site, and lead to the renegotiation of the PMDA. As such, the committee directs the strategic review to include but not be limited to MOX. In considering MOX, the strategic review must take account of the investments made to date and ways to increase efficiency and to reduce the cost of the MOX program. Because the committee added $80.0 million in fiscal year 2014 to the program, the committee stresses to the Department of Energy, that during the review, it minimizes any impact to the progress of the program.

While the current MOX construction project is over 50 percent complete, it is approximately $3.0 billion over budget (from $4.8 billion to $7.7 billion) and three years late to completion (fiscal year 2020 instead of fiscal year 2017) due to a range of factors including a lower than planned funding profile, poor contractor performance, and poor management by NNSA. The Government Accountability Office has testified before the committee that the total life cycle cost will exceed $24.2 billion, including actual costs of $5.2 billion for prior years (fiscal year 1999 to fiscal year 2012).

The estimate stretches out to fiscal year 2036. Last year, the fiscal year 2013 budget request had a proposal of funding the program at $921.0 million for fiscal 2013 and $721.0 million for fiscal year 2014, a reduction of $200.0 million. In an effort to minimize the impacts of the strategic review, the committee recommends $582.6 million for fissile materials disposition, an increase of $80.0 million above the amount of the budget request.

Global threat reduction initiative

The committee recommends $424.5 million for the global threat reduction initiative, the amount of the budget request. The committee supports this effort to secure within 4 years vulnerable nuclear material that could be used in a dirty bomb or in an improvised nuclear device.

Nuclear counterterrorism incident response

The committee recommends $256.0 million for nuclear counterterrorism incident response, the amount of the budget request.

Office of the Administrator

The committee recommends $397.8 million for the Office of the Administrator.

Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.3 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities at the DOE. The defense environmental cleanup activities support the cleanup of contaminated facilities, soil, ground and surface water, and the treatment and disposal of radioactive and other waste generated through the production of nuclear weapons and weapons materials. The Environmental Management program was established in 1989 to clean up 50 years of Cold War waste from the production of nuclear weapons and materials including plutonium and highly enriched uranium. The committee notes that a legislative assumption accompanies the budget request of $463.0 million for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund, to reauthorize section 1101 of the Energy Policy Act of 2002 (P.L. 102–48, 42 U.S.C. 2297g) for industry contributions. As in fiscal year 2013, this legislation was not reauthorized and the committee assumes it will not be reauthorized again this year. Accordingly, the committee redistributes the $462.0 million associated with this assumption to other higher priority cleanup needs in the Department.

Savannah River Site

The committee recommends $1.2 billion for the Savannah River Site cleanup, an increase of $150.0 million, to help accelerate and meet tank stabilization milestones under the consent order with the State of South Carolina. The committee commends the NNSA and the Office of Environmental Management for continuing operations at the H canyon, which is the only large-scale reprocessing line left in the United States. The H canyon is the Nation's last full reprocessing line and will continue to serve vital missions whether it involves purifying plutonium for mixed oxide fuel or down blend-

ing waste from Canada containing highly enriched uranium. The committee is aware of the critical milestones with the State of South Carolina for tank close-out by 2028. In that regard, the start-up of the Salt Waste Processing Facility is a critical element to separate high level waste from the low level waste. The committee expects to be informed of the final baseline cost estimate for the Salt Waste Processing Facility due to the delays of the large vessels that are part of the facility.

Waste Treatment Plant

The committee continues to follow the progress at the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) at DOE Hanford Site in Richland, Washington. Unlike the Savannah River Site, the composition of the waste in the tanks is non-uniform adding complexity to the separation and treatment of high and low level waste. The Department is encouraged to expedite the treatment of the low level waste streams and come to a decision on whether an additional pre-treatment plant is needed for the high level waste stream. The overall completion cost of the project has risen from $5.8 billion to $12.3 billion. The construction of an additional pre-treatment plant for high level waste will increase the cost further. The committee directs the Department to ensure the committee is informed of decisions on directly treating the low level waste and whether another pre-treatment plant is needed for the high level waste. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee has directed the Government Accountability Office to give the committee quarterly reviews of the project.

Hanford Site

The committee recommends $941.8 million for the Hanford River Site (excluding the waste treatment and immobilization plant), an increase of $20.0 million for the River Corridor cleanup to help accelerate and stabilize the chromium groundwater contamination as well as nuclear facility cleanup.

Idaho National Laboratory

The committee recommends $395.0 million, an increase of $30.0 million for the Idaho Waste Cleanup to continue to remove the transuranic waste and other buried waste, as applicable, for shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant and to continue sodium bearing waste treatment operations.

Los Alamos National Laboratory

The committee recommends $259.8 million for Los Alamos National Laboratory to continue to remove transuranic waste for shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant and monitor groundwater contamination.

Oak Ridge Reservation

The committee recommends $203.9 million for the Oak Ridge Reservation, an increase of $10.0 million to continue consolidation of special nuclear material associated with uranium 233.

Office of River Protection

The committee recommends $1.2 billion, an increase of $50.0 million for radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition to increase surveillance and treat transuranic waste applicable to shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

The committee recommends $236.4 million, an increase of $33.0 million to continue operations and replace aging equipment, especially those related to safety. The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant is an important operation upon which the entire cleanup operations relies upon to dispose of defense transuranic waste.

Security

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for security at the Richland/Hanford site to $89.1 million. The Department should accelerate efforts at Hanford to remove the category I nuclear material from the site to lower security costs.

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for security at the Savannah River Site given the large quantity of category I nuclear material it must safeguard.

Technology Development

The committee recommends an increase of $10.0 million for technology development to $34.1 million.

Program Direction

The committee recommends $300.8 million for program direction, an increase of $20.0 million. The Office of Environmental Management has a staff of over 1,400 civil servants who manage this long and difficult job of honoring the cleanup commitment made by the Department to the local communities at these former defense sites. The committee notes that the recommended level is still some $20.0 million short of the levels in fiscal years 2012 and 2103.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $749.1 million for other defense activities, the amount of the budget request; the committee recommends $251.9 million for health, safety, and security, the amount of the budget request; $196.3 million for specialized security, the amount of the budget request; $176.9 million for Legacy Management, the amount of the budget request; $118.8 million for other defense-related administrative support, the amount of the budget request; and $5.0 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the amount of the budget request. Legislative proposals elsewhere in the Act speak to security at facilities containing categories I and II of nuclear material.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Establishment of Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation in National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3111)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2401 et. Seq.) to establish an Office of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation (CAPE) whose director is Senate confirmed. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has recently established a position in an attempt to control program cost escalation, and they should be commended for this action. This provision makes the position and office permanent in statue given that several such positions and offices have been established and then de-established in both the Department of Energy and the NNSA. The cost growth of nearly every program in the NNSA requires a permanent office and position, but even more important is that the position be Senate confirmed so that individual answers to Congress on their views and progress in controlling cost growth of programs such as the B–61 life extension, the Uranium Processing Facility, the Mixed Oxide Fuel Program, and eventually the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Facility. The Government Accountability Office estimates that through 2031, the NNSA will undertake an estimated $200.0 billion in work scope whether it is life extension programs or recapitalizing new facilities in the complex. While the staff size of the NNSA is relatively small, approximately 1,800 federal positions, the committee expects the office to phase in its activities in over several years and to work jointly with the Department of Defense (DOD) CAPE Office, not only to train personnel but to conduct joint cost estimates of an entire strategic weapon system consisting of the delivery vehicle and the warhead. Currently, these estimates are conducted separately; the warhead through the Nuclear Weapons Council under the 6.X process, and the delivery systems through the DOD acquisition processes.

Plan for improvement and integration of financial management of nuclear security enterprise (sec. 3112)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to develop a plan for a common cost structure between activities at different sites with the purpose of comparing how efficiently different sites within the NNSA complex are carrying out similar activities. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has commented numerous times that each site in the NNSA complex uses a different cost accounting structure for direct and indirect costs. While such cost accounting structures are compliant with the requirements outlined in section 9904.418 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations, it is virtually impossible to compare how funds are spent at different sites. This dilemma has resulted in a degraded ability to perform oversight of the NNSA sites and their contractors. GAO pointed out this issue with respect to accurate costing of facility operations in their report, GAO–10–582, "Actions Needed to Identify Total Costs of Weapons Complex Infrastructure

and Research Production Capabilities," and earlier across the Department of Energy complex in GAO–05–897, "Department of Energy: Additional Opportunities Exist for reducing Laboratory Contractors' Support Costs." The committee recognizes that such a transition will take time and effort given the number of different business systems at each site and accordingly gives a 4–year implementation date for bringing the NNSA complex to a common cost structure.

Not later than June 15, 2014, the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation shall brief the congressional defense committees on an assessment of the plan developed by the Administrator in this provision that includes the extent to which the plan will result in the improvement and integration of the financial management of the nuclear security enterprise and whether sufficient resources are available to enable implementation of the plan.

Certification of security measures at atomic energy defense facilities (sec. 3113)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to certify facilities containing categories I and II quantities of special nuclear material as meeting Department of Energy (DOE) security standards and regulations for physical security of facilities and surrounding infrastructure. For facilities that cannot be certified, the facility will stop routine operations until they meet the applicable standards and regulations. There is a national security waiver for continued operations of non-certified facilities.

The security of special nuclear materials in quantities that present a threat to national security demand nothing short of perfection. There simply is no other acceptable standard. Accountability should be clear and direct starting at the highest official in the responsible organization. The Atomic Energy Act defines that official as the Secretary of Energy.

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to develop a system that tracks deficiencies in securing special nuclear materials at DOE atomic energy defense facilities. The system shall meet the auditing standards of the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

The committee directs GAO to perform an audit of the tracking system no later than June 30, 2014, to and report the findings to the congressional defense committees.

Plan for incorporating exascale computing into the stockpile stewardship program (sec. 3114)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521) to provide for a long-term strategy on exascale computing in the stockpile stewardship program. The provision would ensure that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) continues its leadership role, a role held since the Manhattan Project's collaboration with John Von Neumann, of developing large-scale computing machines. This provision would require the NNSA to provide a long-term strategy for achieving exascale levels of computing (10 to the 18th floating point operations per second) that is necessary to model the full three-dimensional physics of a nuclear weapon.

Integrated plutonium strategy (sec. 3115)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521) to provide for a long-term plutonium strategy for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) as part of its Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan. Plutonium sustainment is at the core of the NNSA stockpile mission. This integrated plan would ensure the NNSA remains focused on its plutonium mission.

Authorization of modular building strategy as an alternative to the replacement project for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Building, Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico (sec. 3116)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3144(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to permit consideration of a modular building strategy for engineering and design if it meets long term stockpile requirements.

Increase in construction design threshold (sec. 3117)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the major capital construction design threshold for the National Nuclear Security Administration from $600,000 to $1.2 million to account for increased construction costs.

Clarification of form of submission of cost estimates on life extension programs and new nuclear facilities (sec. 3118)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4217(b) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2537(b)) to require an unclassified version of the cost estimate with a classified annex if necessary.

Subtitle C—Reports

Assessment of nuclear nonproliferation programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3121)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the National Nuclear Security Administration to undergo a review of their nuclear nonproliferation programs by the National Academies of Science. There is concern in the committee that as programs finish their near-term goals, there is no thought given to future efforts in nuclear non-proliferation. This provision seeks to ensure such future missions are considered.

Modification of reviews relating to cost-benefit analysis of management and operating contracts of the National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3122)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3121(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to lower the number of mandatory reports by the Government Accountability Office.

Modification of deadline for certain reports relating to program on scientific engagement for nonproliferation (sec. 3123)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3122(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to require a 30–day notice for extending the program on scientific engagement for non-proliferation to a new country. The provision gives the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration a national security waiver of the requirement as long as there is a report filed within 30 days.

Modification of certain reports on cost containment for uranium capabilities replacement project (sec. 3124)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3123(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112–239) to change the Government Accountability Office reporting requirement from the end of project life to 1 year after the date of enactment in consultation with the congressional defense committees. The end of project life would require reporting for approximately the next 23 years with 90 such reports.

Submission of interim report of Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 3125)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3166(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to extend the date of the interim report from 180 days after the date of enactment to 180 days after the first meeting of the advisory panel.

Subtitle D—Technical Corrections

Technical corrections to the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (sec. 3131)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (41 U.S.C. 2401 et. seq.) with technical and clarifying corrections.

Technical corrections to the Atomic Energy Defense Act (sec. 3132)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Atomic Energy Defense Act (42 U.S.C. 2501 et. seq.) with technical and clarifying corrections.

Budget Item

Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund

The Department of Energy (DOE) budget request for fiscal year 2014 made an assumption of $463.0 million based on a legislative proposal being enacted to reauthorize section 1101 of the Energy Policy Act of 2002 (P.L. 102–48, 42 USC 2297g). A similar legislative assumption was made in the fiscal year 2013 request, which the committee assumed would not be reauthorized. Similar to last

fiscal year, the committee assumes again that this legislation will not be reauthorized ($463.0 million decrease) and increases by $462.0 million the following accounts: Mixed Oxide Fuel construction, project 99–D–143, $80.0 million; Hanford River Corridor and other clean-up operations, $20.0 million; Idaho clean-up and waste disposition, $30.0 million; Hanford radioactive waste liquid tank stabilization, $50.0 million; Savannah River radioactive waste tank stabilization, $150.0 million; Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, $33.0 million; Program Direction, $20.0 million; security at Richland and Hanford, $10.0 million; security at Savannah River Site, $10.0 million; and Technology Development, $10.0 million.

Items of Special Interest

B–61 Mod 12 life extension program

The National Nuclear Security Agency has now entered phase 6.3, engineering development, of the B–61 Mod 12 life extension program (LEP). The committee has reviewed the Weapons Design and Cost Report and is concerned about possible concurrency in the overall program, work load scheduling with other programs underway at the production sites (Kansas City, Y–12, and Pantex), as well as technology and manufacturing maturation. The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to submit a report that examines key elements of the B–61 Mod 12 LEP within 180 days of the enactment of this Act. These elements shall include: (1) technology readiness and manufacturing readiness levels; (2) research and development and productions concurrency; (3) work load and scheduling between the production sites and the weapons laboratories; (4) coordination and integration with other LEP programs such as W88 Alt 370, W76, W78/88, and long-range standoff warhead life extensions; and (5) ongoing developmental and production work by the Air Force for the tail kit guidance assembly. After the initial report, GAO shall review the B–61 at key phases of the 6.X process (production engineering, first production, and quantity production) at the direction of the committee.

Review of National Nuclear Security Administration Capital Projects

Serious questions have been raised about the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) analyses of project alternatives associated with critical decision 1 under Department of Energy (DOE) Order 413.3B, "Program and Project Management of Capital Assets" stemming from NNSA's decisions in 2012 to cancel and defer two major nuclear facilities after spending more than a decade and hundreds of millions of dollars on the design of each facility. Specifically, NNSA announced in January 2012 its decision to cancel the Pit Disassembly and Conversion Facility (PDCF) after having spent 12 years and $730 million on the facility design. PDCF was one of two planned high-hazard nuclear facilities needed to support NNSA's Plutonium Disposition Program. In cancelling PDCF, NNSA explained that other alternatives had been identified that would better meet the mission need. Also, in February 2012 NNSA announced its decision to defer for at least five years another planned major nuclear facility needed for plutonium re-

search—the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement (CMRR) Nuclear Facility. NNSA spent about 10 years and more than $350 million on the design of the CMRR Nuclear Facility. In cancelling this project, NNSA explained that it has adequate alternatives for conducting plutonium research in the near term using existing facilities and that it is investigating other alternatives to building the CMRR. Other projects that have had similar issues include NNSA's Radioactive Liquid Waste Treatment Facility (RLWTF) at Los Alamos and the Uranium 233 Disposition Project managed by the Office of Environmental Management (EM). NNSA is currently reaffirming the CD–1 decision regarding the alternatives analysis for the RLWTF and EM cancelled the U–233 project after spending approximately $255 million on design and construction.

Given the amount of time and money spent on designing these facilities before they were cancelled and deferred, these decisions raise serious questions about how well NNSA scrutinizes the analyses of alternatives prior to submitting them for review and approval. The committee is also concerned about the extent to which other NNSA projects are proceeding through design without a rigorous analysis of alternatives and the extent to which NNSA projects may languish in the design phase without proper oversight to ensure that the need for these projects remains viable. As such, the committee directs that the Government Accountability Office investigate the following questions and report back to the committee with initial results no later than February 28, 2014 and a final report no later than September 9, 2013 on the following issues:

(1) What is NNSA's process for conducting analyses of alternatives prior to project starts, and to what extent have projects deviated from the alternatives originally selected for those projects?

(2) How does NNSA plan for and execute its projects' design phases prior to the establishment of a cost and schedule baseline, and what improvements if any can be made?

(3) How much has NNSA spent in recent years on capital acquisition projects prior to critical decision 2, the point at which 90 percent design maturity is now required for high-hazard nuclear facilities, and how do these costs compare to total project costs?

(4) What are the roles, responsibilities, and accountability of federal project directors during the design phases of capital acquisition projects?

Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant project

The committee notes that the Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant may change scope for the high level waste pretreatment systems and begin treating only low level waste streams. The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to monitor the status of this construction and to periodically brief the committee on the status of construction and operations at the facility through the end of fiscal year 2014.

Assessment of Department of Energy defense nuclear facilities that will be transferred to the Department of Energy Office of Environmental Management

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) currently operates in a number of older nuclear facilities that will be transferred to the Office of Environmental Management (EM) for demolition and decontamination. The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to assess the inventory of facilities that NNSA plans to transfer to EM, which will have the responsibility to remove and remediate the surrounding area. GAO shall provide the results of this assessment to the committee by June 30, 2014, or at a date determined by the committee.

Travel by scientists and other technical personnel to conferences and other venues of benefit to the NNSA mission

The committee directs the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to assess the impact that recent Office of Management and Budget directives have had on the ability of federal and national laboratory scientists and other technical personnel to travel to professional conferences and other venues associated with advancing scientific and technical knowledge that is of benefit to the NNSA mission. This assessment shall be due to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2014.

Use of the term National Security Laboratory in the Atomic Energy Defense Act

The committee notes that the use of the term "National Security Laboratory" in the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501 et. seq.) is not meant to preclude the use by the Federal Government of other Department of Energy national laboratories as defined in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–58, 42 U.S.C. 15801) who perform important work in a broad area of national security activities.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Authorization (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board at $29.9 million.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Maritime Administration (sec. 3501)

The committee recommends a provision that would re-authorize certain aspects of the Maritime Administration.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

Authorization of amounts in funding tables (sec. 4001)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, the provision would also require that decisions by agency heads to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on authorized, transparent, statutory criteria, or merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

Funding tables (secs. 4101–4701)

The committee recommends provisions that provide line-item guidance for the funding authorized in this Act, in accordance with the requirements of section 4001. The provisions also display the line-item funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2014 budget request and show where the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts.

The Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts, as set forth in the provision or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense, without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
National Defense, Base Budget			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Title I—Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,024,387	–19,984	5,004,403
Missile Procurement, Army	1,334,083		1,334,083
Procurement of Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,597,267	–159,439	1,437,828
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,540,437	–84,800	1,455,637
Other Procurement, Army	6,465,218		6,465,218
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	17,927,651	32,000	17,959,651
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,122,193	6,400	3,128,593
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	589,267		589,267
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	14,077,804	155,300	14,233,104
Other Procurement, Navy	6,310,257		6,310,257
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,343,511		1,343,511
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,398,901	–17,200	11,381,701
Missile Procurement, Air Force	5,343,286		5,343,286
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	759,442		759,442
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,760,581		16,760,581
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,534,083	11,844	4,545,927
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	98,800		98,800
Subtotal, Title I—Procurement	**98,227,168**	**–75,879**	**98,151,289**
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	7,989,102	29,578	8,018,680
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	15,974,780	–100,875	15,873,905
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	25,702,946	–49,600	25,653,346
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	17,667,108	142,156	17,809,264
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	186,300		186,300
Subtotal, Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**67,520,236**	**21,259**	**67,541,495**
Title III—Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	35,073,077	616,600	35,689,677
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	3,095,036	36,400	3,131,436
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	7,054,196	74,200	7,128,396
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	39,945,237	434,768	40,380,005
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	6,254,650	56,000	6,310,650
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,197,752	10,800	1,208,552
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	263,317		263,317
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	37,270,842	512,600	37,783,442
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,164,607	8,700	3,173,307
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,566,004	28,200	6,594,204
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	32,997,693	–244,401	32,753,292
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	13,606		13,606

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—
Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid	109,500		109,500
Cooperative Threat Reduction	528,455		528,455
DoD Acquisition Workforce Development Fund	256,031		256,031
Environmental Restoration, Army	298,815		298,815
Environmental Restoration, Navy	316,103		316,103
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	439,820		439,820
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	10,757		10,757
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	237,443		237,443
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	5,000		5,000
Subtotal, Title III—Operation and Maintenance	**175,097,941**	**1,533,867**	**176,631,808**
Title IV—Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	130,399,881	–270,000	130,129,881
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	6,676,750		6,676,750
Subtotal, Title IV—Military Personnel	**137,076,631**	**–270,000**	**136,806,631**
Title XIV—Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	25,158		25,158
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	61,731		61,731
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	46,428		46,428
Working Capital Fund, Defense Commissary Agency	1,412,510		1,412,510
National Defense Sealift Fund	730,700	–112,200	618,500
Defense Health Program	33,054,528	218,000	33,272,528
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Defense	1,057,123		1,057,123
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	938,545	–5,840	932,705
Office of the Inspector General	312,131	35,900	348,031
Subtotal, Title XIV—Other Authorizations	**37,638,854**	**135,860**	**37,774,714**
Total, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations	**515,560,830**	**1,345,107**	**516,905,937**
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Military Construction			
Army	1,119,875		1,119,875
Navy	1,700,269	–85,673	1,614,596
Air Force	1,156,573	–192,377	964,196
Defense-Wide	3,985,300	–1,054,641	2,930,659
Army National Guard	320,815		320,815
Air National Guard	119,800		119,800
Army Reserve	174,060		174,060
Navy Reserve	32,976		32,976
Air Force Reserve	45,659		45,659
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	122,536		122,536
NATO Security Investment Program	239,700		239,700
Subtotal, Military Construction	**9,017,563**	**–1,332,691**	**7,684,872**
Family Housing			
Construction, Army	44,008	–16,600	27,408

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—
Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Operation and Maintenance, Army	512,871		512,871
Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	73,407		73,407
Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps	389,844		389,844
Construction, Air Force	76,360		76,360
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	388,598		388,598
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	55,845		55,845
Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,780		1,780
Subtotal, Family Housing	**1,542,713**	**–16,600**	**1,526,113**
Base Realignment and Closure			
Army	180,401		180,401
Navy	144,580		144,580
Air Force	126,376		126,376
Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure	**451,357**		**451,357**
Total, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations	**11,011,633**	**–1,349,291**	**9,662,342**
Total 051, Department of Defense-Military	**526,572,463**	**–4,184**	**526,568,279**
Function 053, Atomic Energy Activities			
Division C: Department of Energy National Security and Independent Federal Agency Authorizations			
Department of Energy Authorizations			
Energy Programs			
Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	16,000	–16,000	
Nuclear Energy	94,000		94,000
Subtotal, Energy Programs	**110,000**	**–16,000**	**94,000**
National Nuclear Security Administration			
Weapons Activities	7,868,409		7,868,409
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	2,140,142	80,000	2,220,142
Naval Reactors	1,246,134		1,246,134
Office of the Administrator	397,784		397,784
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	**11,254,685**	**80,000**	**11,732,469**
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,316,909	–80,000	5,236,909
Other Defense Activities	749,080		749,080
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**6,065,989**	**–80,000**	**5,985,989**
Subtotal, Department of Energy Authorizations	**17,828,458**	**–16,000**	**17,812,458**
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	29,915		29,915
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	**29,915**		**29,915**
Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security and Independent Federal Agency Authorizations	**17,858,373**	**–16,000**	**17,842,373**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Total, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,858,373**	**–16,000**	**17,842,373**
Total, National Defense, Base Budget	**544,430,836**	**–20,184**	**544,410,652**
National Defense, Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) Budget			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Procurement, OCO			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	771,788		771,788
Missile Procurement, Army	128,645		128,645
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	180,900		180,900
Other Procurement, Army	603,123		603,123
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	1,000,000	–151,000	849,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	240,696		240,696
Weapons Procurement, Navy	86,500		86,500
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	206,821		206,821
Other Procurement, Navy	17,968		17,968
Procurement, Marine Corps	129,584		129,584
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	115,668		115,668
Missile Procurement, Air Force	24,200		24,200
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	159,965		159,965
Other Procurement, Air Force	2,574,846		2,574,846
Procurement, Defense-Wide	111,275		111,275
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	15,000		15,000
Subtotal, Procurement	**6,366,979**	**–151,000**	**6,215,979**
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, OCO			
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	7,000		7,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	34,426		34,426
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	9,000		9,000
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	66,208		66,208
Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**116,634**		**116,634**
Operation and Maintenance, OCO			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	29,279,633	129,300	29,408,933
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	42,935		42,935
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	199,371		199,371
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	7,726,720		7,726,720
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund	279,000	–29,000	250,000
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	6,067,993		6,067,993
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	2,669,815	26,000	2,695,815
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	55,700		55,700
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	12,534		12,534
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	10,005,224		10,005,224
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	32,849		32,849
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	22,200		22,200

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—
Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	6,435,078	7,000	6,442,078
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**62,829,052**	**133,300**	**62,962,352**
Military Personnel, OCO			
Military Personnel Appropriations	9,689,307		9,689,307
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	164,033		164,033
Subtotal, Military Personnel	**9,853,340**		**9,853,340**
Other Authorizations, OCO			
Working Capital Fund, Army	44,732		44,732
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	88,500		88,500
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	131,678		131,678
Defense Health Program	904,201		904,201
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	376,305		376,305
Office of the Inspector General	10,766		10,766
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	**1,556,182**		**1,556,182**
Total, National Defense, OCO Budget	**80,722,187**	**–17,700**	**80,704,487**
MEMORANDUM: SUMMARY TOTALS			
Department of Defense-Military, Base Budget (051)	526,572,463	–4,184	526,568,279
Department of Defense-Military, OCO Budget (051)	80,722,187	–17,700	80,704,487
Total, Department of Defense-Military (051)	**607,294,650**	**–21,884**	**607,272,766**
Atomic energy defense activities, Base Budget (053)	17,858,373	–16,000	17,842,373
Total, National Defense (050)	**625,153,023**	**–37,884**	**625,115,139**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV—Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	67,800		67,800
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADDS)			
Title X—General Transfer Authority (non-add)	[4,000,000]		[4,000,000]
Title XV—Special Transfer Authority (non-add)	[4,000,000]		[4,000,000]

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Defense Discretionary Authorizations (Programs in the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee)			
National Defense (050)			
Department of Defense-Military, Base Budget (051)	526,572,463	–4,184	526,568,279
Department of Defense-Military, OCO Budget (051)	80,722,187	–17,700	80,704,487
Atomic energy defense activities, Base Budget (053)	17,858,373	–16,000	17,842,373
Total, National Defense (050)	**625,153,023**	**–37,884**	**625,115,139**
Other Defense Discretionary Authorizations (Programs Outside the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committees or Already Authorized)			
Department of Defense-Military (051)			
Defense Production Act Purchases	25,135		25,135
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	10,000		10,000
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	30,000		30,000
Subtotal, Department of Defense-Military (051)	**65,135**		**65,135**
Atomic energy defense activites (053)			
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	104,000		104,000
Subtotal, Atomic energy defense activities (053)	**104,000**		**104,000**
Defense-related activities (054)			
Other Discretionary Programs	7,407,000		7,407,000
Subtotal, Defense-related activities (054)	**7,407,000**		**7,407,000**
Total, Other Defense Discretionary Authorizations (050)	**7,576,135**		**7,576,135**
Discretionary Budget Authority Implication (050)			
National Defense (050)			
Department of Defense—Military (051)	607,359,785	–21,884	607,337,901
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	17,962,373	–16,000	17,946,373
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,407,000		7,407,000
Total, Discretionary Budget Authority Implication, 050	**632,729,158**	**–37,884**	**632,691,274**
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Estimates)			
Department of Defense-Military (051)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	7,126,000		7,126,000
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,156,000		1,156,000
Offsetting receipts	–1,752,000		–1,752,000
Subtotal, Department of Defense-Military (051)	**6,530,000**		**6,530,000**
Atomic energy defense activites (053)			
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,281,000		1,281,000
Subtotal, Atomic energy defense activities (053)	**1,281,000**		**1,281,000**

