AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

114TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
114–102

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1735

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 5, 2015.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

114TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
114–102

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 1735

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 5, 2015.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

94–373 WASHINGTON : 2015

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LOBIONDO, New Jersey
ROB BISHOP, Utah
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN FLEMING, Louisiana
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
MO BROOKS, Alabama
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida
PAUL COOK, California
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana
BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama
SAM GRAVES, Missouri
RYAN K. ZINKE, Montana
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona
STEPHEN KNIGHT, California
THOMAS MACARTHUR, New Jersey
STEVE RUSSELL, Oklahoma

ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
JOHN GARAMENDI, California
HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
JACKIE SPEIER, California
JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
SCOTT H. PETERS, California
MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
TIMOTHY J. WALZ, Minnesota
BETO O'ROURKE, Texas
DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey
RUBEN GALLEGO, Arizona
MARK TAKAI, Hawaii
GWEN GRAHAM, Florida
BRAD ASHFORD, Nebraska
SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts
PETE AGUILAR, California

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the Legislation	1
Rationale for the Committee Bill	2
Hearings	8
Committee Position	8
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	8
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	8
Summary of Discretionary Authorizations in the Bill	8
Budget Authority Implication	9
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	9
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	9
OVERVIEW	9
Aircraft Procurement, Army	9
Overview	9
Items of Special Interest	10
AH–64 Apache helicopter multi-year production contract	10
Armed aerial scout rotorcraft	10
Army UH–60A to UH–60L conversions for the National Guard	10
Improved MQ–1C Gray Eagle modifications	11
Missile Procurement, Army	11
Overview	11
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	11
Overview	11
Items of Special Interest	12
Bradley Fighting Vehicles	12
Combat vehicle industrial base management	12
Hercules recovery vehicle	14
M1 Abrams Tank Fleet Configuration	14
M240 production and industrial base sustainment	15
Modular Handgun System	15
Small arms production industrial base	16
Stryker lethality upgrades	16
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	17
Overview	17
Items of Special Interest	17
Cost assessment of decommissioning lead-based ammunition and associated components	17
Joint Hydra 70 guided rocket acquisition strategy	18
M3 Multi-role Anti-Armor Anti-tank Weapon System	18
Small caliber ammunition industrial base	19
Other Procurement, Army	19
Overview	19
Items of Special Interest	19
Army radio modernization	19
Civil Support Team Information Management System	20
Mine resistant ambush protected family of vehicles enduring requirement	20
Personal protective equipment modernization and industrial base sustainment	21
Rough Terrain Container Handler recapitalization	22
U.S. Army Europe garrison communications	22
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	22
Overview	22
Items of Special Interest	23

Page
Airborne electronic attack low band transmitter consolidation 23
MH–60R and MH–60S service life extension plans 23
MQ–8 Fire Scout 23
Reporting of the April 8, 2000, MV–22 mishap at Marana, Arizona 24
V–22 for carrier on-board delivery 24
V–22 medical evacuation capability 25
Weapons Procurement, Navy 25
Overview 25
Items of Special Interest 25
Joint Standoff Weapon sustainment 25
Tomahawk Block IV 26
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps 27
Overview 27
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy 27
Overview 27
Items of Special Interest 27
Advance procurement for Afloat Forward Staging Base 27
Air and Missile Defense Radar Testing Evaluation 27
Amphibious ship construction 28
Coast Guard polar icebreaker 28
Joint High Speed Vessel Build Specification 29
National Defense Sealift Fund 29
Naval electric weapons systems fielding plan 30
Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine replacement 30
Shipbuilding and industrial base 31
USS John F. Kennedy two-phase acquisition strategy 31
Virginia Payload Module 32
Other Procurement, Navy 32
Overview 32
Items of Special Interest 32
Aegis Refurbishment and Ship Modernization 32
Air and Missile Defense Radar 33
Destroyer modernization 34
Littoral Combat Ship simulation training 34
Radar Obsolescence and Availability Recovery Upgrades 34
Procurement, Marine Corps 35
Overview 35
Items of Special Interest 35
Garrison Mobile Engineering Equipment 35
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 35
Overview 35
Items of Special Interest 36
A–10 aircraft 36
Air National Guard Wildfire Assistance 36
Air Refueling Recapitalization Strategy 37
Battlefield airborne communications node 37
C–130 modernization plan 37
C–130H Modernization 38
EC–130H Compass Call aircraft 39
F–15 and F–16 spare engine shortfall 39
F–16 block 40/50 mission training center 40
F–35 aircraft program 40
Joint surveillance and target attack system sustainment report 42
KC–10 42
KC–46A quarterly report 42
RQ–4 and U–2 high-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities 43
UH–1N replacement program 43
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force 44
Overview 44
Missile Procurement, Air Force 44
Overview 44
Other Procurement, Air Force 44
Overview 44
Items of Special Interest 44
Air Force Fire Emergency Services and Personal Protective Equipment 44

Page
Civil engineers construction, surveying, and mapping equipment 45
Procurement, Defense-Wide 45
Overview 45
Items of Special Interest 45
Procurement of Standard Missile-3 block IB interceptors 45
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 46
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 46
Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations 46
Subtitle B—Army Programs 46
Section 111—Limitation on Availability of Funds for AN/TPQ–53 Radar Systems 46
Section 112—Prioritization of Upgraded UH–60 Blackhawk Helicopters within Army National Guard 46
Section 113—Report on Options to Accelerate Replacement of UH–60A Blackhawk Helicopters of Army National Guard 46
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 47
Section 121—Modification to Multiyear Procurement Authority for Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers and Associated Systems 47
Section 122—Procurement Authority for Aircraft Carrier Programs 47
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 47
Section 131—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Executive Communications Upgrades for C–20 and C–37 Aircraft 47
Section 132—Backup Inventory Status of A–10 Aircraft 47
Section 133—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Retirement of A–10 Aircraft 48
Section 134—Prohibition on Retirement of EC–130H Aircraft 48
Section 135—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment or Transfer of KC–10 Aircraft 48
Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters 48
Section 141—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Joint Battle Command-Platform 48
Section 142—Strategy for Replacement of A/MH–6 Mission Enhanced Little Bird Aircraft to Meet Special Operations Requirements 49
Section 143—Independent Assessment of United States Combat Logistic Force Requirements 49
Section 144—Report on Use of Different Types of Enhanced 5.56mm Ammunition by the Army and the Marine Corps 49
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 50
OVERVIEW 50
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army 50
Overview 50
Items of Special Interest 50
Acoustic mixing technology for energetic materials 50
Active protection system 51
Advanced tactical shelters 51
Army airborne networking radios 52
Army Energy Efficiency Research and Development Programs 52
Army Warfighting Assessment and network experimentation activities 52
Ballistic Resistant Adaptive Seating System 53
Composite barrel technology development 53
Detection and threat identification technologies 54
Fuel system survivability technology and standards 54
Geo-Enabled Mission Command Enterprise 55
High-resolution 3–D topographic terrain data supporting tactical operations 55
Human performance research 56
Improved Turbine Engine Program 56
Indirect Fire Protection Capability 56
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Analysis Tool 57
Land-Based Anti-Ship Missile Program 57
Lethal Miniature Aerial Munition System 58
Lithium ion super-capacitors 58
Material development, characterization, and computational modeling 58
Medical evaluation of anthropomorphic data on vehicle blast testing .. 59
Mobile camouflage systems development 59
Next-Generation signature management system 59

Page

Pacific Theater High Performance Computing Capabilities 59
Rotorcraft Degraded Visual Environment 60
Simplified Army Radio Network 60
Situational Awareness Prototype Constellation for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction 61
Soldier Enhancement Program 61
Soldier Protection System and weight reduction technology 62
Technology for countering enemy unmanned aerial systems 62
Ultra-light combat tactical vehicle test and evaluation 62
Vehicle occupant protection technology development 63
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy 63
Overview 63
Items of Special Interest 64
Advanced Low Cost Munitions Ordnance 64
Anti-Submarine Warfare Continuous Trail Unmanned Vessel 64
Anti-surface warfare missile capability for Littoral Combat Ship 64
Automated Test and Retest 65
Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range 66
Continuation of Brimstone missile assessment 66
F414 Engine Noise Reduction Research and Development 67
Five-inch precision guided projectile development for naval surface fire support 67
Fully homomorphic encryption 68
National Sea Based Deterrence Fund 68
Navy communications experimentation 69
Requirements maturation and developmental planning 69
Service life extension program for Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research 69
Spectral Warrior 70
Tactical Combat Training System program 70
Unmanned carrier aviation 71
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force 72
Overview 72
Items of Special Interest 72
Adaptive engine transition program 72
Advanced manufacturing for low-cost sustainment 73
Advanced pilot training family of systems 73
Air Force Minority Leaders Program 73
Airborne sensor data correlation 74
B–52 radar modernization program 74
Conformal phased array antennas 75
Digital polarimetric radar development 75
Experimentation program 75
F–16 active electronically scanned array radar upgrade 75
F–35 dual-capable aircraft development program 76
Fifth generation tactical data link enterprise 76
KC–135 auto throttles 77
KC–46 aerial refueling tanker aircraft program 77
Long-range strike bomber 77
Long-range strike bomber program 78
Next Generation Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System Electro-Optical, Infrared Sensor Capability 78
Next Generation Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System operational concepts 79
Technology transfer 79
Three-Dimensional Expeditionary Long-Range Radar 80
Wide area surveillance 80
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide 81
Overview 81
Items of Special Interest 81
Advanced semiconductor platform 81
Assessment of the directed energy industrial base 81
Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office 82
Comptroller General review of advanced semiconductors and microelectronics 83
Comptroller General review of technology transition efforts of the Department of Defense 83

Page

Computational Research and Engineering Acquisition Tools and Environment ... 84
Corrosion control and prevention ... 85
Department of Defense infectious disease research and development ... 85
Electronic Warfare Executive Committee ... 86
Enhancing situation awareness for military aircraft ... 86
High Power Directed Energy research ... 86
Language Translation Technology ... 87
Multiple-Object Kill Vehicle ... 87
Report on the Special Operations Command Development of Directed Energy ... 87
Research and development work with biosafety facilities ... 88
Ribonucleic acid technology research ... 88
Simulation training for emerging health threats ... 89
Special Operations Forces Combat Diving Program ... 89
Strategic Capabilities Office transitions of technology ... 89
Technology supporting information operations and strategic communications ... 90
U.S. Special Operations Command Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar program for MC–130J aircraft ... 91
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense ... 92
Overview ... 92
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 92
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ... 92
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations ... 92
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations ... 92
Section 211—Extension of Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program ... 92
Section 212—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Medical Countermeasures Program ... 92
Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for F–15 Infrared Search and Track Capability Development ... 93
Section 214—Independent Assessment of F135 Engine Program ... 93
Subtitle C—Other Matters ... 94
Section 221—Expansion of Education Partnerships To Support Technology Transfer and Transition ... 94
Section 222—Strategies for Engagement with Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority-Serving Institutions of Higher Education ... 94
Section 223—Plan for Advanced Weapons Technology War Games ... 94
Section 224—Comptroller General Review of Autonomic Logistics Information System for F–35 Lightening II Aircraft ... 95
Section 225—Briefing on Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program 96
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE ... 96
OVERVIEW ... 96
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 97
Budget Request Adjustments ... 97
Air Force Remotely Piloted Aircraft Training and Operations ... 97
Base Realignment and Closure 2017 ... 98
Energy Issues ... 98
Analysis for Additional Uses of Energy Savings Performance Contracts 98
Briefing on Energy Performance Initiatives ... 99
Briefing on Military Installation Readiness ... 99
Collaboration on Operational Energy ... 100
Progress and Savings from Net Zero Installation Initiatives ... 100
Tubular Light-Emitting Diode Technology ... 101
Logistics and Sustainment Issues ... 101
Auxiliary Personnel Lighter Barracks Ships ... 101
Combat Footwear for Female Service Members ... 102
Continuous Technology Refreshment ... 102
Decision Analysis Using Readiness Cost Analysis Tool ... 103
Defense Personal Property System ... 103
Defense Supply Single Point of Failure Assessment ... 104
Department of Defense Corrosion Control Efforts ... 104
Depot Maintenance Capability ... 105
Humidity-Controlled Shelters and Temporary Buildings ... 105
Laser Ablation of Coatings ... 106

Page

Marine Corps Systems Command Engineering Support 106
Planning for Critical Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment Innovation 107
Report on Asset Tracking 107
Service Life Extension of Emergency Vehicles 108
Readiness Issues 108
Advanced Foreign Language Proficiency Training Systems 108
Air Combat Training Range Upgrades 108
Analysis of Continuous Bomber Presence on Guam 109
Army Explosive Ordnance Disposal 109
Aviation Support to the Joint Readiness Training Center 110
Comptroller General Assessment of Army and Air Force Training Requirements 110
Comptroller General Assessment of Plans to Rebuild Readiness 111
Initial Flight Training 112
Marine Corps Search and Rescue 113
Optimizing National Guard Training 113
Performance and Effectiveness of Department of Defense's Joint Exercise Program 114
Review of the Navy's Optimized Fleet Response Plan 114
Synthetic Training for Small Arms Weapons Skills and Combat Readiness 115
U.S. Army Pacific Pathways Program 116
Use of Service Contracts for Simulated Training and Associated Equipment 117
Uses of Modeling and Simulation 117
Other Matters 117
Arctic Investments and Capabilities 117
Briefing on Retirement and Storage of Air Force One (VC–25) 118
Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle 118
Deep Water Unexploded Ordnance 119
Flame Retardant Military Uniform Safety 119
United States Special Operations Command Global Inform and Influence Activities 119
Weather and Geographic Impacts on Aerospace Control Alert Missions . 120
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 120
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 120
Section 301—Authorization of Appropriations 120
Subtitle B—Energy and Environment 120
Section 311—Limitation on Procurement of Drop-In Fuels 120
Section 312—Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas 120
Section 313—Revision to Scope of Statutorily Required Review of Projects Relating to Potential Obstructions to Aviation so as to Apply Only to Energy Projects 121
Section 314—Exclusions from Definition of "Chemical Substance" under Toxic Substances Control Act 121
Section 315—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement 121
Section 316—Limitation on Plan, Design, Refurbishing, or Construction of Biofuels Refineries 121
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment 121
Section 321—Assignment of Certain New Requirements Based on Determinations of Cost-Efficiency 121
Section 322—Inclusion in Annual Technology and Industrial Capability Assessments of a Determination about Defense Acquisition Program Requirements 121
Section 323—Amendment to Limitation on Authority to Enter into a Contract for the Sustainment, Maintenance, Repair, or Other Overhaul of the F117 Engine 122
Section 324—Pilot Programs for Availability of Working-Capital Funds for Product Improvements 122
Section 325—Report on Equipment Purchased from Foreign Entities that Could be Manufactured in United States Arsenals or Depots 122
Subtitle D—Other Matters 122
Section 333—Improvements to Department of Defense Excess Property Disposal 122
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 123

Page

OVERVIEW 123
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 124
Subtitle A—Active Forces 124
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 124
Section 402—Revisions in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels 124
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 124
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 124
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 125
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 125
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2016 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians 126
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support 126
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 126
Section 421—Military Personnel 126
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 127
OVERVIEW 127
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 127
Air Force Remotely Piloted Aircraft Manning Issues 127
Alcohol Abuse Prevention Programs 128
Assistance to Local Education Agencies 128
Commissary Transportation Costs 128
Comptroller General Report on Nutrition Assistance for Active Duty Service Members and Their Families 129
Comptroller General Review of the Federal Voting Assistance Program 129
DACA Impact on Military Readiness 130
Diversity in Department of Defense Advertising 130
Improvements to the Transition Assistance Program 130
Increasing Diversity in Military Academies 131
Inspector General Report on Separation of Members who Made a Sexual Assault Report 131
Installation Access for Regular College Student Counseling 131
National Military Dependent Student Identifier 132
O–6 Command Selection Board Processes 132
Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces 133
Recognizing the Value of the Military Commissary Benefit 133
Religious Accommodations in the Armed Forces 134
Report on Female Muslim Garb Policy 134
Report on Performance and Efficiency of Incorporation of Community-based Transition Programs in the Department of Defense Transition Assistance Program 135
Report on Prisoner of War and Missing in Action Declassification Procedures 135
Rulemaking Under the Military Lending Act 135
Support Ongoing Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps Programs and Encourage Existing Participation 136
The Reverent Treatment of Remains 137
Timely Access to Child Care on Military Installations 137
Tracking for Non-Disability Mental Conditions 137
Transfer of Post-9/11 GI Bill Education Benefits 138
U.S. Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force and Families Program 138
United States Government Accountability Office Study on Gambling and Problem Gambling in the Armed Forces 139
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 140
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 140
Section 501—Equitable Treatment of Junior Officers Excluded from an All-Fully-Qualified-Officers List Because of Administrative Error . 140
Section 502—Authority to Defer Until Age 68 Mandatory Retirement for Age of a General or Flag Officer Serving as Chief or Deputy Chief of Chaplains of the Army, Navy, or Air Force 140
Section 503—Implementation of Comptroller General Recommendation on the Definition and Availability of Costs Associated with General and Flag Officers and their Aides 140

Page

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 140
Section 511—Clarification of Purpose of Reserve Component Special Selection Boards as Limited to Correction of Error at a Mandatory Promotion Board 140
Section 512—Ready Reserve Continuous Screening Regarding Key Positions Disqualifying Federal Officials from Continued Service in the Ready Reserve 141
Section 513—Exemption of Military Technicians (Dual Status) from Civilian Employee Furloughs 141
Section 514—Annual Report on Personnel, Training, and Equipment Requirements for the Non-Federalized National Guard to Support Civilian Authorities in the Prevention and Response to Non-Catastrophic Domestic Disasters 141
Section 515—National Guard Civil and Defense Support Activities and Related Matters 141
Subtitle C—Consolidation of Authorities to Order Members of Reserve Components to Perform Duty 141
Section 521—Administration of Reserve Duty 141
Section 522—Reserve Duty Authorities 141
Section 523—Purpose of Reserve Duty 142
Section 524—Training and Other Duty Performed by Members of the National Guard 142
Section 525—Conforming and Clerical Amendments 142
Section 526—Effective Date and Implementation 142
Subtitle D—General Service Authorities 142
Section 531—Temporary Authority to Develop and Provide Additional Recruitment Incentives 142
Section 532—Expansion of Authority to Conduct Pilot Programs on Career Flexibility to Enhance Retention of Members of the Armed Forces 143
Section 533—Modification of Notice and Wait Requirements for Change in Ground Combat Exclusion Policy for Female Members of the Armed Forces 143
Section 534—Role of Secretary of Defense in Development of Gender-Neutral Occupational Standards 143
Section 535—Burdens of Proof Applicable to Investigations and Reviews Related to Protected Communications of Members of the Armed Forces and Prohibited Retaliatory Actions 143
Section 536—Revision of Name on Military Service Record to Reflect Change in Gender Identity After Separation from the Armed Forces .. 143
Section 537—Establishment of Breastfeeding Policy for the Department of the Army 144
Section 538—Sense of the House of Representatives Regarding Secretary of Defense Review of Section 504 of Title 10, United States Code, Regarding Enlisting Certain Aliens in the Armed Forces 144
Subtitle E—Military Justice, Including Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Prevention and Response 144
Section 541—Improvements to Special Victims' Counsel Program 144
Section 542—Department of Defense Civilian Employee Access to Special Victims' Counsel 144
Section 543—Access to Special Victims' Counsel for Former Dependents of Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces 144
Section 544—Representation and Assistance from Special Victims' Counsel in Retaliatory Proceedings 144
Section 545—Timely Notification to Victims of Sex-related Offenses of the Availability of Assistance from Special Victims' Counsel 145
Section 546—Participation by Victim in Punitive Proceedings and Access to Records 145
Section 547—Victim Access to Report of Results of Preliminary Hearing under Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice 145
Section 548—Minimum Confinement Period Required for Conviction of Certain Sex-Related Offenses Committed by Members of the Armed Forces 145
Section 549—Strategy to Prevent Retaliation Against Members of the Armed Forces Who Report or Intervene on Behalf of the Victim in Instances of Sexual Assault 145

Page

Section 550—Improved Department of Defense Prevention and Response to Sexual Assaults in which the Victim is a Male Member of the Armed Forces 145
Section 551—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Training for Administrators and Instructors of the Junior and Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps 146
Section 552—Modification of Manual for Courts-Martial to Require Consistent Preparation of the Full Record of Trial 146
Section 553—Inclusion of Additional Information in Annual Reports Regarding Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response 146
Section 554—Retention of Case Notes in Investigations of Sex-Related Offenses Involving Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps 146
Section 555—Additional Guidance Regarding Release of Mental Health Records of Department of Defense Medical Treatment Facilities in Cases Involving any Sex-related Offense 146
Section 556—Public Availability of Records of Certain Proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice 146
Section 557—Revision of Department of Defense Directive-Type Memorandum 15–003, Relating to Registered Sex Offender Identification, Notification, and Monitoring in the Department of Defense 147
Section 558—Improved Implementation of Changes to Uniform Code of Military Justice 147
Subtitle F—Member Education, Training, and Transition 147
Section 561—Availability of Preseparation Counseling for Members of the Armed Forces Discharged or Released After Limited Active Duty 147
Section 562—Availability of Additional Training Opportunities under Transition Assistance Program 147
Section 563—Enhancements to Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program .. 147
Section 564—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by Delegates in Congress from the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 147
Section 565—Recognition of Additional Involuntary Mobilization Duty Authorities Exempt from Five-Year Limit on Reemployment Rights of Persons who Serve in the Uniformed Services 148
Section 566—Job Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee 148
Section 567—Direct Employment Pilot Program for Members of the National Guard and Reserve 148
Section 568—Program Regarding Civilian Credentialing for Skills Required for Certain Military Occupational Specialties 148
Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters 148
Section 571—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 148
Section 572—Extension of Authority to Conduct Family Support Programs for Immediate Family Members of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Special Operations Forces 148
Section 573—Support for Efforts to Improve Academic Achievement and Transition of Military Dependent Students 149
Section 574—Study Regarding Feasibility of Using DEERS to Track Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees Who are Elementary or Secondary Education Students 149
Section 575—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces Attending Specialized Camps 149
Subtitle H—Decorations and Awards 149
Section 581—Authorization for Award of the Distinguished-Service Cross for Acts of Extraordinary Heroism During the Korean War 149
Section 582—Limitation on Authority of Secretaries of the Military Departments Regarding Revocation of Combat Valor Awards 149
Section 583—Award of Purple Heart to Members of the Armed Forces who were Victims of the Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Bombing 149
Subtitle I—Reports and Other Matters 150

Page

Section 591—Authority for United States Air Force Institute of Technology to Charge and Retain Tuition for Instruction of Persons Other Than Air Force Personnel Detailed for Instruction at the Institute 150
Section 592—Honoring Certain Members of the Reserve Components as Veterans 150
Section 593—Support for Designation of 2015 as the Year of the Military Diver 150
Section 594—Transfer and Adoption of Military Animals 150
Section 595—Coordination with Non-Government Suicide Prevention Organizations and Agencies to Assist in Reducing Suicides 150
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 151
OVERVIEW 151
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 151
Military Allotment Prohibition Briefing to Congress 151
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 152
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 152
Section 601—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances 152
Section 602—Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reductions Based on the Duration of Temporary Duty Assignment or Civilian Travel 152
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 152
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 152
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals 153
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers 153
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities 153
Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays 153
Section 616—Increase in Maximum Annual Amount of Nuclear Officer Bonus Pay 153
Section 617—Modification to Special Aviation Incentive Pay and Bonus Authorities for Officers 154
Section 618—Repeal of Obsolete Special Travel and Transportation Allowance for Survivors of Deceased Members of the Armed Forces from the Vietnam Conflict 154
Subtitle C—Modernization of Military Retirement System 154
Section 631—Full Participation for Members of the Uniformed Services in Thrift Savings Plan 154
Section 632—Modernized Retirement System for Members of the Uniformed Services 154
Section 633—Continuation Pay for Full TSP Members with 12 Years of Service 155
Section 634—Effective Date and Implementation 155
Subtitle D—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations 155
Section 641—Preserving Assured Commissary Supply to Asia and the Pacific 155
Section 642—Prohibition on Replacement or Consolidation of Defense Commissary and Exchange Systems Pending Submission of Required Report on Defense Commissary System 155
Subtitle E—Other Matters 155
Section 651—Improvement of Financial Literacy and Preparedness of Members of the Armed Forces 155
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 156
OVERVIEW 156
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 156
Access to Mental Health Care 156
Alcohol Prevention and Monitoring Programs 157
Compound Drug Prescriptions 157
Comptroller General Report on Army Warrior Transition Units 157
Dietary Guidelines for Military Nutrition Programs 158
Direct Hire Authority for Critical Health Care Occupational Shortages 158
Medical Readiness 159

Page

Meeting the Needs of Female Service Member Amputees 159
Military Doctors of Podiatric Medicine 159
Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder 160
Screening, Prevention and Treatment of Hepatitis A, B and C 160
Status and Impacts of Reductions in TRICARE Prime Service Areas 160
Study and Report on the Use of Equine Therapy 161
Transport Telemedicine 161
Trauma Care 162
Wounded Warrior Recovery Care Coordination 162
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 163
Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits 163
Section 701—Joint Uniform Formulary for Transition of Care 163
Section 702—Access to Broad Range of Methods of Contraception Approved by the Food and Drug Administration for Members of the Armed Forces and Military Dependents at Military Treatment Facilities 163
Section 703—Access to Contraceptive Method for Duration of Deployment 163
Section 704—Access to Infertility Treatment for Members of the Armed Forces and Dependents 163
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration 164
Section 711—Unified Medical Command 164
Section 712—Licensure of Mental Health Professionals in TRICARE Program 164
Section 713—Reports on Proposed Realignments of Military Medical Treatment Facilities 164
Section 714—Pilot Program for Operation of Network of Retail Pharmacies Under TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program 164
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters 165
Section 721—Extension of Authority for DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund 165
Section 722—Extension of Authority for Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund 165
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 165
OVERVIEW 165
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 168
Additions to the Department of Defense's Small Business Policy Website 168
Contracting Activities to Employ Disabled Persons 168
Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund 168
Department Management of Unobligated Funds 169
Department of Defense Oversight of Non-Major Defense Acquisition Programs 170
Education and Training Related to Commercial Item Procurements 171
Education and Training Related to Setting of Requirements 171
Education and Training Related to the Conduct of Market Research 172
Enabling Systemic Review of Acquisition Laws and Regulations by Establishing Sunset Dates for Acquisition Statutes 172
Ethics Awareness and Training 173
Exchanges with Industry 174
Foreign Military Sales Procedural Improvements 174
Impact of Rescinded Solicitations on Efficiency and Innovation 175
Importance of the North American Defense Industrial Base 175
Improvements in Accountability for Contracted Services Spending 176
Improving the Acquisition of Contracted Services 176
Improving the Efficiency of the Defense Contract Audit Agency 177
Improving the Financial Auditability of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service 178
Improving the Goals and Metrics for Contracted Services 179
Improving the Requirements Development for and Acquisition of Contracted Services 179
Improving Transparency of Defense Contracted Services Budget Information 180
Increased Transparency in Non-Appropriated Fund Contracting 181

Page

Inspector General Review of Requirements for Senior Department of Defense Officials Seeking Employment with Defense Contractors 182
Joint Exercises in Operational Contract Support 182
Mentor-Protege Program 183
Operational Test and Evaluation Processes and Activities of the Department of Defense 183
Report on the Effect of Delays in First-Article Testing 184
Requirements Process 184
Secretary of Defense Review of Implementing Guidance and Regulation 185
Shared Savings through Value Engineering 185
Small Business Implications of the Department of Defense Use of OASIS Contract Vehicle 186
Strategic Minerals Domestic Production Research 186
Streamlining Acquisition Reviews by Reducing Unnecessary Documentation 187
Study and Report Related to Mandates regarding Suitability for Selection as a Senior Official in the Acquisition Workforce 188
Tracking of Contractor Personnel During Contingencies 188
Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics Assessment of the Value, Feasibility, and Cost of Greater Utilization of HALT/HASS Testing 188
Use of Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable Source Selection Processes 189
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 190
Section 800—Sense of Congress on the Desired Tenets of the Defense Acquisition System 190
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management 190
Section 801—Report on Linking and Streamlining Requirements, Acquisition, and Budget Processes within Armed Forces 190
Section 802—Required Review of Acquisition-related Functions of the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces 191
Section 803—Independent Study of Matters Related to Bid Protests 191
Section 804—Procurement of Commercial Items 192
Section 805—Modification to Information Required to be Submitted by Offeror in Procurement of Major Weapon Systems as Commercial Items 192
Section 806—Amendment Relating to Multiyear Contract Authority for Acquisition of Property 192
Section 807—Compliance with Inventory of Contracts for Services 193
Subtitle B—Workforce Development and Related Matters 194
Section 811—Amendments to Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund 194
Section 812—Dual-Track Military Professionals in Operational and Acquisition Specialties 194
Section 813—Provision of Joint Duty Assignment Credit for Acquisition Duty 194
Section 814—Requirement for Acquisition Skills Assessment Biennial Strategic Workforce Plan 194
Section 815—Mandatory Requirement for Training Related to the Conduct of Market Research 194
Section 816—Independent Study of Implementation of Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Efforts 195
Section 817—Extension of Demonstration Project Relating to Certain Acquisition Personnel Management Policies and Procedures 195
Subtitle C—Weapon Systems Acquisition and Related Matters 196
Section 821—Sense of Congress on the Desired Characteristics for the Weapon Systems Acquisition System 196
Section 822—Acquisition Strategy Required for Each Major Defense Acquisition Program and Major System 196
Section 823—Revision to Requirements Relating to Risk Management in Development of Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Systems 196
Section 824—Modification to Requirements Relating to Determination of Contract Type for Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Systems 197
Section 825—Required Determination before Milestone A Approval or Initiation of Major Defense Acquisition Programs 197

Page

Section 826—Required Certification and Determination before Milestone B Approval of Major Defense Acquisition Programs 198
Subtitle D—Industrial Base Matters 198
Section 831—Codification and Amendment of Mentor-Protege Program 198
Section 832—Amendments to Data Quality Improvement Plan 199
Section 833—Notice of Contract Consolidation for Acquisition Strategies 199
Section 834—Clarification of Requirements Related to Small Business Contracts for Services 199
Section 835—Review of Government Access to Intellectual Property Rights of Private Sector Firms 200
Section 836—Requirement that Certain Ship Components be Manufactured in the National Technology and Industrial Base 200
Section 837—Policy Regarding Solid Rocket Motors Used in Tactical Missiles 200
Section 838—FAR Council Membership for Administrator of Small Business Administration 200
Section 839—Surety Bond Requirements and Amount of Guarantee 200
Section 840—Certification Requirements for Procurement Center Representatives, Business Opportunity Specialists, and Commercial Market Representatives 201
Section 841—Including Subcontracting Goals in Agency Responsibilities 201
Section 842—Modifications to Requirements for Qualified HUBZone Small Business Concerns Located in a Base Closure Area 201
Section 843—Joint Venturing and Teaming 201
Subtitle E—Other Matters 202
Section 851—Additional Responsibility for Director of Operational Test and Evaluation 202
Section 852—Use of Recent Prices Paid by the Government in the Determination of Price Reasonableness 202
Section 853—Codification of Other Transaction Authority for Certain Prototype Projects 202
Section 854—Amendments to Certain Acquisition Thresholds 203
Section 855—Revision of Method of Rounding when Making Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Dollar Thresholds 203
Section 856—Repeal of Requirement for Stand-Alone Manpower Estimates for Major Defense Acquisition Programs 204
Section 857—Examination and Guidance Relating to Oversight and Approval of Services Contracts 204
Section 858—Streamlining of Requirements Relating to Defense Business Systems 204
Section 859—Consideration of Strategic Materials in Preliminary Design Review 204
Section 860—Procurement of Personal Protective Equipment 204
Section 861—Amendments Concerning Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts 204
Section 862—Revision to Duties of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering 205
Section 863—Extension of Limitation on Aggregate Annual Amount Available for Contract Services 205
Section 864—Use of Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable Evaluation Method for Procurement of Audit or Audit Readiness Services 205
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 206
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 206
Improving Agility in Shaping the Workforce 206
Productivity Goals 207
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 207
Section 901—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 207
Section 902—Change of Period for Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Review of the Unified Command Plan 207
Section 903—Update of Statutory Specification of Functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Relating to Joint Force Development Activities 208

Page
Section 904—Sense of Congress on the United States Marine Corps 208
Section 905—Additional Requirements for Streamlining of Department of Defense Management Headquarters 209
Section 906—Sense of Congress on Performance Management and Workforce Incentive System 209
Section 907—Guidelines for Conversion of Functions Performed by Civilian or Contractor Personnel to Performance by Military Personnel . 209
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 210
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 210
Counter-Drug Activities 210
Counter-Drug Authority Regarding Support to Certain Foreign Governments 210
Counternarcotics and Global Threats Strategy 210
National Guard Counterdrug Programs 211
Unaccompanied Alien Children 212
Western Hemisphere Maritime Intelligence 212
Other Matters 213
Adequacy of Support Assets for Asia 213
Attendance at Professional and Technical Conferences 214
Comptroller General Review of Drawdown Authority 215
Comptroller General Review of Homeland Response Forces 216
Comptroller General Review of Pandemic Civil Support Planning 217
Comptroller General Review of Transferring Improvised Explosive Device Knowledge and Technology Gained by Department of Defense to Civil Authorities 217
Congressional Review of Federal Acquisition Regulation Rulemaking 218
Counter Threat Financing and Analytic Tools 218
Defense Innovation Initiative 219
Defense Strategy 219
Department of Defense Installation Security 220
Electromagnetic Spectrum Roadmap 220
Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account 221
Importance of the Department of Defense Meeting Audit Deadlines 222
Navy's Proposed Transition to an Evolved Contracting Strategy 223
Notifications of Changes to the Defense Federal Acquisition Supplement to Congress 224
Pacific Command Operational Plans 224
Proposed Retirement of Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 84 and 85 Aircraft 224
Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Briefing 225
Strategic Vision and Plan for an Effective Global Response Force 225
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 226
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 226
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority 226
Section 1002—Authority to Transfer Funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to Sustain Nuclear Weapons Modernization and Naval Reactors 226
Section 1003—Accounting Standards to Value Certain Property, Plant, and Equipment Items 226
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities 226
Section 1011—Extension of Authority to Provide Additional Support for Counter-drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments 226
Section 1012—Statement of Policy on Plan Central America 227
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 227
Section 1021—Restrictions on the Overhaul and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards 228
Section 1022—Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Expenses for Certain Navy Mess Operations Afloat 228
Section 1023—Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships 228
Section 1024—Limitation on the Use of Funds for Removal of Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities from Ticonderoga Class Cruisers 228
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 228
Section 1031—Permanent Authority to Provide Rewards through Government Personnel of Allied Forces and Certain Other Modifications to Department of Defense Program to Provide Rewards 229

Page

Section 1032—Congressional Notification of Sensitive Military Operations 229
Section 1033—Repeal of Semiannual Reports on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for Combating Terrorism Program 229
Section 1034—Reports to Congress on Contact between Terrorists and Individuals Formerly Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 229
Section 1035—Inclusion in Reports to Congress Information about Recidivism of Individuals Formerly Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 230
Section 1036—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 230
Section 1037—Prohibition on Use of Funds to Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States to House Detainees Transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 230
Section 1038—Prohibition on Use of Funds to Transfer or Release Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Combat Zones 231
Section 1039—Requirements for Certifications Relating to the Transfer of Detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities 231
Section 1040—Submission to Congress of Certain Documents Relating to Transfer of Individuals Detained at Guantanamo to Qatar 232
Section 1041—Submission of Unredacted Copies of Documents Relating to the Transfer of Certain Individuals Detained at Guantanamo to Qatar 232
Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 232
Section 1051—Enhancement of Authority of Secretary of Navy to Use National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund 232
Section 1052—Department of Defense Excess Property Program 233
Section 1053—Limitation of Transfer of Certain AH–64 Apache Helicopters from Army National Guard to Regular Army and Related Personnel Levels 233
Section 1054—Space Available Travel for Environmental Morale Leave by Certain Spouses and Children of Deployed Members of the Armed Forces 233
Section 1055—Information-Related and Strategic Communications Capabilities Engagement Pilot Program 234
Section 1056—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Retirement of Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 84 and 85 Aircraft 234
Section 1057—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Destruction of Certain Landmines 235
Section 1058—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Modifying Command and Control of United States Pacific Fleet 235
Section 1059—Prohibition on the Closure of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 235
Subtitle F—Studies and Reports 235
Section 1061—Provision of Defense Planning Guidance and Contingency Planning Guidance Information to Congress 235
Section 1062—Modification of Certain Reports Submitted by Comptroller General of the United States 236
Section 1063—Report on Implementation of the Geographically Distributed Force Laydown in the Area of Responsibility of United States Pacific Command 236
Section 1064—Independent Study of National Security Strategy Formulation Process 237
Section 1065—Study and Report on Role of Department of Defense in Formulation of Long-term Strategy 237
Section 1066—Report on Potential Threats to Members of the Armed Forces of United States Naval Forces Central Command and United States Fifth Fleet in Bahrain 238
Subtitle G—Repeal or Revision of National Defense Reporting Requirements 238
Section 1071—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Military Personnel Issues 238

Page

Section 1072—Repeal or Revision of Certain Reports Relating to Readiness 239
Section 1073—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Naval Vessels and Merchant Marine 240
Section 1074—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Nuclear, Proliferation, and Related Matters 240
Section 1075—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Missile Defense 241
Section 1076—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Acquisition 241
Section 1077—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Civilian Personnel 241
Section 1078—Repeal or Revision of Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements 241
Subtitle H—Other Matters 242
Section 1081—Technical and Clerical Amendments 242
Section 1082—Executive Agent for the Oversight and Management of Alternative Compensatory Control Measures 242
Section 1083—Navy Support of Ocean Research Advisory Panel 242
Section 1084—Level of Readiness of Civil Reserve Air Fleet Carriers 243
Section 1085—Authorization of Transfer of Surplus Firearms to Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety 243
Section 1086—Modification of Requirements for Transferring Aircraft within the Air Force Inventory 243
Section 1087—Reestablishment of Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attacks 243
Section 1088—Department of Defense Strategy for Countering Unconventional Warfare 244
Section 1089—Mine Countermeasures Master Plan 244
Section 1090—Congressional Notification and Briefing Requirement on Ordered Evacuations of United States Embassies and Consulates Involving the Use of United States Armed Forces 244
Section 1091—Determination and Disclosure of Transportation Costs Incurred by Secretary of Defense for Congressional Trips Outside the United States 245
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS 245
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 245
Assessment of Hiring Authorities for Personnel at the Major Range and Test Facility Base 245
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 245
Section 1101—One-Year Extension of Temporary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Civilian Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone 245
Section 1102—Authority to Provide Additional Allowances and Benefits for Defense Clandestine Service Employees 245
Section 1103—Extension of Rate of Overtime Pay for Department of the Navy Employees Performing Work Aboard or Dockside in Support of the Nuclear-Powered Aircraft Carrier Forward Deployed in Japan 246
Section 1104—Modification to Temporary Authorities for Certain Positions at Department of Defense Research and Engineering Facilities 246
Section 1105—Preference Eligibility for Members of Reserve Components of the Armed Forces Appointed to Competitive Service; Clarification of Appeal Rights 246
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS 246
OVERVIEW 246
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 248
Central American Police Forces 248
Combatant Commander Requirements for Directed Energy Weapons 249
Command and Control within Operation Inherent Resolve 249
Comptroller General Inventory of Department of Defense Security Cooperation Programs 250
Department of Defense Training Programs on Military Justice and Accountability 251
Foreign Military Financing in U.S. European Command 252
Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation 252
Multilateral Sales to Allies 253

Page
National Guard State Partnership Program 253
Nonlethal Military Support for Ukraine 254
Operation United Assistance 254
Oversight of Assistance to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan 255
Report on Government Police Training and Equipping Programs 256
Russian Unconventional Warfare 257
Support to Coalition Partners Conducting Military Operations within Operation Inherent Resolve 258
The Transition or Termination of the Mission to Counter the Lord's Resistance Army 259
The Utilization of General Purpose Forces to Meet U.S. Africa Command Requirements 259
U.S.-Philippines Defense Cooperation 260
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 260
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 260
Section 1201—One-Year Extension of Logistical Support for Coalition Forces Supporting Certain United States Military Operations 260
Section 1202—Strategic Framework for Department of Defense Security Cooperation 260
Section 1203—Modification and Two-Year Extension of National Guard State Partnership Program 261
Section 1204—Extension of Authority for Non-Reciprocal Exchanges of Defense Personnel Between the United States and Foreign Countries 262
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan and Pakistan 262
Section 1211—Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan 262
Section 1212—Extension and Modification of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations 262
Section 1213—Sense of Congress on United States Policy and Strategy in Afghanistan 263
Section 1214—Extension of Authority to Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan 263
Section 1215—Extension of Authority to Transfer Defense Articles and Provide Defense Services to the Military and Security Forces of Afghanistan 263
Section 1216—Sense of Congress Regarding Assistance for Afghan Translators, Interpreters, and Administrative Aids 264
Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Syria and Iraq 264
Section 1221—Extension of Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq 264
Section 1222—Comprehensive Strategy for the Middle East and to Counter Islamic Extremism 264
Section 1223—Modification of Authority to Provide Assistance to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant 265
Section 1224—Report on United States Armed Forces Deployed in Support of Operation Inherent Resolve 266
Section 1225—Modification of Authority to Provide Assistance to the Vetted Syrian Opposition 266
Section 1226—Assistance to the Government of Jordan for Border Security Operations 267
Section 1227—Report on Efforts of Turkey to Fight Terrorism 267
Subtitle D—Matters Relating to Iran 267
Section 1231—Extension of Annual Report on Military Power of Iran 267
Section 1232—Sense of Congress on the Government of Iran's Nuclear Program and its Malign Military Activities 267
Section 1233—Report on Military Posture Required in the Middle East to Deter Iran from Developing a Nuclear Weapon 268
Subtitle E—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation 268
Section 1241—Notifications and Updates Relating to Testing, Production, Deployment, and Sale or Transfer to Other States or Non-State Actors of the Club-K Cruise Missile System by the Russian Federation 268
Section 1242—Notifications of Deployment of Nuclear Weapons by Russian Federation to Territory of Ukrainian Republic 269