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Defense-related activities (054)			
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	76,000		76,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	514,000		514,000
Subtotal, Defense-related activities (054)	**590,000**		**590,000**
Total, National Defense Mandatory Programs (050)	**8,401,000**		**8,401,000**
Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implication (050)			
Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implication (050)			
Department of Defense—Military (051)	613,889,785	–21,884	613,867,901
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,243,373	–16,000	19,227,373
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,997,000		7,997,000
Total, Budget Authority Implication (050)	**641,130,158**	**–37,884**	**641,092,274**

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
01	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	1	19,730			1	19,730
03	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	4	142,050	–4	0	0	142,050
	Reduction of 4 EMARSS LRIP aircraft			[–4]	[–114,700]		
	Modification of transferred Liberty A/C				[114,700]		
04	MQ–1 UAV	15	518,460			15	518,460
05	RQ–11 (RAVEN)		10,772				10,772
	ROTARY						
06	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	10	96,227			10	96,227
07	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	42	608,469			42	608,469
08	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN ADV PROC (CY)		150,931				150,931
09	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD		0				0
10	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD ADV PROC (CY)		0				0
12	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	65	1,046,976		–19,984	65	1,026,992
	Transfer to PE 0203774A at Army request				[–19,984]		
12	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)		116,001				116,001
14	CH–47 HELICOPTER	28	801,650			28	801,650
15	CH–47 HELICOPTER ADV PROC (CY)		98,376				98,376
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						

16	MQ–1 PAYLOAD—UAS		97,781			97,781
17	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)		10,262			10,262
18	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		12,467			12,467
19	AH–64 MODS		53,559			53,559
20	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		149,764			149,764
21	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		17,500			17,500
22	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	167	74,095		167	74,095
23	KIOWA MODS WARRIOR	3	184,044		3	184,044
24	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN		152,569			152,569
25	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE		92,779			92,779
26	GATM ROLLUP		65,613			65,613
27	RQ–7 UAV MODS		121,902			121,902
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS					
28	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		47,610			47,610
29	SURVIVABILITY CM		5,700			5,700
30	CMWS		126,869			126,869
	OTHER SUPPORT					
31	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	705	6,809		705	6,809
32	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		65,397			65,397
33	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		45,841			45,841
34	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		79,692			79,692
35	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,615			1,615
36	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		2,877			2,877
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY Total		**5,024,387**	**–19,984**		**5,004,403**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM					
02	MSE MISSILE	56	540,401		56	540,401
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM					
03	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY		4,464			4,464
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS					
04	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	449	110,510		449	110,510

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
05	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	988	49,354			988	49,354
06	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY ADV PROC (CY)		19,965				19,965
07	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,788	237,216			1,788	237,216
08	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2,412	19,022			2,412	19,022
	MODIFICATIONS						
11	PATRIOT MODS		256,438				256,438
12	STINGER MODS		37,252				37,252
13	ITAS/TOW MODS		20,000				20,000
14	MLRS MODS		11,571				11,571
15	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		6,105				6,105
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
16	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		11,222				11,222
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
17	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,530				3,530
18	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		1,748				1,748
19	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		5,285				5,285
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY Total		**1,334,083**		**0**		**1,334,083**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
01	STRYKER VEHICLE		374,100				374,100
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
02	STRYKER (MOD)		20,522				20,522
03	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)		29,965				29,965
04	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		158,000				158,000
05	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		4,769				4,769

06	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	18	260,177		–40,700	18	219,477
	Transfer to PE 0604854A at Army Request				[–40,700]		
07	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)		111,031				111,031
08	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)		2,500				2,500
09	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	14	62,951			14	62,951
10	M88 FOV MODS		28,469				28,469
11	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE		2,002				2,002
12	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		178,100				178,100
13	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		0				0
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
14	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		1,544				1,544
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
15	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY	1,424	69,147	–1,424	–69,147		0
	XM25 Counter Defilade Target Engagement			[–1,424]	[–69,147]		
18	MORTAR SYSTEMS		5,310				5,310
19	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	5,061	24,049			5,061	24,049
21	CARBINE	41,897	70,846	–29,897	–49,592	12,000	21,254
	Individual Carbine early to need			[–29,897]	[–49,592]		
23	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	242	56,580			242	56,580
24	HANDGUN		300				300
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH						
26	M777 MODS		39,300				39,300
27	M4 CARBINE MODS		10,300				10,300
28	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		33,691				33,691
29	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		7,608				7,608
30	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		2,719				2,719
31	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		7,017				7,017
32	M119 MODIFICATIONS		18,707				18,707
33	M16 RIFLE MODS		2,136				2,136
34	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		1,569				1,569
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
35	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,024				2,024

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
36	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		10,108				10,108
37	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		459				459
38	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		1,267				1,267
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY Total		**1,597,267**		**–159,439**		**1,437,828**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
2	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		112,167		–25,000		87,167
	Program decrease				[–25,000]		
3	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		58,571		–5,000		53,571
	Program decrease				[–5,000]		
4	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		9,858				9,858
5	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		80,037		–25,000		55,037
	Program decrease				[–25,000]		
7	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		16,496		–10,300		6,196
	Program decrease				[–10,300]		
8	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		69,533		–19,500		50,033
	Program decrease				[–19,500]		
9	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		55,781				55,781
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
10	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		38,029				38,029
11	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		24,656				24,656
12	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		60,781				60,781
	TANK AMMUNITION						
13	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES		121,551				121,551
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						

14	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES		39,825			39,825
15	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		37,902			37,902
16	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	802	67,896		802	67,896
17	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL		71,205			71,205
	ROCKETS					
20	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		1,012			1,012
21	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		108,476			108,476
	OTHER AMMUNITION					
22	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		24,074			24,074
23	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		33,242			33,242
24	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		7,609			7,609
25	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		5,228			5,228
	MISCELLANEOUS					
26	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		16,700			16,700
27	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		7,366			7,366
28	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		3,614			3,614
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (AMMO)		12,423			12,423
30	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		16,604			16,604
31	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		14,328			14,328
32	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES		108			108
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT					
33	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		242,324			242,324
34	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION		179,605			179,605
35	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,436			3,436
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY Total		**1,540,437**	**–84,800**		**1,455,637**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	TACTICAL VEHICLES					
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	25	4,000		25	4,000
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	40	6,841		40	6,841
3	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	837	223,910		837	223,910
4	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		11,880			11,880

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
5	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	220	14,731			220	14,731
6	PLS ESP	74	44,252			74	44,252
9	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV	77	39,525			77	39,525
10	HMMWV RECAPITALIZATION PROGRAM		0				0
11	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	746	51,258			746	51,258
12	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	34	49,904			34	49,904
13	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		2,200				2,200
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
14	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN		400				400
15	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		716				716
16	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		5,619				5,619
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
18	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	2,139	973,477			2,139	973,477
19	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		14,120				14,120
20	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY		7,869				7,869
21	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		5,296				5,296
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
22	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	31	147,212			31	147,212
23	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS		7,998				7,998
24	SHF TERM		7,232				7,232
25	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		3,308				3,308
26	SMART-T (SPACE)		13,992				13,992
28	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS	94	28,206			94	28,206
29	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	15	2,778			15	2,778
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM						
31	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		17,590				17,590

	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS				
32	ARMY DATA DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (DATA RADIO)		786		786
33	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	10,523	382,930	10,523	382,930
34	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	130	19,200	130	19,200
35	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		1,438		1,438
36	SINCGARS FAMILY		9,856		9,856
37	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	2,066	14,184	2,066	14,184
38	TRACTOR DESK		6,271		6,271
40	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		1,030		1,030
41	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM	15,967	31,868	15,967	31,868
42	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE		18,000		18,000
44	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY		1,166		1,166
45	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE		22,867		22,867
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM				
48	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,512		1,512
49	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	323	61,096	323	61,096
	INFORMATION SECURITY				
50	TSEC—ARMY KEY MGT SYS (AKMS)		13,890		13,890
51	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	1,133	23,245	1,133	23,245
52	BIOMETRICS ENTERPRISE		3,800		3,800
53	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	877	24,711	877	24,711
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS				
55	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		43,395		43,395
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS				
57	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		104,577		104,577
58	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)		612		612
59	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		39,000		39,000
60	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		248,477		248,477
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)				
64	JTT/CIBS-M		824		824
65	PROPHET GROUND	10	59,198	10	59,198
67	DCGS-A (MIP)	2,717	267,214	2,717	267,214

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
68	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	5	9,899			5	9,899
69	TROJAN (MIP)		24,598				24,598
70	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)		1,927				1,927
71	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		6,169				6,169
72	MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM-M		2,924				2,924
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
74	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	18	40,735			18	40,735
75	EW PLANNING & MANAGEMENT TOOLS (EWPMT)		13				13
76	ENEMY UAS		2,800				2,800
79	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		1,237				1,237
80	CI MODERNIZATION		1,399				1,399
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
82	SENTINEL MODS	86	47,983			86	47,983
83	SENSE THROUGH THE WALL (STTW)		142				142
84	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	6,879	202,428			6,879	202,428
85	LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		5,183				5,183
86	NIGHT VISION, THERMAL WPN SIGHT		14,074				14,074
87	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	1,491	22,300			1,491	22,300
89	GREEN LASER INTERDICTION SYSTEM (GLIS)		1,016				1,016
90	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS	5	55,354			5	55,354
91	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		800				800
92	PROFILER		3,027				3,027
93	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)		1,185				1,185
94	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	3,866	103,214			3,866	103,214
96	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	167	26,037			167	26,037
97	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	120	23,100			120	23,100

98	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	19	312,727	19	312,727
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS				
101	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	574	43,228	574	43,228
102	BATTLE COMMAND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT SYSTEM	167	14,446	167	14,446
103	FAAD C2		4,607		4,607
104	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	8	33,090	8	33,090
105	IAMD BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM		21,200		21,200
107	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		1,795		1,795
109	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		54,327		54,327
110	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	2,959	59,171	2,959	59,171
111	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)		83,936		83,936
113	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION		25,476		25,476
114	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	212	19,341	212	19,341
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION				
115	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		11,865		11,865
116	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		219,431		219,431
117	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM		6,414		6,414
118	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)		62,683		62,683
120	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		34,951		34,951
121	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (A/V)		7,440		7,440
122	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	16	1,615	16	1,615
123	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)		554		554
124	BCT EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES		20,000		20,000
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
124A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,558		3,558
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
126	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)		762		762
127	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	3,759	20,630	3,759	20,630
128	CBRN DEFENSE	24,530	22,151	24,530	22,151
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT				
130	TACTICAL BRIDGING	2	14,188	2	14,188
131	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	34	23,101	34	23,101

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
132	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP		15,416				15,416
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
134	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)	311	50,465			311	50,465
135	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)		6,490				6,490
136	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION		1,563				1,563
137	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	6,774	20,921			6,774	20,921
138	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS		100				100
139	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	70	2,271			70	2,271
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
140	HEATERS AND ECU'S	464	7,269			464	7,269
141	LAUNDRIES, SHOWERS AND LATRINES		200				200
142	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT		1,468				1,468
143	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	31,530	26,526			31,530	26,526
144	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	5,547	81,680			5,547	81,680
147	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	217	28,096			217	28,096
148	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	6,904	56,150			6,904	56,150
149	MORTUARY AFFAIRS SYSTEMS	248	3,242			248	3,242
150	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	289	38,141			289	38,141
151	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)	210	5,859			210	5,859
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
152	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	508	60,612			508	60,612
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
153	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	3,258	22,042			3,258	22,042
154	MEDEVAC MISSON EQUIPMENT PACKAGE (MEP)	88	35,318			88	35,318
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
155	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	25	19,427			25	19,427

156	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	347	3,860	347	3,860
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT				
157	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		2,000		2,000
159	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	52	36,078	52	36,078
160	MISSION MODULES—ENGINEERING	13	9,721	13	9,721
162	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	109	50,122	109	50,122
163	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	84	28,828	84	28,828
164	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	19	19,863	19	19,863
166	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	34	23,465	34	23,465
168	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP	109	13,590	109	13,590
169	CONST EQUIP ESP	80	16,088	80	16,088
170	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	66	6,850	66	6,850
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT				
171	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP		38,007		38,007
172	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		10,605		10,605
	GENERATORS				
173	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	5,239	129,437	5,239	129,437
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
174	ROUGH TERRAIN CONTAINER HANDLER (RTCH)		1,250		1,250
175	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	60	8,260	60	8,260
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT				
176	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	309	121,710	309	121,710
177	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	8,181	225,200	8,181	225,200
178	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	15	30,063	15	30,063
179	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	2	34,913	2	34,913
180	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		9,955		9,955
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)				
181	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	3	8,241	3	8,241
182	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	1,810	67,506	1,810	67,506
183	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	2,105	18,755	2,105	18,755
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
184	M25 STABILIZED BINOCULAR	647	5,110	647	5,110

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
185	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,110				5,110
186	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		62,904				62,904
187	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		1,427				1,427
188	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)	1,936	96,661			1,936	96,661
189	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		2,450				2,450
190	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	69	11,593			69	11,593
191	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	1,597	8,948			1,597	8,948
192	TRACTOR YARD		8,000				8,000
	OPA2						
195	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	15	59,700			15	59,700
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY Total		**6,465,218**		**0**		**6,465,218**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	EA–18G	21	2,001,787			21	2,001,787
3	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET		206,551				206,551
5	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	4	1,135,444			4	1,135,444
6	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV—ADV PROC (CY)		94,766				94,766
7	JSF STOVL	6	1,267,260			6	1,267,260
8	JSF STOVL—ADV PROC (CY)		103,195				103,195
9	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	18	1,432,573			18	1,432,573
10	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)—ADV PROC (CY)		55,196				55,196
11	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	25	749,962			25	749,962
12	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)—ADV PROC (CY)		71,000				71,000
13	MH–60S (MYP)	18	383,831			18	383,831
14	MH–60S (MYP)—ADV PROC (CY)		37,278				37,278

15	MH–60R (MYP)	19	599,237		19	599,237
16	MH–60R (MYP)—ADV PROC (CY)		231,834			231,834
17	P–8A POSEIDON	16	3,189,989		16	3,189,989
18	P–8A POSEIDON—ADV PROC (CY)		313,160			313,160
19	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	5	997,107		5	997,107
20	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE—ADV PROC (CY)		266,542			266,542
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT					
21	JPATS	29	249,080		29	249,080
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
22	KC–130J	2	134,358		2	134,358
23	KC–130J—ADV PROC (CY)		32,288			32,288
25	RQ–4 UAV—ADV PROC (CY)		52,002			52,002
26	MQ–8 UAV	1	60,980		1	60,980
28	OTHER SUPPORT AIRCRAFT	1	14,958		1	14,958
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT					
29	EA–6 SERIES		18,577			18,577
30	AEA SYSTEMS		48,502			48,502
31	AV–8 SERIES		41,575			41,575
32	ADVERSARY		2,992			2,992
33	F–18 SERIES		875,371			875,371
34	H–46 SERIES		2,127			2,127
36	H–53 SERIES		67,675			67,675
37	SH–60 SERIES		135,054			135,054
38	H–1 SERIES		41,706			41,706
39	EP–3 SERIES		55,903	22,000		77,903
	12th aircraft to Spiral 3			[8,000]		
	Sensor obsolescence			[14,000]		
40	P–3 SERIES		37,436			37,436
41	E–2 SERIES		31,044			31,044
42	TRAINER A/C SERIES		43,720			43,720
43	C–2A		902			902
44	C–130 SERIES		47,587			47,587

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
45	FEWSG		665				665
46	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		14,587				14,587
47	E–6 SERIES		189,312				189,312
48	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		85,537				85,537
49	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		3,684		10,000		13,684
	Program office sustainment				[5,000]		
	Sensor obsolescence				[5,000]		
50	T–45 SERIES		98,128				98,128
51	POWER PLANT CHANGES		22,999				22,999
52	JPATS SERIES		1,576				1,576
53	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT MODS		6,267				6,267
54	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		141,685				141,685
55	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		120,660				120,660
56	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		3,554				3,554
57	ID SYSTEMS		41,800				41,800
58	P–8 SERIES		9,485				9,485
59	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		14,431				14,431
60	MQ–8 SERIES		1,001				1,001
61	RQ–7 SERIES		26,433				26,433
62	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		160,834				160,834
63	F–35 STOVL SERIES		147,130				147,130
64	F–35 CV SERIES		31,100				31,100
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
65	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,142,461				1,142,461
66	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		410,044				410,044
67	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		27,450				27,450

68	WAR CONSUMABLES		28,930			28,930
69	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		5,268			5,268
70	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		60,306			60,306
71	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,775			1,775
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY Total		**17,927,651**	**32,000**		**17,959,651**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES					
1	TRIDENT II MODS		1,140,865			1,140,865
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES					
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		7,617			7,617
	STRATEGIC MISSILES					
3	TOMAHAWK	196	312,456		196	312,456
	TACTICAL MISSILES					
4	AMRAAM	54	95,413		54	95,413
5	SIDEWINDER	225	117,208		225	117,208
6	JSOW	328	136,794		328	136,794
7	STANDARD MISSILE	81	367,985		81	367,985
8	RAM	66	67,596		66	67,596
9	HELLFIRE	363	33,916		363	33,916
11	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	50	6,278		50	6,278
12	AERIAL TARGETS		41,799			41,799
13	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,538			3,538
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES					
14	ESSM	53	76,749		53	76,749
15	HARM MODS	143	111,902		143	111,902
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES					
16	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,138			1,138
17	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		23,014			23,014
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
18	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		84,318			84,318
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
19	SSTD		3,978				3,978
20	ASW TARGETS		8,031				8,031
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
21	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS	150	125,898			150	125,898
22	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	108	53,203			108	53,203
23	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		7,800				7,800
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
24	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		59,730				59,730
25	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		4,222				4,222
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
26	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,963				3,963
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
27	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		12,513				12,513
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
28	CIWS MODS		56,308		6,400		62,708
	Additional RMA kits				[6,400]		
29	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		10,727				10,727
30	GUN MOUNT MODS		72,901				72,901
31	CRUISER MODERNIZATION WEAPONS		1,943				1,943
32	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		19,758				19,758
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
34	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		52,632				52,632
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY Total		**3,122,193**		**6,400**		**3,128,593**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						

1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		37,703			37,703
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		65,411			65,411
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		20,284			20,284
4	PRACTICE BOMBS		37,870			37,870
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		53,764			53,764
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		67,194			67,194
7	JATOS		2,749			2,749
8	LRLAP 6″ LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE		3,906			3,906
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		24,151			24,151
10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		33,080			33,080
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		40,398			40,398
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		61,219			61,219
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		10,637			10,637
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,578			4,578
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION					
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		26,297			26,297
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		6,088			6,088
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES		7,644			7,644
18	60MM, ALL TYPES		3,349			3,349
20	120MM, ALL TYPES		13,361			13,361
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		2,149			2,149
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		27,465			27,465
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES		26,366			26,366
28	AMMO MODERNIZATION		8,403			8,403
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,201			5,201
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC Total		**589,267**		**0**	**589,267**
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY					
	OTHER WARSHIPS					
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM		944,866			944,866
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	2,930,704		2	2,930,704
4	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE ADV PROC (CY)		2,354,612			2,354,612

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		1,705,424				1,705,424
6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS ADV PROC (CY)		245,793				245,793
7	DDG 1000		231,694				231,694
8	DDG–51	1	1,615,564			1	1,615,564
9	DDG–51 ADV PROC (CY)		388,551				388,551
10	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	4	1,793,014			4	1,793,014
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
12	AFLOAT FORWARD STAGING BASE	1	524,000		55,300	1	579,300
	Navy requested adjustment				[55,300]		
14	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL		2,732				2,732
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
16	MOORED TRAINING SHIP		183,900				183,900
17	OUTFITTING		450,163				450,163
19	LCAC SLEP	4	80,987			4	80,987
20	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		625,800		100,000		725,800
	Help buy 3rd DDG–51 in FY 13				[100,000]		
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY Total		**14,077,804**		**155,300**		**14,233,104**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
1	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE		10,180				10,180
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE		5,536				5,536
3	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)		16,956				16,956
	GENERATORS						
4	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E		19,782				19,782
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						

5	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	39,509	39,509
	PERISCOPES		
6	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	52,515	52,515
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		
7	DDG MOD	285,994	285,994
8	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,389	14,389
9	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	2,436	2,436
10	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE	12,700	12,700
11	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM	40,329	40,329
12	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	19,603	19,603
13	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,678	8,678
14	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	74,209	74,209
15	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	47,078	47,078
16	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	37,000	37,000
17	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	25,053	25,053
18	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	12,986	12,986
19	DSSP EQUIPMENT	2,455	2,455
20	CG MODERNIZATION	10,539	10,539
21	LCAC	14,431	14,431
22	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	36,700	36,700
23	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	119,902	119,902
24	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	3,678	3,678
25	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	8,292	8,292
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT		
27	REACTOR COMPONENTS	286,744	286,744
	OCEAN ENGINEERING		
28	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	8,780	8,780
	SMALL BOATS		
29	STANDARD BOATS	36,452	36,452
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
30	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	36,145	36,145
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
31	OPERATING FORCES IPE		69,368				69,368
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
32	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		106,328				106,328
33	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT		45,966				45,966
34	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES		59,885				59,885
35	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES		37,168				37,168
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT						
36	LSD MIDLIFE		77,974				77,974
	SHIP SONARS						
38	SPQ–9B RADAR		27,934				27,934
39	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		83,231				83,231
40	SSN ACOUSTICS		199,438				199,438
41	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		9,394				9,394
42	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		12,953				12,953
43	ELECTRONIC WARFARE MILDEC		8,958				8,958
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
44	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		24,077				24,077
45	SSTD		11,925				11,925
46	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		94,338				94,338
47	SURTASS		9,680				9,680
48	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNSAISANCE FORCE		18,130				18,130
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
49	AN/SLQ–32		203,375				203,375
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
50	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		123,656				123,656
51	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)		896				896

	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		
52	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	49,475	49,475
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
53	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	34,692	34,692
54	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	396	396
55	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	15,703	15,703
56	ATDLS	3,836	3,836
57	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	7,201	7,201
58	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	54,400	54,400
59	SHALLOW WATER MCM	8,548	8,548
60	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	11,765	11,765
61	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	6,483	6,483
62	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	7,631	7,631
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT		
63	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	53,644	53,644
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
64	MATCALS	7,461	7,461
65	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,140	9,140
66	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	20,798	20,798
67	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	19,754	19,754
68	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	8,909	8,909
69	LANDING SYSTEMS	13,554	13,554
70	ID SYSTEMS	38,934	38,934
71	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	14,131	14,131
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
72	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL	3,249	3,249
73	MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	11,646	11,646
74	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	18,189	18,189
75	DCGS-N	17,350	17,350
76	CANES	340,567	340,567
77	RADIAC	9,835	9,835
78	CANES-INTELL	59,652	59,652

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
79	GPETE		6,253				6,253
80	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		4,963				4,963
81	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		4,664				4,664
82	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		66,889				66,889
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
84	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		23,877				23,877
86	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M		28,001				28,001
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
87	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		7,856				7,856
88	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		74,376				74,376
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
89	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		27,381				27,381
90	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)		215,952				215,952
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
91	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		4,463				4,463
92	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		778				778
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
94	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		133,530				133,530
95	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM		1,000				1,000
96	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		12,251				12,251
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
97	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		2,893				2,893
	SONOBUOYS						
99	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES		179,927				179,927
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
100	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		55,279				55,279

101	EXPEDITIONARY AIRFIELDS	8,792	8,792
102	AIRCRAFT REARMING EQUIPMENT	11,364	11,364
103	AIRCRAFT LAUNCH & RECOVERY EQUIPMENT	59,502	59,502
104	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	19,118	19,118
105	DCRS/DPL	1,425	1,425
106	AVIATION LIFE SUPPORT	29,670	29,670
107	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	101,554	101,554
108	LAMPS MK III SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT	18,293	18,293
109	PORTABLE ELECTRONIC MAINTENANCE AIDS	7,969	7,969
110	OTHER AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	5,215	5,215
111	AUTONOMIC LOGISTICS INFORMATION SYSTEM (ALIS)	4,827	4,827
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT		
112	NAVAL FIRES CONTROL SYSTEM	1,188	1,188
113	GUN FIRE CONTROL EQUIPMENT	4,447	4,447
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		
114	NATO SEASPARROW	58,368	58,368
115	RAM GMLS	491	491
116	SHIP SELF DEFENSE SYSTEM	51,858	51,858
117	AEGIS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	59,757	59,757
118	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	71,559	71,559
119	VERTICAL LAUNCH SYSTEMS	626	626
120	MARITIME INTEGRATED PLANNING SYSTEM-MIPS	2,779	2,779
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
121	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	224,484	224,484
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
122	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	85,678	85,678
123	SUBMARINE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,913	3,913
124	SURFACE ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	3,909	3,909
125	ASW RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	28,694	28,694
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
126	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	46,586	46,586
127	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	11,933	11,933

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE						
128	ANTI-SHIP MISSILE DECOY SYSTEM		62,361				62,361
129	SURFACE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		41,813				41,813
130	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS		26,672				26,672
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
131	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		5,600				5,600
132	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		3,717				3,717
133	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		10,881				10,881
134	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		14,748				14,748
135	TACTICAL VEHICLES		5,540				5,540
136	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		5,741				5,741
137	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		3,852				3,852
138	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		25,757				25,757
139	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,182				1,182
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
140	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		14,250				14,250
141	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,401				6,401
142	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,718				5,718
143	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		22,597				22,597
	TRAINING DEVICES						
144	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		22,527				22,527
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
145	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		50,428				50,428
146	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,292				2,292
147	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,925				4,925
149	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,202				3,202

151	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		24,294				24,294
152	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		4,287				4,287
153	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		18,276				18,276
154	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		134,495				134,495
155	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		324,327				324,327
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
156A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		12,140				12,140
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
157	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		317,234				317,234
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY Total		**6,310,257**		**0**		**6,310,257**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
01	AAV7A1 PIP		32,360				32,360
02	LAV PIP		6,003				6,003
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
03	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		589				589
04	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		3,655				3,655
05	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		5,467				5,467
06	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		20,354				20,354
	OTHER SUPPORT						
07	MODIFICATION KITS		38,446				38,446
08	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		4,734				4,734
	GUIDED MISSILES						
09	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		15,713				15,713
10	JAVELIN	219	36,175			219	36,175
12	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)		1,136				1,136
	OTHER SUPPORT						
13	MODIFICATION KITS		33,976				33,976
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS						
14	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER		16,273				16,273
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
15	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		41,063				41,063
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
16	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		2,930				2,930
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
18	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		1,637				1,637
19	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		18,394				18,394
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
20	RADAR SYSTEMS		114,051				114,051
21	RQ–21 UAS	25	66,612			25	66,612
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
22	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,749				3,749
23	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		75,979				75,979
26	RQ–11 UAV		1,653				1,653
27	DCGS-MC		9,494				9,494
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
28	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		6,171				6,171
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
29	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		121,955				121,955
30	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		83,294				83,294
31	RADIO SYSTEMS		74,718				74,718
32	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		47,613				47,613
33	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		19,573				19,573
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
33A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		5,659				5,659
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
34	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		1,039				1,039

35	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	31,050		31,050
	TACTICAL VEHICLES			
36	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	36,333		36,333
37	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	3,137		3,137
40	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS	27,385		27,385
	OTHER SUPPORT			
41	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	7,016		7,016
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT			
42	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	14,377		14,377
43	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	24,864		24,864
44	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	21,592		21,592
45	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	61,353		61,353
46	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,827		4,827
47	EOD SYSTEMS	40,011		40,011
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT			
48	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	16,809		16,809
49	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)	3,408		3,408
50	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	48,549		48,549
51	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	190		190
	GENERAL PROPERTY			
52	FIELD MEDICAL EQUIPMENT	23,129		23,129
53	TRAINING DEVICES	8,346		8,346
54	CONTAINER FAMILY	1,857		1,857
55	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	36,198		36,198
56	RAPID DEPLOYABLE KITCHEN	2,390		2,390
	OTHER SUPPORT			
57	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,525		6,525
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS			
58	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	13,700		13,700
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS Total	**1,343,511**	**0**	**1,343,511**