Page

Section 1243—Non-Compliance by the Russian Federation with its Obligations under the INF Treaty 270
Section 1244—Modification of Notification and Assessment of Proposal to Modify or Introduce New Aircraft or Sensors for Flight by the Russian Federation under Open Skies Treaty 270
Section 1245—Sense of Congress on Support for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania 271
Section 1246—Sense of Congress on Support for Georgia 271
Subtitle F—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region 271
Section 1251—Sense of Congress Recognizing the 70th Anniversary of the End of Allied Military Engagement in the Pacific Theater 271
Section 1252—Sense of Congress Regarding Consolidation of United States Military Facilities in Okinawa, Japan 271
Section 1253—Strategy to Promote United States Interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific Region 271
Section 1254—Sense of Congress on the United States Alliance with Japan 272
Subtitle G—Other Matters 272
Section 1261—Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities 272
Section 1262—Amendment to the Annual Report under Arms Control and Disarmament Act 272
Section 1263—Permanent Authority for NATO Special Operations Headquarters 273
Section 1264—Extension of Authorization to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction 273
Section 1265—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, for Arms Control Implementation 273
Section 1266—Modification of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism 273
Section 1267—United States-Israel Anti-Tunnel Defense Cooperation 273
Section 1268—Efforts of the Department of Defense to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally 273
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION 274
OVERVIEW 274
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 274
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Funds 275
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 275
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 275
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 275
Assessment of Current State of Global Tantalum Supply 275
Insufficient Working-Capital Fund Rate Calculations 276
Review of Electronic Waste Recycling 277
Review of Non-Navy Workload within Navy Working Capital Fund Activities 277
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 278
Subtitle A—Military Programs 278
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds 278
Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund 278
Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense 278
Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 278
Section 1405—Defense Inspector General 279
Section 1406—Defense Health Program 279
Section 1407—National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund 279
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile 279
Section 1411—Extension of Date for Completion of Destruction of Existing Stockpile of Lethal Chemical Agents and Munitions 279
Subtitle C—Working-Capital Funds 279
Section 1421—Limitation on Furlough of Department of Defense Employees Paid Through Working-Capital Funds 279
Section 1422—Working-Capital Fund Reserve Account for Petroleum Market Price Fluctuations 279
Subtitle D—Other Matters 280

Page

Section 1431—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 ... 280
Section 1432—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home ... 280
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS ... 280
OVERVIEW ... 280
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 280
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund ... 280
Funding and Support for the European Reassurance Initiative ... 281
National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Account ... 282
Support to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant ... 282
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 283
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations ... 283
Section 1501—Purpose ... 283
Section 1502—Procurement ... 283
Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation ... 283
Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance ... 283
Section 1505—Military Personnel ... 283
Section 1506—Working Capital Funds ... 283
Section 1507—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide ... 283
Section 1508—Defense Inspector General ... 284
Section 1509—Defense Health Program ... 284
Subtitle B—Financial Matters ... 284
Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations ... 284
Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority ... 284
Subtitle C—European Reassurance Initiative and Related Matters ... 284
Section 1531—Statement of Policy Regarding European Reassurance Initiative ... 284
Section 1532—Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine ... 284
Subtitle D—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters ... 285
Section 1541—Continuation of Existing Limitation on Use of Afghanistan Security Forces Fund ... 285
Section 1542—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund ... 286
TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS ... 286
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 286
Army Space Programs ... 286
Calibration of Space Sensors ... 287
Combatant Command Commercial Imagery Tasking ... 287
Commercial Space-based Environmental Monitoring ... 287
Comptroller General Review of Patriot System ... 288
Continuing Oversight of Missile Defense Discussions with the Russian Federation ... 289
Cyber Defense Network Segmentation ... 289
Cyber Support to Civil Authorities ... 289
Department of Defense Cyber Mission Forces ... 290
Deployment of a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Battery in the Republic of Korea ... 291
Development of Missile Defense Targets Related to the Hypersonic Threat ... 291
Distributed Common Grounds System-Army GAO Report ... 292
Evaluation of Missile Defense Options to Confront Hypersonic Missile Systems ... 292
Evaluation of National Security Space and Missile Test Ranges and Infrastructure ... 293
Funding for Pilot Program for Acquisition of Commercial Satellite Communication Services ... 294
Funding Mechanism for Department of Defense Priorities at the National Nuclear Security Administration ... 294
Global Positioning System ... 294
Ground Based Strategic Deterrent ... 295

Page
Imagery Analysis and Acquisition 296
Improving Contract Cost Data Collection and Analysis at the Missile Defense Agency through Evaluation of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Multiyear Procurement 296
Integrated Air and Missile Defense Strategy 297
Interagency Collaboration on Physical Security for Nuclear Weapons 297
Joint Integrated Lifecycle Surety 298
Joint Space Operations Center Mission System 298
Mission System Cybersecurity 299
Mobile User Objective System 299
Modeling and Simulation for Nuclear Targeting and Planning 300
Multi-source Cyber Intelligence Analysis Needs 300
Multiyear Procurement of Commercial Satellite Communications 301
National Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Resilience 301
National Security Space Acquisition 302
Network Access Control Technologies for Secure Facilities 302
Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications Budget Displays 303
Nuclear Detection Capability 303
Nuclear Enterprise Review 304
Operationally Responsive Space 304
Organization of the Military Service and Technical Intelligence Centers 305
Patriot Product Improvement 305
Programmable Embedded Information Security Product 306
Protected Tactical Satellite Communications 306
Quarterly Briefings on Strategic Forces 307
Report on Current and Anticipated Global Demand for U.S. Missile Defense Systems 308
Report on Improving Discrimination for Missile Defense 308
Report on Patriot Guidance Enhanced Missile Tactical Ballistic Missile Recertification for Allied Inventory 308
Report on Strategic Missile Commonality 309
Responsive Launch 310
Roadmap for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System 310
Satellite Communications Interference 311
Satellite Ground Systems and Overhead Persistent Infrared Data 311
Science and Technology Intelligence 312
Smart Building Cyber Vulnerability Assessment 313
Space Situational Awareness 313
Spaceports 313
Strategic Deterrence Research and Education 313
Strengthening National Security Space 314
Study on Left-of-Launch 315
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 317
Subtitle A—Space Activities 317
Section 1601—Major Force Program and Budget for National Security Space Programs 317
Section 1602—Modification to Development of Space Science and Technology Strategy 317
Section 1603—Rocket Propulsion System Development Program 317
Section 1604—Modification to Prohibition on Contracting with Russian Suppliers of Rocket Engines for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program 318
Section 1605—Delegation of Authority Regarding Purchase of Global Positioning System User Equipment 318
Section 1606—Acquisition Strategy for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program 319
Section 1607—Procurement of Wideband Satellite Communications 320
Section 1608—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Weather Satellite Follow-On System 320
Section 1609—Modification of Pilot Program for Acquisition of Commercial Satellite Communication Services 320
Section 1610—Prohibition on Reliance on China and Russia for Space-Based Weather Data 321
Section 1611—Evaluation of Exploitation of Space-based Infrared System Against Additional Threats 321

Page

Section 1612—Plan on Full Integration and Exploitation of Overhead Persistent Infrared Capability 321
Section 1613—Options for Rapid Space Reconstitution 322
Section 1614—Sense of Congress on Space Defense 322
Section 1615—Sense of Congress on Missile Defense Sensors in Space .. 322
Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities 322
Section 1621—Executive Agent for Open-Source Intelligence Tools 322
Section 1622—Waiver and Congressional Notification Requirements Related to Facilities for Intelligence Collection or for Special Operations Abroad 322
Section 1623—Prohibition on National Intelligence Program Consolidation 323
Section 1624—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Distributed Common Ground System of the Army 323
Section 1625—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Distributed Common Ground System of the United States Special Operations Command 323
Section 1626—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence 323
Section 1627—Clarification of Annual Briefing on the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Requirements of the Combatant Commands 324
Section 1628—Department of Defense Intelligence Needs 324
Section 1629—Report on Management of Certain Programs of Defense Intelligence Elements 324
Section 1630—Government Accountability Office Review of Intelligence Input to the Defense Acquisition Process 324
Subtitle C—Cyberspace-related Matters 325
Section 1641—Codification and Addition of Liability Protections Relating to Reporting on Cyber Incidents or Penetrations of Networks and Information Systems of Certain Contractors 325
Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces 325
Section 1651—Organization of Nuclear Deterrence Functions of the Air Force 325
Section 1652—Assessment of Threats to National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System 326
Section 1653—Procurement Authority for Certain Parts of Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Fuzes 326
Section 1654—Annual Briefing on the Costs of Forward-Deploying Nuclear Weapons in Europe 326
Section 1655—Sense of Congress on Importance of Cooperation and Collaboration between United States and United Kingdom on Nuclear Issues 326
Section 1656—Sense of Congress on Organization of Navy for Nuclear Deterrence Mission 327
Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs 327
Section 1661—Prohibitions on Providing Certain Missile Defense Information to Russian Federation 327
Section 1662—Prohibition on Integration of Missile Defense Systems of China into Missile Defense Systems of United States 328
Section 1663—Prohibition on Integration of Missile Defense Systems of Russian Federation into Missile Defense Systems of United States and NATO 328
Section 1664—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Long-Range Discriminating Radar 328
Section 1665—Limitations on Availability of Funds for Patriot Lower Tier Air and Missile Defense Capability of the Army 328
Section 1666—Integration and Interoperability of Air and Missile Defense Capabilities of the United States 329
Section 1667—Integration of Allied Missile Defense Capabilities 329
Section 1668—Missile Defense Capability in Europe 330
Section 1669—Availability of Funds for Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense System 331
Section 1670—Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense Program Co-Development and Potential Co-Production 331
Section 1671—Development and Deployment of Multiple-Object Kill Vehicle for Missile Defense of the United States Homeland 332

Page

Section 1672—Boost Phase Defense System 332
Section 1673—East Coast Homeport of Sea-Based X-Band Radar 333
Section 1674—Plan for Medium Range Ballistic Missile Defense Sensor Alternatives for Enhanced Defense of Hawaii 333
Section 1675—Research and Development of Non-terrestrial Missile Defense Layer 333
Section 1676—Aegis Ashore Capability Development 333
Section 1677—Briefings on Procurement and Planning of Left-of-Launch Capability 334

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 334
PURPOSE 334
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW 334
Section 2001—Short Title 335
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law 335
Section 2003—Effective Date 335
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 335
SUMMARY 335
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 335
Defense Generator and Rail Equipment Center 335
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 336
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 336
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 336
Section 2102—Family Housing 336
Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 336
Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 337
Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project 337
Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects 337
Section 2107—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects 337
Section 2108—Additional Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2016 Projects 337
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 337
SUMMARY 337
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 338
Explanation of Funding Adjustment 338
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 339
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 339
Section 2202—Family Housing 339
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 339
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy 339
Section 2205—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects 339
Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects 339
Section 2207—Townsend Bombing Range Expansion, Phase 2 339
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 340
SUMMARY 340
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 340
Explanation of Funding Adjustment 340
Former Norton Air Force Base, California 340
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 341
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 341
Section 2302—Family Housing 341
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 341
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force 341
Section 2305—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project 341
Section 2306—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project 341
Section 2307—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2015 Project 342

Page

Section 2308—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project ... 342
Section 2309—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project ... 342
Section 2310—Limitation on Project Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2016 Project ... 342
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION ... 342
SUMMARY ... 342
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 343
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ... 343
Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility ... 345
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 345
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 345
Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects ... 346
Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies ... 346
Section 2404—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project ... 346
Section 2405—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects ... 346
Section 2406—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects ... 346
Section 2407—Modification and Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project ... 346
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM ... 347
SUMMARY ... 347
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 347
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 347
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO ... 347
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES ... 347
SUMMARY ... 347
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 347
Explanation of Funding Adjustments ... 347
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 348
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations ... 348
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 348
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 348
Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 348
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 348
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects ... 349
Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve ... 349
Subtitle B—Other Matters ... 349
Section 2611—Modification and Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project ... 349
Section 2612—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects ... 349
Section 2613—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects ... 349
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES ... 350
SUMMARY ... 350
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS ... 350
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account ... 350
Section 2702—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round ... 350
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS ... 350
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST ... 350
Collaboration on Electromagnetic Pulse Threats to the Electrical Grid ... 350

Page
Conveyance of Water and Wastewater Systems on Guam 351
Defense Laboratory Enterprise Infrastructure 351
F–35 Stationing, Basing, and Laydown Selection Process 352
Facilities Sustainment and Recapitalization Policy and Funding 352
Impact of Wind Energy Developments on Military Installations 353
Improvement of Design-Build Selection Process 354
Intergovernmental Support Agreements 354
Joint Basing 355
Lincoln Laboratory Recapitalization 355
Major Range and Test Facility Base Military Construction Assessment . 355
Non-Federally Connected Civilian Children Residing in Military Privatized Housing 356
Public Schools on Department of Defense Installations 357
Utility Privatization 357
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 358
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 358
Section 2801—Revision of Congressional Notification Thresholds for Reserve Facility Expenditures and Contributions to Reflect Congressional Notification Thresholds for Minor Construction and Repair Projects 358
Section 2802—Authority for Acceptance and Use of Contributions from Kuwait for Construction, Maintenance, and Repair Projects Mutually Beneficial to the Department of Defense and Kuwait Military Forces . 358
Section 2803—Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program 358
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 358
Section 2811—Enhancement of Authority to Accept Conditional Gifts of Real Property on Behalf of Military Service Academies 358
Section 2812—Consultation Requirement in Connection with Department of Defense Major Land Acquisitions 359
Section 2813—Additional Master Plan Reporting Requirements Related to Main Operating Bases, Forward Operating Sites, and Cooperative Security Locations of Central Command and Africa Command Areas of Responsibility 359
Section 2814—Force-Structure Plan and Infrastructure Inventory and Assessment of Infrastructure Necessary to Support the Force Structure 359
Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment 360
Section 2821—Restriction on Development of Public Infrastructure in Connection with Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region 360
Section 2822—Annual Report on Government of Japan Contributions toward Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region ... 360
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances 360
Section 2831—Land Exchange Authority, Mare Island Army Reserve Center, Vallejo, California 360
Section 2832—Land Exchange, Navy Outlying Landing Field, Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida 360
Section 2833—Release of Property Interests Retained in Connection with Land Conveyance, Fort Bliss Military Reservation, Texas 361
Subtitle E—Military Land Withdrawals 361
Section 2841—Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Land, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California 361
Section 2842—Bureau of Land Management Withdrawn Military Lands Efficiency and Savings 361
Subtitle F—Military Memorials, Monuments, and Museums 361
Section 2851—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio 361
Section 2852—Extension of Authority for Establishment of Commemorative Work in Honor of Brigadier General Francis Marion 361
Section 2853—Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act .. 361
Subtitle G—Other Matters 362
Section 2861—Modification of Department of Defense Guidance on Use of Airfield Pavement Markings 362
Section 2862—Protection and Recovery of Greater Sage Grouse 362
TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 362

Page
SUMMARY 362
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 363
Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Project 363
Section 2902—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 363
Section 2903—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 363
Section 2904—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 363
Section 2905—Authorization of Appropriations 363
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 363
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 363
OVERVIEW 363
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 364
National Nuclear Security Administration 364
Overview 364
Weapons Activities 364
Advanced Radiography 364
B61–12 and W76–1 Life Extension Programs 364
Defense Nuclear Security 365
Deferred Maintenance 366
Funding prioritization within Weapons Activities 367
Funding related to execution of life extension programs 367
Governance and management of the nuclear security enterprise 368
Plutonium strategy 369
Primary Assessment Technologies 369
Stockpile Surveillance and Assessment 370
Uranium for national security purposes 370
W78/88–1 Life Extension Program 371
W88 Alt 370 and W80–4 Life Extension Program 371
Weapons dismantlement and disposition 372
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation 373
Comptroller General assessment of Nonproliferation Research and Development Program 373
Funding prioritization within Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation 373
Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response Program 374
Verification and detection technology 375
Naval Reactors 376
Naval Reactors and Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project 376
Federal Salaries and Expenses 376
Classification guidance 376
Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation 377
Improvements to National Nuclear Security Administration budget structure 377
Labor cost review 378
Provision of information to Congress by management and operating contractors 378
Reforming and streamlining access authorizations for Restricted Data 379
Environmental and Other Defense Activities 379
Overview 379
Defense Environmental Cleanup 379
Hanford and Savannah River 379
Report on Pension Adjustments 380
Technology development 380
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant 380
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal 381
Defense nuclear waste repository 381
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 381
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 381
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration 381
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup 381
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities 382

Page

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 382
Section 3111—Authorized Personnel Levels of National Nuclear Security Administration 382
Section 3112—Full-time Equivalent Contractor Personnel Levels 382
Section 3113—Improvement to Accountability of Department of Energy Employees and Projects 382
Section 3114—Cost-Benefit Analyses for Competition of Management and Operating Contracts 384
Section 3115—Nuclear Weapon Design Responsiveness Program 384
Section 3116—Disposition of Weapons-Usable Plutonium 385
Section 3117—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Fixed Site Radiological Portal Monitors in Foreign Countries 385
Section 3118—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Provision of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Assistance to Russian Federation .. 385
Section 3119—Limitation on Authorization of Production of Special Nuclear Material Outside the United States by Foreign Country with Nuclear Naval Propulsion Program 385
Section 3120—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Development of Certain Nuclear Nonproliferation Technologies 386
Section 3121—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Unilateral Disarmament 386
Section 3122—Use of Best Practices for Capital Asset Projects and Nuclear Weapon Life Extension Programs 387
Subtitle C—Plans and Reports 387
Section 3131—Root Cause Analyses for Certain Cost Overruns 387
Section 3132—Extension and Modification of Certain Annual Reports on Nuclear Nonproliferation 388
Section 3133—Governance and Management of Nuclear Security Enterprise 388
Section 3134—Assessments on Nuclear Proliferation Risks and Nuclear Nonproliferation Opportunities 389
Section 3135—Independent Review of Laboratory-Directed Research and Development Programs 389
Subtitle D—Other Matters 389
Section 3141—Transfer, Decontamination, and Decommissioning of Nonoperational Facilities 389
Section 3142—Research and Development of Advanced Naval Nuclear Fuel System Based on Low-Enriched Uranium 390
Section 3143—Plutonium Pit Production Capacity 391
Section 3144—Analysis of Alternatives for Mobile Guardian Transporter Program 391
Section 3145—Development of Strategy on Risks to Nonproliferation Caused by Additive Manufacturing 392
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD 392
OVERVIEW 392
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 392
Section 3201—Authorization 392
Section 3202—Administration of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 392
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES 393
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 393
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations 393
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION 393
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 393
Merchant Mariner Workforce 393
National Security Multi-Mission Vessel 393
Small Shipyard Grants 394
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 394
Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2016 394
Section 3502—Sense of Congress Regarding Maritime Security Fleet Program 394
Section 3503—Update of References to the Secretary of Transportation Regarding Unemployment Insurance and Vessel Operators 395
Section 3504—Reliance on Classification Society Certification for Purposes of Eligibility for Certificate of Inspection 395

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES 395

Page

Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables 395
Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2016 395
National Defense Budget Authority Implication 401
TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT 403
Section 4101—Procurement 403
Section 4102—Procurement for Overseas Contingency Operations 445
TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 453
Section 4201—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 453
Section 4202—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for Overseas Contingency Operations 487
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 489
Section 4301—Operation and Maintenance 489
Section 4302—Operation and Maintenance for Overseas Contingency Operations 504
Section 4303—Operation and Maintenance for Overseas Contingency Operations for Base Requirements 514
TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL 523
Section 4401—Military Personnel 523
Section 4402—Military Personnel for Overseas Contingency Operations 524
TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 525
Section 4501—Other Authorizations 525
Section 4502—Other Authorizations for Overseas Contingency Operations 529
TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 531
Section 4601—Military Construction 531
Section 4602—Military Construction for Overseas Contingency Operations 544
TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 545
Section 4701—Department of Energy National Security Programs 545

Department of Defense Authorization Request 557
Communications from Other Committees 560
Fiscal Data 572
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 572
Statement Required by the Congressional Budget Act 575
Committee Cost Estimate 575
Advisory of Earmarks 575
Oversight Findings 575
General Performance Goals and Objectives 575
Statement of Federal Mandates 577
Federal Advisory Committee Statement 577
Applicability to the Legislative Branch 577
Duplication of Federal Programs 578
Disclosure of Directed Rule Makings 578
Committee Votes 578
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 607
Dissenting Views 608

114TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
114–102

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

MAY 5, 2015.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1735]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2016: (a) the personnel strength for each Active Duty component of the military departments; (b) the

personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Energy national security programs; and (8) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for the Maritime Administration.