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TACTICAL FORCES						
1	F–35	19	3,060,770			19	3,060,770
2	F–35—ADV PROC (CY)		363,783				363,783
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
5	C–130J	6	537,517			6	537,517
6	C–130J—ADV PROC (CY)		162,000				162,000
7	HC–130J	1	132,121			1	132,121
8	HC–130J—ADV PROC (CY)		88,000				88,000
9	MC–130J	4	389,434			4	389,434
10	MC–130J—ADV PROC (CY)		104,000				104,000
	HELICOPTERS						
15	CV–22 (MYP)	3	230,798			3	230,798
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
17	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	6	2,541			6	2,541
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
20	TARGET DRONES	41	138,669			41	138,669
22	AC–130J	5	470,019			5	470,019
24	RQ–4		27,000				27,000
27	MQ–9	12	272,217		–30,000	12	242,217
	Prior year savings				[–30,000]		
28	RQ–4 BLOCK 40 PROC		1,747				1,747
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
29	B–2A		20,019				20,019
30	B–1B		132,222				132,222
31	B–52		111,002				111,002
32	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		27,197				27,197

	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT			
33	A–10	47,598		47,598
34	F–15	354,624		354,624
35	F–16	11,794		11,794
36	F–22A	285,830		285,830
37	F–35 MODIFICATIONS	157,777		157,777
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT			
38	C–5	2,456		2,456
39	C–5M	1,021,967		1,021,967
42	C–17A	143,197		143,197
43	C–21	103		103
44	C–32A	9,780		9,780
45	C–37A	452		452
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT			
47	GLIDER MODS	128		128
48	T–6	6,427		6,427
49	T–1	277		277
50	T–38	28,686		28,686
	OTHER AIRCRAFT			
52	U–2 MODS	45,591		45,591
53	KC–10A (ATCA)	70,918		70,918
54	C–12	1,876		1,876
55	MC–12W	5,000		5,000
56	C–20 MODS	192		192
57	VC–25A MOD	263		263
58	C–40	6,119		6,119
59	C–130	58,577	47,300	105,877
	C–130 avionics upgrades		[47,300]	
61	C–130J MODS	10,475		10,475
62	C–135	46,556		46,556
63	COMPASS CALL MODS	34,494		34,494
64	RC–135	171,813		171,813

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
65	E–3		197,087				197,087
66	E–4		14,304				14,304
67	E–8		57,472				57,472
68	H–1		6,627				6,627
69	H–60		27,654				27,654
70	RQ–4 MODS		9,313				9,313
71	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		16,300				16,300
72	OTHER AIRCRAFT		6,948				6,948
73	MQ–1 MODS		9,734				9,734
74	MQ–9 MODS		102,970		–34,500		68,470
	Lynx radar reduction				[–34,500]		
76	RQ–4 GSRA/CSRA MODS		30,000				30,000
77	CV–22 MODS		23,310				23,310
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
78	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		463,285				463,285
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
79	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		49,140				49,140
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
81	B–1		3,683				3,683
83	B–2A		43,786				43,786
84	B–52		7,000				7,000
87	C–17A		81,952				81,952
89	C–135		8,597				8,597
90	F–15		2,403				2,403
91	F–16		3,455				3,455
92	F–22A		5,911				5,911

	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS					
94	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		21,148			21,148
	WAR CONSUMABLES					
95	WAR CONSUMABLES		94,947			94,947
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES					
96	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		1,242,004			1,242,004
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
96A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		75,845			75,845
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE Total		**11,398,901**	**–17,200**		**11,381,701**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC					
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		39,104			39,104
	TACTICAL					
2	JASSM	183	291,151		183	291,151
3	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	225	119,904		225	119,904
4	AMRAAM	199	340,015		199	340,015
5	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	413	48,548		413	48,548
6	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	144	42,347		144	42,347
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES					
7	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		752			752
	CLASS IV					
9	MM III MODIFICATIONS		21,635			21,635
10	AGM–65D MAVERICK		276			276
11	AGM–88A HARM		580			580
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		6,888			6,888
13	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB		5,000			5,000
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
14	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		72,080			72,080
	SPACE PROGRAMS					
15	ADVANCED EHF		379,586			379,586
16	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		38,398			38,398

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
17	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	2	486,047			2	486,047
17	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT		–82,616				–82,616
18	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT		74,167				74,167
19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		5,244				5,244
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		55,997				55,997
21	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		95,673				95,673
22	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	5	1,852,900			5	1,852,900
23	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)		583,192				583,192
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
29	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		36,716				36,716
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
29A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		829,702				829,702
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE Total		**5,343,286**		**0**		**5,343,286**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
1	ROCKETS		15,735				15,735
	CARTRIDGES						
2	CARTRIDGES		129,921				129,921
	BOMBS						
3	PRACTICE BOMBS		30,840				30,840
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		187,397				187,397
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	6,965	188,510			6,965	188,510
	OTHER ITEMS						
6	CAD/PAD		35,837				35,837
7	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		7,531				7,531

8	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	499		499
9	MODIFICATIONS	480		480
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,765		9,765
	FLARES			
11	FLARES	55,864		55,864
	FUZES			
13	FUZES	76,037		76,037
	SMALL ARMS			
14	SMALL ARMS	21,026		21,026
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE Total	**759,442**	**0**	**759,442**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE			
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES			
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	2,048		2,048
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES			
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	8,019		8,019
3	CAP VEHICLES	946		946
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	7,138		7,138
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES			
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	13,093		13,093
6	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	13,983		13,983
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT			
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES	23,794		23,794
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT			
8	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	8,669		8,669
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT			
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP	6,144		6,144
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,580		1,580
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)			
12	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	149,661		149,661
13	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	726		726
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS			

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
14	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		2,789				2,789
15	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		31,875				31,875
16	ADVANCE TECH SENSORS		452				452
17	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		14,203				14,203
18	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		46,232				46,232
19	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		11,685				11,685
20	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED		19,248				19,248
21	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS		19,292				19,292
22	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		17,166				17,166
23	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		22,723				22,723
24	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		27,930				27,930
25	TAC SIGNIT SPT		217				217
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
27	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		49,627				49,627
28	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS		13,559				13,559
29	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		11,186				11,186
30	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		43,238				43,238
31	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES		10,431				10,431
32	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		13,769				13,769
33	GCSS-AF FOS		19,138				19,138
34	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		8,809				8,809
35	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS		26,935				26,935
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
36	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS		80,558				80,558
38	AFNET		97,588				97,588
39	VOICE SYSTEMS		8,419				8,419

40	USCENTCOM	34,276	34,276
	SPACE PROGRAMS		
41	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	28,235	28,235
42	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	2,061	2,061
43	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	4,415	4,415
44	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	30,237	30,237
45	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	98,062	98,062
46	MILSATCOM SPACE	105,935	105,935
47	SPACE MODS SPACE	37,861	37,861
48	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	7,171	7,171
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE		
49	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	83,537	83,537
50	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATER	11,884	11,884
51	RADIO EQUIPMENT	14,711	14,711
52	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	10,275	10,275
53	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	50,907	50,907
	MODIFICATIONS		
54	COMM ELECT MODS	55,701	55,701
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP		
55	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	14,524	14,524
56	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	28,655	28,655
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ		
57	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	9,332	9,332
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
58	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	16,762	16,762
59	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	33,768	33,768
60	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	2,495	2,495
61	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	12,859	12,859
62	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	1,954	1,954
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS		
64	DARP RC135	24,528	24,528
65	DCGS-AF	137,819	137,819

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
67	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		479,586				479,586
68	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		45,159				45,159
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
68A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		14,519,256				14,519,256
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
70	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		25,746				25,746
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE Total		**16,760,581**		**0**		**16,760,581**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
1	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,291				1,291
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA						
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		5,711				5,711
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
3	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		47,201				47,201
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
09	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		16,189				16,189
12	TELEPORT PROGRAM		66,075				66,075
13	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		83,881				83,881
14	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		2,572				2,572
15	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		125,557				125,557
17	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		16,941				16,941
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
18	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		13,137				13,137
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT						
19	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	5	15,414			5	15,414

	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA				
20	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,454		1,454
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY				
21	EQUIPMENT		978		978
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS				
22	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		5,020		5,020
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY				
23	VEHICLES	2	100	2	100
24	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	13,395	3	13,395
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY				
26	THAAD	36	581,005	36	581,005
27	AEGIS BMD	52	580,814	52	580,814
28	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS		62,000		62,000
29	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III	1	131,400	1	131,400
31	IRON DOME	1	220,309	1	220,309
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA				
39	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		14,363		14,363
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD				
40	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD		37,345		37,345
41	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INTELLIGENCE		16,678		16,678
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS				
42	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		14,792		14,792
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS				
43	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		35,259		35,259
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
43A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		544,272		544,272
	AVIATION PROGRAMS				
45	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		112,456		112,456
46	MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		81,457		81,457
47	NON-STANDARD AVIATION		2,650		2,650
48	U–28		56,208		56,208
49	MH–47 CHINOOK		19,766		19,766

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
50	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		850				850
51	CV–22 MODIFICATION	3	98,927			3	98,927
52	MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		20,576				20,576
53	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		1,893		13,000		14,893
	Capability Improvements				[13,000]		
55	STUASLO		13,166				13,166
56	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE		107,687				107,687
57	AC/MC–130J		51,870				51,870
59	C–130 MODIFICATIONS		71,940				71,940
	SHIPBUILDING						
61	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS		37,439				37,439
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
63	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M		159,029				159,029
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
66	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		79,819				79,819
68	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS		14,906				14,906
70	OTHER ITEMS <$5M		81,711				81,711
71	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		35,053		–1,156		33,897
	CCFLIR—Transfer at USSOCOM Request				[–1,156]		
74	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		41,526				41,526
75	TACTICAL VEHICLES		43,353				43,353
76	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <$5M		210,540				210,540
78	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS		20,000				20,000
82	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES		6,645				6,645
83	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE		25,581				25,581
89	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		191,061				191,061

	CBDP			
91	INSTALLATION FORCE PROTECTION	14,271		14,271
92	INDIVIDUAL PROTECTION	101,667		101,667
94	JOINT BIO DEFENSE PROGRAM (MEDICAL)	13,447		13,447
95	COLLECTIVE PROTECTION	20,896		20,896
96	CONTAMINATION AVOIDANCE	144,540		144,540
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE Total	**4,534,083**	**11,844**	**4,545,927**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND			
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND			
01	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	98,800		98,800
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND Total	**98,800**	**0**	**98,800**
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT	**98,227,168**	**–75,879**	**98,151,289**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
2	SATURN ARCH (MIP)	4	48,000			4	48,000
4	MQ–1 UAV	4	31,988			4	31,988
	ROTARY						
9	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIB NEW BUILD	4	142,000			4	142,000
11	KIOWA WARRIOR WRA	14	163,800			14	163,800
14	CH–47 HELICOPTER	10	386,000			10	386,000
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY Total		**771,788**		**0**		**771,788**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
3	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	550	54,000			550	54,000
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
7	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	383	39,045			383	39,045
10	ARMY TACTICAL MSL SYS (ATACMS)—SYS SUM	38	35,600			38	35,600
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY Total		**128,645**		**0**		**128,645**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
2	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		4,400				4,400
4	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		1,500				1,500
5	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		5,000				5,000
8	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		60,000				60,000
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
10	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		5,000				5,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
14	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES		10,000				10,000
15	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		10,000				10,000
16	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	120	11,000			120	11,000
	ROCKETS						
21	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		57,000				57,000
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
22	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		4,000				4,000
23	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		3,000				3,000

24	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		8,000			8,000
	MISCELLANEOUS					
28	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES		2,000			2,000
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY Total		**180,900**	**0**		**180,900**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	TACTICAL VEHICLES					
13	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		321,040			321,040
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS					
60	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		25,000			25,000
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)					
67	DCGS-A (MIP)		7,200			7,200
71	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		5,980			5,980
74	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	67	57,800		67	57,800
78	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE		15,300			15,300
79	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		4,221			4,221
91	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	34	1,834		34	1,834
96	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	137	21,000		137	21,000
98	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	4	85,830		4	85,830
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
146	FORCE PROVIDER	3	51,654		3	51,654
147	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	18	6,264		18	6,264
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY Total		**603,123**	**0**		**603,123**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND					
	NETWORK ATTACK					
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK		417,700			417,700
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT					
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		248,886			248,886
	FORCE TRAINING					
3	TRAIN THE FORCE		106,000	–106,000		0
	Program decrease			[–106,000]		

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
4	OPERATIONS		227,414		–45,000		182,414
	Program decrease				[–45,000]		
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND Total		**1,000,000**		**–151,000**		**849,000**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY Total						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
11	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	1	29,520			1	29,520
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
26	MQ–8 UAV	1	13,100			1	13,100
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
31	AV–8 SERIES		57,652				57,652
33	F–18 SERIES		35,500				35,500
39	EP–3 SERIES		2,700				2,700
49	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		3,375				3,375
54	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		49,183				49,183
55	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		4,190				4,190
59	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		20,700				20,700
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
65	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		24,776				24,776
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY Total		**240,696**		**0**		**240,696**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
9	HELLFIRE	270	27,000			270	27,000
10	LASER MAVERICK	500	58,000			500	58,000

11	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	9	1,500		9	1,500
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY Total		**86,500**	**0**		**86,500**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC					
	NAVY AMMUNITION					
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		11,424			11,424
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		30,332			30,332
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		8,282			8,282
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		31,884			31,884
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		409			409
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		11,976			11,976
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		2,447			2,447
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		7,692			7,692
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION					
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		13,461			13,461
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		3,310			3,310
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES		6,244			6,244
18	60MM, ALL TYPES		3,368			3,368
19	81MM, ALL TYPES		9,162			9,162
20	120MM, ALL TYPES		10,266			10,266
21	CTG 25MM, ALL TYPES		1,887			1,887
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		1,611			1,611
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		37,459			37,459
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		970			970
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		418			418
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES		14,219			14,219
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC Total		**206,821**	**0**		**206,821**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
135	TACTICAL VEHICLES		17,968			17,968
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY Total		**17,968**	**0**		**17,968**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	GUIDED MISSILES						
10	JAVELIN	180	29,334			180	29,334
11	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW		105				105
	OTHER SUPPORT						
13	MODIFICATION KITS		16,081				16,081
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
15	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		16,081				16,081
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
17	MODIFICATION KITS		2,831				2,831
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
18	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		8,170				8,170
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
23	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		2,700				2,700
26	RQ–11 UAV		2,830				2,830
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
29	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		4,866				4,866
30	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		265				265
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
42	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		114				114
43	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		523				523
44	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		365				365
45	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		2,004				2,004
47	EOD SYSTEMS		42,930				42,930
	GENERAL PROPERTY						

55	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		385			385
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS Total		**129,584**	**0**		**129,584**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT					
32	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		94,050			94,050
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
52	U–2 MODS		11,300			11,300
59	C–130		1,618			1,618
64	RC–135		2,700			2,700
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
79	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		6,000			6,000
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE Total		**115,668**	**0**		**115,668**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	TACTICAL					
5	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	211	24,200		211	24,200
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE Total		**24,200**	**0**		**24,200**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE					
	ROCKETS					
1	ROCKETS		326			326
	CARTRIDGES					
2	CARTRIDGES		17,634			17,634
	BOMBS					
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		37,514			37,514
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,879	84,459		2,879	84,459
	FLARES					
11	FLARES		14,973			14,973
12	FUZES		3,859			3,859
	SMALL ARMS					
14	SMALL ARMS		1,200			1,200

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE Total		**159,965**		**0**		**159,965**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
22	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		1,800				1,800
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
46	MILSATCOM SPACE		5,695				5,695
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
59	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS		60,600				60,600
61	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		68,000				68,000
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
68	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		58,250				58,250
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
68A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,380,501				2,380,501
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE Total		**2,574,846**		**0**		**2,574,846**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
12	TELEPORT PROGRAM		4,760				4,760
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
41A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		78,986				78,986
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
62	ORDNANCE REPLENISHMENT	25	2,841			25	2,841
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
66	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	1	13,300			1	13,300
84	SOLDIER PROTECTION AND SURVIVAL SYSTEMS	53	8,034			53	8,034

89	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	126	3,354		126	3,354
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE Total		**111,275**	**0**		**111,275**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND					
1	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		15,000			15,000
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND Total		**15,000**	**0**		**15,000**
	TOTAL, PROCUREMENT		**6,366,979**	**–151,000**		**6,215,979**

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	21,803		21,803
2	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	221,901		221,901
3	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	79,359		79,359
4	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	113,662		113,662
		BASIC RESEARCH TOTAL	**436,725**	**0**	**436,725**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
5	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	26,585		26,585
6	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	43,170		43,170
7	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	36,293		36,293
8	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	55,615		55,615
9	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	17,585		17,585
10	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	51,528		51,528
11	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	26,162		26,162
12	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	24,063		24,063
13	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	64,589		64,589

14	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	68,300	10,000	78,300
		WIAMan schedule adjustment		[10,000]	
15	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	4,490		4,490
16	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,818		7,818
17	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	37,798		37,798
18	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	59,021		59,021
19	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	43,426		43,426
20	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	20,574		20,574
21	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	21,339		21,339
22	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	20,316		20,316
23	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	34,209		34,209
24	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	10,439		10,439
25	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	70,064		70,064
26	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	17,654		17,654
27	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	31,546		31,546
28	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	93,340		93,340
		APPLIED RESEARCH TOTAL	**885,924**	**10,000**	**895,924**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
29	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	56,056		56,056
30	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	62,032		62,032
31	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	81,080		81,080
32	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	63,919		63,919
33	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	97,043		97,043
34	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,866		5,866
35	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	7,800		7,800
36	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	40,416		40,416
37	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	9,166		9,166
38	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	13,627		13,627
39	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	10,667		10,667
41	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	15,054		15,054
42	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	3,194		3,194

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
43	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,367		2,367
44	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	25,348		25,348
45	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,009		64,009
46	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	11,083		11,083
47	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	180,662		180,662
48	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	22,806		22,806
49	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,030		5,030
50	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	36,407		36,407
51	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	11,745		11,745
52	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,717		23,717
53	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	33,012		33,012
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**882,106**	**0**	**882,106**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
54	0603305A	ARMY MISSLE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	15,301		15,301
55	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	13,592		13,592
56	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	10,625		10,625
58	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	30,612		30,612
59	0603653A	ADVANCED TANK ARMAMENT SYSTEM (ATAS)	49,989		49,989
60	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	6,703		6,703
61	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	6,894		6,894
62	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	9,066		9,066
63	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	2,633		2,633
64	0603782A	WARFIGHTER INFORMATION NETWORK-TACTICAL—DEM/VAL	272,384		272,384
65	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	3,874		3,874
66	0603801A	AVIATION—ADV DEV	5,018		5,018
67	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	11,556		11,556

69	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	15,603		15,603
70	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	14,159		14,159
71	0603850A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE	79		79
72	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	55,605		55,605
74	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2–INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	79,232		79,232
75	0604785A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE (BUDGET ACTIVITY 4)	4,476		4,476
76	0305205A	ENDURANCE UAVS	28,991	–28,991	0
		LEMV termination		[–28,991]	
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES TOTAL	**636,392**	**–28,991**	**607,401**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
77	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	76,588		76,588
78	0604220A	ARMED, DEPLOYABLE HELOS	73,309		73,309
79	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	154,621		154,621
80	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	31,826		31,826
81	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	23,341		23,341
82	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	4,839		4,839
83	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	23,841		23,841
84	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	79,855		79,855
85	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	2,140		2,140
86	0604611A	JAVELIN	5,002		5,002
87	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	21,321		21,321
88	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	514		514
93	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	43,405		43,405
94	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	1,939		1,939
95	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	18,980		18,980
97	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	18,294		18,294
98	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,013		17,013
99	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	6,701		6,701
100	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	14,575		14,575
101	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	27,634		27,634
102	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	193,748		193,748

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
103	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	15,721		15,721
104	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	41,703		41,703
105	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	7,379		7,379
106	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	39,468		39,468
107	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	92,285		92,285
108	0604814A	ARTILLERY MUNITIONS—EMD	8,209		8,209
109	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	22,958		22,958
110	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	1,549		1,549
111	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	17,342	–17,115	227
		Excess to requirement		[–17,115]	
112	0604823A	FIREFINDER	47,221		47,221
113	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	48,477		48,477
114	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	80,613	40,700	121,313
		Transfer from WTCV 6 at Army Request		[40,700]	
117	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	68,814		68,814
118	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	137,290		137,290
119	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	116,298		116,298
120	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	68,148		68,148
121	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	33,219		33,219
122	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	15,127		15,127
124	0605456A	PAC–3/MSE MISSILE	68,843		68,843
125	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	364,649		364,649
126	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	592,201		592,201
127	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	10,382		10,382
128	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	21,143		21,143
129	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	84,230		84,230
130	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	3,465		3,465

131	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	10,806		10,806
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION TOTAL	**2,857,026**	**23,585**	**2,880,611**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
132	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	16,934		16,934
133	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,488		13,488
134	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	46,672		46,672
135	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	11,919		11,919
136	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	193,658		193,658
137	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	37,158		37,158
139	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	340,659		340,659
140	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	66,061		66,061
141	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	43,280		43,280
143	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	6,025		6,025
144	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	7,349		7,349
145	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	19,809		19,809
146	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	5,941		5,941
147	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	55,504		55,504
148	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	65,274		65,274
149	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	1,283		1,283
150	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	82,035		82,035
151	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	33,853	5,000	38,853
		Internet mapping		[5,000]	
152	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	53,340		53,340
153	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	5,193		5,193
154	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	54,175		54,175
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT TOTAL	**1,159,610**	**5,000**	**1,164,610**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
156	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	110,576		110,576
157	0607141A	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION	3,717		3,717
159	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	70,053		70,053

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
160	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	98,450		98,450
161	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	30,940		30,940
162	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	177,532		177,532
163	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	36,495		36,495
164	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	257,187	19,984	277,171
		Transfer from APA 11 at Army request		[19,984]	
165	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	315		315
166	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	6,186		6,186
167	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,578		1,578
168	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	62,100		62,100
169	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	18,778		18,778
170	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	7,108		7,108
173	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	7,600		7,600
174	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	9,357		9,357
175	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	41,225		41,225
176	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	18,197		18,197
177	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	14,215		14,215
179	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	33,533		33,533
180	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	27,622		27,622
181	0305219A	MQ–1C GRAY EAGLE UAS	10,901		10,901
182	0305232A	RQ–11 UAV	2,321		2,321
183	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	12,031		12,031
185	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	12,449		12,449
186	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	56,136		56,136
186A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,717		4,717
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**1,131,319**	**19,984**	**1,151,303**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**7,989,102**	**29,578**	**8,018,680**

		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	112,617		112,617
2	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,230		18,230
3	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	484,459		484,459
		BASIC RESEARCH TOTAL	**615,306**	**0**	**615,306**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
4	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	104,513		104,513
5	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	145,307		145,307
6	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	47,334		47,334
7	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	34,163		34,163
8	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	49,689		49,689
9	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	97,701		97,701
10	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,685		45,685
11	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,060		6,060
12	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	103,050		103,050
13	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	169,710		169,710
14	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	31,326		31,326
		APPLIED RESEARCH TOTAL	**834,538**	**0**	**834,538**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
15	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,201		48,201
16	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	28,328		28,328
19	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	56,179		56,179
20	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	132,400		132,400
21	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,854		11,854
22	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	247,931		247,931
23	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,760		4,760
25	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	51,463		51,463
26	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,000		2,000

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**583,116**	**0**	**583,116**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
27	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	42,246		42,246
28	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	5,591		5,591
29	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	3,262		3,262
30	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	74		74
31	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,964		7,964
32	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	5,257		5,257
33	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,570		1,570
34	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	168,040		168,040
35	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	88,649		88,649
36	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	83,902		83,902
37	0603525N	PILOT FISH	108,713		108,713
38	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	9,316		9,316
39	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	77,108		77,108
40	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	762		762
41	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	2,349		2,349
42	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	852,977		852,977
43	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	8,764		8,764
44	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	20,501		20,501
45	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	27,052		27,052
46	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	428,933		428,933
47	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	27,154		27,154
48	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	519,140		519,140
49	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	406,389		406,389
50	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	36,570		36,570

51	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	8,404		8,404
52	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	136,967		136,967
53	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,489		1,489
54	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	38,422		38,422
55	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	69,312		69,312
56	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	9,196		9,196
57	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	18,850		18,850
58	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	45,618		45,618
59	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	3,019		3,019
60	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	144,951		144,951
61	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	5,797		5,797
62	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	308,131		308,131
63	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	195,189		195,189
64	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	56,358		56,358
65	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	55,378		55,378
66	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	48,842		48,842
67	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	7,509		7,509
68	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	5,075		5,075
69	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	51,178		51,178
70	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	205,615		205,615
72	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	37,227		37,227
73	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	169		169
74	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	20,874		20,874
75	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	2,257		2,257
76	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	38,327		38,327
77	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	135,985	–100,000	35,985
		Adjust program to more realistic schedule		[–100,000]	
78	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	50,362		50,362
79	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	8,448		8,448
80	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	153		153
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES TOTAL	**4,641,385**	**–100,000**	**4,541,385**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
81	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	40,558		40,558
82	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	35,825		35,825
83	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	99,891		99,891
84	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	17,565		17,565
85	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,026		4,026
86	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,791		1,791
87	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	11,725		11,725
88	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	68,463		68,463
89	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	152,041		152,041
90	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	47,123		47,123
91	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	30,208		30,208
92	0604262N	V–22A	43,084		43,084
93	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	11,401		11,401
94	0604269N	EA–18	11,138		11,138
95	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	34,964		34,964
96	0604273N	VH–71A EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	94,238		94,238
97	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	257,796		257,796
98	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	3,302		3,302
99	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	240,298		240,298
100	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	1,214		1,214
101	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	46,007		46,007
102	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	75,592		75,592
103	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	117,854		117,854
104	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION	10,080		10,080
105	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	21,413		21,413
106	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM	146,683		146,683

107	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	275,871		275,871
108	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	89,672		89,672
109	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	13,754		13,754
110	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	69,615		69,615
112	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	121,566		121,566
113	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	49,143		49,143
114	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	155,254	20,000	175,254
		Increased LHA–8 design efforts		[20,000]	
115	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,689		3,689
116	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	5,041		5,041
117	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	26,444		26,444
118	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,897		8,897
119	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	6,233		6,233
120	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	442		442
121	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	130,360		130,360
122	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	50,209		50,209
123	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	164,799		164,799
124	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	1,984		1,984
125	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	9,458		9,458
126	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	51,430		51,430
127	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	512,631		512,631
128	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	534,187		534,187
129	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	5,564		5,564
130	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	69,659		69,659
132	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	503,180		503,180
133	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	5,500		5,500
134	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	317,358		317,358
135	0204202N	DDG–1000	187,910		187,910
136	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	2,140		2,140
137	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	9,406		9,406
138	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	22,800		22,800
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION TOTAL	**5,028,476**	**20,000**	**5,048,476**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
139	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	43,261		43,261
140	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	71,872		71,872
141	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	38,033		38,033
142	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	1,352		1,352
143	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	5,566		5,566
144	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	48,345		48,345
146	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	637		637
147	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	76,585		76,585
148	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,221		3,221
149	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	72,725		72,725
150	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	141,778		141,778
151	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	331,219		331,219
152	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	16,565		16,565
153	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	3,265		3,265
154	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	7,134		7,134
155	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	24,082		24,082
156	0305885N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC ACTIVITIES	497		497
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT TOTAL	**886,137**	**0**	**886,137**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
159	0604227N	HARPOON MODIFICATIONS	699		699
160	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT.	20,961		20,961
162	0604766M	MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS	35		35
163	0605525N	CARRIER ONBOARD DELIVERY (COD) FOLLOW ON	2,460		2,460

164	0605555N	STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT	9,757		9,757
165	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	98,057		98,057
166	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	31,768		31,768
167	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,464		1,464
168	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	21,729		21,729
169	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	13,561		13,561
170	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	131,118		131,118
171	0204152N	E–2 SQUADRONS	1,971		1,971
172	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	46,155		46,155
173	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	2,374		2,374
174	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	12,407		12,407
175	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	41,609		41,609
176	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	7,240		7,240
177	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	78,208		78,208
178	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	45,124		45,124
179	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	2,703		2,703
180	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	19,563		19,563
181	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	13,586		13,586
182	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	197,538		197,538
183	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	31,863		31,863
184	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	12,806		12,806
185	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	88,607		88,607
187	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	116,928		116,928
188	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	178,753		178,753
189	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	139,594	–20,875	118,719
		Marine Personnel Carrier program deferred		[–20,875]	
190	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	42,647		42,647
191	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	34,394		34,394
192	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	39,159		39,159
193	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	2,613		2,613
194	0208058N	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL (JHSV)	986		986
199	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	66,231		66,231

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
200	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	24,476		24,476
201	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,531		23,531
206	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	742		742
207	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	4,804		4,804
208	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,381		8,381
211	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,535		5,535
212	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	19,718		19,718
213	0305220N	RQ–4 UAV	375,235		375,235
214	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	48,713		48,713
215	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	102		102
216	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	710		710
217	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	5,013		5,013
219	0305239M	RQ–21A	11,122		11,122
220	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	28,851		28,851
221	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	5,116		5,116
222	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	28,042		28,042
223	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	50,933		50,933
224	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	4,998		4,998
224A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,185,132		1,185,132
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**3,385,822**	**–20,875**	**3,364,947**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**15,974,780**	**–100,875**	**15,873,905**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	373,151		373,151
2	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	138,333		138,333
3	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,286		13,286

		BASIC RESEARCH TOTAL	**524,770**	**0**	**524,770**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
4	0602102F	MATERIALS	116,846		116,846
5	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	119,672		119,672
6	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	89,483		89,483
7	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	197,546		197,546
8	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	127,539		127,539
9	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	104,063		104,063
10	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	81,521		81,521
11	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	112,845		112,845
12	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	138,161		138,161
13	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	40,217		40,217
		APPLIED RESEARCH TOTAL	**1,127,893**	**0**	**1,127,893**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
14	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	39,572		39,572
15	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	12,800		12,800
16	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	30,579		30,579
17	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	77,347		77,347
18	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	149,321		149,321
19	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	49,128		49,128
20	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	68,071		68,071
21	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	26,299		26,299
22	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	20,967		20,967
23	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	33,996		33,996
24	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	19,000		19,000
25	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	41,353		41,353
26	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	49,093		49,093
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**617,526**	**0**	**617,526**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
28	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,983		3,983
29	0603287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,874		3,874
32	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	27,024		27,024
33	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	15,899		15,899
34	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,568		4,568
35	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	379		379
36	0603830F	SPACE PROTECTION PROGRAM (SPP)	28,764		28,764
38	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	86,737		86,737
40	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL	953		953
42	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	379,437		379,437
44	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,606		2,606
45	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	103		103
47	0604337F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	16,018		16,018
49	0604458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER	58,861		58,861
50	0604618F	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,500		2,500
51	0604635F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	21,175		21,175
52	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	0	10,000	10,000
		Program increase		[10,000]	
53	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	13,636		13,636
54	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	2,799		2,799
55	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	70,160		70,160
56	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	137,233		137,233
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES TOTAL	**876,709**	**10,000**	**886,709**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
58	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	977		977
61	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	3,601		3,601

62	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,971		1,971
64	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	51,456	–15,200	36,256
		Unjustified request		[–15,200]	
65	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	50		50
66	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	115,000		115,000
67	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	23,930		23,930
68	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	400,258		400,258
69	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	4,575		4,575
70	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	352,532		352,532
71	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	16,284		16,284
72	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,564		2,564
73	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	17,036		17,036
74	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	7,273		7,273
75	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	33,200		33,200
78	0604800F	F–35—EMD	816,335		816,335
79	0604851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—EMD	145,442		145,442
80	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	27,963		27,963
81	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	5,000		5,000
82	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	129,411		129,411
83	0605213F	F–22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	131,100		131,100
84	0605221F	KC–46	1,558,590		1,558,590
85	0605229F	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	393,558		393,558
86	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	6,242		6,242
87	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	272,872		272,872
88	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	124,805		124,805
89	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	13,948		13,948
90	0605931F	B–2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	303,500		303,500
91	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	67,874		67,874
94	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	4,663		4,663
97	0401318F	CV–22	46,705		46,705
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION TOTAL	**5,078,715**	**–15,200**	**5,063,515**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
99	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	17,690		17,690
100	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	34,841		34,841
101	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	32,956		32,956
103	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	13,610		13,610
104	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	742,658		742,658
105	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	14,203		14,203
106	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	13,000		13,000
107	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	44,160		44,160
108	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,643		27,643
109	0606323F	MULTI-SERVICE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING INITIATIVE	13,935		13,935
110	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	192,348		192,348
111	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	28,647		28,647
112	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	315		315
114	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,785		3,785
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT TOTAL	**1,179,791**	**0**	**1,179,791**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
115	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	383,500		383,500
117	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	5,000		5,000
118	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	90,097		90,097
119	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	32,086		32,086
121	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	24,007		24,007
122	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	450		450
123	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	19,589		19,589
124	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	100,194		100,194
125	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	37,448		37,448

128	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,700		1,700
130	0203761F	WARFIGHTER RAPID ACQUISITION PROCESS (WRAP) RAPID TRANSITION FUND	3,844		3,844
131	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	128,328		128,328
133	0207131F	A–10 SQUADRONS	9,614		9,614
134	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	177,298		177,298
135	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	244,289		244,289
136	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	13,138		13,138
137	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	328,542		328,542
138	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	33,000		33,000
139	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	15,460		15,460
140	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	84,172		84,172
142	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	2,582		2,582
143	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	542		542
144	0207247F	AF TENCAP	89,816	–76,800	13,016
		Reduction fighter communications POD		[–76,800]	
145	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,075		1,075
146	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	10,782		10,782
147	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	139,369		139,369
149	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	6,373		6,373
150	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	22,820		22,820
151	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	7,029		7,029
152	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	186,256		186,256
153	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	743		743
156	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	4,471		4,471
158	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	10,250		10,250
159	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,431		1,431
160	0207449F	COMMAND AND CONTROL (C2) CONSTELLATION	7,329		7,329
161	0207452F	DCAPES	15,081		15,081
162	0207581F	JOINT SURVEILLANCE/TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM (JSTARS)	13,248	9,900	23,148
		Continue T–3 testing operations		[9,900]	
163	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	24,342		24,342
164	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	10,448		10,448

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
165	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,512		5,512
166	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	3,301		3,301
167	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	62,605		62,605
169	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	68,099		68,099
170	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	14,047		14,047
171	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	5,853		5,853
179	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	12,197		12,197
180	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	18,267		18,267
181	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	36,288		36,288
182	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	90,231	10,000	100,231
		ASACoE program		[10,000]	
183	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	725		725
185	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	140,170		140,170
187	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	117,110		117,110
190	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,430		4,430
191	0305103F	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,048		2,048
192	0305105F	DOD CYBER CRIME CENTER	288		288
193	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	35,698		35,698
194	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	24,667		24,667
195	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	35,674		35,674
196	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	21,186		21,186
199	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	195		195
200	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	1,430		1,430
201	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	330		330
206	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,696		3,696
207	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,469		2,469
208	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	8,289		8,289

209	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	13,345		13,345
211	0305202F	DRAGON U–2	18,700		18,700
212	0305205F	ENDURANCE UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	3,000		3,000
213	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	37,828	12,500	50,328
		Blue Devil Replacement WAMI/NVDF		[15,000]	
		Unjustified amount		[–2,500]	
214	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,491		13,491
215	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	7,498		7,498
216	0305219F	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	3,326		3,326
217	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	134,406		134,406
218	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	7,413		7,413
219	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK (CDL)	40,503		40,503
220	0305238F	NATO AGS	264,134		264,134
221	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	23,016		23,016
222	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	221,276		221,276
223	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	58,523		58,523
224	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	2,218		2,218
226	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	50,547		50,547
227	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	18,807		18,807
229	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	1,079		1,079
230	0401115F	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	400		400
231	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	61,492		61,492
232	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	109,134		109,134
233	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	22,443		22,443
234	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	4,116		4,116
238	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	44,553		44,553
239	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	6,213		6,213
240	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,605		1,605
242	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	95,238		95,238
243	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,925		10,925
244	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	1,347		1,347
245	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	65		65

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
246	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	1,083		1,083
247	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	1,577		1,577
248	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	5,990		5,990
249	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	786		786
250	0901279F	FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE	654		654
251	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	135,735		135,735
251A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,874,528	0	11,874,528
		Reduction to classified program		[–70,000]	
		Increase to classified program		[70,000]	
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**16,297,542**	**–44,400**	**16,253,142**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**25,702,946**	**–49,600**	**25,653,346**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	45,837		45,837
2	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	315,033		315,033
3	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	11,171		11,171
4	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	49,500		49,500
5	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	84,271		84,271
6	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	30,895		30,895
7	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	51,426		51,426
		BASIC RESEARCH TOTAL	**588,133**	**0**	**588,133**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
8	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	20,065		20,065
9	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	114,790		114,790
11	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	46,875	–5,000	41,875

		MIT LL reduction		[–5,000]	
13	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	45,000	–15,000	30,000
		PSC S&T reduction		[–15,000]	
14	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	413,260	5,000	418,260
		Plan X increase		[5,000]	
15	0602304E	COGNITIVE COMPUTING SYSTEMS	16,330		16,330
17	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	24,537		24,537
18	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	227,065		227,065
20	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	18,908	0	18,908
		Assuring effective missions		[–2,000]	
		Automated software analysis tools		[2,000]	
21	0602670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) APPLIED RESEARCH	0	5,000	5,000
		HSCB Apl Res extension		[5,000]	
22	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	225,977		225,977
23	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	166,654		166,654
24	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	243,469		243,469
25	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	175,282		175,282
26	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	11,107		11,107
27	1160401BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	29,246		29,246
		APPLIED RESEARCH TOTAL	**1,778,565**	**–10,000**	**1,768,565**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
28	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	26,646		26,646
29	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	19,420		19,420
30	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	77,792	–17,000	60,792
		Reduction due to redundancy		[–17,000]	
31	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	274,033		274,033
32	0603175C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY	309,203	–30,000	279,203
		Directed energy—DPALS		[–5,000]	
		Advanced Technology—unsustainable growth		[–25,000]	
34	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	19,305		19,305
35	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	7,565		7,565

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
36	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	40,426		40,426
37	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	149,804		149,804
38	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	172,546		172,546
39	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	170,847		170,847
40	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,009		9,009
41	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	174,428	–10,000	164,428
		JCTD reduction		[–10,000]	
42	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	20,000	–15,000	5,000
		Net Comm reduction		[–15,000]	
45	0603668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY ADVANCED RESEARCH	19,668	0	19,668
		Assuring effective missions		[–3,000]	
		Automated software analysis tools		[3,000]	
46	0603670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) ADVANCED RESEARCH	0	5,000	5,000
		HSCB Adv Dev extension		[5,000]	
47	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	34,041	25,000	59,041
		IBIF		[25,000]	
48	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	61,971		61,971
50	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	20,000		20,000
51	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	30,256		30,256
52	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	72,324		72,324
53	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	82,700		82,700
54	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	8,431		8,431
55	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	117,080		117,080
57	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	239,078		239,078
59	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	259,006		259,006
60	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	286,364		286,364
61	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,116		12,116

62	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	19,008		19,008
63	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	78,532	–20,000	58,532
		Quick & Rapid Reaction Fund reduction		[–20,000]	
65	0603828J	JOINT EXPERIMENTATION	12,667		12,667
66	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	41,370		41,370
69	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	92,508		92,508
70	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	52,001		52,001
71	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	52,053	3,000	55,053
		Program increase		[3,000]	
72	1160402BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	46,809		46,809
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**3,109,007**	**–59,000**	**3,050,007**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES			
75	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	63,641		63,641
76	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	19,152		19,152
77	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	70,763		70,763
79	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM	17,230	2,000	19,230
		Sustain testing effort		[2,000]	
80	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	71,453		71,453
81	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	268,990		268,990
82	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,033,903		1,033,903
83	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	196,237		196,237
84	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	315,183	30,000	345,183
		Additional homeland missile defense radar		[30,000]	
86	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	377,605		377,605
87	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	286,613		286,613
88	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	937,056		937,056
89	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	44,947		44,947
90	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	6,515		6,515
91	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI.	418,355		418,355
92	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	47,419		47,419

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
93	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	52,131		52,131
94	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	13,864		13,864
95	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	44,478		44,478
96	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	95,782	150,000	245,782
		Arrow Weapon System Improvements		[30,000]	
		Arrow–3 Interceptor		[20,000]	
		David's Sling short-range BMD		[100,000]	
97	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	375,866		375,866
98	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	495,257		495,257
99	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	11,704		11,704
100	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	9,842		9,842
101	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	3,312		3,312
102	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	130,000	–30,000	100,000
		Adv Innov Tech reduction		[–30,000]	
103	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	8,300		8,300
104	0604445J	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	30,000		30,000
105	0604670D8Z	HUMAN, SOCIAL AND CULTURE BEHAVIOR MODELING (HSCB) RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING	0	5,000	5,000
		HSCB Modeling R&E extension		[5,000]	
106	0604775D8Z	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION PROGRAM	0	150,000	150,000
		RIP		[150,000]	
108	0604787J	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	7,402		7,402
110	0604828J	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	7,506		7,506
111	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	129,374		129,374
112	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	308,522		308,522
115	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	3,169		3,169
116	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	946		946
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES TOTAL	**5,902,517**	**307,000**	**6,209,517**

		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION			
118	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	8,155		8,155
119	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	65,440		65,440
120	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	451,306		451,306
122	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	29,138		29,138
123	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	19,475		19,475
124	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	12,901		12,901
125	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,812		13,812
126	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	386		386
127	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	3,763		3,763
128	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	6,788		6,788
129	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	27,917		27,917
130	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	22,297		22,297
131	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INTIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	51,689		51,689
132	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	6,184		6,184
133	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	12,083		12,083
134	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	3,302		3,302
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION TOTAL	**734,636**	**0**	**734,636**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
135	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	6,393		6,393
136	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	2,479		2,479
137	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	240,213		240,213
138	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	2,127		2,127
139	0604943D8Z	THERMAL VICAR	8,287		8,287
140	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	31,000		31,000
141	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	24,379		24,379
143	0605117D8Z	FOREIGN MATERIEL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	54,311		54,311
144	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	47,462		47,462
146	0605130D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	12,134		12,134
147	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	44,237	–5,000	39,237

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		SE transfer to DT&E		[–5,000]	
148	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	5,871		5,871
149	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	5,028		5,028
150	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	6,301		6,301
151	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	6,504		6,504
152	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	92,046		92,046
158	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER (S	1,868		1,868
159	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	8,362		8,362
160	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	56,024	–10,000	46,024
		DTIC reduction		[–10,000]	
161	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	6,908		6,908
162	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	15,451	5,000	20,451
		DT&E transfer from SE		[5,000]	
164	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	71,659		71,659
165	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,083		4,083
167	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	5,306		5,306
168	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	2,097		2,097
172	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	8,394		8,394
175	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	7,624		7,624
178	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	43,247		43,247
179	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	37,712		37,712
180	0901598D8W	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS WHS	607		607
	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	54,914		54,914
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT TOTAL	**913,028**	**–10,000**	**903,028**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
182	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	7,552		7,552

183	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA	3,270		3,270
184	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	287		287
185	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	14,000		14,000
186	0607310D8Z	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,955		1,955
187	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS)	13,250		13,250
188	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	13,026		13,026
190	0607828J	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	12,652		12,652
191	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	3,061		3,061
192	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	72,726		72,726
194	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	6,524		6,524
201	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	512		512
202	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	12,867		12,867
203	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	36,565		36,565
204	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	13,144		13,144
205	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	1,060		1,060
206	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	33,279		33,279
207	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	10,673		10,673
208	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	181,567		181,567
210	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	34,288		34,288
211	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	7,741		7,741
212	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	3,325		3,325
213	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	1,246		1,246
214	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	5,147		5,147
216	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	17,352		17,352
220	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	3,658		3,658
221	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	9,752		9,752
225	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	3,210	1,000	4,210
		CRRC extension		[1,000]	
227	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	21,602		21,602
230	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,195		5,195
233	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,348		3,348
235	0305219BB	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	641		641

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
238	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,338		2,338
239	0305600D8Z	INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES	4,372		4,372
247	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	24,691		24,691
248	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	4,659		4,659
249	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	3,533		3,533
250	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	1,314	12,000	13,314
		Capability Improvements		[12,000]	
254	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	156,561		156,561
256	1160405BB	SPECIAL OPERATIONS INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,705		7,705
257	1160408BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	42,620		42,620
261	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	17,970		17,970
262	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	7,424		7,424
268	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	2,206		2,206
271	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	18,325	1,156	19,481
		CCFLIR—Transfer at USSOCOM Request		[1,156]	
274	1160489BB	SOF GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,304		3,304
275	1160490BB	SOF OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	16,021		16,021
275A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,773,704		3,773,704
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**4,641,222**	**14,156**	**4,655,378**
		UNDISTRIBUTED			
276		UNDISTRIBUTED		–100,000	–100,000
		DARPA undistributed reduction		[–100,000]	
		UNDISTRIBUTED TOTAL		**–100,000**	**–100,000**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**17,667,108**	**142,156**	**17,809,264**

		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
1	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	75,720		75,720
2	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	48,423		48,423
3	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	62,157		62,157
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT TOTAL	**186,300**	**0**	**186,300**
		TOTAL, OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**186,300**	**0**	**186,300**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL	**67,520,236**	**21,259**	**67,541,495**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
87	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	7,000		7,000
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION TOTAL	**7,000**		**7,000**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**7,000**		**7,000**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
224A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	34,426		34,426
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**34,426**		**34,426**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**34,426**		**34,426**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
251A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	9,000		9,000

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**9,000**		**9,000**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**9,000**		**9,000**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
275A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	66,208		66,208
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT TOTAL	**66,208**		**66,208**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**66,208**		**66,208**
		TOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL	**116,634**		**116,634**

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	888,114	195,900	1,084,014
	Readiness funding increase		[195,900]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	72,624		72,624
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	617,402		617,402
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	602,262		602,262
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,032,484		1,032,484
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,287,462	15,800	1,303,262
	Readiness funding increase		[15,800]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,559,656	209,900	3,769,556
	Readiness funding increase		[209,900]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	454,477		454,477
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,481,156	200,000	1,681,156
	Readiness funding increase		[200,000]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,278,154		7,278,154
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,754,712		2,754,712
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	425,271		425,271
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	185,064	–5,000	180,064
	Unjustified growth		[–5,000]	
170	COMBATANT COMMANDERS ANCILLARY MISSIONS	463,270		463,270

	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**21,102,108**	**616,600**	**21,718,708**
	MOBILIZATION			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	360,240		360,240
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONING STOCKS	192,105		192,105
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	7,101		7,101
	MOBILIZATION TOTAL	**559,446**	**0**	**559,446**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	115,992		115,992
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	52,323		52,323
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	43,589		43,589
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	453,745		453,745
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	1,034,495		1,034,495
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	1,016,876		1,016,876
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	186,565		186,565
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	652,514		652,514
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	485,500		485,500
300	EXAMINING	170,912		170,912
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	251,523		251,523
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	184,422		184,422
330	JUNIOR ROTC	181,105		181,105
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING TOTAL	**4,829,561**	**0**	**4,829,561**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	690,089		690,089
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	774,120		774,120
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	651,765		651,765
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	453,051		453,051
390	ADMINISTRATION	487,737		487,737
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,563,115		1,563,115
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	326,853		326,853

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	234,364		234,364
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,212,091		1,212,091
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	243,540		243,540
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	241,101		241,101
460	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	226,291		226,291
470	SUPPORT OF NATO OPERATIONS	426,651		426,651
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	27,248		27,248
480A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,023,946		1,023,946
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**8,581,962**	**0**	**8,581,962**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**35,073,077**	**616,600**	**35,689,677**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,621		1,621
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	24,429		24,429
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	657,099		657,099
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	122,485		122,485
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	584,058		584,058
060	AVIATION ASSETS	79,380		79,380
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	471,616		471,616
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	74,243		74,243
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	70,894		70,894
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	569,801		569,801
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	294,145	36,400	330,545
	Readiness funding increase		[36,400]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	51,853		51,853

	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**3,001,624**	**36,400**	**3,038,024**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,735		10,735
140	ADMINISTRATION	24,197		24,197
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	10,304		10,304
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	10,319		10,319
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	37,857		37,857
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**93,412**	**0**	**93,412**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**3,095,036**	**36,400**	**3,131,436**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	800,880		800,880
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	178,650		178,650
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	771,503		771,503
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	98,699		98,699
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	38,779		38,779
060	AVIATION ASSETS	922,503		922,503
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	761,056		761,056
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	62,971		62,971
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	233,105		233,105
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,019,059		1,019,059
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	712,139	74,200	786,339
	Readiness funding increase		[74,200]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	1,013,715		1,013,715
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**6,613,059**	**74,200**	**6,687,259**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,812		10,812
140	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	1,551		1,551

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
150	ADMINISTRATION	78,284		78,284
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	46,995		46,995
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	6,390		6,390
180	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	297,105		297,105
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**441,137**	**0**	**441,137**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**7,054,196**	**74,200**	**7,128,396**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,952,522	32,500	4,985,022
	Readiness funding increase		[32,500]	
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,826,404	11,200	1,837,604
	Readiness funding increase		[11,200]	
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	38,639		38,639
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	90,030		90,030
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	362,700		362,700
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	915,881		915,881
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	35,838	608	36,446
	Readiness funding increase		[608]	
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	379,914		379,914
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,884,836	99,500	3,984,336
	Readiness funding increase		[99,500]	
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	734,852	61,400	796,252
	Readiness funding increase		[61,400]	
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,191,511	5,700	5,197,211
	Readiness funding increase		[5,700]	

120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,351,274	126,200	1,477,474
	Readiness funding increase		[126,200]	
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	701,316		701,316
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	97,710		97,710
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	172,330		172,330
160	WARFARE TACTICS	454,682		454,682
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	328,406		328,406
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	946,429		946,429
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	142,249		142,249
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,603	660	3,263
	Readiness funding increase		[660]	
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	102,970		102,970
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	199,128	–3,000	196,128
	Classified program decrease		[–3,000]	
230	CRUISE MISSILE	92,671		92,671
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,193,188		1,193,188
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	105,985		105,985
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	532,627		532,627
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	304,160		304,160
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	1,011,528		1,011,528
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,996,821	100,000	2,096,821
	Readiness funding increase		[100,000]	
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,460,918		4,460,918
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**32,610,122**	**434,768**	**33,044,890**
	MOBILIZATION			
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	331,576		331,576
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,638		6,638
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	222,752		222,752
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	73,310		73,310
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,675		2,675
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	23,794		23,794

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	MOBILIZATION TOTAL	**660,745**	**0**	**660,745**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION	148,516		148,516
380	RECRUIT TRAINING	9,384		9,384
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	139,876		139,876
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	630,069		630,069
410	FLIGHT TRAINING	9,294		9,294
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	169,082		169,082
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	164,368		164,368
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	241,733		241,733
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	139,815		139,815
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	94,632		94,632
470	JUNIOR ROTC	51,373		51,373
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING TOTAL	**1,798,142**	**0**	**1,798,142**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	886,088		886,088
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	13,131		13,131
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	115,742		115,742
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	382,150		382,150
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	268,403		268,403
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	317,293		317,293
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	207,128		207,128
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	295,855		295,855
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,140,484		1,140,484
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	52,873		52,873

600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	27,587		27,587
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	75,728		75,728
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	543,026		543,026
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,965		4,965
680A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	545,775		545,775
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**4,876,228**	**0**	**4,876,228**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**39,945,237**	**434,768**	**40,380,005**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	837,012		837,012
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	894,555		894,555
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	223,337	56,000	279,337
	Readiness funding increase		[56,000]	
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	97,878		97,878
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	774,619		774,619
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,166,661		2,166,661
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**4,994,062**	**56,000**	**5,050,062**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	17,693		17,693
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	896		896
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	100,806		100,806
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	46,928		46,928
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	356,426		356,426
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	179,747		179,747
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	52,255		52,255
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,138		23,138
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING TOTAL	**777,889**	**0**	**777,889**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	43,816		43,816
160	ADMINISTRATION	305,107		305,107
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	87,500		87,500
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	46,276		46,276
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**482,699**	**0**	**482,699**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**6,254,650**	**56,000**	**6,310,650**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	586,620	1,900	588,520
	Readiness funding increase		[1,900]	
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	7,008		7,008
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	100,657	8,900	109,557
	Readiness funding increase		[8,900]	
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	305		305
060	AVIATION LOGISTICS	3,927		3,927
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	75,933		75,933
080	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	601		601
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	44,364		44,364
100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	15,477		15,477
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	115,608		115,608
120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	1,967		1,967
130	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	43,726		43,726
140	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	69,011		69,011
150	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	109,604		109,604
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**1,174,808**	**10,800**	**1,185,608**

	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
160	ADMINISTRATION	2,905		2,905
170	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	14,425		14,425
180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,485		2,485
190	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,129		3,129
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**22,944**	**0**	**22,944**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**1,197,752**	**10,800**	**1,208,552**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	96,244		96,244
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	17,581		17,581
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	32,438		32,438
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	95,259		95,259
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**241,522**	**0**	**241,522**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	894		894
060	ADMINISTRATION	11,743		11,743
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	9,158		9,158
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**21,795**	**0**	**21,795**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RES	**263,317**	**0**	**263,317**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,295,814	220,000	3,515,814
	Readiness funding increase		[220,000]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,875,095		1,875,095
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,559,109	30,000	1,589,109

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	Increase for ranges		[30,000]	
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,956,304	190,000	6,146,304
	Readiness funding increase		[190,000]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,834,424	75,000	1,909,424
	Readiness funding increase		[75,000]	
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,779,811		2,779,811
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	913,841		913,841
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	916,837		916,837
100	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	720,349		720,349
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	305,275		305,275
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	433,658		433,658
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	1,146,016	–22,400	1,123,616
	Classified program decrease		[–22,400]	
140	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	231,830		231,830
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**21,968,363**	**492,600**	**22,460,963**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,015,902		2,015,902
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	147,216		147,216
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,556,232		1,556,232
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	167,402		167,402
190	BASE SUPPORT	707,040		707,040
	MOBILIZATION TOTAL	**4,593,792**	**0**	**4,593,792**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
200	OFFICER ACQUISITION	102,334		102,334
210	RECRUIT TRAINING	17,733		17,733

220	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	94,600		94,600
230	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	217,011		217,011
240	BASE SUPPORT	800,327		800,327
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	399,364		399,364
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	792,275		792,275
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	248,958		248,958
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	106,741		106,741
290	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	319,331	20,000	339,331
	Readiness funding increase		[20,000]	
300	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	122,736		122,736
310	EXAMINING	3,679		3,679
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	137,255		137,255
330	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	176,153		176,153
340	JUNIOR ROTC	67,018		67,018
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING TOTAL	**3,605,515**	**20,000**	**3,625,515**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
350	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,103,684		1,103,684
360	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	919,923		919,923
370	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	56,601		56,601
380	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	281,061		281,061
390	BASE SUPPORT	1,203,305		1,203,305
400	ADMINISTRATION	593,865		593,865
410	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	574,609		574,609
420	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	1,028,600		1,028,600
430	CIVIL AIR PATROL	24,720		24,720
460	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	89,008		89,008
460A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,227,796		1,227,796
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**7,103,172**	**0**	**7,103,172**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**37,270,842**	**512,600**	**37,783,442**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,857,951		1,857,951
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	224,462		224,462
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	521,182		521,182
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	89,704	8,700	98,404
	Readiness funding increase		[8,700]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	360,836		360,836
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**3,054,135**	**8,700**	**3,062,835**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	64,362		64,362
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	15,056		15,056
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	23,617		23,617
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,618		6,618
100	AUDIOVISUAL	819		819
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**110,472**	**0**	**110,472**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**3,164,607**	**8,700**	**3,173,307**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,371,871		3,371,871
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	720,305		720,305
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,514,870		1,514,870
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	296,953	28,200	325,153
	Readiness funding increase		[28,200]	

050	BASE SUPPORT	597,303		597,303
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**6,501,302**	**28,200**	**6,529,502**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	32,117		32,117
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	32,585		32,585
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**64,702**	**0**	**64,702**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**6,566,004**	**28,200**	**6,594,204**
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	472,239		472,239
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	5,261,463	–21,800	5,239,663
	USSOCOM RSCC		[–14,700]	
	USSOCOM NCR Contractor Support		[–7,100]	
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**5,733,702**	**–21,800**	**5,711,902**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
040	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	157,397		157,397
050	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	84,899		84,899
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING TOTAL	**242,296**	**0**	**242,296**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	144,443	21,699	166,142
	Starbase		[21,699]	
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	612,207		612,207
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,378,606		1,378,606
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	763,091		763,091
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,326,243		1,326,243
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	29,933		29,933
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	462,545		462,545