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2016, is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to "provide for the common defense"; to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides the House Committee on Armed Services with jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally and over the military application of nuclear energy. The committee bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, conducted through hearings, briefings, and roundtable discussions with Department of Defense and Department of Energy civilian and military officials, intelligence analysts, outside experts, and industry representatives, and informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

Notable events of the last year, including the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, growing instability across the Middle East and Africa, and a revanchist Russian Federation, are a reminder of the continuing need for U.S. military engagement, presence, commitment, and strength to defend U.S. interests, deter would-be aggressors, and reassure allies and partners. Additionally, with the continued diffusion of advanced technology, U.S. military technological superiority is no longer assumed and the dominance U.S. forces have long enjoyed in the air, sea, space, and cyberspace domains is no longer assured. Such a security environment demands that the Nation's Armed Forces are agile, efficient, ready, and lethal.

The bill reflects the committee's steadfast support of the courageous, professional, and dedicated men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces and the committee's appreciation for the sacrifices they make to accomplish their required missions. The committee understands that the capabilities of the Armed Forces are underpinned by the dedicated civilian employees of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, as well as the defense industrial base. Each of these elements is required to enable the U.S. military to be the guarantor of peace and economic security that it has been for generations.

In addition to providing the vital funding and authorities the Nation's military requires, the bill would implement major reforms

within the Department of Defense, as the committee recognizes the need to get more defense for the dollar regardless of the fiscal environment. The bill also seeks to provide the funding required to restore the readiness of the military; enhance the quality of life of military service members and their families; support ongoing military operations and U.S. presence in Iraq, Afghanistan, Europe, and elsewhere across the globe; sustain and improve the Armed Forces; and properly safeguard the national security of the United States.

While the funding authorized in the bill matches the President's request, the committee acknowledges that this level has been described by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the "lower ragged edge" of what is necessary. The committee believes that defense sequestration must be addressed and the committee will continue its bipartisan work to ensure that resources provided for the Nation's defense are sufficient to protect the safety and security of the American people and our vital interests around the world.

Reforming the Department Of Defense

The committee believes that reform of the Department of Defense is necessary to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the defense enterprise to get more defense for the dollar. This is necessary to improve the military's agility and the speed at which it can adapt and respond to the unprecedented technological challenges faced by the Nation. The bill reflects the committee's 18 month long comprehensive reform effort, which included multiple hearings and briefings, as well as consultation with Department of Defense officials, outside experts, industry representatives, and other stakeholders. While this bill is the first substantive step towards comprehensive reform, the committee recognizes that instituting lasting reform is a long-term, collaborative effort, and therefore, it looks forward to working with all key stakeholders to build upon this product.

In the area of acquisition reform, the bill seeks to inject greater flexibility and accountability into the acquisition system. It incorporates many of the reform proposals contained in the bipartisan bill, H.R. 1597, the Agile Acquisition to Retain Technological Edge Act, which was introduced on March 29, 2015. Many of these proposals have since been adjusted based on stakeholder input, prior to inclusion in H.R. 1735. In particular, the bill seeks to reform the acquisition system and streamline the acquisition process by empowering program managers and other Department of Defense decision makers to make judgments in the best interests of U.S. troops and the taxpayer. It also reforms the Department's development of acquisition strategies to include consolidating at least six separate reporting requirements into a single, living document that would be updated as a program moves through the acquisition lifecycle. In addition, it makes the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund permanent; requires training on the commercial market, including on commercial market research; expands ethics training for the acquisition workforce; and simplifies the chain-of-command for acquisition decisions, reforming a process currently mired in layers of bureaucracy.

In the area of compensation and benefits reform, the committee recognizes that an agile military depends on recruiting and retain-

ing the best and brightest. More and more that means competing with the private sector to bring in or to hold onto top talent. To compete effectively, the Department of Defense must offer benefits on par with or better than the private marketplace. The bill incorporates the work of the Military Personnel Subcommittee in implementing many of the reforms recommended by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. However, the committee is also mindful of the potential for unintended consequences, and therefore proposes to delay implementation of its legislated reforms until 2017 to allow the Department and relevant stakeholders time to fully assess and provide feedback on these recommendations.

In the area of organization and management reform, the committee shares the concerns expressed by the Secretary of Defense and other current and former senior defense officials that the Department must do a better job balancing its "tooth-to-tail." The committee is supportive of efforts by the Department to reduce its management headquarters budgets and personnel by 20 percent, and recognizes that the Department has made some progress towards achieving this goal. The bill would therefore require certain reductions in management headquarters budgets and personnel, require a baseline from which to hold the Department accountable to its reductions, and seek to ensure that any reductions are done in a strategic manner, preserving key functions and skillsets.

Lastly, the committee is aware that Congress can often be the source of inefficiency in the Department. Thus, H.R. 1735 would, over the next 6 years, eliminate over 460 congressionally mandated reports.

Resources for Warfighters and Families

The committee believes that caring for the troops and their families is the cornerstone of readiness. H.R. 1735 would build upon the bipartisan work of the Military Personnel Subcommittee in providing the troops the benefits they need, deserve, and have earned. The committee appreciates the valuable work of the Military Compensation and Retirement Reform Commission in ensuring that military compensation and benefits continue to attract and retain the best and brightest. Of the 15 recommendations made by the Commission, the bill would act on 11 of them. However, the committee is mindful of the potential for unintended consequences, and therefore proposes to delay implementation of some of its legislated reforms until 2017 to allow the Department and relevant stakeholders time to fully assess and provide feedback on these recommendations.

One concern raised by the Commission, and shared by the committee, is the lengthy backlog of families waiting to take advantage of military childcare. It is not evident from extensive committee oversight that the backlog is related to funding or military construction. The bill would therefore direct the Secretary of Defense to cut the backlog in half by the end of fiscal year 2017, and to provide a mid-point progress report to Congress, as well as require the Comptroller General of the United States to examine the adequacy of nutrition subsistence programs for military families.

The committee continues to focus on supporting members of the Armed Forces who transition from military service and H.R. 1735

would establish a Job Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee within the current Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Committee. The bill would further direct a joint uniform formulary between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs for medications to treat psychiatric conditions, sleep disorders, and pain management to ensure that transitioning veterans continue to receive the best care when they leave military service.

The committee recognizes that extended deployments are a strain on military families that can be mitigated by visits to deployed family members. The Commission noted that current Space A regulations only allow for spouses and children to visit troops on deployments longer than 120 days. H.R. 1735 would shorten that time to 30 days.

Lastly, the committee continues its vigorous oversight and protection of military personnel from sexual assault. Bipartisan proposals from Members of the committee to improve the Special Victims program are reflected in the bill, including the expansion of sexual assault prevention training to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) and Junior ROTC programs, access to Special Victims Counsel for civilians who are victims of sexual assault, and a requirement for the Department to enhance sexual assault prevention for male victims in the Armed Forces. The Department would also be required to develop a strategy to deal with retaliation against those who intervene on behalf of victims.

Readiness, Force Structure, and Support to Ongoing Military Operations

The committee recognizes that the current threat environment is placing growing demands on the U.S. Armed Forces, and continues to require the Armed Forces to be called upon to support military operations across the globe. In the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, deployed U.S. forces are continuing to conduct training and assistance, as well as counterterrorism operations, as part of Operation Freedom's Sentinel and Operation Resolute Support. In the Republic of Iraq and Syrian Arab Republic, deployed U.S. forces are participating in coalition operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), conducting airstrikes, and providing training and assistance to Iraqi security forces and vetted moderate Syrian opposition forces as part of Operation Inherent Resolve. U.S. forces are also forward-deployed across the Greater Middle East to enable these ongoing military operations; to enhance the defense of regional allies and partners against the ballistic missile, nuclear, and malign military activities of the Islamic Republic of Iran; and to protect U.S. interests in the region.

On the Continent of Africa, deployed U.S. forces continue to conduct counterterrorism operations and provide training and assistance to partners combating violent extremist organizations. In Europe, U.S. forces and capabilities have been enhanced as part of Operation Atlantic Resolve to deter aggression by the Russian Federation and reassure U.S. allies and partners in Europe. In Asia, U.S. forces are forward-deployed to reassure allies and partners concerned about the territorial assertiveness and regional intimidation by the People's Republic of China and the nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In

Central and South America, U.S. forces are providing key capabilities to detect and interdict illicit trafficking that has driven violence and instability to the southern border of the United States. Meanwhile, U.S. forces stationed at home are working to maintain force readiness and are defending the homeland.

The committee recognizes that while the Department's missions and requirements have increased, its resources have not. As the National Defense Panel noted in its July 2014 report to Congress, "To lessen risk in an environment that is becoming more challenging over time, it is important to err on the side of having too much rather than too little." Along this line, H.R. 1735 would take several steps towards preserving the necessary end strength, readiness, and force structure to ensure the Armed Forces can continue to meet both the operational demands of today and the future. The bill would seek to better balance the Department's personnel in the field and in management headquarters. Furthermore, it would reallocate resources to higher priority programs and provide funding to address the Department's shortfalls and unfunded requirements.

In the area of readiness, the bill would fully fund the Operation and Maintenance accounts for an 11th carrier and a 10th air wing, aircraft carrier maintenance reset, ship operations, and collective training exercises, which would allow for 19 Combat Training Center rotations for Brigade Combat Teams. It also would authorize additional Marine Corps resources to meet unfunded aviation readiness requirements, ensure adequate numbers of mission-capable aircraft, and provide additional Air Force training resources for high-demand areas such as unmanned systems pilots and joint terminal controllers.

In the area of force structure, H.R. 1735 would preserve key capabilities by identifying lower priority areas and areas where funding is early-to-need or cost savings have been identified. The bill would fully resource and enable Special Operations Forces and U.S. Special Operations Command activities and programs. It would restore funding for the A–10, as the committee recognizes the continued use of the A–10, including in support of Operation Inherent Resolve, and the unique protective capabilities it provides to Soldiers and Marines on the ground. It would also restore funding for the EC–130H Compass Call, in recognition of the unique electronic warfare capabilities provided by this aircraft.

The bill would authorize additional strike fighters (F–18s for the Navy and F–35Bs for the Marine Corps) and provide increased funds for the protection of deployed Apache helicopters and to accelerate rotorcraft modernization for the Army National Guard. It would reduce the layup time for the refit of Navy cruisers to maximize the number of cruisers in the fleet, expand the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund to appropriately resource the Ohio-class replacement submarine program and maintain a reliable nuclear triad, and reverse the Department's proposal to terminate Tomahawk Block IV missile production. The bill would also authorize the full amount for the Long-Range Strike bomber and KC–46A tanker programs that the Air Force can execute in fiscal year 2016. Lastly, it would authorize additional funds for National Guard and Reserve equipment to address significant equipment shortages.

While the committee recognizes tough choices have to be made in the allocation of limited resources, the committee believes it has

taken prudent steps to preserve and invest in readiness and needed capabilities for the warfighter. However, should sequestration-level budget caps remain in effect for fiscal year 2016 and beyond, the committee recognizes that even harder choices will have to be made. The committee agrees with former Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel, who testified before the committee in March 2014, that "The result would be a military that could not fulfill its defense strategy, putting at risk America's traditional role as a guarantor of global security and, ultimately, our own security."

Addressing emerging threats and challenges

The committee recognizes that it must focus not only on addressing current threats, but also on preparing for emerging and evolving challenges in an increasingly uncertain global security environment, and it must ensure that defense resources are balanced between the two objectives. In particular, with the continued diffusion of advanced technology, U.S. military technological superiority is no longer assumed.

The committee recognizes that the cyber domain of modern warfare continues to grow in scope and sophistication. The country has witnessed recent, bold cyber attacks against Google, large financial institutions, congressional computer systems, and the Pentagon. H.R. 1537 provides for stronger cyber operations capabilities, seeks to safeguard U.S. technological superiority, and includes incentives to improve the sharing of information on threats and defensive measures between the defense industrial base and the Department of Defense. The bill fully resources and authorizes U.S. Cyber Command programs and activities, as well as all Military Service cyber programs and Cyber science and technology initiatives to enhance a Cyber mission force that defends U.S. national security objectives.

The committee also believes that robust military intelligence collection and analysis capabilities are essential to ensuring the Department of Defense is postured to address current and future threats, is investing in the right capabilities, and able to protect its forces in the field. The bill would take steps to ensure military intelligence analysis remains a priority at the national level and that the Department is thinking hard about how it collects and analyzes intelligence to support the needs of the Combatant Commanders and warfighters. The bill would further direct the Department to examine the science and technical intelligence and foreign material exploitation work being done by various military intelligence organizations, identify redundancies, and make changes where necessary.

The committee remains focused on assuring access to space, given the military's dependence on the capabilities provided from satellites. Thus, it remains concerned about the Department's continuing reliance on Russian-designed rocket engines. The bill would authorize an increase in funds for the development of a new, U.S. rocket propulsion system and direct the Air Force to move faster than it is planning to end reliance on Russian rocket engines. It would further take actions to promote greater competition within the space launch industry.

Lastly, in the area of missile defense, the bill would accelerate the development of a next-generation missile defense interceptor;

modify the Aegis Ashore sites in Romania and the Republic of Poland to provide them with anti-air warfare capability for self-defense; provide additional funds for Israeli missile defense; and authorize additional funds for an East Coast missile defense site to add to the defense of the United States, specifically against long-range ballistic missiles from the Islamic Republic of Iran.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 results from hearings that began on February 3, 2015, and that were completed on April 15, 2015. The full committee conducted nine sessions. In addition, a total of 16 sessions were conducted by 6 different subcommittees.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On April 29, 2015, the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 1735, as amended, by a vote of 60–2.

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 1735. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

The bill does not provide budget authority. This bill authorizes appropriations; subsequent appropriations acts will provide budget authority. However, the committee strives to adhere to the recommendations as issued by the Committee on the Budget as it relates to the jurisdiction of this committee.

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

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

SUMMARY OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE BILL

The President requested discretionary budget authority of $604.2 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the committee for fiscal year 2016. Of this amount, $534.2 billion was requested for "base" Department of Defense programs, $50.9 billion was requested for the Overseas Contingency Operations requirements covering the entire fiscal year, and $19.0 billion was requested for

Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

To comport with the Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2016, the committee recommends an overall discretionary authorization of $604.2 billion in fiscal year 2016. The base committee authorization of $515.0 billion is a $0.2 billion increase above the levels provided for in the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The authorization provided in Title XV totals $89.2 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations, of which $38.3 billion is authorized in support of base budget requirements.

The table preceding the detailed program adjustments in division D of this report summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2016 and compares these amounts to the President's request.

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President's total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2016 is $620.2 billion, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. In addition to funding for programs addressed in this bill, the total 050 request includes discretionary funding for national defense programs not in the committee's jurisdiction, discretionary funding for programs that do not require additional authorization in fiscal year 2016, and mandatory programs.

The table preceding the detailed program adjustments in division D of this report details changes to the budget request for all aspects of the national defense budget function.

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $106.96 billion for procurement. This represents a $12.36 billion increase over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommends authorization of $109.74 billion, an increase of $2.76 billion from the fiscal year 2016 request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 procurement program are identified in division D of this Act.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $5.68 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $5.86 billion, an increase of $179.8 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Aircraft Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

AH–64 Apache helicopter multi-year production contract

The budget request contained $1.4 billion in aircraft procurement, Army, for the AH–64 Apache Block IIIA program.

The committee notes that the AH–64 Apache Block IIIA program is increasing production to 64 aircraft in fiscal year 2016, and that the Army plans to maintain a production rate between 52 and 68 aircraft per year in fiscal years 2017–20. The committee believes that the production line is now stable enough for the Army to pursue a multi-year contract for the program, and that such a multi-year contract could potentially save over a hundred million dollars over a 5-year period. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to seek congressional approval of such a multi-year contract award in the fiscal year 2017 budget request.

The committee recommends $1.4 billion, the full amount requested, in aircraft procurement, Army, for the AH–64 Apache Block IIIA program.

Armed aerial scout rotorcraft

The committee understands the Army has an enduring requirement for an Armed Aerial Scout (AAS) platform. Additionally, the committee is aware that the Army's decision to utilize AH–64 Apache Attack helicopters in conjunction with current unmanned aerial systems was a recommended course of action from the official AAS Analyses of Alternatives. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the Army's interim Apache scout implementation plan, as well as the concept for the follow-on plan to replace this interim solution. Based on the information provided to it, the committee continues to have concerns regarding the Army's long-term strategy to address the AAS requirement.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2016, on the conclusions and recommendations of the AAS Analysis of Alternatives. The committee also expects this briefing to address and examine any joint multirole technologies that could be implemented as part of an AAS platform. The committee notes that the Joint Multirole Technology Demonstration program is currently informing the Army's ability to implement potential technologies in Future Vertical Lift aircraft.

Army UH–60A to UH–60L conversions for the National Guard

The budget request contained $46.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army and $227.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army for 40 UH–60A to UH–60L conversions.

The committee notes that based on the Army's current budget projections that Army National Guard units will not be able to replace their aging UH–60A Blackhawk aircraft until the end of fiscal year 2023. The committee further notes that this timeline depends on three separate Army programs: production of new UH–60M helicopters; the UH–60V upgrade program; and the UH–60A

to UH–60L conversion program. The committee supports acceleration of all three programs in order to accelerate the timeline for replacement of UH–60A helicopters in the Army National Guard. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes legislation that would further explore acceleration options. However, the committee also supports action in fiscal year 2016 to generate additional upgraded UH–60 helicopters. The committee understands that the maximum number of UH–60A to UH–60L conversions in fiscal year 2016 is 48 helicopters.

The committee recommends $55.4 million, an increase of $8.8 million, in Aircraft Procurement, Army and $314.6 million, an increase of $86.7 million, in Operation and Maintenance, Army for 48 UH–60A to UH–60L conversions.

Improved MQ–1C Gray Eagle modifications

The budget request contained $276.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army for the MQ–1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aerial System.

The committee notes that the MQ–1C Gray Eagle Unmanned Aircraft System provides critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities to combatant commanders. The committee understands that the Army has already implemented upgrades to modify the current Gray Eagle platform in order to provide extended range capabilities. This capability, known as the "Improved Gray Eagle," includes significant expansion of the fuselage to accommodate larger fuel capacity and additional payloads, as well as integration of an improved heavy fuel engine to support takeoff at heavier weights. However, additional funding is required to upgrade the last 17 legacy Gray Eagle aircraft to the Improved Gray Eagle configuration. The committee believes the increased endurance of a modified Gray Eagle provides combatant commanders greater employment options at increased ranges, expanded payload options, and improved basing flexibility in support of the Global ISR mission.

The committee recommends $293.9 million, an increase of $17.0 million, for improved MQ–1C Gray Eagle modifications.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $1.41 billion for Missile Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.49 billion, an increase of $76.0 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Missile Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $1.88 billion for Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $2.03 billion, an increase of $148.6 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Bradley Fighting Vehicles

The committee is aware that the US Army is working to standardize its fleet of Bradley Fighting Vehicles to two digital configurations; the M2A3 and the M2A2 ODS–SA. The committee understands that the majority of Active Duty and National Guard units are equipped with the most advanced versions of these vehicles that include digitized fire control and communications systems. The committee is aware that two units in particular, the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment and the Nevada National Guard, as well as several other active duty Brigade Engineer Battalions are equipped with the least modernized M2A2–ODS variant.

The committee acknowledges that the Bradley Family of Vehicles, to include the M2A2 ODS, M2A2 ODS–SA, and M2A3, share the same materiel engineering and construction with no differences in protection or survivability and that all three variants are deployable for combat. The committee is concerned that soldiers in the units M2A2 ODS versions lack the technical proficiency necessary to operate the advanced Bradley vehicles utilized in combat operations. The committee is concerned that this could degrade combat effectiveness and pose additional risk to units who deploy with the older Bradley variant.

The committee understands that the Army provides new equipment training for units scheduled to fall-in on equipment with unfamiliar capabilities upon deployment to combat theaters of operation. The committee also understands that the Army maintains a program of record for remanufacturing M2A2–ODS Bradley's that ceased production in 2014 and notes that the budget request did not include funding to modernize these remaining vehicles. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2016 on what resources would be required to maintain the readiness and technical proficiency of these units as well as current and long terms plans for modernizing the remaining vehicles.

Combat vehicle industrial base management

The committee notes that as a result of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), the Army is in the process of reducing its Active Duty end strength to 420,000, unless sequestration is resolved. Additionally, the Army will have reduced Active Component Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) from 45 to 32 by the end of fiscal year 2015. In 2012 the active Army had 17 Armored BCTs (ABCT), 20 Infantry BCTs (IBCT), and 8 Stryker BCTs. Notably, by the end of fiscal year 2015, the Army will have reduced active Army ABCTs to 9, nearly half the number it had in 2012. The committee notes that the ABCT, which is comprised of Abrams tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles, is the only full-spectrum force in the Army's force structure. With regard to the future utility of armored forces, the committee notes that a RAND Corporation report from 2010 concluded that, "Heavy forces-based on tanks and infantry fighting ve-

hicles-are key elements of any force that will fight hybrid enemies that have a modicum of training, organization, and advanced weapons. Light and medium forces can complement heavy forces, particularly in urban and other complex terrain; they do not provide the survivability, lethality, or mobility inherent in heavy forces. Quite simply, heavy forces reduce operational risks and minimize friendly casualties."

The committee is encouraged by the restoration of a third maneuver battalion in Armored and Infantry BCTs, and notes that in the committee report (H. Rept. 109–452) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, the committee opposed the Army's original decision to have only two maneuver battalions per BCT. The committee remains concerned about the reduction of active ABCTs and the Army's ability to have sufficient numbers of fully ready active ABCTs to meet combatant commander steady state and contingency plan requirements. Additionally, the committee has concerns about the mobility, protection, and lethality of IBCT, and encourages the Army to pursue rapid incremental solutions to address these shortfalls.

In addition to the mix of BCTs, the committee continues to need a better understanding of the ramifications to the future combat vehicle industrial base capabilities with regard to the Abrams tank, Bradley fighting vehicle, Paladin howitzer, Hercules recovery vehicle, Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle, and the Stryker combat vehicle. The committee commends the Army for making positive progress in information collection and analysis of long-term sustainment of the combat vehicle industrial base, and also its use of the analytical information collected to mitigate risk at both the prime and vendor level using congressionally appropriated funds. Moreover, the committee acknowledges that this information has helped inform the Army's position that Foreign Military Sales alone is not sufficient to sustain the viability of the combat vehicle industrial base. Such a position poses an unacceptable level of risk at both the prime contractor and vendor level and Congress has been consistently vocal on these risks in previous years.

The committee supports the Army's decision to accelerate the 4th Stryker Double-Vee-Hull conversion and Stryker Engineering Change Proposal (ECP) program for Stryker combat vehicle, as well as continuing its efforts in ECP production of the Bradley fighting vehicle, and M1 Abrams tank, to include development of six pilot M1A2 SEP V3. In addition, the committee understands that the Army awarded an Engineering Manufacturing Development contract for the Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle in December 2015, a program the committee has encouraged the Army to accelerate for several years. The out-year funding reflected in the budget request for fiscal year 2016 indicates a commitment by the Army to move forward with the next major technology upgrades for the existing fleet of weapon systems that would ensure fielding of the highest quality combat vehicles to a smaller force and also sustain the fragile industrial base. However, the committee remains concerned about the stability of Army modernization funding in fiscal year 2017 and beyond given the implications of sequestration. In particular, and verified by the Army's industrial base analysis, the committee is concerned about the viability of select vendor base suppliers, such as the Forward Looking Infra-red and trans-

missions sectors. The committee encourages the Army to continue to monitor these two sectors closely and to take necessary actions to maintain their viability.

Hercules recovery vehicle

The budget request contained $123.6 million for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

The committee is aware that in order to provide greater protection for soldiers, the Army's current and future fleet of combat vehicles has grown significantly in weight. As a result, the current fleet of M88A1 recovery vehicles is approaching its maximum capability, which will be greatly exceeded by the future fleet of combat vehicles. The committee notes that the M88A2 is the only vehicle that can single-handedly recover a main battle tank, and that it was the only vehicle in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan that could recover larger mine-resistant ambush-protected vehicles. The committee understands that the Army has recently increased the M88A2 acquisition objective to 933 systems, of which only 825 have been funded for procurement through fiscal year 2018. The committee supports the Army's decision to pursue a "pure fleet" strategy. However, the committee believes additional funds are needed in order to achieve Army requirements sooner and to provide manufacturing workload beyond fiscal year 2016. The committee also notes that the M88A2 is on the Army's unfunded priorities requirements list.

The committee recommends $195.6 million, an increase of $72.0 million, for the M88A2 improved recovery vehicle program.

M1 Abrams tank fleet configuration

The committee notes that the M1A2 System Enhancement Program (SEP) v2 Abrams tank is the Army's premier ground combat system and has demonstrated its value on the battlefields of Iraq. Its built-in test system ensures that diagnosis and repair are fast and efficient, improving combat availability and saving operational costs. Improved digital displays provide tank commanders and crews with a better understanding of their tank's operational status and their situation on the battlefield.

However, despite the capabilities of the M1A2 SEP v2, the committee is aware that the Army maintains two configurations of Abrams tanks, and believes that this dual configuration is inefficient and increasingly expensive. The committee further notes that all Armor Brigade Combat Teams (ABCT) in the active component are equipped with M1A2 SEP v2 tanks, but that only two out of seven ABCTs in the National Guard are equipped with new M1A2 SEP v2 tanks. The other five ABCTs in the National Guard, and the three separate Combined Arms Battalions, are equipped with less-capable M1A1 Situational Awareness (SA) tanks. The committee is also aware that Army schools currently provide training solely on M1A2 SEP v2s, meaning that Army National Guard soldiers attending an Army armor school are trained on M1A2 SEP v2 tanks, which is not the vehicle they will operate in their units. Finally, the committee also notes that the Army intends to begin fielding a new version of the M1 Abrams tank, the M1A2 SEP v3, in 2018. The committee understands that this tank will be an in-

cremental improvement from the M1A2 SEP v2 and retain significant commonality.

The committee believes that the Army should take advantage of upcoming changes to its ABCT force structure to achieve a pure fleet of M1A2 SEP v2 tanks across both the active duty Army and Army National Guard. The committee believes that maintaining only one type of tank in the Army will reduce support and training costs, allow better integration the Army National Guard, and provide a more capable overall tank fleet for the Army. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 30, 2016, on the potential force structure changes and production programs necessary to achieve a pure fleet of M1 Abrams tanks across the Army.

M240 production and industrial base sustainment

The budget request included $1.4 million for M240 medium machine gun modifications.

The committee is concerned that the budget request for the M240 medium machine gun does not provide adequate resources to maintain the capability of the industrial base workforce. The committee notes the M240 medium machine gun inventory is aging significantly. Consistent with previous committee activity regarding the need for small arms modernization, the committee encourages a general top-line increase for the M240 medium machine program across the Future Years Defense Program in order to sustain the U.S. small arms industrial base, as well as to ensure continued optimal M240 production for the military services. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the Army's long-term sustainment strategy and life-cycle sustainment plans for the M240 medium machine gun.

The committee recommends $1.4 million, the full amount requested, for M240 medium machine gun modifications.

Modular Handgun System

The budget request contained $5.4 million for the procurement of 7,106 new Modular Handgun (MHS) weapon systems.

The MHS is projected to be a non-developmental item, commercial-off-the-shelf replacement handgun for the current M9 pistol. The committee understands the MHS is intended to provide soldiers with improved lethality, accuracy, ergonomics, reliability, durability, and maintainability over current systems. The committee has consistently encouraged the military services to modernize the current inventory of small arms through new procurements, product improvement programs (PIP), or dual-path strategies that consist of new procurements and PIPs. The committee supports the MHS program, but remains concerned over the continued delay in releasing the official request for proposals (RFP). The committee understands that the Army is still finalizing performance requirements, and that the program's schedule is dependent upon final release of the RFP. According to notional schedules reviewed by the committee, the committee notes that the bid sample test program for the MHS could last up to 1 year. Due to the continued delay in releasing the RFP, and the extended bid sample test program,

the committee believes the procurement request for the MHS in fiscal year 2016 is ahead of need.

Therefore, the committee recommends no procurement funding for the MHS program due to funding ahead of need and current schedule delays.

Small arms production industrial base

The committee recognizes that a robust and viable small arms production industrial base (SAPIB) is essential to the long-term sustainment of reliable and capable sources that can develop, produce, and maintain military performance specifications for small arms parts and components, as well as to maintain competitively priced small arms property and services for use by the military services. In the interest of full and open competition, the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) repealed section 2473 of title 10, United States Code, which had required the Department of Defense to only procure certain small arms repair parts and components from a limited number of industry sources that the Department had identified as comprising the SAPIB.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the senior military services acquisition executives, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the current state of the SAPIB, as well as on the effect the repeal is having on the current SAPIB.

Stryker lethality upgrades

The budget request contained $74.0 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army for Stryker modifications and $257.1 million in PE 23735A for the Combat Vehicle Improvement Program.

The committee notes that U.S. Army deployments in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom placed a strain on the Army's combat vehicle fleet and prompted a significant investment in the force protection and survivability of M1 Abrams tanks, Bradley Fighting Vehicles and the Stryker family of wheeled combat vehicles to defeat mines, improvised explosive devices and other threats. One notable example is the success of the Double V Hull on the Stryker vehicle. The committee understands that this necessary investment in vehicle survivability did degrade vehicle mobility and may have caused the Army to defer investments in vehicle lethality.

The committee notes that the Army is addressing the mobility issues with Abrams, Bradley and Stryker with Engineering Change Proposal (ECP) modernization programs that are funded in the fiscal year 2016 request. The committee understands that the Army is also resourcing lethality improvements in later phases of the Abrams and Bradley ECP programs. The committee also notes that the Army is interested in pursuing lethality upgrades within Stryker Brigades, but has not yet resourced these upgrades. The committee understands that the Army has an emerging urgent operational requirement for Stryker Infantry Carrier Vehicles that have a direct fire weapon system. The committee also understands the Army initially wants Stryker vehicles with improved lethality to be fielded to the 2nd Cavalry Regiment, a Stryker Brigade Com-

bat Team forward deployed to Europe, to increase formation lethality against threat vehicles and dismounted infantry. The committee supports this urgent need and believes the Army should continue to pursue lethality upgrades of its Stryker Brigade Combat Teams in order to meet combatant commander requirements.

Further, the committee notes that the Stryker lethality upgrade program will use existing Stryker chassis that are leftover from the Stryker exchange process that creates Double V Hull Strykers, which will reduce the cost of the lethality upgrades.

Finally, the committee encourages the Army to conduct appropriate live fire testing as soon as possible on any potential Stryker survivability enhancements that have the potential to improve crew protection and overall vehicle survivability.

The committee recommends $118.5 million, an increase of $44.5 million, for Stryker modifications procurement and $292.1 million, an increase of $35.0 million, in PE 23735A for Stryker lethality upgrades.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $1.23 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $1.22 billion, a decrease of $11.0 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Procurement of Ammunition, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Cost assessment of decommissioning lead-based ammunition and associated components

The committee is concerned about the potential impact the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601–2629) could have on military ammunition and associated components containing lead components. Specifically, the committee notes that the Toxic Substances Control Act could potentially be used to ban conventional lead-based ammunition which would result in significant increases in the price of conventional ammunition for both ammunition manufacturers and the Department of Defense. The committee is aware that the U.S. Army and the U.S. Marine Corps are now procuring enhanced performance non-lead based 5.56mm and 7.62mm small caliber rounds, which provide better performance against soft and hard targets than lead rounds. However, the committee notes that the other military services still continue to use lead-based small caliber rounds. Additionally, the committee notes that other categories of conventional ammunition beyond small caliber ammunition contain significant amounts of lead-based components and that implementation of the Toxic Substances Control Act to ban lead-based ammunition could have a much broader effect across the ammunition enterprise beyond small caliber rounds.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a cost assessment to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, that details the costs associated with decommis-

sioning lead-based ammunition. The cost assessment should consider all Class V supply items, ammunition of all types, fuses, detonators, pyrotechnics, propellants, and associated component items to include primers.

Joint Hydra 70 guided rocket acquisition strategy

The committee understands that the Hydra 70 rocket is comprised of an unguided rocket system with an M151 fragmentation warhead and is categorized as an area weapon because once launched, the weapon impacts in the general direction that it is fired. The committee also understands that the Navy and the Marine Corps have been procuring and fielding the Advanced Precision Kill Weapon System (APKWS) since 2012. The APKWS adds a precision guided system component to the existing unguided Hydra rocket system, which provides a low-cost, low-yield precision guided kill capability against soft to lightly armored and hardened targets.

The committee is aware the Joint Requirements Oversight Council has recently re-validated the Army Operational Requirements Document for the APKWS, and notes that there is also a validated Army operational needs statement (ONS) for additional APKWS for use in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee understands the Army plans to leverage the Navy APKWS contract to procure Army APKWS rockets to address the ONS. The committee commends the Army for taking the necessary actions to rapidly field this capability to address an immediate warfighter need; however, the committee remains concerned over the absence of a long-term acquisition strategy for guided Hydra rockets. The committee is also concerned by the Department of Defense's perceived inability to field more capable warhead technology with greater lethality that could be used on these precision guided rocket systems. The committee is aware that such warheads exist and are in current inventory.

The committee directs the Secretary of Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the Department of Defense's near- and long-term acquisition and fielding strategies for precision guided rockets and warhead technology.

M3 Multi-role Anti-armor Anti-tank Weapon System

The budget request contained $7.5 million for M3 Multi-role Anti-armor Anti-tank Weapon System (MAAWS) Carl Gustaf High Explosive/High Explosive Dual Purpose combat and target ammunition and a sub-caliber training system to support annual training and maintain a war reserve inventory in accordance with the Army's total munitions requirements. The committee is encouraged that the Army is finalizing a program of record for M3 MAAWS and synchronizing program activities for Type Classification of combat and training ammunition, the M3 and lightweight M3A1 gun variants, as well as leveraging acquisition and logistics functions with U.S. Special Operations Command. The committee encourages the Army to complete system Type Classification and finalize its training sustainment strategy to include annual ammunition requirements, as well as virtual training and Multiple Integrated Laser Engagement System training requirements for se-

lected bases and training centers. To enhance the committee's oversight of this important effort, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the status of the M3 MAAWS program by October 1, 2015.

Small caliber ammunition industrial base

The committee is aware of a study commissioned by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Training to identify issues affecting ammunition production capability and recommended steps necessary to sustain a financially viable U.S. munitions industrial base. The committee commends the Army for previous steps taken, especially as it relates to Government-owned, contractor-operated facilities, to allow plant operators greater flexibility in pursuit of commercial and Foreign Military Sales which can help sustain this critical industrial base. The committee believes additional measures may be required to minimize risk and to better optimize army ammunition plant (AAP) utilization and reuse. The committee intends to work with the Army in assessing and implementing recommendations in the report commissioned by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Training. In particular, the committee is interested in gaining a better understanding on whether the Army should consider establishing a domestic production capability of non-standard small caliber ammunition for use by coalition nations, as well as assess how AAPs could implement more commercially-adopted business practices, such as leasing unused property.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $5.89 billion for Other Procurement, Army. The committee recommends authorization of $5.80 billion, a decrease of $91.0 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Other Procurement, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Army radio modernization

The committee notes that the schedule for the Manpack radio has been delayed. However, the committee continues to support the Army's decision to move forward with the competition using the currently planned multi-vendor acquisition strategy. In addition, the committee continues to support the Army's larger vision of a radio marketplace that drives innovation and technology improvement over the course of the program. Given the investment that the Army has made in the Manpack radio program to date and the clear requirements for the Manpack radio capability, the committee encourages the Army to meet current warfighter requirements as soon as possible. The committee also supports moving forward with an accelerated competition for both the dismounted and mounted versions of the Manpack radio and driving to produce improvements through the planned delivery order competition.

Civil Support Team Information Management System

The committee is aware that the National Guard Bureau Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams (CST) currently field a system called the CST Information Management System (CIMS), to provide a common operating picture, promote information-sharing and real-time collaboration in an emergency situation, and support the CST mission of assisting and advising first responders and facilitating communications with other Federal resources. Given that other National Guard Bureau forces, such as the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High explosive Enhanced Response Force Package (CERFP) and Homeland Defense Response Force (HRF) units are in need of similar capabilities, and in order for these forces to effectively communicate and operate during large-scale domestic events, the committee encourages the National Guard Bureau to expand CIMS to those CERFP and HRF forces.

Furthermore, the committee believes it is important that this CIMS capability increase interoperability and efficiently use prior investments to expand and enhance communication capability without creating unwarranted redundancy. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by November 1, 2015, detailing what steps have been taken to date to expand CIMS to CERFP and HRF units, as well as what action is planned with regard to the expansion of CIMS to CERFP and HRF forces to include timeline, milestones, and a detailed description of any other influencing factors.

Mine resistant ambush protected family of vehicles enduring requirement

The committee commends the military services for retaining the most capable mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicles to meet military operational and training needs, as well as standardizing the fleet to improve long-term sustainment. The committee notes that approximately 8,000 excess MRAP vehicles will first be offered to other U.S. Government entities and then to potential Foreign Military Sales (FMS) or excess defense article (EDA) customers. The committee understands that if there are no U.S. Government, FMS, or EDA claimants, the vehicles will follow approved disposition procedures for demilitarization.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the Chief of Staff of the Army was directed to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the advisability and feasibility of reusing MRAP vehicles as part of current mobile command post modernization strategies. The committee received the briefing and remains interested in the extent to which the Department of Defense has considered options for reuse of MRAP vehicles. The committee notes there could be emerging requirements for MRAP vehicles, such as fulfilling the requirement for Key Leader vehicles, as well as Command and Control vehicles, that may not have been fully considered as part of the broader context for the Department's long-term tactical wheeled vehicle modernization strategy. The committee also notes that since the Department's decision to finalize the enduring requirement for

MRAP vehicles 2 years ago, the military services currently face a significantly worse global threat environment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the following:

(1) The current and planned disposition of MRAP vehicles across the military services' inventory;

(2) Current mission requirements for MRAP vehicles, to include the status of the mobile command post requirement;

(3) The current guidance relative to the prioritization system used for handling excess MRAP vehicles based on threat and national interest; and

(4) A discussion of the relative threat environment, and whether the current threat environment would require a new review of the current enduring MRAP vehicle requirements.

Personal protective equipment modernization and industrial base sustainment

The committee has consistently highlighted the critical need for modernization of personal protective equipment (PPE). In previous legislation, the committee has expressed its concern regarding the Department of Defense's long-term strategy for PPE industrial base sustainment and has encouraged the Department to pursue strategies that would allow for sustainment of this critical industrial base through modernization efforts. The committee has noted the importance of managing PPE programs through a more traditional and deliberative approach to requirements generation and procurement of PPE systems. The committee continues to encourage and recommend a weapon system approach to PPE acquisition, in particular body armor, with an established procurement line item for PPE. The committee believes this would provide for more efficient planning, programming, and budgeting for PPE and would create a more stable environment for the industrial base to continue to invest in innovation and weight reduction technology. Instead of "reacting" to urgent operational needs, as the Department did in the 2000s during the buildups for Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, the Department and the industrial base would be better positioned to respond to any future threat or immediate warfighter need through this approach.

Section 146 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) required a federally funded research and development center to conduct a study to identify and assess alternative and effective means for stimulating competition and innovation in the personal protection equipment industrial base, to include body armor. The committee understands this study is now complete and is being reviewed by the Department, but regrettably will not be delivered to the committee in time for consideration as part of the committee's consideration of the current defense authorization bill.

The committee is aware that current body armor demand has prompted industry consolidation and restructuring decisions that will affect the Department's ability to respond to future warfighter requirements. The committee also notes that the committee report (H. Rept. 113–113) accompanying the Department of Defense Ap-

propriations Act, 2014 required a report addressing current capabilities of domestic body armor manufacturers to meet future surge requirements, inventory requirements, and steps taken by the Department to ensure the availability of domestic hard armor manufacturers for body armor systems. The committee understands the Department is still compiling data to address this reporting requirement, but notes that previous capability analysis indicated a minimum of two suppliers is needed to achieve surge production and maintain competition for the hard armor industrial base. The committee encourages the Department to take the necessary actions to maintain at least two vendors as part of this critical industrial base.