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	222,979		222,979
170	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	21,594		21,594
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	788,389	–19,000	769,389
	Regional centers for security centers—undistributed decrease		[–12,000]	
	Combating terrorism fellowship program		[–7,000]	
190	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	546,603		546,603
210	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	35,151		35,151
220	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	438,033		438,033
240	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,713,756	30,000	2,743,756
	Supplemental Impact Aid		[25,000]	
	Disability Impact Aid		[5,000]	
250	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	256,201		256,201
270	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	371,615	–273,300	98,315
	Program decrease		[–273,300]	
280	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	2,010,176	–7,000	2,003,176
	OUSD(P) program decrease		[–7,000]	
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	616,572		616,572
290A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,283,558	25,000	14,308,558
	Reduction to Operation Observant Compass		[–15,000]	
	Increase to Operation Observant Compass		[40,000]	
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**27,021,695**	**–222,601**	**26,799,094**
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**32,997,693**	**–244,401**	**32,753,292**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,606		13,606
010	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	109,500		109,500

010	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT	528,455		528,455
010	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	256,031		256,031
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	298,815		298,815
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	316,103		316,103
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	439,820		439,820
110	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	10,757		10,757
130	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	237,443		237,443
150	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000		5,000
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**2,215,530**		**2,215,530**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**175,097,941**	**1,533,867**	**176,631,808**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	217,571		217,571
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	8,266		8,266
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	56,626		56,626
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	4,209,942		4,209,942
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	950,567	–7,000	943,567
	NSHQ—Transfer at DoD Request		[–7,000]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	474,288		474,288
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,349,152	136,300	1,485,452
	BuckEye terrain data increase		[56,300]	
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Train the Force		[80,000]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	655,000		655,000

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	301,563		301,563
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	706,214		706,214
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	11,519,498		11,519,498
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	60,000		60,000
160	RESET	2,240,358		2,240,358
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**22,749,045**	**129,300**	**22,878,345**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	4,601,356		4,601,356
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	17,418		17,418
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	110,000		110,000
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	94,820		94,820
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	54,000		54,000
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	250,000		250,000
480A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,402,994		1,402,994
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**6,530,588**	**0**	**6,530,588**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**29,279,633**	**129,300**	**29,408,933**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	6,995		6,995
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,332		2,332
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	608		608
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	33,000		33,000
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**42,935**	**0**	**42,935**

	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**42,935**	**0**	**42,935**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	29,314		29,314
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	1,494		1,494
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	15,343		15,343
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,549		1,549
060	AVIATION ASSETS	64,504		64,504
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	31,512		31,512
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	42,179		42,179
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HQ'S	11,996		11,996
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**240,826**	**0**	**240,826**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,480		1,480
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**1,480**	**0**	**1,480**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**199,371**	**0**	**199,371**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND			
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			
010	SUSTAINMENT	2,735,603		2,735,603
020	INFRASTRUCTURE	278,650		278,650
030	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	2,180,382		2,180,382
040	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	626,550		626,550
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE TOTAL	**5,821,185**	**0**	**5,821,185**
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
060	SUSTAINMENT	1,214,995		1,214,995
080	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	54,696		54,696
090	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	626,119		626,119

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR TOTAL	**1,895,810**	**0**	**1,895,810**
	DETAINEE OPS			
110	SUSTAINMENT	7,225		7,225
140	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	2,500		2,500
	DETAINEE OPS TOTAL	**9,725**	**0**	**9,725**
	TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**7,726,720**	**0**	**7,726,720**
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND			
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND			
010	POWER	279,000	–29,000	250,000
	Unjustified expenditure		[–29,000]	
	AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND TOTAL	**279,000**	**0**	**250,000**
	TOTAL, AFGHANISTAN INFRASTRUCTURE FUND TOTAL	**279,000**	**–29,000**	**250,000**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	845,169		845,169
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	600		600
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	17,489		17,489
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	78,491		78,491
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	162,420		162,420
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,700		2,700
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	50,130		50,130
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	949,539		949,539

100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	20,226		20,226
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,679,660		1,679,660
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	37,760		37,760
160	WARFARE TACTICS	25,351		25,351
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	20,045		20,045
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,212,296		1,212,296
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	10,203		10,203
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	127,972		127,972
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	221,427		221,427
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	13,386		13,386
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	110,940		110,940
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**5,585,804**	**0**	**5,585,804**
	MOBILIZATION			
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	18,460		18,460
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	227,033		227,033
	MOBILIZATION TOTAL	**245,493**	**0**	**245,493**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	50,269		50,269
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	5,400		5,400
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING TOTAL	**55,669**	**0**	**55,669**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	2,418		2,418
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	516		516
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,107		5,107
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,411		1,411
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	2,545		2,545
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	153,427		153,427
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	8,570		8,570
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,425		1,425

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
680A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	5,608		5,608
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**181,027**	**0**	**181,027**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**6,067,993**	**0**	**6,067,993**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	992,190		992,190
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	559,574		559,574
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	570,000		570,000
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	69,726		69,726
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**2,191,490**	**0**	**2,191,490**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	108,270	26,000	134,270
	Transfer from JIEDDO—Train the Force		[26,000]	
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING TOTAL	**108,270**	**26,000**	**134,270**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	365,555		365,555
160	ADMINISTRATION	3,675		3,675
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	825		825
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**370,055**	**0**	**370,055**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**2,669,815**	**26,000**	**2,695,815**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			

	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	17,196		17,196
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	200		200
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,000		6,000
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	12,304		12,304
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,790		6,790
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	13,210		13,210
	TOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**55,700**	**0**	**55,700**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**55,700**	**0**	**55,700**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	11,124		11,124
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,410		1,410
	TOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**12,534**	**0**	**12,534**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**12,534**	**0**	**12,534**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,712,393		1,712,393
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	836,104		836,104
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	14,118		14,118
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,373,480		1,373,480
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	122,712		122,712
060	BASE SUPPORT	1,520,333		1,520,333
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	31,582		31,582
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	147,524		147,524
110	LAUNCH FACILITIES	857		857
120	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	8,353		8,353
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	50,495		50,495

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**5,886,185**	**0**	**5,886,185**
	MOBILIZATION			
150	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	3,091,133		3,091,133
160	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	47,897		47,897
170	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	387,179		387,179
180	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	7,043		7,043
190	BASE SUPPORT	68,382		68,382
	MOBILIZATION TOTAL	**3,601,634**	**0**	**3,601,634**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
200	OFFICER ACQUISITION	100		100
210	RECRUIT TRAINING	478		478
240	BASE SUPPORT	19,256		19,256
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	12,845		12,845
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	731		731
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	607		607
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	720		720
320	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	152		152
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING TOTAL	**34,889**	**0**	**34,889**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
350	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	86,273		86,273
360	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	2,511		2,511
390	BASE SUPPORT	19,887		19,887
400	ADMINISTRATION	3,493		3,493
410	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	152,086		152,086

420	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	269,825		269,825
460	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	117		117
460A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	16,558		16,558
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**550,750**	**0**	**550,750**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**10,005,224**	**0**	**10,005,224**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	26,599		26,599
050	BASE SUPPORT	6,250		6,250
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**32,849**	**0**	**32,849**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**32,849**	**0**	**32,849**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	22,200		22,200
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**22,200**	**0**	**22,200**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**22,200**	**0**	**22,200**
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND	2,222,868	7,000	2,229,868
	NSHQ—Transfer at DoD Request		[7,000]	
	OPERATING FORCES TOTAL	**2,277,917**	**7,000**	**2,284,917**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	27,781		27,781
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	45,746		45,746
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	76,348		76,348

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	99,538		99,538
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	9,620		9,620
180	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,950,000		1,950,000
240	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	100,100		100,100
280	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	38,227		38,227
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	2,784		2,784
290A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,862,066		1,862,066
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES TOTAL	**4,212,210**	**0**	**4,212,210**
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**6,435,078**	**7,000**	**6,442,078**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**62,829,052**	**133,300**	**62,962,352**

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL			
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS			
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	130,399,881	–270,000	130,129,881
Permanent Change of Station Travel		[–150,000]	
Undistributed reduction consistent with pace of drawdown		[–120,000]	
SUBTOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	**130,399,881**	**–270,000**	**130,129,881**
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS			
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS	6,676,750		6,676,750
SUBTOTAL, MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS	**6,676,750**	**0**	**6,676,750**
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	**137,076,631**	**–270,000**	**136,806,631**

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL			

MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS			
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	9,689,307		9,689,307
SUBTOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	**9,689,307**	**0**	**9,689,307**
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS			
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS	164,033		164,033
SUBTOTAL, MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS	**164,033**	**0**	**164,033**
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	**9,853,340**	**0**	**9,853,340**

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
010	PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	25,158		25,158
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**25,158**	**0**	**25,158**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
030	FUEL COSTS	61,731		61,731
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**61,731**	**0**	**61,731**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
010	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	46,428		46,428
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**46,428**	**0**	**46,428**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
010	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,412,510		1,412,510
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,412,510**	**0**	**1,412,510**
	TOTAL, ALL WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	**1,545,827**	**0**	**1,545,827**
	NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
020	MPF MLP	134,917	–112,200	22,717
	Navy requested adjustment		[–112,200]	

030	POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	43,404		43,404
050	LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	116,784		116,784
060	DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	60,703		60,703
070	TAH MAINTENANCE	19,809		19,809
080	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	56,058		56,058
090	READY RESERVE FORCE	299,025		299,025
	TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	**730,700**	**–112,200**	**618,500**
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
	DHP O&M			
010	IN-HOUSE CARE	8,880,738		8,880,738
020	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	15,842,732		15,842,732
030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,505,640		2,505,640
040	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,450,619		1,450,619
050	MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	368,248		368,248
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	733,097		733,097
070	BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,872,660		1,872,660
070A	UNDISTRIBUTED, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	0	218,000	218,000
	Restore Tricare savings		[218,000]	
	SUBTOTAL, DHP O&M	**31,653,734**	**218,000**	**31,871,734**
	DHP RDT&E			
080	R&D RESEARCH	9,162		9,162
090	R&D EXPLORATRY DEVELOPMENT	47,977		47,977
100	R&D ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	291,156		291,156
110	R&D DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	132,430		132,430
120	R&D ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	161,674		161,674
130	R&D MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	72,568		72,568
140	R&D CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	14,646		14,646
	SUBTOTAL, DHP RDT&E	**729,613**	**0**	**729,613**
	DHP PROCUREMENT			
170	PROC INITIAL OUTFITTING	89,404		89,404
180	PROC REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	377,577		377,577

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
190	PROC IEHR	204,200		204,200
	SUBTOTAL, DHP PROCUREMENT	**671,181**	**0**	**671,181**
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**33,054,528**	**218,000**	**33,272,528**
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
01	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	451,572		451,572
02	RDT&E	604,183		604,183
03	PROCUREMENT	1,368		1,368
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**1,057,123**	**0**	**1,057,123**
	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
010	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES	815,965	–5,840	810,125
	Joint Interagency Task Force—West (PC3309)		[–3,000]	
	U.S. European Comman Counternarcotics Hedquaters Support (PC2346)		[–1,640]	
	U.S. Special Operations Forces Support to U.S. European Command (PC6505)		[–1,200]	
030	DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	122,580		122,580
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**938,545**	**–5,840**	**932,705**
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
010	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	311,131	35,900	347,031
	Program increase		[35,900]	
030	PROCUREMENT	1,000		1,000
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**312,131**	**35,900**	**348,031**
	TOTAL, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**37,638,854**	**135,860**	**37,774,714**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
010	PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	44,732		44,732
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**44,732**	**0**	**44,732**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
030	FUEL COSTS	88,500		88,500
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**88,500**	**0**	**88,500**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
010	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	131,678		131,678
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**131,678**	**0**	**131,678**
	TOTAL, ALL WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	**264,910**	**0**	**264,910**
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
	DHP O&M			
010	IN-HOUSE CARE	375,958		375,958
020	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	382,560		382,560
030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	132,749		132,749
040	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	2,238		2,238
050	MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	460		460
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	10,236		10,236
	SUBTOTAL, DHP O&M	**904,201**	**0**	**904,201**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**904,201**	**0**	**904,201**
	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
010	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES	376,305		376,305
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**376,305**	**0**	**376,305**
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
010	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	10,766		10,766
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**10,766**	**0**	**10,766**
	TOTAL, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**1,556,182**	**0**	**1,556,182**

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
ACTIVE SERVICIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
ARMY	ALASKA	FT WAINWRIGHT	Aviation Battalion Complex	45,000		45,000
ARMY	ALASKA	FT WAINWRIGHT	Aviation Storage Hangar	58,000		58,000
ARMY	COLORADO	FT CARSON, CO	Fire Station	12,000		12,000
ARMY	COLORADO	FT CARSON, CO	Headquarters Building	33,000		33,000
ARMY	COLORADO	FT CARSON, CO	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	73,000		73,000
ARMY	COLORADO	FT CARSON, CO	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	66,000		66,000
ARMY	COLORADO	FT CARSON, CO	Runway	12,000		12,000
ARMY	COLORADO	FT CARSON, CO	Simulator Building	12,200		12,200
ARMY	COLORADO	FT CARSON, CO	Central Energy Plant	34,000		34,000
ARMY	FLORIDA	EGLIN AFB	Automated Sniper Field Fire Range	4,700		4,700
ARMY	GA	FT GORDON	Adv Individual Training Barracks Cplx, Ph2	61,000		61,000
ARMY	HAWAII	FT SHAFTER	Command and Control Facility—Admin	75,000		75,000
ARMY	KANSAS	FT LEAVENWORTH	Simulations Center	17,000		17,000
ARMY	KENTUCKY	FT CAMPBELL, KY	Battlefield Weather Support Facility	4,800		4,800
ARMY	MARYLAND	ABERDEEN PROVING GND	Operations and Maintenance Facilities	21,000		21,000
ARMY	MARYLAND	FT DETRICK	Hazardous Material Storage Building	4,600		4,600
ARMY	MARYLAND	FT DETRICK	Entry Control Point	2,500		2,500
ARMY	MISSOURI	FT LEONARD WOOD	Adv Individual Training Barracks Cplx, Ph1	86,000		86,000
ARMY	MISSOURI	FT LEONARD WOOD	Simulator Building	4,700		4,700

ARMY	NEW YORK	U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY	Cadet Barracks, Incr 2	42,000		42,000
ARMY	NC	FT BRAGG	Command and Control Facility	5,900		5,900
ARMY	TEXAS	FT BLISS	Control Tower	10,800		10,800
ARMY	TEXAS	FT BLISS	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Complex	36,000		36,000
ARMY	VIRGINIA	JT BASE LANGLEY-EUSTIS	Adv Individual Training Barracks Cplx, Ph3	50,000		50,000
ARMY	WASHINGTON	YAKIMA	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun Range	9,100		9,100
ARMY	WASHINGTON	JT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	Airfield Operations Complex	37,000		37,000
ARMY	WASHINGTON	JT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	79,000		79,000
ARMY	WASHINGTON	JT BASE LEWIS-MCCHORD	Aviation Battalion Complex	28,000		28,000
ARMY	KWAJALEIN	KWAJALEIN ATOLL	Pier	63,000		63,000
ARMY	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	Company Operations Complex	33,000		33,000
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Minor Construction FY14	25,000		25,000
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design FY14	41,575		41,575
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Host Nation Support FY14	33,000		33,000
SUBTOTAL, ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**1,119,875**	**0**	**1,119,875**
NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	BARSTOW	Engine Dynamometer Facility	14,998		14,998
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PENDLETON, CA	Ammunition Supply Point Upgrade	13,124		13,124
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	POINT MUGU	Aircraft Engine Test Pads	7,198		7,198
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	POINT MUGU	BAMS Consolidated Maintenance Hangar	17,469		17,469
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	PORT HUENEME	Unaccompanied Housing Conversion	33,600		33,600
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	SAN DIEGO	Steam Plant Decentralization	34,331		34,331
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	TWENTYNINE PALMS, CA	Camp Wilson Infrastructure Upgrades	33,437		33,437
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	CORONADO	H–60 Trainer Facility	8,910		8,910
NAVY	FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE	P–8A Training & Parking Apron Expansion	20,752		20,752
NAVY	FLORIDA	KEY WEST	Aircraft Crash/Rescue & Fire Headquarters	14,001		14,001
NAVY	FLORIDA	MAYPORT	LCS Logistics Support Facility	16,093		16,093
NAVY	GA	ALBANY	Weapons Storage and Inspection Facility	15,600		15,600
NAVY	GA	ALBANY	CERS Dispatch Facility	1,010		1,010
NAVY	GA	SAVANNAH	Townsend Bombing Range Land Acq—Phase 1	61,717		61,717
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	Armory Addition and Renovation	12,952		12,952

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	3rd Radio Bn Maintenance/Operations Complex	25,336		25,336
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar Upgrades	31,820		31,820
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	Aircraft Maintenance Expansion	16,968		16,968
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	Aviation Simulator Modernization/Addition	17,724		17,724
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	MV–22 Parking Apron and Infrastructure	74,665		74,665
NAVY	HAWAII	KANEOHE BAY	MV–22 Hangar	57,517		57,517
NAVY	HAWAII	PEARL CITY	Water Transmission Line	30,100		30,100
NAVY	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	Drydock Waterfront Facility	22,721		22,721
NAVY	HAWAII	PEARL HARBOR	Submarine Production Support Facility	35,277		35,277
NAVY	ILLINOIS	GREAT LAKES	Unaccompanied Housing	35,851		35,851
NAVY	MAINE	BANGOR	NCTAMS VLF Commercial Power Connection	13,800		13,800
NAVY	MAINE	KITTERY	Structural Shops Consolidation	11,522		11,522
NAVY	MARYLAND	FT MEADE	MARFORCYBERCOM HQ-OPS Building	83,988		83,988
NAVY	NEVADA	FALLON	Wastewater Treatment Plant	11,334		11,334
NAVY	NC	CAMP LEJEUNE, NC	Operations Training Complex	22,515		22,515
NAVY	NC	CAMP LEJEUNE, NC	Landfill—Phase 4	20,795		20,795
NAVY	NC	CAMP LEJEUNE, NC	Steam Decentralization—Camp Johnson	2,620		2,620
NAVY	NC	CAMP LEJEUNE, NC	Steam Decentralization—Hadnot Point	13,390		13,390
NAVY	NC	CAMP LEJEUNE, NC	Steam Decentralization—BEQ Nodes	18,679		18,679
NAVY	NC	NEW RIVER	Corrosion Control Hangar	12,547		12,547
NAVY	NC	NEW RIVER	CH–53K Maintenance Training Facility	13,218		13,218
NAVY	NC	NEW RIVER	Regional Communication Station	20,098		20,098
NAVY	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	TACAMO E–6B Hangar	14,144		14,144
NAVY	RHODE ISLAND	NEWPORT	Hewitt Hall Research Center	12,422		12,422
NAVY	SOUTH CAROLINA	CHARLESTON	Nuclear Power Operational Training Facility	73,932		73,932
NAVY	VIRGINIA	DAM NECK	Aerial Target Operation Consolidation	10,587		10,587
NAVY	VIRGINIA	NORFOLK	Pier 11 Power Upgrades for CVN–78	3,380		3,380

NAVY	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	ATC Transmitter/Receiver Relocation	3,630		3,630
NAVY	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	Fuller Road Improvements	9,013		9,013
NAVY	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	Academic Instruction Facility TECOM Schools	25,731		25,731
NAVY	VIRGINIA	YORKTOWN	Small Arms Ranges	18,700		18,700
NAVY	WASHINGTON	WHIDBEY ISLAND	EA–18G Facility Improvements	32,482		32,482
NAVY	WASHINGTON	WHIDBEY ISLAND	P–8A Hangar and Training Facilities	85,167		85,167
NAVY	WASHINGTON	BREMERTON	Integrated Water Treatment Sys Dry Docks 3&4	18,189		18,189
NAVY	WASHINGTON	KITSAP	Explosives Handling Wharf #2 (INC)	24,880		24,880
NAVY	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	BAMS Forward Operational & Maintenance Hangar	61,702		61,702
NAVY	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar—North Ramp	85,673	–85,673	0
NAVY	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	Modular Storage Magazines	63,382		63,382
NAVY	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	X-Ray Wharf Improvements	53,420		53,420
NAVY	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	Emergent Repair Facility Expansion	35,860		35,860
NAVY	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	Dehumidified Supply Storage Facility	17,170		17,170
NAVY	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	Sierra Wharf Improvements	1,170		1,170
NAVY	JAPAN	YOKOSUKA	Communication System Upgrade	7,568		7,568
NAVY	JAPAN	CAMP BUTLER	Airfield Security Upgrades	5,820		5,820
NAVY	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	Armory	6,420		6,420
NAVY	DJIBOUTI	CAMP LEMONIER, DJIBOUTI	Unaccompanied Housing	22,580		22,580
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	19,740		19,740
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	MCON Design Funds	89,830		89,830
SUBTOTAL, NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**1,700,269**	**–85,673**	**1,614,596**
AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
AF	ARIZONA	LUKE AFB	F–35 Field Training Detachment	5,500		5,500
AF	ARIZONA	LUKE AFB	F–35 Sq Ops/Aircraft Maintenance Unit #3	21,400		21,400
AF	CALIFORNIA	BEALE AFB	Distributed Common Ground Station Ops Bldg	62,000		62,000
AF	FLORIDA	TYNDALL AFB	F–22 Munitions Storage Complex	9,100		9,100
AF	HAWAII	JT BASE PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM	C–17 Modernize Hgr 35, Docks 1&2	4,800		4,800
AF	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	KC–46A 1–Bay Maintenance Hangar (Air Force Requested Change).		32,000	32,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
AF	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	KC–46A 2–Bay Corrosion/Fuel Hangar (Air Force Requested Change).		82,000	82,000
AF	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	KC–46A 3–Bay General Purpose Maintenance Hangar (Air Force Requested Change).		80,000	80,000
AF	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	KC–46A ADAL Flight Simulator Buildings (Air Force Requested Change).		2,150	2,150
AF	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	KC–46A Alter Aircraft Parking Apron (Air Force Requested Change).		2,200	2,200
AF	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	KC–46A Alter Apron Fuels Distribution Systems (Air Force Requested Change).		12,800	12,800
AF	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	KC–46A Alter Miscellaneous Facilities (Air Force Requested Change).		970	970
AF	KANSAS	MCCONNELL AFB	KC–46A Pipeline Student Dormitory (Air Force Requested Change).		7,000	7,000
AF	KENTUCKY	FT CAMPBELL, KY	19th Air Support Operations Sqdrn Expansion	8,000		8,000
AF	MARYLAND	FT MEADE	CYBERCOM Joint Operations Center, Increment 1	85,000		85,000
AF	MARYLAND	JT BASE ANDREWS	Helicopter Operations Facility	30,000		30,000
AF	MISSOURI	WHITEMAN AFB	WSA MOP Igloos and Assembly Facility	5,900		5,900
AF	NEBRASKA	OFFUTT AFB	USSTRATCOM Replacement Facility, Incr 3	136,000		136,000
AF	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	Dormitory (240 RM)	35,000		35,000
AF	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F–35 Alt Mission Equip (AME) Storage	5,000		5,000
AF	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F–35 Parts Store	9,100		9,100
AF	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	F–35 Fuel Cell Hangar	9,400		9,400
AF	NEVADA	NELLIS AFB	Add RPA Weapons School Facility	20,000		20,000
AF	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	Airmen and Family Readiness Center	5,500		5,500
AF	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	Satellite Dining Facility	6,600		6,600
AF	NEW MEXICO	CANNON AFB	Dormitory (144 RM)	22,000		22,000

AF	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	F–16 Aircraft Covered Washrack and Pad	2,250		2,250
AF	NEW MEXICO	KIRTLAND AFB	Nuclear Systems Wing & Sustainment Center (Ph	30,500		30,500
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	MINOT AFB	B–52 ADAL Aircraft Maintenance Unit	15,530		15,530
AF	NORTH DAKOTA	MINOT AFB	B–52 Munitions Storage Igloos	8,300		8,300
AF	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	KC–46A Land Acquisition	8,600		8,600
AF	OKLAHOMA	ALTUS AFB	KC–46A FTU ADAL Fuel Systems Maintenance Dock For Hangar (Air Force Requested Change).		3,350	3,350
AF	OKLAHOMA	ALTUS AFB	KC–46A FTU ADAL Squadron Operations/AMU (Air Force Requested Change).		7,400	7,400
AF	OKLAHOMA	ALTUS AFB	KC–46A FTU FTC Simulator Facility (Air Force Requested Change).		12,600	12,600
AF	OKLAHOMA	ALTUS AFB	KC–46A FTU Fuselage Trainer (Air Force Requested Change).		6,300	6,300
AF	OKLAHOMA	ALTUS AFB	KC–46A Renovate Facility for 97 OG and 97 MXTS (Air Force Requested Change).		1,200	1,200
AF	TEXAS	FT BLISS	F–16 BAK 12/14 Aircraft Arresting System	3,350		3,350
AF	UTAH	HILL AFB	Fire Crash Rescue Station	18,500		18,500
AF	UTAH	HILL AFB	F–35 Aircraft Mx Unit Hangar 45E Ops #1	13,500		13,500
AF	VIRGINIA	JT BASE LANGLEY-EUSTIS	4–Bay Conventional Munitions Inspection Bldg	4,800		4,800
AF	GREENLAND	THULE AB	Thule Consolidation, Phase 2	43,904		43,904
AF	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	PAR—Tanker GP Mx Hangar/AMU/Sqd Ops	132,600	–132,600	0
AF	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	PAR—Fuel Sys Hardened Bldgs	20,000	–20,000	0
AF	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	PAR—Strike Tactical Missile Mxs Facility	10,530		10,530
AF	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	PRTC RED HORSE Airfield Operations Facility	8,500		8,500
AF	GUAM	JT REGION MARIANAS	PRTC SF Fire Rescue & Emergency Mgt	4,600		4,600
AF	MARIANA ISLANDS	SAIPAN	PAR—Maintenance Facility	2,800		2,800
AF	MARIANA ISLANDS	SAIPAN	PAR—Airport POL/Bulk Storage AST	18,500		18,500
AF	MARIANA ISLANDS	SAIPAN	PAR—Hazardous Cargo Pad	8,000		8,000
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	ROYAL AF LAKENHEATH	Guardian Angel Operations Facility	22,047	–22,047	0
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	CROUGHTON RAF	Main Gate Complex	12,000	–12,000	0
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	KC–46A MOB #1 Facility Projects	192,700	–192,700	0
			Air Force Requested Change		[–192,700]	

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	KC–46A FTU Facility Projects	63,000	–63,000	0
			Air Force Requested Change		[–63,000]	
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	20,448		20,448
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning & Design	11,314		11,314
SUBTOTAL, AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**1,156,573**	**–192,377**	**964,196**
DEFENSE-WIDE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
DEFW	BELGIUM	BRUSSELS	NATO Headquarters Facility	38,513		38,513
DEFW	BELGIUM	BRUSSELS	NATO Headquarters Fit-Out	29,100		29,100
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Energy Conservation Investment PRGM	150,000		150,000
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
DISA	HAWAII	FORD ISLAND	DISA Pacific Facility Upgrades	2,615		2,615
DLA	CALIFORNIA	DEFENSE DIST DEPOT-TRACY	General Purpose Warehouse	37,554		37,554
DLA	CALIFORNIA	MIRAMAR	Replace Fuel Pipeline	6,000		6,000
DLA	FLORIDA	JACKSONVILLE	Replace Fuel Pipeline	7,500		7,500
DLA	FLORIDA	PANAMA CITY	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	2,600		2,600
DLA	FLORIDA	TYNDALL AFB	Replace Fuel Pipeline	9,500		9,500
DLA	GA	MOODY AFB	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	3,800		3,800
DLA	GA	HUNTER ARMY AIRFIELD	Replace Fuel Island	13,500		13,500
DLA	HAWAII	JT BASE PEARL HARBOR-HICKAM	Alter Warehouse Space	2,800		2,800
DLA	NEW JERSEY	JT BASE MCGUIRE-DIX-LAKEHURST	Replace Fuel Distribution Components	10,000		10,000
DLA	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	21,400		21,400
DLA	NORTH DAKOTA	MINOT AFB	Replace Fuel Pipeline	6,400		6,400
DLA	OKLAHOMA	ALTUS AFB	Replace Refueler Parking	2,100		2,100