Rough Terrain Container Handler recapitalization

The committee is concerned that the budget request did not include funding for the Rough Terrain Container Handler, a system considered vital and critical to Department of Defense expeditionary logistics. The committee notes that many of these deployed assets may be categorized as combat losses because of their high usage and subsequent decreased life expectancy in the austere environments of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. Consistent with current recapitalization strategies for the Family of Forklifts to account for legacy systems used as left behind equipment, the committee encourages the Army to consider funding recapitalization of this critical logistics element.

U.S. Army Europe garrison communications

The committee is concerned about communications security shortfalls at U.S. Army Europe (USAREUR) bases, which are in many cases using an outdated garrison emergency communications platform that does not support multi-party conversations and fully secure communications. The committee is particularly concerned about how this outdated equipment could hinder a fully effective response to a terrorist event or other emergency situation on Army bases in Europe. In addition, the committee notes that third-party studies, such as one conducted by the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Crane, have recommended that USAREUR standardize and integrate its garrison communications infrastructure into a single enterprise operation by entering into a joint agreement with U.S. Air Forces Europe (USAFE) to utilize their existing, modern, Enterprise Land Mobile Radio (ELMR) program. The committee recognizes that significant savings may be achieved through a joint USAFE–USAREUR ELMR program and that such an effort would also support broader Joint Information Environment goals.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $16.12 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $18.34 billion, an increase of $2.21 billion, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Aircraft Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Airborne electronic attack low band transmitter consolidation

The budget request contained $23.2 million for airborne electronic attack systems, but did not include any funds for the low band transmitter consolidation engineering change proposal (ECP).

The committee notes that the Navy's Next Generation Jammer (NGJ) program will eventually replace legacy ALQ–99 jammers and will be fielded incrementally starting in 2021. The committee also notes that the Increment 2 (Inc 2) element of the NGJ program, which addresses low band jammer issues, is planned to begin fielding later, in 2026. As a result, the committee understands that current ALQ–99 low band transmitters will be required in the interim. According to Navy program officials, ALQ–99 low band transmitters are still in production and a low band transmitter consolidation ECP effort can be fielded in 2019 which leverages significant industry investment, optimizes the jammers for the EA–18G Growler, and provides critical operational capabilities until the fielding of NGJ Inc 2.

Therefore, the committee recommends $37.2 million, an increase of $15.0 million, for the low band transmitter consolidation ECP. The committee expects that these funds would be used for production and fielding of low band transmitter consolidation ECP installations.

MH–60R and MH–60S service life extension plans

The budget request contained $995.2 million for procurement of MH–60S and MH–60R helicopters.

The committee notes that production of new MH–60S helicopters will end in fiscal year 2015 and that production of new MH–60R helicopters will end in fiscal year 2018. The committee also notes that the long timeline for the future vertical lift program will likely require a service life extension program (SLEP) for the MH–60S and MH–60R fleets in order to keep the required number of aircraft in service. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, that includes a detailed layout of the timeline and funding for a potential SLEP program that maintains enough aircraft to meet requirements through fiscal year 2030 or beyond for the MH–60S and MH–60R helicopter fleets.

The committee recommends $995.2 million, the full amount requested, for the MH–60S and MH–60R helicopters.

MQ–8 Fire Scout

The budget request contained $120.0 million for MQ–8C Fire Scout procurement, of which $44.2 million was for procurement of two MQ–8C air vehicles.

The MQ–8C Fire Scout is a vertical take-off and landing unmanned aerial vehicle which provides real-time and non-real time intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) data to tactical users without the use of manned aircraft or reliance on limited theater or national assets. The committee notes that the budget request reflects a production quantity reduction from five MQ–8Cs per year in fiscal year 2015 to two per year for fiscal year 2016, and understands that a production quantity of five MQ–8Cs per

year is the minimum sustaining rate. The committee further understands that procurement of five MQ–8Cs per year supports an efficient and cost effective production rate, and would mitigate the risk of a production break.

Consequently, the committee recommends $156.0 million, an increase of $36.0 million, for MQ–8C Fire Scout procurement for an additional three MQ–8C air vehicles.

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

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee noted that subsequent to an April 8, 2000, MV–22 mishap at Marana Northwest Regional Airport, Arizona, the Marine Corps released information on July 27, 2000, regarding the MV–22 accident investigation report which caused confusion concerning the cause of the mishap by not making a clear distinction between the terms "human factors" and "pilot error." Consequently, the committee encouraged the Commandant of the Marine Corps to work with interested committee members to further clarify the Marine Corps' public statements about the April 8, 2000, MV–22 mishap so that media reporting of this accident would more accurately portray the causal factors of the accident. Unfortunately, this situation has yet to be fully resolved.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to publicly clarify the causes of the MV–22 mishap at Marana Northwest Regional Airport, Arizona, in a way consistent with the results of all investigations as soon as possible.

V–22 for carrier on-board delivery

The Department of the Navy currently uses the C–2A aircraft to perform the carrier on-board delivery (COD) mission, and has chosen the V–22 to replace the C–2A for the COD mission. The COD mission is the use of aircraft to ferry personnel, mail, supplies, and high-priority cargo, such as replacement parts, from shore bases to an aircraft carrier at sea.

The committee supports the Department of the Navy's decision to use the V–22 for its COD mission, and notes that both the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force have had a long-standing program of record to develop and procure the V–22 aircraft. The committee further notes that both the MV–22 and CV–22 are proven platforms for the both the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force.

The committee believes that the V–22's unique combination of speed, range, cargo capacity, and vertical agility will transform the way that sea-based logistics are accomplished for the COD mission, and carrier strike groups will have more flexible options for resupply, while the V–22's direct delivery method will allow aviation assets currently used for vertical resupply to be used for other missions. The committee understands that the Department of the Navy's military utility assessment found the V–22 to be an effective, flexible, and safe capability to conduct the COD mission, with no adverse impact to cyclical flight operations. Accordingly, the committee believes that executing the Department of the Navy's program of record for the V–22 provides an affordable, low-risk acquisition for the future COD mission.

V–22 medical evacuation capability

The committee notes that the Navy's plan for the next generation of Department of the Navy carrier onboard delivery (COD) will be performed by the V–22 Osprey. One of the benefits of this new platform will be an expanded patient medical evacuation (medevac) capability by a non-catapult platform. The current COD C–2A aircraft has the capability to transport litter patients but this capability is limited due to the G-forces associated with arrested landings and catapult takeoffs. The V–22 vertical takeoff will increase the range of intubated patient movement from the current helicopter range and catapult-induced G-forces will no longer be a concern for patients with orthopedic or neurologic trauma. The committee encourages the Department of the Navy to address this mission capability by developing a V–22 medevac equipment package. Retaining the medevac equipment onboard the carrier could potentially allow any COD mission to transition to a medevac mission with little pre-mission planning and without major impact to outbound cargo or passenger space.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $3.15 billion for Weapons Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $3.23 billion, an increase of $77.8 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Weapons Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Joint Standoff Weapon sustainment

The budget request contained $21.4 million to fund termination costs for the Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW) C–1 program.

The JSOW C–1 program provides for a standardized medium-range precision guided glide munition system that can engage defended targets from outside the range of standard anti-aircraft defenses. The committee has concerns about the proposed termination of the JSOW C–1 program given the current threat environment, as well as current munition inventories. The committee is troubled by the lack of analysis supporting the proposed termination by the Navy and its associated impacts to the industrial base. The committee notes this request contradicts budget justification material used as part of the President's request for fiscal year 2015. The committee also notes that the Chief of Naval Operations has indicated potential shortfalls exist for the JSOW C–1 munitions. The committee understands that a technical Nunn-McCurdy breach has been triggered by the reduction in quantities proposed in the request, and encourages the Secretary of Defense to expeditiously complete required certifications to continue the remaining program.

The committee is aware there is approximately $2.00 billion in Foreign Military Sales (FMS) that are expected across the Future Years Defense Program for JSOW C–1 munitions, however the committee is concerned about the Navy's position that Foreign

Military Sales alone would be sufficient to sustain the viability of the JSOW munitions industrial base. The committee notes FMS cases often take years longer than originally planned to materialize and believes the Navy is assuming unacceptable levels of risk. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the plan to support continued JSOW modernization, to include plans for integration on the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter, as well as the planned schedule for FMS sales.

The committee recommends $69.2 million, an increase of $47.8 million, to help procure additional JSOW C–1 munitions at the minimum sustaining rate of 200 per year in fiscal year 2016 to better sustain the industrial base and mitigate potential inventory shortfalls.

Tomahawk Block IV

The budget request contained $184.8 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy for procurement of 100 Tomahawk missiles, which is a decrease of 96 missiles below the minimum sustaining rate. The budget request also would terminate Tomahawk Block IV procurement beginning in fiscal year 2017.

The committee is concerned by the Secretary of the Navy's recommendation to terminate procurement of the Nation's only long-range, surface-launched land-attack cruise missile production capability prior to finalizing concept development of the Next Generation Land Attack Weapon, which is not planned to be operationally fielded until 2024 at the earliest. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the capability to recertify current inventory Block IV Tomahawk missiles could be put at risk if the Secretary of the Navy decides to shutter the Tomahawk Block IV production line in fiscal year 2017. In addition, the Secretary has not clearly articulated how the inventory of long-range cruise missiles will be replenished if the current stock of Tomahawk missiles is utilized to fulfill test, training, and warfighting requirements between 2016–24. The committee is also concerned that the Navy is well below all categories of inventory requirements and is discouraged that the Navy is only using one category of inventory requirements in stating that there is no risk by terminating Tomahawk Block IV production in fiscal year 2017.

Finally, the committee notes that although the fiscal year 2016 budget request is 96 missiles below the minimum sustaining rate, the Secretary has committed to procure 47 Tomahawk Block IV missiles in fiscal year 2016 using $45.5 million provided in the Overseas Contingency Operations account of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2015 (division C of Public Law 113–235). As a result, the committee understands that an additional 49 missiles are required in fiscal year 2016 to meet minimum sustaining rate.

Therefore, the committee recommends $214.8 million, an increase of $30.0 million, in Weapons Procurement, Navy for procurement of 149 Tomahawk missiles and to reduce risk to the Tomahawk missile industrial base. The committee supports continuing the minimum sustaining rate of Tomahawk Block IV to fully satisfy inventory requirements and bridge transition to Tomahawk Block IV recertification and modernization.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $723.7 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $723.7 million, full funding of the request, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Procurement of Ammunition, Navy and Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $16.59 billion for Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $16.27 billion, a decrease of $327.2 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Advance procurement for Afloat Forward Staging Base

The budget request contained no funds for advance procurement for an Afloat Forward Staging Base.

The committee notes that the Administration has programmed $661.0 million for a third Afloat Forward Staging Base in fiscal year 2017. The committee believes that there will be a costly and disruptive industrial production base break between the fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2017 ships unless advance procurement funds for fiscal year 2016 can be allocated for long lead-time ship material and component orders that would help support a shipbuilder start of construction for this required military capability 1 year earlier.

Therefore, the committee recommends $97.0 million for advance procurement for an Afloat Forward Staging Base.

Air and Missile Defense Radar Testing evaluation

The committee notes that the Navy plans to use the *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers (DDG 51) hull form as the platform for the Air and Missile Defense Radar (AMDR), which will provide integrated air and ballistic missile defense capability for the fleet. The committee further notes that the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation has disagreed with the Navy's plans for AMDR testing and believes that in order to achieve full end-to-end test results, testing must be performed aboard the self-defense test ship. Considering the central role that AMDR and DDG 51 Flight III will play in sea-based ballistic missile defense and the magnitude of the Navy's planned investment, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, as to the potential use of AMDR on the self-defense test ship. This report should include, but is not limited to, an analysis of the following:

(1) Maturity of AMDR and the Navy's plans for developing, testing, and integrating AMDR, to include a cost benefit of performing AMDR testing aboard the self-defense test ship versus a manned ship;

(2) Risks associated with the Navy's planned acquisition strategy for the DDG 51 class and AMDR; and

(3) Any additional items the Comptroller General deems relevant to the report.

Amphibious ship construction

The budget request contained no funds for advance procurement associated with the replacement amphibious warship (LX(R)).

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have agreed to support the LX(R) as a derivative of the LPD 17 *San Antonio*-class hull form. The committee also notes that the fiscal year 2016 budget submission from the Department of the Navy continues investment in the nation's amphibious warship fleet with the completion costs anticipated for LPD 28. The committee supports the Navy's initiative to use an existing hull form and commends the Navy on efforts to decrease costs and reduce schedule. However, the committee is concerned that the Navy shipbuilding plan does not take advantage of the efficiencies and subsequent cost avoidance inherent in maintaining an active industrial base for construction of vessels utilizing the LPD 17 hull form. The committee believes that the optimum construction start for the LX(R) class of vessels is in fiscal year 2018 rather than the current Navy program of record of fiscal year 2020.

Therefore, the committee recommends $250.0 million in advance procurement for amphibious vessels in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, for investment in engineering design and planning, and long lead time equipment including propulsion, steering and electrical generating equipment, air conditioning plants, castings, and other items necessary to move construction start of the first LX(R) vessel to fiscal year 2018.

Coast Guard polar icebreaker

The committee notes that the United States Coast Guard initiated a new project for the design and construction of a new polar icebreaker in fiscal year 2013, but the timing and execution of this project have become uncertain. The project received $7.6 million in the Department of Defense, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113–6), $2.0 million in Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76), and no funding in fiscal year 2015. The budget request for fiscal year 2016 requests $4.0 million to continue initial acquisition activities for the ship. A new polar icebreaker is projected to cost between $900 million to $1.10 billion.

The Department of Homeland Security (DHS) approved a Mission Need Statement for the polar icebreaker recapitalization project in June 2013. The MNS states, "This Mission Need Statement (MNS) establishes the need for polar icebreaker capabilities provided by the Coast Guard, to ensure that it can meet current and future mission requirements in the polar regions. . . . Current requirements and future projections based upon cutter demand

modeling, as detailed in the HLMAR [High Latitude Mission Analysis Report], indicate the Coast Guard will need to expand its icebreaking capacity, potentially requiring a fleet of up to six icebreakers (3 heavy and 3 medium) to adequately meet mission demands in the high latitudes. . . .”

The committee believes that the administration has inadequately valued the necessity to procure required icebreaking capacity. The committee believes the failure to acquire all domain access capability in polar regions expeditiously may irreparably harm Department of Defense national security missions, and may leave the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating unable to meet its anticipated future responsibilities related to maritime safety and security, search and rescue, environmental response, and fishery law enforcement. The committee supports the use of Department of Defense authorities and acquisition expertise to acquire required icebreaking capabilities. The committee is supportive of interim leasing authority to meet short- and mid-term icebreaking requirements to include the use of section 2401 of title 10, United States Code, leasing authority and other such leasing authorities resident in the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating. The committee encourages the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to acquire all domain access capability in polar regions expeditiously. Such a plan should address both a bridging strategy to cover the period between the end of the useful life of the USCGC Polar Star and the construction of a new medium or heavy icebreaker.

Joint High Speed Vessel Build Specification

The committee notes that appropriations for an additional Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV) was provided in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235) and the Secretary of the Navy is negotiating an award for the construction of that ship. The committee also notes the JHSV is a growing part of the fleet and is now included in the count of the Battle Force ships. In order to ensure the Navy realizes the benefits associated with the cost efficiencies gained in building the first ten JHSVs and avoids any schedule delays in the delivery of the eleventh ship to Fleet, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy, to the maximum extent possible, to grant any waivers to regulatory or statutory changes that have been instituted since the award of the original JHSV contract. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to prepare a brief to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by October 1, 2015 on efforts to continue the regulatory and statutory changes that were in effect for the first 10 JHSVs with the additional JHSV 11.

National Defense Sealift Fund

The committee notes that the National Defense Sealift Fund (NDSF) was created by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (Public Law 102–484) to address sealift funding issues using a revolving fund concept. Since its inception, the committee notes that NDSF has been successfully used to support multiple procurements and has a legacy of success in supporting U.S. shipbuilding interests.

Therefore, the committee recommends the transfer of $674.2 million for the Navy TAO(X) Oiler Shipbuilding Program from the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy account to the National Defense Sealift Fund, Navy account.

Naval electric weapons systems fielding plan

The committee is aware that the Navy has been pursuing development and operational demonstration of a number of electric weapons systems, including both directed energy systems and electromagnetic railguns. This class of electric weapons has the potential to provide revolutionary new capabilities for Navy platforms, including increased range, increased safety, and deeper magazines than conventional weapons. The committee believes that such systems will be important in the future to counter cost-imposing strategies in an anti-access environment where swarms of low-cost weapons could be used to overwhelm higher-cost, limited numbers of defensive weapons. However, as the Navy continues to pursue increasing power and decreasing size for such weapons, the committee believes that the Navy should also be considering how to field and integrate such systems into future naval platforms in order to facilitate successful transition from the laboratory to the fleet.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to develop a plan for fielding electric weapon systems within the Department of the Navy for both the current and future fleet, and to provide a briefing on the results of this plan to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016. As part of this plan, the Secretary of the Navy shall detail proposals for the allocation of the requisite power and space for the fielding of electric weapons systems, such as the Laser Weapons System, electromagnetic railgun, or other similar systems currently in development for the current and future fleet.

Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine replacement

The Navy's *Ohio*-class replacement program is intended to replace the current fleet of existing *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarines. The Navy plans to procure 12 submarines to replace the 14 existing *Ohio*-class submarines, at an estimated total program cost of over $95.00 billion in fiscal year 2015 dollars. The Navy plans to begin procuring the lead ship in the class starting in fiscal year 2021, with detail design planned for 2017. The Navy has recognized that given the investment requirements associated with the *Ohio*-class replacement program, it will face serious resource challenges starting in fiscal year 2020. The Navy is currently in the early design phase of this program and is investigating various cost reduction efforts, such as an early reduction of requirements and ongoing efforts to identify mature technologies that can be leveraged from other submarine and ship programs. The Government Accountability Office has reported in the past on the importance of attaining key knowledge early in shipbuilding programs in order to reduce the risk of future cost growth and schedule delays.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, on the *Ohio*-class replacement program, which should include the following specific elements:

(1) The feasibility of the Navy's planned technical approaches to meeting identified performance requirements;

(2) The maturity of the technologies identified for the *Ohio*-class replacement, including the development of a new nuclear reactor;

(3) The status of prototyping efforts to reduce technical risk in advance of lead ship construction;

(4) The readiness and capacity of the industrial base to design and build the submarines and the availability of any unique materials necessary for submarine construction; and

(5) Any risk in the Navy's planned acquisition strategy for the class.

Shipbuilding and industrial base

The committee remains concerned about the health of the non-nuclear surface combatant industrial base. While the Navy public shipyards are expanding to meet significant workload increases associated with the growth of unplanned *Nimitz*-class carrier work and the nuclear undersea warfare industrial base is programmed to increase their capacity with the introduction of the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine replacement program beginning in fiscal year 2019, the committee notes that a limited shipbuilding and conversion Navy account may disproportionately and irrevocably impact the non-nuclear surface combatant industrial base. Some of these non-nuclear surface combatant industrial base partners are reviewing significant reductions in the workload unless a concurrent increase in their work effort is programmed. The committee notes that the continued ship design and construction of LPD–28, continued construction of two *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers and three Littoral Combat Ships, and the advance procurement associated with Afloat Forward Staging Base and the replacement amphibious warship (LX(R)), will serve to partially mitigate the dearth of workload programmed at the non-nuclear surface combatant shipyards; but the committee believes that a significant infusion of additional naval focus in ship construction is necessary to sustain the current industrial base.

The committee notes that the administration has offered a number of initiatives to help mitigate this shortfall including an innovative contracting method that places certain amphibious and auxiliary ships under a contract to better sustain the industrial base.

The committee believes that continued long-term, multiyear procurement and block buy contracts are integral to sustaining the overall industrial base. The committee has provided a multitude of such authorities for a variety of these ship classes to sustain this effort and provide a stable industrial base. The committee encourages the Department of the Navy to continue innovative contracting efforts and workload agreements that focus on the non-nuclear surface combatant industrial base to ensure its long-term health and viability as a national security asset.

USS John F. Kennedy two-phase acquisition strategy

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy has prepared a two-phase acquisition strategy to support the delivery of the USS *John F. Kennedy* (CVN 79) that would be concurrent with the inactivation of the USS *Nimitz* (CVN 68). This strategy would complete the hull, mechanical and electrical construction work

(phase I) and then after a planned incremental availability, would install relevant shipboard combat systems and electronics during another availability (phase II). The Navy has indicated that this two-phase acquisition strategy will reduce construction costs, increase flexibility in the schedule, provide an opportunity to install a lower-cost radar solution, and preempt required obsolescence management in the first planned incremental availability. The committee is concerned, however, that this two-phase strategy may unnecessarily extend the USS *John F. Kennedy* fleet induction timeline by 18 months and increase costs as a result of extended overhead and inflationary losses.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, about the two-phase acquisition strategy. The report shall include an assessment of conducting the proposed phase II work concurrent with the phase I USS *John F. Kennedy* effort, and assess the cost and inflationary implications associated with the proposed and concurrent work options.