DLA	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	Replace Fuel Distribution Facilities	36,000		36,000
DLA	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF DIST DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	Upgrade Public Safety Facility	5,900		5,900
DLA	PENNSYLVANIA	DEF DIST DEPOT NEW CUMBERLAND	Upgrade Hazardous Material Warehouse	3,100		3,100
DLA	TENNESSEE	ARNOLD AF BASE	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	2,200		2,200
DLA	VIRGINIA	DEF DIST DEPOT RICH-MOND	Operations Center Phase 1	87,000		87,000
DLA	WASHINGTON	WHIDBEY ISLAND	Replace Fuel Pier Breakwater	10,000		10,000
DLA	JAPAN	ATSUGI	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility	4,100		4,100
DLA	JAPAN	IWAKUNI	Construct Hydrant Fuel System	34,000		34,000
DLA	JAPAN	YOKOSUKA	Upgrade Fuel Pumps	10,600		10,600
DLA	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF MILDENHALL	Replace Fuel Storage	17,732	–17,732	0
DODEA	GA	FT BENNING	Faith Middle School Addition	6,031		6,031
DODEA	GA	FT BENNING	White Elemtary School Replacement	37,304		37,304
DODEA	GA	FT STEWART, GA	Diamond Elementary School Replacement	44,504		44,504
DODEA	KENTUCKY	FT CAMPBELL, KY	Marshall Elementary School Replacement	38,591		38,591
DODEA	KENTUCKY	FT CAMPBELL, KY	Fort Campbell High School Replacement	59,278		59,278
DODEA	KENTUCKY	FT KNOX	Consolidate/Replace Van Voorhis-Mudge ES	38,023		38,023
DODEA	MASSACHUSETTS	HANSCOM AFB	Hanscom Primary School Replacement	36,213		36,213
DODEA	NC	FT BRAGG	Consolidate/Replace Pope Holbrook Elementary	37,032		37,032
DODEA	SOUTH CAROLINA	BEAUFT	Bolden Elementary/Middle School Replacement	41,324		41,324
DODEA	VIRGINIA	QUANTICO	Quantico Middle/High School Replacement	40,586		40,586
DODEA	GERMANY	KAISERLAUTERN AB	Kaiserslautern Elementary School Replacement	49,907	–49,907	0
DODEA	GERMANY	RAMSTEIN AB	Ramstein High School Replacement	98,762	–98,762	0
DODEA	GERMANY	WEISBADEN	Hainerberg Elementary School Replacement	58,899	–58,899	0
DODEA	GERMANY	WEISBADEN	Wiesbaden Middle School Replacement	50,756	–50,756	0
DODEA	JAPAN	KADENA AB	Kadena Middle School Addition/Renovation	38,792		38,792
DODEA	KOREA	CAMP WALKER	Daegu Middle/High School Replacement	52,164		52,164
DODEA	UNITED KINGDOM	ROYAL AF LAKENHEATH	Lakenheath High School Replacement	69,638	–69,638	0
MDA	ALASKA	CLEAR AFS	BMDS Upgrade Early Warning Radar	17,204		17,204
MDA	ALASKA	FT GREELY	Mechanical-Electrical Bldg Missile Field #1	82,000		82,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MDA	ROMANIA	DEVESELU, ROMANIA	Aegis Ashore Missile Def Sys Cmplx, Increm. 2	85,000		85,000
MDA	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	CLASSIFIED LOCATION	AN/TPY–2 Radar Site	15,000		15,000
NSA	MARYLAND	FT MEADE	NSAW Recapitalize Building #1/Site M Inc 2	58,000		58,000
NSA	MARYLAND	FT MEADE	High Performance Computing Capacity Inc 3	431,000	–50,000	381,000
SOCOM	CALIFORNIA	BRAWLEY	SOF Desert Warfare Training Center	23,095		23,095
SOCOM	COLORADO	FT CARSON, CO	SOF Group Support Battalion	22,282		22,282
SOCOM	FLORIDA	HURLBURT FIELD	SOF ADD/ALTER Operations Facility	7,900		7,900
SOCOM	FLORIDA	KEY WEST	SOF Boat Docks	3,600		3,600
SOCOM	KENTUCKY	FT CAMPBELL, KY	SOF Group Special Troops Battalion	26,342		26,342
SOCOM	NC	CAMP LEJEUNE, NC	SOF Performance Resiliency Center	14,400		14,400
SOCOM	NC	CAMP LEJEUNE, NC	SOF Sustainment Training Complex	28,977		28,977
SOCOM	NC	FT BRAGG	SOF Upgrade Training Facility	14,719		14,719
SOCOM	NC	FT BRAGG	SOF Engineer Training Facility	10,419		10,419
SOCOM	NC	FT BRAGG	SOF Civil Affairs Battalion Annex	37,689		37,689
SOCOM	NC	FT BRAGG	SOF Language and Cultural Center	64,606		64,606
SOCOM	NC	FT BRAGG	SOF Combat Medic Skills Sustain. Course Bldg	7,600		7,600
SOCOM	VIRGINIA	DAM NECK	SOF Human Performance Center	11,147		11,147
SOCOM	VIRGINIA	JT EXP BASE LITTLE CREEK—STORY	SOF LOGSU Two Operations Facility	30,404		30,404
SOCOM	JAPAN	TORRI COMMO STATION	SOF Facility Augmentation	71,451		71,451
SOCOM	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF MILDENHALL	SOF Squadron Operations Facility	11,652	–11,652	0
SOCOM	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF MILDENHALL	SOF Hangar/AMU	24,371	–24,371	0
SOCOM	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF MILDENHALL	SOF Airfiled Pavements	24,077	–24,077	0
SOCOM	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF MILDENHALL	SOF MRSP and Parts Storage	6,797	–6,797	0
TMA	KENTUCKY	FT KNOX	Ambulatory Health Center	265,000	–190,000	75,000
TMA	MARYLAND	ABERDEEN PROVING GND	Public Health Command Lab Replacement	210,000	–135,000	75,000

TMA	MARYLAND	BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL	Mech & Electrical Improvements	46,800		46,800
TMA	MARYLAND	BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL	Parking Garage	20,000		20,000
TMA	MARYLAND	FT DETRICK	USAMRIID Replacement Stage 1, Incr 8	13,000		13,000
TMA	MARYLAND	JT BASE ANDREWS	Ambulatory Care Center Inc 2	76,200	–38,100	38,100
TMA	NEW MEXICO	HOLLOMAN AFB	Medical Clinic Replacement	60,000		60,000
TMA	TEXAS	FT BLISS	Hospital Replacement Incr 5	252,100	–152,100	100,000
TMA	TEXAS	JT BASE SAN ANTONIO	SAMMC Hyperbaric Facility Addition	12,600		12,600
TMA	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW ASIA	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	45,400		45,400
TMA	GERMANY	RHINE ORDNANCE BARRACKS	Medical Center Replacement, Incr 3	151,545	–75,000	76,545
WHS	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	PFPA Support Operations Center	14,800		14,800
WHS	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	Boundary Channel Access Control Point	6,700		6,700
WHS	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	Army Navy Drive Tour Bus Drop Off	1,850	–1,850	0
WHS	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	Raven Rock Exterior Cooling Tower	4,100		4,100
WHS	VIRGINIA	PENTAGON	Raven Rock Administrative Facility Upgrade	32,000		32,000
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,000		3,000
DLA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,430		7,430
DODEA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,409		5,409
MDA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000		2,000
NSA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500		1,500
SOCOM	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,170		5,170
TJS	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Exercise Related Minor Construction	9,730		9,730
TMA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	9,578		9,578
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	50,192		50,192
DODEA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	75,905		75,905
MDA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning & Design	10,891		10,891
NSA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	57,053		57,053
SOCOM	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	36,866		36,866
WHS	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	6,931		6,931
SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE-WIDE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**3,985,300**	**–1,054,641**	**2,930,659**

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
SUBTOTAL, ACTIVE SERVICES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**7,962,017**	**–1,332,691**	**6,629,326**
NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
ARMY	ALABAMA	DECATUR	National Guard Readiness Center Add/Alt	4,000		4,000
ARMY	ARKANSAS	FT CHAFFEE	Scout/RECCE Gunnery Complex	21,000		21,000
ARMY	FLORIDA	PINELLAS PARK	Ready Building	5,700		5,700
ARMY	ILLINOIS	KANKAKEE	Readiness Center	14,000		14,000
ARMY	ILLINOIS	KANKAKEE	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	28,000		28,000
ARMY	MASSACHUSETTS	CAMP EDWARDS	Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training Add	19,000		19,000
ARMY	MICHIGAN	CAMP GRAYLING	Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training	17,000		17,000
ARMY	MINNESOTA	STILLWATER	Readiness Center	17,000		17,000
ARMY	MISSISSIPPI	CAMP SHELBY	Water Supply/Treatment Building, Potable	3,000		3,000
ARMY	MISSISSIPPI	PASCAGOULA	Readiness Center	4,500		4,500
ARMY	MISSOURI	MACON	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	9,100		9,100
ARMY	MISSOURI	WHITEMAN AFB	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	5,000		5,000
ARMY	NEW YORK	NEW YORK	Readiness Center Add/Alt	31,000		31,000
ARMY	OHIO	RAVENNA ARMY AMMU PLANT	Sanitary Sewer	5,200		5,200
ARMY	PENNSYLVANIA	FT INDIANTOWN GAP	Aircraft Maintenance Instructional Building	40,000		40,000
ARMY	SOUTH CAROLINA	GREENVILLE	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	13,000		13,000
ARMY	SOUTH CAROLINA	GREENVILLE	Readiness Center	13,000		13,000
ARMY	TEXAS	FT WORTH	Armed Forces Reserve Center Add	14,270		14,270
ARMY	WYOMING	AFTON	National Guard Readiness Center	10,200		10,200
ARMY	PUERTO RICO	CAMP SANTIAGO	Maneuver Area Training & Equipment Site Addit	5,600		5,600
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	12,240		12,240

ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	29,005		29,005
SUBTOTAL, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**320,815**	**0**	**320,815**
AIR NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
AF	ALABAMA	BIRMINGHAM IAP	Add to and Alter Distributed Ground Station F	8,500		8,500
AF	INDIANA	HULMAN REGIONAL AIRPORT	Add/Alter Bldg 37 For Dist Common Ground Sta	7,300		7,300
AF	MARYLAND	FT MEADE	175th Network Warfare Squadron Facility	4,000		4,000
AF	MARYLAND	MARTIN STATE AIRPORT	CYBER/ISR Facility	8,000		8,000
AF	MONTANA	GREAT FALLS IAP	Intra-Theater Airlift Conversion	22,000		22,000
AF	NEW YORK	FT DRUM, NEW YORK	MQ–9 Flight Training Unit Hangar	4,700		4,700
AF	OHIO	SPRINGFIELD BECKLEY-MAP	Alter Intelligence Operations Facility	7,200		7,200
AF	PENNSYLVANIA	FT INDIANTOWN GAP	Communications Operations and Training Facili	7,700		7,700
AF	RHODE ISLAND	QUONSET STATE AIRPORT	C–130J Flight Simulator Training Facility	6,000		6,000
AF	TENNESSEE	MCGHEE-TYSON AIRPORT	TEC Expansion- Dormitory & Classroom Facility	18,000		18,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	13,000		13,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	13,400		13,400
SUBTOTAL, AIR NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**119,800**	**0**	**119,800**
SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**440,615**	**0**	**440,615**
RESERVE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
ARMY RESERVE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
ARMY	CALIFORNIA	CAMP PARKS	Army Reserve Center	17,500		17,500
ARMY	CALIFORNIA	FT HUNTER LIGGETT	TASS Training Center (TTC)	16,500		16,500
ARMY	MARYLAND	BOWIE	Army Reserve Center	25,500		25,500
ARMY	NEW JERSEY	JT BASE MCGUIRE-DIX-LAKEHURST	Consolidated Dining Facility	13,400		13,400
ARMY	NEW JERSEY	JT BASE MCGUIRE-DIX-LAKEHURST	Central Issue Facility	7,900		7,900

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
ARMY	NEW JERSEY	JT BASE MCGUIRE-DIX-LAKEHURST	Automated Multipurpose Machine Gun (MPMG)	9,500		9,500
ARMY	NEW JERSEY	JT BASE MCGUIRE-DIX-LAKEHURST	Modified Record Fire Range	5,400		5,400
ARMY	NEW YORK	BULLVILLE	Army Reserve Center	14,500		14,500
ARMY	NC	FT BRAGG	Army Reserve Center	24,500		24,500
ARMY	WISCONSIN	FT MCCOY	Access Control Point/Mail/Freight Center	17,500		17,500
ARMY	WISCONSIN	FT MCCOY	NCO Academy Dining Facility	5,900		5,900
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,748		1,748
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	14,212		14,212
SUBTOTAL, ARMY RESERVE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**174,060**	**0**	**174,060**
NAVY RESERVE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
NAVY	CALIFORNIA	MARCH AFB	NOSC Moreno Valley Reserve Training Center	11,086		11,086
NAVY	MISSOURI	KANSAS CITY	Reserve Training Center—Belton, Missouri	15,020		15,020
NAVY	TENNESSEE	MEMPHIS	Reserve Boat Maintenance and Storage Facility	4,330		4,330
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	USMCR Planning and Design	1,040		1,040
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	MCNR Planning & Design	1,500		1,500
SUBTOTAL, NAVY RESERVE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**32,976**	**0**	**32,976**
AIR FORCE RESERVE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION						
AF	CALIFORNIA	MARCH AFB	Joint Regional Deployment Processing Center,	19,900		19,900
AF	FLORIDA	HOMESTEAD AFS	Entry Control Complex	9,800		9,800
AF	OKLAHOMA	TINKER AFB	Air Control Group Squadron Operations	12,200		12,200
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,530		1,530
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	VARIOUS WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	2,229		2,229
SUBTOTAL, AIR FORCE RESERVE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**45,659**	**0**	**45,659**

	SUBTOTAL, RESERVE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION			**252,695**	**0**	**252,695**
	TOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION MAJOR ACCOUNTS			**8,655,327**	**–1,332,691**	**7,322,636**
CHEM-DEMIL						
ARMY	KENTUCKY	BLUE GRASS ARMY DEPOT	Ammunition Demilitarization Facility, Ph XIV	122,536		122,536
	SUBTOTAL, CHEM-DEMIL			**122,536**	**0**	**122,536**
NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM						
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PRGM	Nato Security Investment PRGM	239,700		239,700
	SUBTOTAL, NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM			**239,700**	**0**	**239,700**
MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING						
ARMY FAMILY HOUSING						
ARMY FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION						
ARMY	WISCONSIN	FT MCCOY	Family Housing New Construction (56 units)	23,000		23,000
ARMY	GERMANY	SOUTH CAMP VILSECK	Family Housing New Construction (29 units)	16,600	–16,600	0
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Family Housing P & D	4,408		4,408
	SUBTOTAL, ARMY FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION			**44,008**	**–16,600**	**27,408**
ARMY FAMILY HOUSING O&M						
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Utilities	96,907		96,907
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Management Account	54,433		54,433
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Services	13,536		13,536
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Furnishings	33,125		33,125
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Miscellaneous	646		646
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Leased Housing	180,924		180,924
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Maintenance of Real Property Facilities	107,639		107,639
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Military Housing Privitization Initiative	25,661		25,661
	SUBTOTAL, ARMY FAMILY HOUSING O&M			**512,871**	**0**	**512,871**
	SUBTOTAL, ARMY FAMILY HOUSING			**556,879**	**–16,600**	**540,279**

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
NAVY FAMILY HOUSING						
NAVY FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION						
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Improvements	68,969		68,969
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Design	4,438		4,438
SUBTOTAL, NAVY FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION				**73,407**	**0**	**73,407**
NAVY FAMILY HOUSING O&M						
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Utilities Account	94,313		94,313
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Furnishings Account	21,073		21,073
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Management Account	60,782		60,782
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Miscellaneous Account	362		362
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Services Account	20,596		20,596
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Leasing	74,962		74,962
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Maintenance of Real Property	90,122		90,122
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Privatization Support Costs	27,634		27,634
SUBTOTAL, NAVY FAMILY HOUSING O&M				**389,844**	**0**	**389,844**
SUBTOTAL, NAVY FAMILY HOUSING				**463,251**	**0**	**463,251**
AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING						
AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION						
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Improvements	72,093		72,093
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Planning and Design	4,267		4,267
SUBTOTAL, AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION				**76,360**	**0**	**76,360**
AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING O&M						
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Utilities Account	70,532		70,532

AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Management Account	53,044		53,044
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Services Account	16,862		16,862
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Furnishings Account	39,470		39,470
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Miscellaneous Account	1,954		1,954
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Leasing	54,514		54,514
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Maintenance (RPMA RPMC)	110,786		110,786
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Housing Privatization	41,436		41,436
	SUBTOTAL, AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING O&M			**388,598**	**0**	**388,598**
	SUBTOTAL, AIR FORCE FAMILY HOUSING			**464,958**	**0**	**464,958**
DEFENSE-WIDE FAMILY HOUSING						
DEFENSE-WIDE FAMILY HOUSING O&M						
DLA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Utilities Account	288		288
NSA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Utilities Account	12		12
DIA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Furnishings Account	3,196		3,196
DLA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Furnishings Account	20		20
DLA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Services Account	32		32
DLA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Management Account	418		418
NSA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Furnishings Account	67		67
DIA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Leasing	40,433		40,433
NSA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Leasing	10,994		10,994
DLA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Maintenance of Real Property	311		311
NSA	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Maintenance of Real Property	74		74
	SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE-WIDE FAMILY HOUSING O&M			**55,845**	**0**	**55,845**
	SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE-WIDE FAMILY HOUSING			**55,845**	**0**	**55,845**
DOD FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND						
DEFW	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,780		1,780
	SUBTOTAL, DOD FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENT FUND			**1,780**	**0**	**1,780**
	TOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING			**1,542,713**	**–16,600**	**1,526,113**

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE						
ARMY BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE						
ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	BRAC, ARMY	Base Realignment and Closure	180,401		180,401
SUBTOTAL, ARMY BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE				**180,401**	**0**	**180,401**
NAVY BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE						
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	BRAC, NAVY	Base Realignment & Closure	108,300		108,300
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	DON–172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA	5,766		5,766
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	DON–138: NAS Brunswick, ME	993		993
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	DON–157: MCSA Kansas City, MO	40		40
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	DON–84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg AP	1,216		1,216
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	DON–100: Planing, Design and Management	7,277		7,277
NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	DON–101: Various Locations	20,988		20,988
SUBTOTAL, NAVY BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE				**144,580**	**0**	**144,580**
AIR FORCE BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE						
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPEC	UNSPEC WORLDWIDE	DoD BRAC Activities—AF	126,376		126,376
SUBTOTAL, AIR FORCE BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE				**126,376**	**0**	**126,376**
TOTAL, BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE				**451,357**	**0**	**451,357**
TOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SECONDARY ACCOUNTS				**2,356,306**	**–16,600**	**2,339,706**
GRAND TOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION				**11,011,633**	**–1,349,291**	**9,662,342**

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY & ENERGY RELIABILITY			
ELECTRICITY DELIVERY & ENERGY RELIABILITY			
INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY & ENERGY RESTORATION (HS)	16,000	–16,000	0
Not a defense function		[–16,000]	
TOTAL, ELECTRICITY DELIVERY & ENERGY RELIABILITY	**16,000**	**0**	**0**
NUCLEAR ENERGY			
IDAHO SITEWIDE SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY	94,000		94,000
TOTAL, NUCLEAR ENERGY	**94,000**	**0**	**94,000**
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES			
LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAMS AND MAJOR ALTERATIONS			
B61 LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM	537,044		537,044
W76 LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM	235,382		235,382
W78/88–1 LIFE EXTENSION PROGRAM	72,691		72,691
W88 ALT 370	169,487		169,487
TOTAL, STOCKPILE ASSESSMENT AND DESIGN	**1,014,604**	**0**	**1,014,604**

STOCKPILE SYSTEMS			
B61 STOCKPILE SYSTEMS	83,536		83,536
W76 STOCKPILE SYSTEMS	47,187		47,187
W78 STOCKPILE SYSTEMS	54,381		54,381
W80 STOCKPILE SYSTEMS	50,330		50,330
B83 STOCKPILE SYSTEMS	54,948		54,948
W87 STOCKPILE SYSTEMS	101,506		101,506
W88 STOCKPILE SYSTEMS	62,600		62,600
TOTAL, STOCKPILE SYSTEMS	**454,488**	**0**	**454,488**
WEAPONS DISMANTLEMENT AND DISPOSITION			
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	49,264		49,264
STOCKPILE SERVICES			
PRODUCTION SUPPORT	321,416		321,416
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT	26,349		26,349
R&D CERTIFICATION AND SAFETY	191,259		191,259
MANAGEMENT, TECHNOLOGY, AND PRODUCTION	214,187		214,187
PLUTONIUM SUSTAINMENT	156,949		156,949
TOTAL, STOCKPILE SERVICES	**910,160**	**0**	**910,160**
TOTAL, DIRECTED STOCKPILE WORK	**2,428,516**	**0**	**2,428,516**
CAMPAIGNS:			
SCIENCE CAMPAIGN			
ADVANCED CERTIFICATION	54,730		54,730
PRIMARY ASSESSMENT TECHNOLOGIES	109,231		109,231
DYNAMIC MATERIALS PROPERTIES	116,965		116,965
ADVANCED RADIOGRAPHY	30,509		30,509
SECONDARY ASSESSMENT TECHNOLOGIES	86,467		86,467
TOTAL, SCIENCE CAMPAIGN	**397,902**	**0**	**397,902**
ENGINEERING CAMPAIGN			

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
ENHANCED SURETY	51,771		51,771
WEAPON SYSTEMS ENGINEERING ASSESSMENT TECHNOLOGY	23,727		23,727
NUCLEAR SURVIVABILITY	19,504		19,504
ENHANCED SURVEILLANCE	54,909		54,909
TOTAL, ENGINEERING CAMPAIGN	**149,911**	**0**	**149,911**
INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION IGNITION AND HIGH YIELD CAMPAIGN			
IGNITION	80,245		80,245
SUPPORT OF OTHER STOCKPILE PROGRAMS	15,001		15,001
DIAGNOSTICS, CRYOGENICS AND EXPERIMENTAL SUPPORT	59,897		59,897
PULSED POWER INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION	5,024		5,024
JOINT PROGRAM IN HIGH ENERGY DENSITY LABORATORY PLASMAS	8,198		8,198
FACILITY OPERATIONS AND TARGET PRODUCTION	232,678		232,678
TOTAL, INERTIAL CONFINEMENT FUSION AND HIGH YIELD CAMPAIGN	**401,043**	**0**	**401,043**
ADVANCED SIMULATION AND COMPUTING CAMPAIGN	564,329		564,329
READINESS CAMPAIGN			
COMPONENT MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT	106,085		106,085
TRITIUM READINESS	91,695		91,695
TOTAL, READINESS CAMPAIGN	**197,780**	**0**	**197,780**
TOTAL, CAMPAIGNS	**1,710,965**	**0**	**1,710,965**
NUCLEAR PROGRAMS			
NUCLEAR OPERATIONS CAPABILITY	265,937		265,937
CAPABILITIES BASED INVESTMENTS	39,558		39,558
CONSTRUCTION:			

12–D–301 TRU WASTE FACILITIES, LANL	26,722		26,722
11–D–801 TA–55 REINVESTMENT PROJECT PHASE 2, LANL	30,679		30,679
07–D–220 RADIOACTIVE LIQUID WASTE TREATMENT FACILITY UPGRADE PROJECT, LANL	55,719		55,719
06–D–141 PED/CONSTRUCTION, URANIUM CAPABILITIES REPLACEMENT PROJECT Y–12	325,835		325,835
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	**438,955**	**0**	**438,955**
TOTAL, NUCLEAR PROGRAMS	**744,450**	**0**	**744,450**
SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET			
OPERATIONS AND EQUIPMENT	122,072		122,072
PROGRAM DIRECTION	97,118		97,118
TOTAL, SECURE TRANSPORTATION ASSET	**219,190**	**0**	**219,190**
SITE STEWARDSHIP			
NUCLEAR MATERIALS INTEGRATION	17,679		17,679
CORPORATE PROJECT MANAGEMENT	13,017		13,017
MINORITY SERVING INSTITUTION PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAM	14,531		14,531
ENTERPRISE INFRASTRUCTURE			
SITE OPERATIONS	1,112,455		1,112,455
SITE SUPPORT	109,561		109,561
SUSTAINMENT	433,764		433,764
FACILITIES DISPOSITION	5,000		5,000
SUBTOTAL, ENTERPRISE INFRASTRUCTURE	**1,660,780**	**0**	**1,660,780**
TOTAL, SITE STEWARDSHIP	**1,706,007**	**0**	**1,706,007**
DEFENSE NUCLEAR SECURITY			
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	664,981		664,981
CONSTRUCTION:			
14–D–710 DAF ARGUS, NNSS	14,000		14,000
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR SECURITY	**678,981**	**0**	**678,981**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
NNSA CIO ACTIVITIES	148,441		148,441
LEGACY CONTRACTOR PENSIONS	279,597		279,597
SUBTOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	**7,916,147**	**0**	**7,916,147**
ADJUSTMENTS			
USE OF PRIOR YEAR BALANCES	–47,738		–47,738
RESCISSION			0
TOTAL, ADJUSTMENTS	**–47,738**	**0**	**–47,738**
TOTAL, WEAPONS ACTIVITIES	**7,868,409**	**0**	**7,868,409**
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION			
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS			
GLOBAL THREAT REDUCTION INITIATIVE	424,487		424,487
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION R&D			
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	388,838		388,838
NONPROLIFERATION AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY	141,675		141,675
INTERNATIONAL MATERIAL PROTECTION AND COOPERATION	369,625		369,625
FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION			
U.S. SURPLUS FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION			
OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE			
U.S. PLUTONIUM DISPOSITION	157,557		157,557

U.S. URANIUM DISPOSITION	25,000		25,000
TOTAL, OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	**182,557**	**0**	**182,557**
CONSTRUCTION:			
99–D–143 MIXED OXIDE FUEL FABRICATION FACILITY, SAVANNAH RIVER, SC	320,000	80,000	400,000
Program increase		[80,000]	
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	**320,000**	**80,000**	**400,000**
TOTAL, U.S. SURPLUS FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION	**502,557**	**80,000**	**582,557**
TOTAL, FISSILE MATERIALS DISPOSITION	**502,557**	**80,000**	**582,557**
LEGACY CONTRACTOR PENSIONS	93,703		93,703
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS	**1,920,885**	**80,000**	**2,000,885**
NUCLEAR COUNTERTERRORISM INCIDENT RESPONSE PROGRAM	181,293		181,293
COUNTERTERRORISM AND COUNTERPROLIFERATION PROGRAMS	74,666		74,666
SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	**2,176,844**	**80,000**	**2,256,844**
ADJUSTMENTS			
USE OF PRIOR YEAR BALANCES	–36,702		–36,702
TOTAL, ADJUSTMENTS	**–36,702**	**0**	**–36,702**
TOTAL, DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION	**2,140,142**	**80,000**	**2,220,142**
NAVAL REACTORS			
NAVAL REACTORS OPERATIONS AND INFRASTRUCTURE	455,740	–2,000	453,740
Excess to need		[–2,000]	
NAVAL REACTORS DEVELOPMENT	419,400		419,400
OHIO REPLACEMENT REACTOR SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	126,400		126,400
S8G PROTOTYPE REFUELING	144,400		144,400
PROGRAM DIRECTION	44,404		44,404
CONSTRUCTION:			
14–D–902 KL MATERIALS CHARACTERIZATION LABORATORY EXPANSION, KAPL	1,000		1,000
14–D–901 SPENT FUEL HANDLING RECAPITALIZATION PROJECT, NRF	45,400		45,400

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
13–D–905 REMOTE-HANDLED LOW-LEVEL WASTE FACILITY, INL	21,073		21,073
13–D–904 KS RADIOLOGICAL WORK AND STORAGE BUILDING, KSO	600	2,000	2,600
Program increase		[2,000]	
NAVAL REACTOR FACILITY, ID	1,700		1,700
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	**69,773**	**2,000**	**71,773**
SUBTOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	**1,260,117**	**0**	**1,260,117**
ADJUSTMENTS:			
USE OF PRIOR YEAR BALANCES (NAVAL REACTORS)	–13,983		–13,983
TOTAL, NAVAL REACTORS	**1,246,134**	**0**	**1,246,134**
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR			
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	397,784		397,784
TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR	**397,784**	**0**	**397,784**
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP			
CLOSURE SITES:			
CLOSURE SITES ADMINISTRATION	4,702		4,702
HANFORD SITE:			
RIVER CORRIDOR AND OTHER CLEANUP OPERATIONS	393,634	20,000	413,634
Program increase		[20,000]	
CENTRAL PLATEAU REMEDIATION	513,450		513,450
RICHLAND COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY SUPPORT	14,701		14,701
TOTAL, HANFORD SITE	**921,785**	**20,000**	**941,785**
IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY:			

IDAHO CLEANUP AND WASTE DISPOSITION	362,100	30,000	392,100
Program increase		[30,000]	
IDAHO COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY SUPPORT	2,910		2,910
TOTAL, IDAHO NATIONAL LABORATORY	**365,010**	**30,000**	**395,010**
NNSA SITES			
LAWRENCE LIVERMORE NATIONAL LABORATORY	1,476		1,476
NUCLEAR FACILITY D & D SEPARATIONS PROCESS RESEARCH UNIT	23,700		23,700
NEVADA	61,897		61,897
SANDIA NATIONAL LABORATORIES	2,814		2,814
LOS ALAMOS NATIONAL LABORATORY	219,789	40,000	259,789
Program increase		[40,000]	
TOTAL, NNSA SITES AND NEVADA OFF-SITES	**309,676**	**40,000**	**349,676**
OAK RIDGE RESERVATION:			
OR NUCLEAR FACILITY D & D	73,716		73,716
OR CLEANUP AND DISPOSITION	115,855	10,000	125,855
Program increase		[10,000]	
OR RESERVATION COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY SUPPORT	4,365		4,365
TOTAL, OAK RIDGE RESERVATION	**193,936**	**10,000**	**203,936**
OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION:			
WASTE TREATMENT AND IMMOBILIZATION PLANT			
01–D–416 A-E/ORP-0060 / MAJOR CONSTRUCTION	690,000		690,000
TANK FARM ACTIVITIES			
RAD LIQUID TANK WASTE STABILIZATION AND DISPOSITION	520,216	50,000	570,216
Program increase		[50,000]	
TOTAL, OFFICE OF RIVER PROTECTION	**1,210,216**	**50,000**	**1,260,216**
SAVANNAH RIVER SITES:			
SAVANNAH RIVER RISK MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS	432,491		432,491

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
SR COMMUNITY AND REGULATORY SUPPORT	11,210		11,210
RADIOACTIVE LIQUID TANK WASTE:			
RADIOACTIVE LIQUID TANK WASTE STABILIZATION AND DISPOSITION	552,560	150,000	702,560
Program increase		[150,000]	
CONSTRUCTION:			
05–D–405 SALT WASTE PROCESSING FACILITY, SAVANNAH RIVER	92,000		92,000
TOTAL, CONSTRUCTION	**92,000**	**0**	**92,000**
TOTAL, RADIOACTIVE LIQUID TANK WASTE	**644,560**	**150,000**	**794,560**
TOTAL, SAVANNAH RIVER SITE	**1,088,261**	**150,000**	**1,238,261**
WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PLANT			
WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PLANT	203,390	33,000	236,390
Program increase		[33,000]	
TOTAL, WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PLANT	**203,390**	**33,000**	**236,390**
PROGRAM DIRECTION	280,784	20,000	300,784
Program increase		[20,000]	
PROGRAM SUPPORT	17,979		17,979
SAFEGUARDS AND SECURITY:			
OAK RIDGE RESERVATION	18,800		18,800
PADUCAH	9,435		9,435
PORTSMOUTH	8,578		8,578
RICHLAND/HANFORD SITE	69,078	10,000	79,078
Program increase		[10,000]	
SAVANNAH RIVER SITE	121,196	10,000	131,196

Program increase		[10,000]	
WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PROJECT	4,977		4,977
WEST VALLEY	2,015		2,015
TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,091	10,000	34,091
Program increase		[10,000]	
SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	**4,853,909**	**383,000**	**8,902,461**
URANIUM ENRICHMENT D&D FUND CONTRIBUTION (LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL)	463,000	–463,000	0
Program decrease		[–463,000]	
TOTAL, DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP	**5,316,909**	**–80,000**	**5,236,909**
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES			
HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY			
HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY	143,616		143,616
PROGRAM DIRECTION	108,301		108,301
UNDISTRIBUTED ADJUSTMENT			
TOTAL, HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY	**251,917**	**0**	**251,917**
SPECIALIZED SECURITY ACTIVITIES	196,322		196,322
OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT			
LEGACY MANAGEMENT	163,271		163,271
PROGRAM DIRECTION	13,712		13,712
TOTAL, OFFICE OF LEGACY MANAGEMENT	**176,983**	**0**	**176,983**
DEFENSE RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT			
CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER	38,979		38,979
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER	79,857		79,857
TOTAL, DEFENSE RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT	**118,836**	**0**	**118,836**
OFFICE OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS	5,022		5,022

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2014 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
SUBTOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	749,080	0	749,080
TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES	749,080	0	749,080

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

Four separate legislative proposals on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 were submitted as executive communications to the President of the Senate by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs of the Department of Defense and subsequently referred to the committee. Information on these executive communications appears below. All of these executive communications are available for review at the committee.

Executive Communication No.	Dated	Received in the Committee on Armed Services
EC–1470	April 29, 2013	May 15, 2013
EC–1552	May 7, 2013	May 21, 2013
EC–1592	May 20, 2013	May 23, 2013
EC–1766	May 22, 2013	June 4, 2013

On May 23, 2013, Senators Levin and Inhofe introduced by request the administration's proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. This bill—S. 1034—was introduced for the purpose of placing the administration's proposals before Congress and the public without expressing the views of Senators Levin or Inhofe on the substance of those proposals. In accordance with past practice, the committee reported an original bill rather than acting on S. 1034.

Committee Action

The committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 passed by roll call vote, 23–3, as follows: In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, and Blunt. Opposed: Senators Vitter, Lee, and Cruz.

The 13 other roll call votes on motions and amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the full committee markup are as follows:

1. MOTION: To include a provision that would require a review of decisions not to refer charges of certain sexual offenses to trial by court-martial.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 17–9.

In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Blunt, and Lee.

Opposed: Senators Udall, Hagan, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Vitter, and Cruz

2. MOTION: To include multiple provisions addressing sexual assaults in the military.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 26–0.

In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: None.

3. MOTION: To conduct full Committee markups in closed session because classified information will be discussed.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 20–6.

In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, and Blunt.

Opposed: Senators McCaskill, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Lee, and Cruz.

4. MOTION: To include a provision exempting the Department of Defense from alternative fuel procurement requirement.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 13–13.

In favor: Senators Manchin, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, and King

5. MOTION: To include a provision for limitations on allowable costs of salaries of contractor employees.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 12–14.

In favor: Senators Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, King, and Vitter.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Shaheen, Kaine, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

6. MOTION: To include an alternative provision providing for limitations on allowable costs of salaries of contractor employees.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 6–20.

In favor: Senators Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, and Graham.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Ayotte, Fischer, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

7. MOTION: To include a provision for cost comparison for procurement of alternative fuel.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 12–14.

In favor: Senators Manchin, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Fischer.

8. MOTION: To include a provision requiring certification for biofuel refinery construction.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 11–15.

In favor: Senators Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Fischer.

9. MOTION: To include report language addressing the use of amounts authorized for base defense requirements to pay for warfighting costs of Overseas Contingency Operations.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 12–14.

In favor: Senators Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, and King.

10. MOTION: To strike a provision that would restore the previous policy regarding restrictions on use of Department of Defense medical facilities.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 15–11.

In favor: Senators Nelson, Manchin, Donnelly, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Hirono, Kaine, and King.

11. MOTION: To include a provision to enhance the protection of rights of conscience of members of the armed forces and chaplains of such members.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 19–7.

In favor: Senators Nelson, McCaskill, Hagan, Manchin, Donnelly, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Udall, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, and Hirono.

12. MOTION: To strike the one-year extension and modification of authority for program to develop and carry out infrastructure projects in Afghanistan and require a report on transition of project management.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 7–19.

In favor: Senators McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, Udall, Hagan, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, and Blunt.

13. MOTION: To restrict funding for the Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 26–0.

In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: None.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during Senate floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there

is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2014.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. INHOFE

One of the defining characteristics of the Senate Armed Services Committee is its Members' ability to put partisan considerations aside and work together toward enhancing our national security, increasing the capabilities of our armed forces, and providing a better quality of life for our service members. This is not to mean the Members of the Committee do not have differences of opinion regarding important policy matters. However, the Members of the Committee and I are grateful for Chairman Levin's leadership and his tireless commitment to ensure every Member's concerns are heard and considered.

In order to further the Committee's goals of enhancing our national security and increasing the capabilities of our armed forces, as Ranking Member, I developed a list of policy areas on which I will place particular importance. I am pleased to report significant progress has been made in each of these policy areas during the Committee's consideration of the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization bill, but more needs to be done.

Missile Defense and Nuclear Modernization

In the area of Missile Defense, the Committee agreed to an amendment offered by Senator Ayotte and myself which added an additional $30 million for the deployment of an X-band radar, or other comparable sensor, to enhance the defense of the homeland against long-range ballistic missile threats. Deployed in a location optimized for the defense of the East Coast, this radar will be an important step toward providing a more effective defense against the growing nuclear and ballistic missile threat from Iran. But this is not sufficient. Congress should direct the Department of Defense to begin deployment of an additional homeland missile defense interceptor site to better defend the East Coast. Since an East Coast anti-ballistic missile interceptor site was included in the House's version of the Defense Authorization bill, it is my hope that continued progress in this area will occur during the Conference Committee. Separately, I secured an "Item of Special Interest" in the bill encouraging the Missile Defense Agency to develop a next generation advanced kill vehicle for the ground-based interceptor. This will further enable our defenses to stay ahead of future threats.

Regarding the modernization of our nuclear forces, the Committee agreed to fully fund the President's budget request. However, the amount requested by the administration for the National Nuclear Security Administration was $285 million less than commitment for Fiscal Year 2014 made by the President during consideration of the New START Treaty. The bill also contains a legisla-

tive provision reaffirming Congress' commitment to modernize our triad of nuclear delivery systems, which consists of bombers, intercontinental ballistic missiles and ballistic missile submarines. Most importantly, this legislation also includes support for the renewal of our nuclear weapons production capabilities.

In addition, to prevent the President from contemplating unilateral nuclear force reductions below New START Treaty levels or entering into an executive agreement with the Russian President, I authored an amendment expressing the Sense of Congress that any future reductions in our nuclear forces must take place by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Unfortunately, due to jurisdiction issues, this amendment was ruled out of order. However, I am committed to offering this amendment again on the Senate floor.

Acquisition Reform

Despite important reforms such as the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009, defense acquisition programs continue to be behind schedule and over budget. During this period of budget austerity, it is critical every taxpayer dollar allocated to defense acquisition be spent prudently. Accordingly, I initiated a number of reforms which were included in the Defense Authorization bill. These include a section which authorizes the Comptroller General to review the Department of Defense's processes for the acquisition of major weapons systems. The objective of the review is to identify those acquisition processes that provide no value, little value, or which value is outweighed by the creation of additional costs and schedule delays. The recommendations of the report can then be incorporated in next year's Defense Authorization bill to create greater efficiencies and savings in the acquisition realm.

In addition, I was able to place in the bill a second Comptroller General review based upon the acquisition reform recommendations of the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review's Independent Panel. Specifically, the review will evaluate the Panel's recommendation to place greater emphasis on the role of the armed services, in particular the respective Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff, in the acquisition of weapons systems. As a result, it is my hope the review will identify new management models to increase the effectiveness of the acquisition system.

Readiness and Capabilities

I am very concerned about the rapid degradation of military capabilities of both our forces engaged in combat and those preparing for the next contingency operation. This deterioration is a result of the administration's decision to cut Defense budgets by over $600 billion over ten years and is in addition to those cuts required by sequestration.

Accordingly, I crafted several provisions included in the bill which are designed to direct the attention of the Committee to the negative effects of sequestration, in particular the pending reality of a hollow force. In addition, I added language requiring each branch of the Armed Forces to establish a long-term plan and investment strategy for the reconstitution of military equipment being returned from Afghanistan.

I was also pleased to work with the Chairman to establish a new authority to allow the Department of Defense to transfer funds to a new Readiness Restoration Account. This account will permit the Department to transfer funds from lower priorities to more critical areas, such as military training and the maintenance of military equipment.

Threat, Strategy and Resources

In an era of fiscal austerity, our strategies and resources must be tightly matched to confront looming threats. Therefore, I strongly supported a report to assess the capabilities of stealth, fifth generation Chinese fighter aircraft and their potential impact to our Pacific strategy. This assessment will also review the capabilities of the Taiwanese Air Force.

In the Middle East, $75 million under the Cooperative Threat Reduction program was allocated towards reducing the threat of Syrian chemical weapon proliferation. As part of this effort, $150 million was also allotted to assist the Jordanian Armed Forces with their security operations on its border with Syria.

As the events in Benghazi highlighted, U.S. Africa Command ("AFRICOM") has not received sufficient resources to thoroughly counter the growing terrorist threat in North Africa. One of the lessons learned from this tragedy is in order to meet the threats of today and tomorrow we must adopt an interagency strategy which is designed to overcome the challenges which confront not just one nation but the region as a whole. Accordingly, the Secretary of Defense is directed to review AFRICOM's rapid reaction assets and develop a regional strategy which addresses the terrorist threat in North Africa.

In addition, the bill extends through 2018 the Global Train and Equip Authority. Combat commanders routinely state this authority greatly assists our forces in achieving theater counterterrorism and stability operational objectives.

Efficiencies

During sequestration it is vital we make every dollar count. Therefore, I have worked to ensure, through report requirements and assessments from the General Accounting Office, that the Department of Defense's science and technology efforts are focused on current warfighter requirements, quickly transiting technologies from the lab to the battlefield, and eliminating duplicative programs. Accordingly, the bill reallocates $200 million within the science and technology budget to more effectively meet the warfighter's requirements.

Combating Sequestration

The bill which the Committee passed provides $526.5 billion to the Department of Defense. Unfortunately, I do not believe this is a sufficient sum to adequately confront our nation's current and future threats. However, what is even more disturbing is we are on the verge of cutting the defense budget even further as a new round of sequestration is set to take effect next year. These automatic and mindless cuts continue to plague our military. Specifically, sequestration undermines the ability of military commanders

to plan, it wreaks havoc on our industrial base, and the resulting uncertainty can only embolden our adversaries around the world.

Accordingly, during markup, I offered a proposal to cancel sequestration for the Department of Defense for Fiscal Year 2014. This amendment was fully paid for with an offset. Unfortunately, the Committee's Chairman ruled my amendment out of order due to a jurisdictional issue. However, I am not deterred and I am strongly considering offering this amendment again during the bill's consideration on the Senate floor.

Ending Sexual Assault in the Military

Ending the scourge of sexual assault in our nation's military is one of my highest priorities. The issue of sexual assault requires vigorous and continuous oversight to ensure its complete eradication from our military forces. However, I believe the most effective way to solve this problem is by better utilizing one of the military's greatest strengths: the chain of command. Therefore, I was grateful to work with Chairman Levin to craft reforms which will better ensure justice is done while maintaining the chain of command. Specifically, the Levin/Inhofe amendment, which was adopted, requires a higher level of review when a commander decides not to prosecute a sexual assault allegation. This higher review will go all the way to the respective service Secretary when a commander disagrees with a military lawyer's recommendation to prosecute a sexual offense.

In addition, recently, there have been a small number of cases where a commander has overturned a sexual assault conviction. To address this issue, Senator Graham offered an amendment which restricts the ability of a commander to modify court-martial findings of guilty for a sexual offense. I look forward to the reconsideration of the Graham Amendment when the bill is brought to the Senate floor later this year.

Guantanamo Bay Detainees

This year's Senate Defense Authorization bill's provisions regarding Guantanamo Bay detainees are a fundamental shift from policies enacted in previous years' Defense Authorization Acts. Specifically, this bill creates large loopholes which, if enacted, will result in the transfer of detainees to the shores of our country and permit their easier conveyance to foreign countries. This contrasts sharply with previous years' legislation which ensured detainees would not be brought to the United States and would not be transferred to other countries unless reasonable conditions were met. Adding to my agitation on this matter, is that previous years' statutes were built upon a bipartisan consensus, consistent with public opinion, which was formed after years of congressional debate and were written to follow the rulings of the Supreme Court. Removing these provisions will make our nation less secure. Accordingly, I will resolutely oppose the inclusion of these proposed sections in the final Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act.

Putting the So-Called Green Agenda Before the Needs of the Warfighter

Under current law, the Department of Defense is required to certify the alternative fuel it purchases does not exceed the level of greenhouse gas emissions of equivalent petroleum products. Clearly, this statue, Section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, was crafted to support a political agenda rather than to meet the operational requirements of the warfighter. Specifically, this prohibition denies the Department access to the full range of synthetic fuels which are comparable in price to fossil fuels. Therefore, I was very disappointed when an amendment designed to exempt the Department from the onerous provisions of Section 526 was not adopted by the Committee. I look forward to revisiting this issue when the bill is considered on the floor of the Senate.

In addition, in an effort to create savings for the Department, I offered two amendments regarding the use of Defense funds for a national biofuels program. The first amendment codified the existing policy of the Department not to make bulk purchases of alternative drop-in replacement fuels, unless those fuels are cost-competitive with petroleum products. The second amendment provided the Secretary of Defense the discretion to assess, in light of sequestration, whether continued construction of a commercial biofuels refinery is in the best interest of the national defense. I strongly believe the military is better served by cancelling the construction of this refinery and using the resulting $170 million in savings for more urgent priorities. For example, the $170 million could be used to resume flight training for 10 of the 17 Air Force squadrons which are currently grounded due to sequestration. Another possibility is to procure for the Marines more efficient power generators for forward locations in Afghanistan. Pursing this option will save fuel, reduce the number fuel conveys, and save lives.

Lack of Funding for Overseas Contingency Operations

There exists no more important responsibility of a government then to fully support the men and women it places in harm's way. Therefore, I am astonished neither the Administration nor the Committee has acted to rectify significant funding shortfalls in accounts which are used to pay for our operations in Afghanistan and maintain the capabilities of our armed forces.

Congress routinely authorizes funding for our military through two separate and distinct funding mechanisms. The first is for "base" accounts, which pays for normal military expenses in such areas as personnel compensation, training, and acquisition of weapons systems. The second, called Overseas Contingency Operations ("OCO") accounts, are for ongoing combat operations and responding to humanitarian crisis. OCO funds are usually authorized through supplemental emergency funding requests submitted by the Executive Branch. One of the primary benefits of using these two account systems is to ensure core defense requirements are not sacrificed to pay for combat and humanitarian operations. Therefore, ensuring both the base and OCO accounts receive the appropriate level of funding is critical to maintaining the long-term

health of our military and successfully prosecuting our operations overseas.

In order to ensure our forces receive all the support and equipment they need, OCO funding has previously garnered strong bipartisan support. However, despite the vital importance of OCO funds, currently there is an $11.0 billion shortfall for Fiscal Year 2013. According to the Administration this deficit is a result of an "operating tempo exceed[ing] the level anticipated," and "transportation costs are also higher because of unanticipated problems with the Ground Lines of Communication in Pakistan." One would expect Congress, working with the Executive Branch, would seek an immediate remedy to this situation. Therefore, I was indignant and shocked when the Committee did not rectify this significant deficit nor the Administration offer more than a partial remedy.

Normally, this situation would be resolved by the Executive Branch requesting additional supplemental appropriations. However, the Administration appears to have decided not to pursue this course and seeks only a partial remedy by transferring $7.3 billion to cover the shortfall in Fiscal Year 2013 OCO accounts. Specifically, the Department seeks to transfer $2.3 billion from base readiness accounts, $1.5 billion from cuts to other defense accounts, and $3.5 billion from other OCO priorities. However, even after these transfers a $3.7 billion deficit will remain. Adding to this consternation, the $3.7 billion deficit figure was only arrived at after many lower priority OCO initiatives were cut. In addition, the continued reductions in base defense accounts due to sequestration and from offsets to the OCO accounts continue to have a negative impact on multiple military personnel and procurement accounts. Also, the Administration's proposed transfer of funds to offset the OCO deficit will consume over 95 percent of the amount permitted under the law to be reallocated, leaving the Department with a limited ability to respond to other priorities.

Accordingly, to act as a catalyst to resolve this issue, I offered an amendment encouraging the Administration to immediately submit to Congress an additional emergency supplemental appropriations request for Fiscal Year 2013. The amendment called for the Administration to request sufficient funds to cover all emerging OCO requirements, including the $3.7 billion deficit. My amendment also encouraged the Department to restore the cuts to the base defense accounts from which funds had been transferred to OCO accounts.

Unfortunately, on a party-line vote, my amendment was not adopted. As a result, the Committee has refused to encourage the Administration to demonstrate leadership and cooperation with Congress and address emerging and critical warfighter needs through a request for additional OCO funds. This is a critical issue which must be resolved before further damage is incurred not only to the Department, but to its most important resource: the warfighter. Accordingly, I will bring my amendment to the Senate floor for further consideration.

In conclusion, I have been able to incorporate a number of important initiatives into the Defense Authorization bill. However, I view this as only the beginning of my efforts, as Ranking Member, to enhance our national security and increase the capabilities of our armed forces. I look forward to working with the members of the

Committee and my colleagues in the Senate to ensure an even greater number of reforms are enacted into law.

JAMES M. INHOFE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. McCAIN

I voted, with most of my colleagues, in favor of passing the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act out of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Consideration of this bill should be taken up by the full Senate at the earliest opportunity to give the Department sufficient time to implement the policies contained within it and to help the Senate return to the regular order of authorizing and appropriating legislation. Congress' failure to authorize and appropriate in a timely and regular way, including the recurring use of Continuing Appropriations Resolutions, has perpetuated defense planning uncertainty, wasted untold resources and harmed national defense.

The President's failure to provide constructive leadership to avert budget sequestration has likewise damaged our defense institutions; I remain deeply concerned about the impact sequester is having on the composition and operational readiness of our forces. For reasons of jurisdiction, we were unable to fully consider proposals to mitigate or nullify the automatic cuts to defense and I look forward to debating ways to solve this problem before the full Senate.

The committee also chose to defer matters relating to the detention of enemy combatants at Guantanamo Bay. Having completed my most recent visit to the detention facility this month, I continue to believe strongly that it is in our national interest to end detention at Guantanamo, with a safe and orderly transition of the detainees to other locations. Much of the work necessary to make that happen should take place in the public eye and by the hand of the full Senate.

One issue we must continue to grapple with is how the Department of Defense can most effectively reduce instances of sexual assault and ensure that offenders are held accountable. This is a problem that threatens the very fabric of our military. I believe it is an issue of defending basic human rights and one that, if left unaddressed, will undermine the readiness of our forces—particularly, the Department's ability to recruit and retain the fighting force it needs to ensure our Nation's defense.

In the aftermath of the Vietnam War, we faced a similar problem in dealing with the scourge of racism in the military. We addressed that issue decisively and aggressively and put in place programs and policies that helped to bring an end to a culture of racism in our military. We must do the same thing in the case of the current sexual assault crisis.

I support provisions offered by members of the committee that (1) provide assistance and ease reporting for victims of alleged sexual abuse; (2) strengthen penalties for perpetrators of these crimes; (3) maintain the fundamental role of the chain-of-command in convening courts martial; (4) hold commanders accountable for the leadership climate they establish; (5) prevent sexual offenders from

entering the armed services or staying in uniform; and (6) encourage the cultural change necessary for the Department of Defense to reduce and ultimately eliminate these poisonous offenses from our ranks. I hope that as this legislation is debated on the Floor of the Senate, we can continue to build on that consensus to ensure that this problem is addressed effectively and responsibly.

Also, I believe that Congress' and the Department of Defense's understanding of the nature and scope of the problem of sexual assault in the military is in need of refinement. To this end, policymakers and military leaders would benefit from a survey that follows up on the Department's most recent gross estimate by, among other things, categorizing the types of reported offenses.

The Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program continues to attract significant congressional oversight—as befits the Department of Defense's largest weapons procurement program. After years of helping to oversee how the JSF program is being managed and legislate changes to it, I am pleased to see signs that the Department may be finally containing excessive cost growth in this top defense procurement priority. In a March 2013 report, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) described this program as "moving in the right direction". On May 23, the Department of Defense released its latest JSF Selected Acquisition Report, announcing a 1.1 percent reduction in the overall program cost of the JSF—a $4.5 billion savings from the previous estimate. While these reports suggest improvements, Congress must continue to scrutinize this critically important program to ensure that they endure.

In support of its oversight role, the Subcommitee on Seapower investigated a number of Navy shipbuilding and weapons program this year. Late last year, GAO reported notable but limited improvement in how effectively the Department has been able to hold down excessive cost growth in its major defense acquisition programs since the enactment of the 2009 Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act. But, the Department of Defense and the Navy continue to structure excessive concurrency between development and production into its strategies to acquire its largest weapon systems, which exposes these programs to the risk of excessive cost increases and schedule slips late in production. In some Navy ship construction programs this has been manifested in dangerously high-risk development schedules and accelerated procurement plans while delivering uncertain capabilities amidst constantly shifting requirements.

The current Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program is a good example of the foregoing dynamics and represents a departure from the program that was first envisioned a decade ago by Admiral Vern Clark. After having originally doubled over its original estimate, the current cost per seaframe has stabilized for the moment. But, major challenges abound that threaten whether this program will indeed be able to deliver intended combat capability. The decision to use a commercial hull has not resulted in a shortened fielding period; the two-variant seaframe acquisition has resulted in decreased commonality; and capabilities for the seaframes and mission modules are still unknown and untested. Yet, the Navy continues with the retirement of the patrol craft, frigates, and minesweepers that LCS was intended to replace.

Despite the risks, the Navy plans for 52 LCS to comprise one third of the Navy's total surface combatant fleet by 2028. In addition, according to schedules provided by the Navy, by the time integrated LCS capabilities are tested—in 2019—the Navy will have procured or put under contract more than half of the total number of seaframes planned for purchase.

Four reports issued in the last year have raised significant questions as to whether LCS, as currently designed, has the capabilities to meet combatant requirements for the next thirty years. An internal Navy report issued in 2012 raised fundamental questions about LCS' suitability, lethality, and survivability. A recent draft GAO report is equally critical of the program, stating that "[n]either Congress nor the Navy can be certain that the LCS is the right system to meet the warfighter needs . . . the apparent disconnect between the LCS acquisition strategy and the needs of the end users suggest that a pause is needed."

The Navy has spent some $12 billion on LCS to date and is planning to spend another $28 billion through 2034. At this point program we need an honest, objective look at the requirements, capabilities, and current acquisition strategy for LCS. I encourage my colleagues to consider a reporting requirement that would direct the Secretary of the Navy to submit to Congress specific certifications on LCS acquisition milestones and capabilities before being authorized to obligate funds for LCS 21 and beyond.

The Ford Class Aircraft Carrier program is also at risk of significant and continued cost increases and major schedule slips. The committee approved the Navy's request to increase the statutory cost cap on the lead ship, CVN–78 with the acknowledgment that first-in-class ships often experience cost growth as new systems are designed, integrated and tested. These challenges must be overcome and contained in the first ship—not allowed to continue with subsequent ship builds. I am concerned that the Navy is rushing to put the second ship, CVN–79, on contract before the costs of the first ship have stabilized.

If allowed to continue on their current path, the Navy will put CVN–79 on a fixed-price construction contract early in the fall of 2013—before the ship has a complete design and bill of materials; before having a firm set of stable requirements; before testing critical new technologies including aircraft launch and retrieval systems and a new radar; and before the ship has an optimal build plan. This fundamentally deviates from widely-recognized commercial shipbuilding practices and would expose the program to an unreasonable risk of excessive cost growth and schedule slips.

The Navy reports that design work on CVN–78 is not yet finalized, construction is 60% complete and behind schedule, critical systems testing is behind schedule, and that no integration testing has occurred. Yet, despite a great deal of residual risk and uncertainty in the lead ship, the Navy continues to plan a September 2013 multi-billion, sole source construction contract award for the second ship. This course of action would increase the likelihood of frequent change orders to the contract as technical difficulties, which should have been addressed in the first-in-class ship, have to be solved, at great expense, in the second ship.