Virginia Payload Module

The committee notes the retirement of the *Ohio*-class guided missile submarine in the 2020s will cause a significant shortfall in the strike capacity of the undersea forces. In response to the pending retirement of these guided missile submarines, the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) supported the inclusion of a Virginia Payload Module (VPM) to partially offset the strike loss.

The committee supports the JROC determination to incorporate VPM into the *Virginia*-class submarine, but is concerned that the introduction period of VPM be based on a one per year build strategy during the 2020s. The committee notes that the tables accompanying the 30-year shipbuilding plan include a *Virginia*-class build rate that varies between one and two per year during the 2020s. The committee is perplexed by the Navy decision to not incorporate VPM into every Block V *Virginia*-class submarine and believes that this inconsistent build rate suboptimizes the overall development of this important capability.

The committee supports the expeditious development of this capability consistent with the delivery of every Block V *Virginia*-class submarine.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $6.61 billion for Other Procurement, Navy. The committee recommends authorization of $6.72 billion, an increase of $111.5 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Other Procurement, Navy program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Aegis refurbishment and ship modernization

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy has a significant challenge associated with the modernization of the de-

stroyer and cruiser force structure. Specifically, the software and hardware configurations for the Aegis weapon system of the in-service destroyers and cruisers are challenged to keep pace with current and future threats. The plethora of over ten Aegis software baselines and inability to focus modernization efforts undermine the Navy's large surface combatants' relevancy through their expectant service lives. The committee supports options to improve the capability of the in-service Aegis fleet by updating the Aegis computer program configurations of the ships to an Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD) capability to include refurbishing and modernizing the SPY–I radar hardware of the ships. The committee believes computer program updates are cost effective, performance-enhancing ways of deploying the proven Aegis Common Source Library across the Flight I, II and IIA destroyers, to include reusing existing computing equipment where prudent to reduce cost and increase operational availability. There is also operational utility in merging legacy anti-air warfare and ballistic missile defense Aegis computer programs aboard Flight I and II destroyers.

With respect to the SPY–I radar improvements, the committee also believes that a multitude of options are available to the Navy that should provide improvements to sensor coverage, raid capacity, flexibility in ship stationing, and target discrimination, including hardware changes, that can be accomplished pier-side in order to reduce cost and increase operational availability. Finally, in order to reduce cost and increase operational availability, the committee is supportive of Aegis hardware changes that do not considerably alter current ship configuration (i.e. deckhouse design) and that can be accomplished within acceptable margins for space, weight and power and cooling.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chief of Naval Operations and the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to prepare a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of the act:

(a) An overview of the Aegis in service options that are being considered to modernize Aegis computer program configurations and SPY–I radar hardware;

(b) For each option being considered in (a), the report shall include the cost and implementation data associated with each option; affordability and risk assessments; and any other supporting analyses the Chief of Naval Operations and the Director of the Missile Defense Agency consider appropriate.

Air and Missile Defense Radar

The committee understands that the Navy Air and Missile Defense Radar (AMDR) is designed to be fully scalable and modular to support a variety of shipboard radar applications on a variety of platforms. The committee further understands that the flexibility in the design of AMDR could also provide the foundation for land based applications.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, on the Department of the Navy's plan to utilize the AMDR investment across existing and future platforms in the fleet. The briefing shall also include options that the Secretary is considering to exploit

AMDR scalability in other service radar acquisitions to realize greater affordability through economies of scale.

Destroyer modernization

The budget request contained $364.2 million in Other Procurement, Navy for destroyer modernization.

The committee notes that one destroyer combat system modernization, valued at $60.0 million, was eliminated in the budget request and that a total of five destroyer modernizations were eliminated across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Navy has applied insufficient resources toward modernization efforts and that a dearth of capabilities will result when compared against needed capabilities outlined in the most recent Navy Force Structure Assessment.

Therefore, the committee recommends $424.2 million, an increase of $60.0 million, for an additional destroyer modernization.

Littoral Combat Ship simulation training

The committee notes the significant cost savings, increase in fidelity of training, and improved operational readiness rates that are achievable through the use of game-based immersive virtual ship training environments (IVSE), as is being developed for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS). The committee also notes that the Navy intends to delay funding for this LCS courseware developments that may provide near-term efficiencies and longer-term operational cost-savings.

The committee believes that IVSE is integral to initial training initiatives and concurrency training in order to ensure mission readiness for the crews of the LCS squadron. The committee also believes IVSE may not only expand the LCS multi-mission training profile, but that it may also provide opportunities for expansion to aircraft maintenance and other vessel training. The committee would support opportunities that expand IVSE mission training to additional platform training programs that may include aviation, surface, and subsurface operation and maintenance virtual training environments.

Radar Obsolescence and Availability Recovery Upgrades

The budget request contains $11.757 million for Radar Obsolescence and Availability Recovery upgrades to convert one AN/SPS–48E radar system to the AN/SPS–48G configuration on aircraft carriers and amphibious assault ships. The committee notes that, since its inception in 2005, Navy officials have repeatedly cited this upgrade program as a high priority, as the AN/SPS–48G configuration allows for operations under dynamic threat conditions, improves operational availability, and reduces ownership costs. The committee further notes that part of this plan's effectiveness has been the ability to order and execute three kits per year, providing a better price for the Navy and coinciding with planned servicing schedules for the fleet.

The committee is concerned that the reduction from three AN/SPS–48G kits to one kit in fiscal year 2016 will increase the unit cost of this program and delay the availability of this upgrade throughout the fleet. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the

House of Representatives not later than August 31, 2015 as to: (1) the unit cost impact due to a reduction from three AN/SPS–48G units to one as proposed in the Fiscal Year 2016 budget request; (2) the approximate date at which the Navy anticipates completing its upgrade to the AN/SPS–48G radar at rates of one unit per year versus three units per year; and (3) any capability gaps and vulnerabilities to large surface combatants due to using the legacy AN/SPS–48E radar instead of the AN/SPS–48G. This report may contain a classified annex.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $1.13 billion for Procurement, Marine Corps. The committee recommends authorization of $1.16 billion, an increase of $37.5 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Procurement, Marine Corps program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Garrison Mobile Engineering Equipment

The budget request contained $1.4 million for procurement of Garrison Mobile Engineering Equipment.

The committee understands this program procures commercial construction and engineering equipment, such as graders, backhoes, cranes, and other construction equipment. The committee notes that the Marine Corps has initiated a program for precision upgrades for Garrison Mobile Engineering Equipment that would consist of competitively awarded contracts to upgrade current systems with global positioning system grade control systems and laser-leveling survey sets. The committee understands these upgrades could provide for better performance, reduced time to conduct missions, and fuel savings, as well as reduce Marine construction engineers' exposure to enemy fire in combat conditions. The committee believes additional investment for these precision upgrades would provide for improved capability for current engineering equipment, and provide for increased force protection for deployed Marine construction engineers. The committee encourages the Marine Corps to continue to invest in this capability portfolio.

The committee recommends $1.4 million, the full amount of the request, for procurement of Garrison Mobile Engineering Equipment.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $15.65 billion for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $15.94 billion, an increase of $290.5 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Aircraft Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

A–10 aircraft

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force plans to retire 164 A–10 aircraft in fiscal year 2016. For fiscal year 2015, the Department of the Air Force proposed the retirement of 100 A–10 aircraft and in H.R. 4435, the Howard P."Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as reported by the House Committee on Armed Services, the committee included a provision that would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense to be obligated or expended to retire A–10 aircraft. The committee notes that since last year, A–10 aircraft have been deployed for combat in Operation Inherent Resolve and to Europe as part of theater security packages. The committee continues to believe that the capabilities provided by the A–10 including persistent, effective, and precise close air support; interdiction; airborne forward air control; combat search and rescue; and strike control and reconnaissance, are critical to meet national security requirements. The committee further notes that with the proposed retirement of the 164 A–10 aircraft in fiscal year 2016, the Department expects to be 181 fighter aircraft short of its 2,000-aircraft fighter requirement, and the committee believes that retiring 164 A–10 aircraft in fiscal year 2016 presents an unacceptable capacity risk.

Air National Guard wildfire assistance

The committee notes that the U.S. Global Change Research Program has determined that the frequency of large wildfires and the length of the fire season have increased substantially in recent decades. The committee acknowledges that the U.S. Geological Survey Federal Fire Occurrence Database indicates that the occurrences of catastrophic wildfires in the United States are more prevalent in the western half of the country. Air National Guard units flying C–130 aircraft equipped with Modular Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS) have been an integral part of wildfire suppression, saving not only property but lives. The committee acknowledges that as catastrophic wildfires continue to grow in severity, it is important to provide the assistance of our Air National Guard. The committee believes that MAFFS should be located in positions that maximize the effectiveness of MAFFS units consistent with the highest probability of risk for the United States.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to prepare a brief to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2015 that assess the locations of C–130 MAFFS units. Such a briefing should provide a listing of the current United States Air Force units, their utilization rates, and a future force allocation determination that most efficiently utilizes the MAFFS units. This briefing shall specifically assess opportunities to expand coverage of MAFFS units in the western United States.

Air refueling recapitalization strategy

The committee notes that the Department of Defense continues to develop a long-range plan to replace the KC–10 Extender and KC–135 Stratotanker fleets with the KC–46A Pegasus, as well as the KC–Y and KC–Z programs. The committee strongly reiterates the importance of maintaining our nation's robust air-refueling capability in a current fiscal environment that has required our forces to be more agile and rapidly deployable. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by September 30, 2015 on the Air Force's long-range air refueling recapitalization plans, including the Air Force's strategy to meet air refueling demands specific to the Asia-Pacific area of responsibility.

Battlefield airborne communications node

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force's battlefield airborne communication node (BACN) program was developed to meet critical communications needs and was fielded through rapid acquisition authorities to support urgent operational requirements. The committee further notes that BACN continues to act as a critical communications and data relay system, flying on EQ–4B and E–11A aircraft not only in support of Operation Freedom's Sentinel, but also throughout the U.S. Central Command's area of responsibility and elsewhere in support of operational requirements.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee encouraged the Secretary of the Air Force to transition BACN to a traditional program of record. The committee remains concerned that the potential decline of Overseas Contingency Operations funding in the future and no clear plan to transition BACN to a traditional program of record may place the program at risk, and that previous investments as well as operational experience may be lost. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a plan to transition BACN to a base budget program of record in order to meet current operational needs, as well as anticipated future requirements across theaters to ensure that this capability is maintained in the Department of the Air Force for the long-term.

C–130 modernization plan

The budget request contained $8.5 million for procurement of C–130 modifications but included no funds for the T–56 3.5 engine modification or for the C–130 eight-bladed propeller upgrade. The T–56 3.5 engine modification lowers fuel consumption, improves performance, and improves engine life, and the eight-bladed propeller upgrade improves the thrust of the C–130's engine.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee expressed a concern that the Department of the Air Force has not been taking actions to ensure that the C–130H aircraft fleet is being upgraded with modifications that address obsolescence, diminishing manufacturing sources, and increased operations and sustainment costs. The committee notes that for fiscal year 2016, the C–130H modernization program in-

cludes a center wing box replacement program and a program to address certain airspace compliance concerns. The committee supports this modernization program and encourages the Air Force to address cockpit modifications required to mitigate obsolescence and diminishing manufacturing sources. The committee believes that a comprehensive program should be developed to ensure that the C–130H has a service life through 2040 as currently planned.

The committee notes that the report of the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review states that the Department of the Air Force will maintain 300 combat-coded C–130H and C–130J aircraft in the tactical airlift fleet inventory to support requirements and the objectives of the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance. The committee further notes that the Department plans to divest C–130 aircraft in the Future Years Defense Program so that the tactical airlift fleet is reduced to 308, and the committee believes that the Department of the Air Force inventory of C–130 aircraft should not be less than 308 aircraft.

To provide for improved C–130H propulsion performance, reliability, and efficiency, the committee recommends $71.7 million for C–130 modifications, an increase of $33.2 million for the T–56 3.5 engine modification and an increase of $30.0 million for the C–130 eight-bladed propeller upgrade.

C–130H modernization

The committee is encouraged that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force has proposed a plan that finally addresses the committee's longstanding concern for the modernization of C–130H aircraft that reside primarily in the National Guard and Reserve components of the Department of the Air Force. The Department of the Air Force has briefed the committee on multiple occasions on a new plan, which is being referred to as the Avionics and Modernization Program (AMP) Increments 1 and 2 that appears to address many of the committee's concerns. However, the committee remains concerned that the plan's timeline for implementation may still leave some C–130H aircraft non-compliant with future airspace requirements and still susceptible to increased diminishing manufacturing sources (DMS) and obsolescence issues. Specifically, the proposed timeline proposes to complete certain Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) compliance concerns by 2022, two years after FAA direction, requiring non-compliant aircraft to seek waivers or limit flight operations. Additionally, the AMP increment 2 only supports eight aircraft modernizations per year which also does not appear to support a fleet viability requirement.

The committee supports an acceleration of the modernization effort both in terms of meeting FAA compliance by the 2020 deadline and acceleration of the increment 2 modernization plan. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on the implementation of C–130H AMP Increments 1 and 2 to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016. At a minimum, this report should address:

(1) The timeline for implementation of both AMP Increments 1 and 2;

(2) An assessment to accelerate AMP Increment 1 to ensure all C–130H aircraft are compliant with all airspace requirements by

2020 to include the possibility of using existing contracting offices such as the Rapid Acquisition Office to accelerate these upgrades;

(3) An assessment to accelerate the build rate for AMP Increment 2 in order to address future DMS and obsolescence issues; and

(4) Any plans for recapitalization of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve C–130 aircraft.

The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force will require additional resources to begin implementing this new plan and therefore recommends $10.0 million for C–130 AMP, an increase of $10.0 million.

EC–130H Compass Call aircraft

The budget request contained $68.4 million for EC–130H Compass Call aircraft modifications. The EC–130H Compass Call aircraft is the Department of the Air Force's wide-area coverage airborne electronic attack and offensive counter information weapon system. The EC–130H counters adversary communications, information processing, navigation, radar systems, and improvised explosive devices.

The committee notes that the EC–130H Compass Call aircraft has demonstrated a powerful effect on enemy command and control networks in multiple military operations, including in the Republic of Kosovo, Republic of Haiti, Republic of Panama, Republic of Iraq, Republic of Serbia, and Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and is consistently in demand with all unified commands. However, due to fiscal constraints, the committee further notes that the Department of the Air Force plans to divest 8 of its 16-aircraft fleet of EC–130H Compass Call aircraft in fiscal year 2016. The committee believes that divesting eight EC–130H Compass Call aircraft would present unacceptable risk to ongoing and future combat operations. The committee notes that the Air Force Chief of Staff included the restoration of eight EC–130H Compass Call aircraft among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2016.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $97.1 million, an increase of $28.7 million, for EC–130H Compass Call aircraft modifications.

F–15 and F–16 spare engine shortfall

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee expressed concern with the Department of the Air Force's shortfall of up to 24 spare F–100 engines for F–16 and F–15 aircraft. The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has yet to take any action to mitigate this shortfall and remains concerned that the Department has not allocated the funds necessary to fulfill the validated engine shortfall in the F–15 and F–16 fleets. The committee understands that the production line for these engines will begin to close in early fiscal year 2017, and that as a result, the Department of the Air Force has little time remaining to procure the engines. With these aircraft expected to continue to play a key role in the Air Force until the F–35 is fielded in sufficient numbers, the committee is concerned about the Department's ability to address engine requirements without action on this issue. Therefore, the committee

encourages the Department of the Air Force to evaluate the possible utility of a reprogramming request to procure at least some of the 24 engines needed to meet validated spare engine requirements.

F–16 block 40/50 mission training center

The budget request did not contain any funds for other aircraft support equipment and facilities, or for the procurement of an F–16 block 40/50 mission training center for the Air National Guard.

An F–16 block 40/50 mission training center (MTC) is a distributed mission operations-capable flight simulator for F–16 block 40 and 50 weapons systems. Each MTC includes high-fidelity simulator cockpits, instructor operator stations, a threat server, and briefing and debriefing capability. Each MTC is also capable of linking to geographically distributed high-fidelity combat and combat support training devices including command and control and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems. This capability allows the warfighters at home station to exercise and train at the operational and strategic levels of war, as well as conduct networked unit-level training. The committee notes that the F–16 block 40/50 MTC allows F–16 block 40 and block 50 pilots to train in scenarios that are either impossible or too expensive to conduct in home-station flying training, and believes that the MTC significantly improves F–16 pilot skill and readiness to perform actual combat missions with increased effectiveness.

The committee understands that F–16 block 40/50 MTCs are currently planned for Hill Air Force Base (AFB), Shaw AFB, and Holloman AFB in the continental United States. The committee further understands that other F–16 block 40 or 50 pilots located in the continental United States would need to travel to one of the three MTC locations, and believes an additional MTC would save travel costs and make the F–16 block 40/50 MTC more available to Active Duty, Reserve, and Air National Guard F–16 block 40 and 50 pilots, resulting in enhanced readiness.

Consequently, the committee recommends $24.7 million for other aircraft support equipment and facilities, an increase of $24.7 million, for procurement of an additional MTC for the Air National Guard.

F–35 aircraft program

The F–35 aircraft program is the largest acquisition program within the Department of Defense, with a current planned procurement of 2,443 aircraft for the Department of the Navy and the Department of the Air Force to meet fifth generation U.S. fighter requirements. The committee continues to strongly support the requirement for fifth generation fighter aircraft due to projected increases in the effectiveness and quantities of threat anti-aircraft ground systems and adversary aircraft and their associated air-to-air weapons. The committee believes that without advanced fifth generation aircraft, the United States may be significantly limited in its ability to project power in the future.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy anticipates a strike fighter aircraft shortfall of about 134 aircraft in 2020, with an average shortfall of about 100 aircraft between fiscal years 2015 and 2020. Due to the constraints of the decreased budg-

et authority contained in the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), the committee notes that the Department of the Navy has deferred 16 F–35C aircraft out of the Future Years Defense Program, and believes that this deferral will result in a higher strike fighter shortfall, as well as a reduction in strike fighter capabilities. The F–35C is also planned for an 8,000-hour life span, which is 33 percent longer than legacy aircraft, and the committee believes that the F–35's longer life should also help improve the strike fighter shortfall. Accordingly, the committee urges the Department of the Navy to restore the 16 F–35Cs deferred in this budget request when it submits the budget request for fiscal year 2017. The committee also notes that the Commandant of the Marine Corps has included an additional six F–35Bs among his unfunded priorities for fiscal year 2016, and elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends an increase for this purpose and believes that this increase will also help alleviate the Department of the Navy strike fighter shortfall.

The F–35 program is approximately 60 percent through its flight test program, which is planned to be completed in the first quarter of fiscal year 2018. At a hearing held by the House Committee on Armed Services' Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on April 14, 2015, the F–35 program executive officer testified that the F–35 program is making solid and steady progress on all aspects of the program. The committee notes that the F–35 program executive officer has identified the software development for the final development software block, known as block 3F, as an area with some risk remaining which could result in a 4- to 6-month delay in delivery of software block 3F, but that this delay will not affect the Department of the Navy's initial operational capability for the F–35C in 2018. The committee continues to monitor software progress. Also at the hearing on April 14, 2015, the F–35 program manager mentioned the F–35's F135 engine as a challenging area subsequent to the June 23, 2014, engine fire and failure at Eglin Air Force Base, and noted that the program has yet to identify a long-term repair for this engine failure. The committee shares this concern and consequently recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an assessment of the F135 engine program, including a thorough assessment of the F135 engine failure, and to submit a report containing such assessment by March 16, 2016. The committee further notes that at the hearing held on April 14, 2015, the F–35 program manager testified that the price of F–35s have continued to decline with each successive lot. The committee remains pleased with these price reductions, and discussions with F–35 program officials suggest that the budget request for procurement of F–35s is slightly higher than required for procurement of the F–35s in fiscal year 2016. Accordingly, elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends reductions to each of the three variants to account for lower than anticipated costs when these aircraft are procured.

The committee has also identified funds for development of the future block 4 modifications which could be reduced for fiscal year 2016, and discussions with F–35 program officials revealed that some of the funds requested for development of the block 4 modification are excess to need for fiscal year 2016. Therefore, else-

where in this Act, the committee recommends reductions for the block 4 development program. The committee does not intend for these reductions to affect the development of the F–35 dual-capable aircraft.

Joint surveillance and target attack system sustainment report

The E–8C aircraft was developed for ground surveillance, targeting, and battle management. Air battle managers onboard the E–8C joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) aircraft use its wide-area ground surveillance radar to build situation awareness and identify targets which are passed to strike assets or cross-cued with other intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms.