I want to ensure the cost-saving efforts proposed by the Navy in its recent report to Congress will be achieved. This can be done without delaying the delivery of CVN–79 to the fleet. I strongly encourage my colleagues to consider measures that would require the Secretary of the Navy to have a greater degree of certainty about the design and cost of CVN–78 before awarding a construction contract for CVN–79.

JOHN MCCAIN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MS. AYOTTE

Building on its well-deserved reputation for bipartisanship in support of our men and women in uniform and American national security, the Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC) voted overwhelmingly to approve its version of the fiscal year (FY) 2014 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). In today's partisan climate in Washington, this act of bipartisanship is worth noting. While this bill is not perfect, there are several praiseworthy components in areas related to contingency contracting, military sexual assault, our attack submarine fleet, and acquisition reform. In addition to the concerns regarding the components of the bill related to Guantanamo that are highlighted in a separate additional views section, I also remain very concerned about the impact that defense sequestration is having on our men and women in uniform and our nation's military readiness.

Never Contract with the Enemy

The federal government has a deep moral obligation to serve as a responsible steward of the people's tax dollars. Congress must conduct rigorous oversight of federal spending to eliminate fraud, waste, and abuse. Especially at a time when our nation has incurred approximately $17 trillion in debt, we simply cannot afford to allow our tax dollars to be misspent.

When the United States engages in contracting overseas we must ensure our tax dollars do not end up in the hands of our enemies. Our troops should never have to worry that American tax dollars are funding those with whom they are fighting on the battlefield.

As we have conducted more rigorous oversight of U.S. contracting overseas, particularly where the U.S. has spent billions of dollars in Iraq and Afghanistan, it has become clear that acquisition laws and regulations—as well as existing oversight mechanisms within the Pentagon, the State Department, and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)—are dramatically insufficient to addressing the contracting challenges.

From 2002 to 2011, the Commission on Wartime Contracting conservatively estimated that $31 billion to $60 billion in contracts were lost to waste and fraud.

Even worse, the Commission found that the second largest source of income for insurgents in Afghanistan has been U.S. contracting dollars. Whether through negligence or the deliberate actions of malign actors, these contracts sometimes result in taxpayer funds being diverted to our enemies.

One of the reasons for this unacceptable situation was that our acquisition officials in Iraq and Afghanistan were often operating under laws and regulations that were designed for contracting in the United States during peacetime, not in Baghdad or Bagram during wartime.

As a result, once we discovered that a U.S. contract was allowing money to end up in the hands of our enemies, it would take far too long to terminate the contract and end the flow of contract funds to those who were opposing the United States.

In February 2011, I teamed up with Senator Scott Brown (R-MA) to introduce S. 341, The No Contracting with the Enemy Act. We then worked with SASC to include key elements of our legislation in the FY 2012 NDAA. These Section 841 and 842 authorities gave Department of Defense (DoD) acquisition officials in Afghanistan the ability to more quickly sever ties with contractors who funnel taxpayer resources to those who oppose the United States.

Since December 2011, these authorities have enabled the Central Command Commander to identify four Afghan vendors and 28 entities associated with these four vendors that have been engaged in hostile activities, resulting in the termination of 10 subcontracts with foreign vendors and withholding of funds from one foreign prime contractor. These termination actions have resulted in approximately $31 million in savings.

While the Section 841 and 842 authorities were a major step in the right direction, more can and should be done. To expand and enhance the authorities that were established in 2011, on April 9, 2013, Senator Richard Blumenthal (D-CT) and I introduced the bipartisan S. 675, The Never Contract with the Enemy Act. I am pleased that key components of our bill are included in this Committee-approved NDAA. Among other improvements, the language in this year's bill expands these authorities to all geographic combatant commands, extends the authorities which would have expired in December 2014 until December 2018, and lowers the contract threshold from $100,000 to $20,000.

I look forward to ensuring this important language is in the final NDAA. I also look forward to working with other committees and the full Senate to ensure these authorities are available to acquisition officials outside of DoD.

S. 675 seeks to expand these essential authorities to acquisition officials in the entire federal government. Yet, in the SASC-approved NDAA, while we were able to expand these authorities to all geographic combatant commands within the Department of Defense, due to jurisdictional constraints, we were not able to expand these authorities to acquisition officials outside of the Department of Defense.

As General Joseph Dunford, the commander of all U.S. and coalition forces in Afghanistan, testified on April 16, 2013, it is essential that acquisition officials outside the Department of Defense possess the same authorities to quickly terminate contracts. In addition to endorsing our legislation, he testified that it will be "critical" that the State Department and USAID have the same authorities to cancel contracts as DoD so that we "don't contract with the enemy." He said that, "Expanding that [authority] to include non-DoD organizations makes a lot of sense."

In addition, the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) and the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) have endorsed our efforts to expand these authorities to all federal government acquisition officials operating overseas.

I look forward to working with members of both parties to strengthen current laws and regulations to make sure the federal government serves as a responsible steward of our tax dollars and to ensure our resources do not end up in the hands of our enemies.

Military Sexual Assault

The prevalence of sexual assaults occurring in the military represents a serious threat to the honor and dignity of our men and women who serve in uniform and to the readiness and cohesion of our units. The status quo is simply unacceptable, and I am pleased that this committee has so openly and passionately discussed how to best stop sexual assaults from occurring in our military. A real solution to this growing problem is past due.

I believe we have developed a strong and appropriate legislative response to aggressively combat this issue, including reforms to the legal framework under which these crimes are prosecuted and providing additional protections and resources to victims of these terrible crimes.

I am pleased that the bill incorporates several key provisions of S. 871, The Combating Military Sexual Assault Act, which I coauthored with Senator Patty Murray (D–WA) and which has more than 37 cosponsors. Our provisions, which were included in the SASC-approved bill, will provide sexual assault victims in all military branches with Special Victims' Counsel (SVC)—a trained military lawyer to guide a victim through the legal process. Air Force Chief of Staff General Mark Welsh testified before this committee that responses of victims in the Air Force's SVC pilot program have been "overwhelmingly positive." Furthermore, Chairman Martin Dempsey supports "providing victims of sexual assault this important resource." The defense bill includes our provisions that enhance responsibilities for the Pentagon's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office and provide Sexual Assault Response Coordinators to members of the National Guard and Reserve.

In addition, I was a cosponsor of Chairman Carl Levin's (D–MI) amendment, which modifies the disposition authority in cases of certain sex-related crimes. The Chairman's amendment provides for the review of a convening authority's (CA's) decision not to take charges of certain sexual offenses to trial by court-martial in all instances—both when a staff Judge Advocate General (JAG) recommends that such charges be taken to trial by court-martial and when a staff JAG recommends that such charges not be taken to trial by court-martial. In other words, a decision not to take charges of sexual offenses to trial by court-martial will always be reviewed by a higher authority, in some instances by the civilian Secretary of the military department concerned. Such involvement and oversight by higher authorities is appropriate given the severity of the sexual assault crisis in our military.

Further, Chairman Levin's amendment prohibits retaliation against a member of the Armed Forces for reporting a criminal offense, which is particularly important given that 62 percent of victims who have made reports of sexual offenses also report experiencing some form of retaliation for doing so. The amendment also expresses the Sense of the Senate that commanding officers are responsible for establishing a command climate in which a victim

should feel safe reporting a crime, and that failure to establish such an environment is an appropriate basis for relief from command positions. Senior officers should evaluate commanding officers based on their performance in establishing such a command climate.

We must tackle this problem from multiple fronts and change the culture of our military with respect to sexual assault. We must deter such behavior in the first place while simultaneously ensuring victim support in the event such a crime is committed. Our military leaders must translate zero tolerance rhetoric into zero tolerance policy and practice. I am hopeful that the significant changes to current law contained in this bill will empower victims to come forward to report crimes so that they can receive the care and justice they need and deserve. In addition to preventing such crimes and appropriately punishing those who commit them, we must focus on the victims and empower them with the care, resources, and confidence they need to overcome the mental and physical consequences of such a crime—crimes of power and control. We must help them to restore their own sense of power and control.

To be clear, Congress will not pass this year's defense bill, hope for the best, and then lose interest. Members of this committee are united in our determination to address the scourge of sexual assault in the military. We will continue to demand the best from our military leaders. We will continue to exercise the oversight that the American people demand. As the service chiefs testified before this committee, the chain of command is crucial to fixing this problem. Rest assured that we will hold them accountable, and we will continue to exercise aggressive oversight to ensure our men and women can serve in an environment free of sexual assault that allows them to focus on accomplishing their missions.

Attack Submarine Fleet

As anti-access/area denial threats to our forces grow, the Virginia Class submarine provides the U.S. military an essential capability. Yet, as Admiral Mark Ferguson testified on April 18, 2013, the Navy is only able to meet "about half" of combatant commander requests for attack submarines.

Ensuring our combatant commanders have a sufficient number of attack submarines will become even more important as U.S. strategic interests demand an increased focus on the maritime-dominated Asia Pacific region, as well as the Persian Gulf. As Los Angeles Class submarines reach the end of their service life, if we don't build enough Virginia Class submarines, the Navy's ability to meet combatant commander requirements for attack submarines will decline even further.

For these reasons, building on our work from last year, I am pleased that this bill authorizes and supports the administration's request to build two Virginia Class submarines in FY 2014. The construction of a second Virginia Class submarine next fiscal year, as well as moving forward on the Virginia Payload Module, will help ensure that U.S. naval supremacy—which serves as an essential guarantor of U.S. economic and national security interests—will continue well into the future.

MEADS: Ending the Missile to Nowhere

I am encouraged that the Committee adopted my provision to prohibit any spending in FY 2014 on the Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS).

Between FY 2004 and FY 2011, the U.S. spent almost $3 billion on MEADS. With $17 trillion in national debt, we cannot afford to spend another cent on a weapons system that DoD has no intention of procuring.

On March 23, 2013, during consideration of the budget resolution (S. Con. Res. 8), the Senate overwhelmingly approved (94 to 5) my amendment (S. AMDT. 136) aimed at scrapping money for MEADS in FY 2014. Echoing the clear position of the overwhelming majority of the Senate, in a letter to me on June 12, 2013, The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Frank Kendall reiterated that the "Department views the FY 2013 funds for the MEADS program as the final obligation" and that additional U.S. funding for MEADS is "not required and was not included in the President's FY 2014 Budget Submission." Secretary Kendall also confirmed that the "Department has no plan for or intention of requesting additional MEADS funding."

The prohibition in the SASC-approved NDAA makes clear that this Committee is opposed to any additional funding in FY 2014 for MEADS. At a time when Congress is struggling to provide the resources needed to maintain the readiness of our forces, as Secretary Kendall wrote in his letter to me, we must avoid "spending that is not needed."

Reducing Costly Pentagon Redundancy

I am pleased that the report language accompanying the SASC-approved NDAA includes my provisions related to duplication in ground radar programs and air-to-ground rocket and missile programs. Our nation's fiscal crisis and increasingly constrained defense budgets require that the Pentagon look for every opportunity to develop joint programs and reduce costs, while meeting valid service requirements. I look forward to reviewing closely the findings of the Comptroller General of the General Accountability Office in order to determine whether the Pentagon could consolidate requirements, reduce redundancy, develop joint programs, and save money in its ground radar and air-to-ground rocket and missile programs.

Sequestration: A Threat to Our Military Readiness

While the NDAA passed by the Committee seeks to maintain the readiness of our forces, I remain seriously concerned about the impact of sequestration and budget uncertainty on our military readiness.

I worry that some members of Congress think sequestration is acceptable or even desirable. We should be clear: at a time of enormous national security challenges in places such as North Korea, Iran, and Syria, sequestration represents an avoidable, irresponsible, and dangerous policy.

Friends and potential enemies alike are watching. We must do everything possible to retain the most powerful military in the world so that there will be no doubt that the United States is capa-

ble of protecting our interests and those of our allies. If we allow defense sequestration to continue, the deterrence of our potential enemies and assurance of our allies provided by our military readiness will deteriorate over time. The impacts of defense sequestration will eat away at our strategic depth and military capability—inviting aggressors to take greater risk, increasing the likelihood of conflict, and making Americans less safe.

For these reasons, as I have for over a year and a half, I stand ready to work with members of both parties to identify alternative spending reductions to end defense sequestration once and for all.

KELLY AYOTTE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. VITTER

The Committee's mark-up reflects the first major step in the FY14 National Defense Authorization Act process for the Department of Defense. The NDAA will next be considered by the full Senate and then conference with the House of Representatives. However, this bill as written, while it includes vital funding priorities, unfortunately ignores sequestration and the Budget Control Act, which means that many of these programs will face further unstructured cuts.

While it has been argued that there is hope of an agreement before the NDAA is considered by the full Senate or conference with the House of Representatives, I believe it is imperative to set appropriate authorization and serious levels that do not place significant funding priorities in limbo. The FY 2014 budget request for the Department of Defense comes at a very challenging time with a unique set of global threats; however, that does not substitute the need to comply with the current law or include real guidance for priority decisions.

Drafting measures that do not adhere to the Budget Control Act (BCA) and its sequester levels is tantamount to failure. The failure does not rest with the Senate or with the House; that failure is due to the Department of Defense and the Administration's inability to adequately prioritize and communicate those priorities. Previously, the Administration forced the Military Services to hold off on providing any clarity or reports on the impacts of sequester. Reports have surfaced[1] that the White House Office of Management and Budget had instructed three separate cabinet agencies that they were not allowed to talk about pending budget cuts unless they cleared their remarks first with the White House budget office. This led Senator Barbara Mikulski to state that the White House had placed its own cabinet agencies under a "gag order" and, ultimately, to the December 5, 2012 OMB decision to direct[2] the Pentagon to start sequestration planning. After eighteen months of requests by members of this committee and two separate legislative requirements, the White House finally released a report[3] in January 2013 on the harmful impacts of sequester, providing the detail requested only two to three weeks before sequester was set to hit.

Given that the DOD is preparing to drastically reduce its personnel size and restructure its forces over the next years, it is critical that it budget or identify where the Department is able to cut while maintaining its primary purpose: maintaining a ready and capable force prepared for defense of the nation. Allowing arguments that the budget must go beyond the BCA and sequester lev-

[1] http://www.politico.com/story/2013/02/cabinet-under-gag-order-on-sequester–87231.html
[2] http://www.defense.gov/news/newsarticle.aspx?id=118712
[3] http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/02/08/fact-sheet-examples-how-sequester-would-impact-middle-class-families-job

els due to mismanagement, overruns, and DOD shortfalls, would only continue the uncertainty and does nothing to solve the problem at hand.

Analysts largely agree that the DOD budget request was irrelevant because it did not factor in the BCA levels, did not contain an OCO Budget (numbers which we now know included huge shortfalls and continue to expand), and ignored the sequester even while it was delayed for a month to "account for sequester". Our military desperately needs leadership to put forth a defense budget that addresses the unprecedented challenges before us and the budget crisis here at home. Despite its stated need, the Defense Department is currently facing a hugely disproportionate amount of the cuts, and the President continues to submit a budget plan that will perpetuate increases in federal debt due to non-defense spending over the next ten years instead of trying to cut through non-defense. Our military men and women must not be the sole bearer of balancing our budget.

In fact, during the FY14 NDAA committee markup when Senator Inhofe tried to address the budget problem through an amendment that would have partially offset the sequester in a way previously accepted by the President during negotiations[4], Senator Levin did not allow him to bring up his proposal for debate during the markup process.

In my view, this signifies Administration and Senate majority leadership refusing to address the truth about our budget crisis. Unless President Obama, our Commander in Chief, provides the necessary leadership to protect the Defense Department from disproportionate cuts, there is a present and clear danger (from sequester, the law of the land) that the funding for this mark will be reduced. The current mode of operation in Washington appears to be to backload on defense plans and place the costs and shortfalls on future generations. That mentality is not something I can support.

DAVID VITTER.

[4] http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/factsheet/chained-cpi-protections

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MESSRS. INHOFE, SESSIONS, CHAMBLISS, WICKER, MS. AYOTTE, MRS. FISCHER, AND MESSRS. VITTER, BLUNT, AND CRUZ

Guantanamo Bay Detainees

The U.S. detention facility at Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, provides a secure location to detain and interrogate enemy combatants as well as prevent these detainees from returning to the battlefield. Holding these detainees at Guantanamo Bay has enabled the U.S. to gather intelligence which has prevented additional attacks on our country and assisted in tracking down other members of al Qaeda and associated terrorist organizations.

Unfortunately, this year's Senate Defense Authorization bill creates large loopholes which, if enacted, will result in the transfer of detainees to the shores of our country and permits the easier conveyance of detainees to foreign countries. Let there be no mistake, the bill's provisions are a fundamental shift from previous years' Defense Authorization Acts which ensured detainees would not be brought to the United States and would not be transferred to other countries unless reasonable conditions could be met. Accordingly, we will resolutely oppose the inclusion of these sections in the final Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act.

Previously, Congress had addressed this issue through legislative compromises which: prevented the transfer of detainees to the United States; blocked the construction or modification of facilities to house detainees in the United States; and required stringent certifications to be made before transferring detainees to foreign nations. These statutes were built upon a bipartisan consensus, consistent with public opinion, which was formed after years of congressional debate and were written to follow the rulings of the Supreme Court.

The previous legislation contrasts greatly from the provisions included in this year's Senate Defense Authorization bill. Specifically, the bill permits the transfer of detainees to the U.S. for trial and detention and to receive medical care, despite Guantanamo Bay's first rate medical care and facilities. In addition, due to the Administration's objections that the current certifications were too difficult to meet, the bill greatly reduces the thresholds required before a detainee can be transferred to a foreign country.

The proposal to transfer detainees to the U.S. for trial and detention does not take into account one of the primary reasons why the bipartisan consensus arose in the first place. Specifically, Congress and many Americans disagreed with the Administration's decision to try Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the September 11th attacks, and others in a federal courthouse located in New York City. This was reflected by the Senate's 54–41 vote in November 2012, which supported a permanent prohibition on the transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States. Why

then should the Senate so quickly reverse itself and enact legislation which permits the very thing so many of our citizens considered the wrong thing to do?

In addition, why should we reduce the thresholds for transferring detainees to foreign countries as called for in this year's Defense Authorization bill? According to a March 2013 report from the Director of National Intelligence, 28 percent of those detainees who have been released continue, or are suspected to have continued, to engage in terrorist activity against the U.S. or our allies. For example, after Said al Shihri was released from Guantanamo Bay, he became one of the senior leaders of al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula. Why then should we lower the standards? This is especially true since current law, specifically, Section 1028 of the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Act, requires strict but reasonable certifications before transferring detainees to foreign countries.

Adding to the perplexing nature of the bill's provisions is the fact that housing detainees in the U.S. will cost millions, perhaps hundreds of millions, more during this period of budget austerity and sequestration. As FBI Director Robert Mueller warned, these detainees cannot be placed in normal federal prisons since there is the very real possibility these individuals will recruit more terrorists from among the federal inmate population and attempt to continue al Qaeda operations. One must remember this is precisely how the individuals convicted in the 2009 plot to bomb a New York synagogue were radicalized.

The risk of bringing detainees to the United States contrasts sharply with the advantages of continuing the use of the detainee complexes at Guantanamo Bay. The facilities at Guantanamo Bay are in a secure location away from population centers. They provide the maximum security required to prevent escape and are composed of multiple levels of confinement based upon the detainee's compliance. In addition, the Expeditionary Legal Complex has recently been completed. This facility is a secure location to try detainees while enabling their access to defense counsel and also assists in preventing the compromise of classified material. The Complex will also permit greater coverage by the press of the legal proceedings.

The logic of continuing to utilize the established facilities at Guantanamo Bay also contrasts with the apparent lack of an in-depth, comprehensive plan by the Administration to address the enormous security, logistical, and legal issues which must be resolved before any detainee's transfer to the United States is even contemplated. In addition, the Administration's unwillingness to place new detainees in Guantanamo Bay has forced our armed forces to use makeshift detention facilities. For example, due to the Administration's reluctance to use Guantanamo Bay, Ahmed Abdulkadir Warsame was detained and interrogated on a U.S. Navy ship for two months. Clearly, what is required is a plan for the long-term, law of war detention outside of the United States for foreign members of al Qaeda and associated forces, as called for by Senator Ayotte, Senator Chambliss, and others.

Those of us who voted for the National Defense Authorization Act in Committee did so based on the agreement that we will have

an opportunity to address these major shortcomings in the bill when the full Senate considers the legislation. We look forward to doing so.

In conclusion, we are opposed to the provisions included in the Senate's version of the Defense Authorization bill which, if enacted, will permit the transfer of detainees to our country. Most disappointingly, this represents a fundamental departure from previous years' Defense Authorization Acts. Accordingly, we will seek legislative remedies to restore the statutes which will maintain the current law with respect to the transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees.

JAMES M. INHOFE.
JEFF SESSIONS.
SAXBY CHAMBLISS.
ROGER F. WICKER.
KELLY AYOTTE.
DEB FISCHER.
DAVID VITTER.
ROY BLUNT.
TED CRUZ.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MESSRS. INHOFE AND SESSIONS, MS. AYOTTE, MRS. FISCHER, AND MR. VITTER

Missile Defense

The Committee's direction to deploy an X-band radar, or comparable sensor, for the defense of the homeland against long-range ballistic missile threats is a good first step toward addressing the growing ICBM threat from Iran and, potentially, other countries. But it does not go far enough: we also need to proceed as soon as possible with the deployment of an additional interceptor site on the east coast to compensate for the loss of the planned third interceptor site in Poland.

The decision by the President not to proceed with development and deployment of the SM–3 block IIB missile in Poland means that the defense of the homeland against Iranian long-range ballistic missiles will not be as effective as originally intended. Missile defense planners in the Pentagon have long understood the advantages provided by an additional missile defense site (beyond those in Alaska and California) for a more effective defense against long range ballistic missile threats from the Middle East. The approach taken by the Bush Administration was to deploy 10 Ground-Based Interceptors (GBIs) in Poland. The Obama Administration opted, instead, for the development and deployment of some 24 SM–3 block IIB missiles in Poland. Both of these options would serve the similar purpose of defending Europe and the United States against intermediate to long-range Iranian ballistic missiles.

The Administration's rationale for the 15 March announcement to deploy an additional 14 GBIs in Alaska, beyond the current 30, is "to stay ahead of the long-range ballistic missile threat posed by North Korea and Iran."[5] According to DoD, the North Korean threat is growing faster than anticipated: North Korea conducted its third nuclear test in February, has displayed road-mobile ICBMs, and has demonstrated long-range missile technology through its launch of the Taepo Dong-2 rocket, which put a satellite in orbit.

A DoD Fact Sheet notes similar developments in Iran: "Iran also continues to advance its space-launch and longer-range ballistic missile capabilities. Iran has used a space-launch vehicle, the Safir-2, to place a satellite in orbit, demonstrating some of the key technologies required for ICBM development." Likewise, General Jacoby, the Commander of U.S. Northern Command, recently told Congress that "we should consider that Iran has a capability within the next few years of flight testing ICBM capable technologies[6];"

[5] DoD Fact Sheet, "Strengthening Homeland Missile Defense," March 15, 2013.
[6] SASC Hearing, March 19, 2013

and that "the Iranians are intent on developing an ICBM.[7]" Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified before this committee on April 18th, that "The Iranians are pursuing development of two systems that potentially could have intercontinental capability . . . The belief is about the first time they'd be ready to do that would be as early as 2015."[8]

If the rationale for beefing up our defenses against North Korea is based on that nation's nuclear ambitions coupled with advances in long-range missile technology (derived from the ability to launch satellites), then this similarly argues for strengthening our defenses against Iran—a country that also has demonstrated a space launch capability and appears to be nearing a nuclear weapons capability.

Increasing the numbers of Ground Based Interceptors in Alaska, as the administration proposes, while sound, is not sufficient. There are inherent limitations of the Alaska and California sites. U.S. Strategic Command head, General Robert Kehler, told Congress that "I am confident that we can defend against a limited attack from Iran, although we are not in the most optimum posture to do that today doesn't provide total defense today."[9] General Jacoby affirmed this when he told Congress: We have the capability of limited defense right now. And I think that it's not optimum and I think that we've made some important steps forward in what was rolled out. And I think we need to continue to assess the threat and make sure we stay ahead of it."[10]

An additional homeland missile defense site on the East Coast would raise the probability of successfully engaging Iranian threats and preserve GBI inventory in Alaska for North Korean threats. A study conducted by the National Research Council of the National Academies explains:

> "While it is kinematically possible to defend the eastern part of the continental United States (CONUS) against threat ICBMs from the Middle East using GBI sites at Fort Greely and Vandenberg, AFB, an additional GBI site located in northeastern CONUS would be much more effective and reliable and would allow considerably more battle space and firing doctrine options."[11]

General Jacoby explained this to Congress in similar terms:

> "What a third site gives me, whether it's on the East Coast or an alternate location, would be increased battle space; that means increased opportunity for me to engage threats from either Iran or North Korea."[12]
>
> "I would agree that a third site, wherever the decision is to build a third site, would give me better weapons access, increased GBI inventory and allow us the battle

[7] HASC Hearing, March 20, 2013
[8] SASC Hearing, April 18, 2013
[9] SASC Hearing, March 12, 2013
[10] SASC Hearing , March 19, 2013
[11] National Research Council, "Making Sense of Ballistic Missile Defense," Washington, D.C., 2012, p.85.
[12] SASC Hearing, March 19, 2013

space to more optimize our defense against future threats from Iran and North Korea."[13]

Though acknowledging the potential advantages provided by an East Coast site, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Dr. James Miller, told Congressional staff in March that the additional 14 GBIs in Alaska could compensate for the termination of the SM–3 Block IIB missile ("which was designed to provide a first shot at any Iranian missile that could be coming towards the United States."[14]). However, as noted by Generals Jacoby and Kehler (and by the National Research Council), this approach is not optimal. Rather than defend the United States only from Alaska, an east coast missile defense site would increase the probability of successfully engaging an Iranian threat by providing increased battle space, multiple shot opportunities, and different angles of attack, supported by different sensors. Moreover, if those additional 14 missiles are needed to defend against a growing threat from North Korea, which is the Administration's rationale for deploying them,[15] those weapons may not be available in a scenario where the U.S. is threatened simultaneously by Iran and North Korea.

Regarding the cost of an east coast missile defense site, it is hard for the administration to argue it can't afford an east coast site when the budget of the Missile Defense Agency has seen drastic cuts over the past few years. The President's 5-year spending plan for MDA for FY2012–2016 amounted to $43.5 billion; for the five year plan from FY 2014–2018, that amount declined by $5.9 billion to $37.6 billion. Moreover, the cancelation of the SM–3 block IIB missile and the Precision Tracking Space System by the President means that MDA avoids some $3.5 billion in spending over the next five years. Had those savings been returned to the Missile Defense Agency, there would have been ample funding for an East Coast site.

The administration is conducting environmental impact studies for three potential locations, as directed by the FY 2013 NDAA (due by December 31, 2013). The provision (Sec. 227) also requires the MDA to develop a contingency plan in case the president determines to proceed with such an additional deployment.

While these studies will determine the optimal location for an additional homeland missile defense site, we need not await this analysis before determining whether such a deployment is in the interests of the United States.

There remains a presidentially directed requirement for a missile defense site—beyond the sites in Alaska and California—explicitly for the defense of the homeland. With the cancelation of the SM–3 block IIB missile (intended for Poland), that requirement remains unmet. An east coast missile defense site can meet that need and should proceed as expeditiously as possible.

An east coast missile defense site would provide important additional protection against an Iranian ICBM inbound for the east

[13] HASC Hearing, March 20, 2013

[14] Words of General Jacoby, HASC hearing, March 20, 2013)

[15] DoD Spokesman said on March 26, 2013: "The decision to place additional ground-based interceptors in Alaska is really in large measure to growing North Korean threats and the development of their own missile programs. It's very clear." U.S. Takes N. Korea Threats very seriously," AFP, March 26, 2013.

coast of the United States that the U.S. currently does not have and that 14 additional ground based interceptors in Alaska will not provide.

If we start today, there will be a 3–4 year gap between the potential emergence of this Iranian capability and our ability to have this needed additional protection.

We do not need more delay. The intercontinental ballistic missile threat from Iran is emerging quickly, and the protection of the east coast of the United States against this threat must be improved. If we fail to move ahead with an east coast missile defense site expeditiously, we are placing the nation at more risk than can be justified.

JAMES M. INHOFE.
JEFF SESSIONS.
KELLY AYOTTE.
DEB FISCHER.
DAVID VITTER.

○