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force plans a JSTARS recapitalization program which would replace the aging E–8C aircraft with a modern, more efficient, and capable aircraft and mission systems, with an initial operational capability of 2023 and a full operational capability in subsequent years. Until the JSTARS replacement aircraft attains full operational capability, the committee believes that the current E–8C JSTARS aircraft will require a modest amount of sustainment funding, especially to address the issue of diminishing manufacturing sources.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2016, which describes all actions required to avoid degradation to the performance of the E–8C radar and fleet, each upgrade required to meet minimum warfighter requirements for combat operations and to pace evolving threats during this period, and the Secretary's plan, schedule and budgets to accomplish this objective between fiscal years 2016 and the time that the JSTARS replacement aircraft achieves full operational capability.

KC–10

The committee notes that in executing any possible long-term KC–10 divesture strategy, the Department of Defense must ensure that the nation's aerial refueling capabilities are not placed at risk by ensuring critical mission taskings remain unfilled. The committee also notes specifically that to meet current and future threats and missions, the unique KC–10 capability to execute a strategic air bridge must not be compromised, whether an Arctic, Pacific, or transatlantic air route. The committee strongly reiterates the importance of maintaining our nation's robust aerial refueling capability in the current fiscal environment that requires our forces to be more agile and rapidly deployable.

KC–46A quarterly report

The committee supports the current acquisition strategy associated with the KC–46A aircraft. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to discontinue the quarterly reporting associated with the KC–46A aircraft required in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

RQ–4 and U–2 high-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities

Over the past 3 years, the committee has supported retaining both the RQ–4 Global Hawk Block 30 and U–2 Dragon Lady for the high-altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) mission. The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has determined that Global Hawk operating costs have decreased while the Global Hawk Block 30 fleet has flown an increased number of hours compared to previous years in support of the combatant commanders.

While the committee was pleased that the Air Force requested funding for both the RQ–4 Global Hawk Block 30 and the U–2 in the budget request for fiscal year 2016, the committee is concerned about the possibility that the Department of the Air Force still plans to retire the U–2 fleet in fiscal year 2019. While the committee realizes that the Department can never fully meet the ISR demand of combatant commanders, reasonable and necessary ISR requests appear very likely to go unfilled if the current high-altitude airborne ISR collection capabilities of the U–2 are terminated. The committee also notes that section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) limits the retirement of U–2 aircraft until equal or greater ISR capability is available to commanders of the combatant commands.

Finally, the committee supports the Department of the Air Force efforts to upgrade the Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft to meet the requirements of the combatant commanders, but notes that this will take several years. In light of the known gaps, the committee has concerns with any plan that will leave the combatant commanders with less overall capacity and capability than they have today.

UH–1N replacement program

The budget request contained $2.5 million for the UH–1N replacement program.

The UH–1N replacement program would replace the Department of the Air Force UH–1N fleet of 62 aircraft by acquiring a non-developmental commercial or U.S. Government vertical lift aircraft. The committee understands that the current 47-year-old UH–1N aircraft fleet fails to meet speed, range, payload, and defensive system requirements, and that modifications to the existing fleet will not enable the UH–1N to meet mission requirements. Accordingly, the committee believes the UH–1N replacement program is timely. The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force is currently assessing requirements for the UH–1N replacement, conducting market research, and developing UH–1N replacement acquisition alternatives. The committee further notes that the Department of the Air Force has selected the HH–60W for its combat rescue helicopter, and believes that procurement of currently produced UH–60Ms for the UH–1N replacement could provide significant commonality with the HH–60W, reducing procurement and life-cycle costs.

The committee recommends $2.5 million, the full amount of the request, for the UH–1N replacement program.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $1.75 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $1.73 billion, a decrease of $20.0 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $2.98 billion for Missile Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $2.98 billion, full funding of the request, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Missile Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $18.27 billion for Other Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends authorization of $18.29 billion, an increase of $22.9 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Other Procurement, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Air Force Fire Emergency Services and Personal Protective Equipment

The committee understands the most recent contract award for Air Force Fire Emergency Services (FES) Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) was canceled in its entirety due to the need for the Air Force to take corrective action under a Government Accountability Office (GAO) protest. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 1, 2015 that details the current acquisition strategy for Air Force FES PPE. The briefing should provide the justification for how the Air Force determined that the Defense Logistics Agency Fire and Emergency Services Equipment Tailored Logistics Support Program contract does not meet the requirements of the Air Force and discuss why the Air Force made the determination for setting aside for small business manufacturing meets the requirements of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 19.502–2(b).

Civil engineers construction, surveying, and mapping equipment

The budget request contained $9.1 million for base procured equipment. Of this amount, no funds were requested for modernization of equipment used by base civil engineer units or Red Horse squadron (RHS) engineer units.

Red Horse squadrons provide the Air Force with a highly mobile civil engineering response force to support contingency and special operations worldwide. The committee understands current civil engineer equipment has been discontinued for approximately 5 years and maintenance requirements for this legacy equipment could potentially be cost prohibitive. The committee notes that to date, 66 percent of existing equipment is known to be discontinued, with some individual components ranging as high as 94 percent. The committee is aware that the Air Force Civil Engineer Center, Operations Directorate (AFCEC/CO) is considering a long-term replacement and modernization strategy for legacy equipment and software across the Future Years Defense Program, and notes the AFCEC/CO has identified an urgent unfunded requirement to support the initial modernization strategy for modern civil engineering equipment. The committee believes additional funds would help to accelerate the modernization of legacy civil engineering equipment. The committee expects these funds would be obligated under full and open competition to provide the best-value equipment to Air Force base civil engineer units and RHS units.

The committee recommends $13.1 million, an increase of $4.0 million, to competitively procure modernized engineer equipment and address any unfunded requirements.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $5.13 billion for Procurement, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends authorization of $5.26 billion, an increase of $132.4 million, for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 Procurement, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Procurement of Standard Missile-3 block IB interceptors

The budget request included $548.9 million for procurement of Standard Missile-3, block IB interceptors (including canisters and advanced procurement funding).

The committee is aware of the significant demand amongst the combatant commanders for inventory of the Standard Missile-3 block IB missile interceptor. The committee is also aware that because of recent flight and ground test challenges, the Department of Defense has decided to focus on continuing initial lot procurement of block IB missiles in fiscal year 2016 and focusing on multiyear procurement, advanced procurement, and full rate production in subsequent years.

The committee has concerns about continuing procurement of block IB interceptors before resolution of the current technical un-

certainties, though the committee notes that the planned flight tests of the block IB missile to prove out the technical fix will occur before any missiles procured in fiscal year 2016 would actually be delivered to the Missile Defense Agency. The committee has also been assured that the Missile Defense Agency will not take delivery of fiscal year 2015 procurement block IB interceptors until the fix has been proved out by flight test.

The committee is also troubled that the technical challenges in the block IB program are leading to a higher price per unit for missiles the combatant commanders need. The committee expects the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to negotiate for the lowest possible per unit price, and to ensure all appropriate contractual remedies are used to offset the costs of these challenges.

The committee recommends $521.6 million, a decrease of $27.3 million, for procurement of Standard Missile-3, block IB interceptors (including canisters). The committee notes that elsewhere in this Act, additional funding is recommended for Aegis BMD testing related to the block IB proof of concept.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations

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

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Limitation on Availability of Funds for AN/TPQ–53 Radar Systems

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds for AN/TPQ–53 radar systems until 30 days after the date on which the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology submits to the congressional defense committees a review of the current delegation of acquisition authority to the Program Executive Officer for Missiles and Space.

Section 112—Prioritization of Upgraded UH–60 Blackhawk Helicopters within Army National Guard

This section would require the Chief, National Guard Bureau to issue guidance within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that prioritizes UH–60 helicopter upgrades within the Army National Guard to those units with the highest flight hour aircraft and highest utilization rates. This section would also require the Chief to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 30 days after issuing such guidance that describes such guidance.

Section 113—Report on Options to Accelerate Replacement of UH–60A Blackhawk Helicopters of Army National Guard

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016,

containing detailed options for the potential acceleration of the replacement of all UH–60A helicopters of the Army National Guard.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Modification to Multiyear Procurement Authority for Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers and Associated Systems

This section would amend section 123(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) and provide authority to the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a multiyear contract for a Flight III destroyer, in addition to the existing multiyear authority for a Flight IIA destroyer.

The committee supports the changes proposed by the Secretary of the Navy to integrate the Air and Missile Defense Radar in the Arleigh Burke class destroyer and the inclusion of the Flight III guided missile destroyer into the current multiyear authority. However, the committee is concerned about the Secretary of the Navy's strategy to implement an Engineering Change Proposal to fundamentally change integral elements of the Arleigh Burke class destroyer multiyear procurement without congressional authorization. When the initial multiyear procurement was authorized by section 123 of Public Law 112–239, the authorization was limited to an "Arleigh Burke class Flight IIA guided missile destroyer." The committee includes this provision because it believes that implementation of a Flight III destroyer without an explicit congressional authorization would violate section 123 of Public Law 112–239, by constituting a cardinal change in the scope of the initial authorization.

Section 122—Procurement Authority for Aircraft Carrier Programs

This section would provide economic order quantity authority for the construction of two Ford class aircraft carriers and incremental funding authority for the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of five Nimitz class aircraft carriers.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Executive Communications Upgrades for C–20 and C–37 Aircraft

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 to upgrade the executive communications of C–20 and C–37 aircraft unless the Secretary of the Air Force certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that such upgrades do not cause such aircraft to exceed any weight limitations or reduce the operational capability of such aircraft. This section would also allow the Secretary of the Air Force to waive the limitation if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is necessary for the national security of the United States and notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver.

Section 132—Backup Inventory Status of A–10 Aircraft

This section would require that the Secretary of the Air Force not move more than 18 A–10 aircraft in the Active Component to

backup flying status pursuant to an authorization made by the Secretary of Defense under section 133(b)(2)(A) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). This section would also make a conforming amendment to section 133(b)(2)(A) by striking "36" and inserting "18".

Section 133—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Retirement of A–10 Aircraft

This section would prohibit funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of the Air Force to be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any A–10 aircraft, before December 31, 2016, except as provided by section 132; would require the Department of the Air Force to maintain a minimum of 171 A–10 aircraft designated as primary mission aircraft inventory; and would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from making any significant reductions to manning levels with respect to any A–10 aircraft squadrons or divisions before December 31, 2016. This section would also require the Secretary of the Air Force to commission an appropriate entity outside the Department of Defense to conduct an assessment by September 30, 2016, of the required capabilities or mission platform to replace the A–10 aircraft and submit a report on that assessment to the congressional defense committees.

Section 134—Prohibition on Retirement of EC–130H Aircraft

This section would prohibit funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of the Air Force to be obligated or expended to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on back up flying status any EC–130H aircraft. It would require the Secretary of the Air Force to commission an assessment of the required capabilities or mission platform to replace the EC–130H aircraft, and to submit a report on that assessment to the congressional defense committees not later than September 30, 2016. Additionally, this section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from retiring, preparing to retire, placing in storage or placing on back up flying status any EC–130H aircraft until 60 days after the Secretary submits the report on an assessment of the required capabilities or mission platform to replace the EC–130H aircraft.

Section 135—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Divestment or Transfer of KC–10 Aircraft

This section would prohibit funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of the Air Force to be obligated or expended to divest or transfer, or prepare to divest or transfer, any KC–10 aircraft.

SUBTITLE E—DEFENSE-WIDE, JOINT, AND MULTISERVICE MATTERS

Section 141—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Joint Battle Command—Platform

This section would require the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology to submit a report by

March 1, 2016, to the congressional defense committees that addresses the effectiveness, suitability, and survivability shortfalls of the joint battle command—platform equipment identified by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation in the Director's fiscal year 2014 annual report to Congress. This section would further limit the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds for the joint battle command—platform until 30 days after the Assistant Secretary submits such a report.

Section 142—Strategy for Replacement of A/MH–6 Mission Enhanced Little Bird Aircraft to Meet Special Operations Requirements

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a strategy to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act for the replacement of the A/MH–6 Mission Enhanced Little Bird aircraft to meet requirements particular to special operations for future rotary-wing, light attack, reconnaissance requirements.

Section 143—Independent Assessment of United States Combat Logistic Force Requirements

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an assessment of the anticipated future demands of the combat logistics force ships of the Navy and the challenges these ships may face when conducting and supporting future naval operations in contested maritime environments. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit the assessment to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2016.

Section 144—Report on Use of Different Types of Enhanced 5.56mm Ammunition by the Army and the Marine Corps

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, regarding the current use of two different types of 5.56mm ammunition in combat by the Army and the Marine Corps. The report shall include, but not be limited to, the following: (1) an explanation of the reasons for the Army and the Marine Corps current use of different 5.56mm combat ammunition; (2) an explanation of the appropriateness, effectiveness, and suitability issues that may arise from the use of these two types of ammunition; (3) an explanation of any additional costs that have resulted from the use of two different types of 5.56mm combat ammunition by the two services, if any; (4) an explanation of the future plans, if any, of the Army or the Marine Corps to eventually transition back to using one standard 5.56mm combat ammunition round; and (5) if no such plans exists, an analysis of the potential benefits of a transition back to a common 5.56mm combat round in the future, including how long such a transition may take to occur.

The committee understands that the Army and the Marine Corps have proceeded on different paths to upgrade 5.56mm ammunition in terms of both soft tissue damage and penetration of certain hard materials. As a result, the Army and the Marine Corps currently use different 5.56mm ammunition in combat, with the Army using

the M855A1 round and the Marine Corps using the Mk318 Mod 0 round. The committee notes that the military services appear to have different requirements and a different perspective on the utility of the two rounds. As a result, the small arms ammunition logistics system has to maintain two separate, incompatible inventories of 5.56mm ammunition. In addition, the committee believes there may be additional costs to the Department of Defense in procuring two types of ammunition rather than just one, which it had been doing before 2009. While the current inventory levels of the two rounds is substantial, with the Marine Corps having more than two million in stock, this section is intended to encourage the Department to develop a plan to get back to one standard 5.56mm combat round.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $69.77 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation. This represents a $6.09 billion increase over the amount authorized for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommends $68.35 billion, a decrease of $1.42 billion to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 research, development, test, and evaluation program are identified in division D of this Act.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

Overview

The budget request contained $6.91 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army. The committee recommends $7.02 billion, an increase of $105.5 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 research, development, test, and evaluation, Army program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Acoustic mixing technology for energetic materials

The committee understands that the Army currently uses low-frequency, high-intensity sound waves, in a technology called "acoustic mixing" during the manufacturing of some munitions. The committee understands acoustic mixing technology is currently being used at McAlester Army Ammunition Plant (MCAAP) where a 5-gallon capacity acoustic batch mixer is being employed to produce munitions boosters at a cost savings of $1,000 per unit. The U.S. Air Force demand for this product is 2,500 per month, which should result in an equipment payback of less than 6 months. The committee notes that MCAAP has embraced acoustic mixing technology with the intent of utilizing it to further exploit its usefulness, further increase productivity, as well as environmental and safety improvements at their facilities.

The committee believes this technology could have broader applications and could have the potential to improve industrial efficiency and productivity throughout the Department of Defense munitions enterprise. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to continue to evaluate and refine acoustic mixing technology capabilities.

Active protection system

The budget request contained $55.4 million in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advance technology, which includes funding for Active Protection System (APS) research and development.

The committee is encouraged that funding for APS research and development was included in the fiscal year 2016 budget request. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee noted that a lack of investment could soon create a critical capability gap for Army combat vehicles due to the rapid proliferation of advanced anti-tank guided missiles and next-generation rocket propelled grenades. The committee notes that there are numerous types of APS available, including some that have already been fielded on operational vehicles in other countries and have performed well in recent demonstrations. It is crucial the Army keeps momentum going in this important effort; therefore, the committee encourages the Army to establish a program of record to ensure APS is integrated into the Army's combat and tactical vehicle platforms as soon as practicable based on technology development and funding. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2016, that includes a description of all currently planned and budgeted activities that are related to active protection systems.

The committee recommends $55.4 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63005A for combat vehicle and automotive advance technology.

Advanced tactical shelters

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense Joint Committee on Tactical Shelters has identified emerging requirements for current and future advanced tactical shelters. Among those is a requirement to provide antimicrobial protection for tactical medical shelters, as well as for protection from the adverse effects of electromagnetic interference and electromagnetic pulse (EMI/EMP). Further, the committee is aware of an emerging technology process called cold spray which has the potential to address these two requirements. Cold spray has proven effective in the application of copper-based alloys onto touch surfaces in order to protect against microbial infection in field hospitals. Similarly, cold spray technology provides a non-destructive process, currently unavailable through traditional joining methods, for sealing aluminum joint panels in tactical shelters, thereby reducing EMI/EMP leakage and infrared signature, as well as improving energy efficiency. The committee encourages the Department to continue development of advanced materials and materials processing approaches such as cold spray to attempt to meet these requirements.

Army airborne networking radios

The budget request contained $12.9 million in PE 65380A in research, development, test, and evaluation, Army for the Airborne, Maritime, Fixed Station (AMF) Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS). Of this amount, $6.8 million was requested for the Small Airborne Link 16 Terminal (SALT) and $6.2 million was requested for the Small Airborne Networking Radio (SANR).

The committee supports continued fielding of network capability to Army airborne systems. The committee notes with concern that both the SALT and SANR programs have been delayed by 3 years, with milestone C now scheduled for fiscal year 2019. The committee believes that delay in procurement of next-generation radios for the aerial network tier will require the Army's airborne platforms to rely on legacy waveforms. As a result, airborne assets will not be able to leverage the terrestrial network or an airborne network for increased situational awareness or connectivity. The committee notes that the Army is examining interim, competitively awarded, solutions for both of these systems. The committee supports both the procurement of effective interim solutions that provide capability as soon as possible and the potential acceleration of both the SALT and SANR programs.

The committee recommends $12.9 million, the full amount requested, in PE 65380A in research, development, test, and evaluation, Army for the AMF Joint Tactical Radio System.

Army energy efficiency research and development programs

The committee is aware that the Army has numerous research and development efforts in the area of reducing energy use across the Army. However, the committee seeks to better understand the totality of the Army's efforts. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services no later than April 1, 2016 on all Army Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) undertaken in the last 5 years on technologies that may improve the range and endurance of tactical vehicles without increasing fuel demand. The briefing should also include RDT&E efforts involving auxiliary power units, batteries, and other engine technologies for running 'hotel' loads and surveillance systems during silent watch. Finally, the briefing should include information on any ongoing efforts or future plans for incorporating these technologies into programs of record or new acquisitions. For all systems described, the briefing should identify funding amounts and requirements.

Army Warfighting Assessment and network experimentation activities

The budget request contained $99.2 million in PE 64798A for Brigade Analysis, Integration and Evaluation.

The committee supports the Army's Force 2025 initiative to make the Army a more expeditionary force while improving tactical mobility, lethality, protection, and sustainability. In addition, the committee supports the Network Integration Evaluation (NIE) and Army Warfighting Assessment (AWA), which are required to ensure the Army can attain Force 2025 goals. The committee believes that the NIE and AWA must continue to be an integral part of the Army's modernization to ensure future policies and procurements

can successfully be integrated into the Army's operations. The Army should ensure that NIE and AWA remain a part of the Army's acquisition, and research, development, testing, and evaluation processes into the future.

The committee recommends $99.2 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64798A for Brigade Analysis, Integration and Evaluation.

Ballistic resistant adaptive seating system

The committee understands current helicopter seating systems (HSS) were designed for primarily limited duration missions and focused solely on mitigating injuries from hard landings. The current seating system design did not consider other areas of concern that could impact the warfighter, such as increases in flight duration, the long-term effects of poor ergonomics, whole body vibration, as well as changes in pilot demographics, to include omitting female pilot anthropomorphic data. The committee understands the Department of Defense and the Army are studying current HSS designs and have identified a need to improve current systems. The committee is aware the Joint Aircraft Survivability Program Office, the U.S. Army Aviation Development Directorate—Aviation Applied Technology Directorate, and industry are now focusing on identifying, developing, and optimizing new technologies in order to mitigate or eliminate deficiencies in current HSS performance. The committee believes the Department should develop ways to accelerate this technology, which could provide increases in force protection, survivability, as well as eliminate long-term disability that is common in rotary wing aviators. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than January 15, 2016, on any plans for the potential improvement of the HSS.

Composite barrel technology development

The committee has long championed weight reduction initiatives for individual soldier equipment to include small arms and mortars. The committee believes that advances in material technology for small arms and mortar components could significantly improve overall performance of these weapon systems. The committee is aware that hybridized advanced composite barrel systems should be designed to incorporate high-performance materials such as a polyimide matrix composite comprising a resin matrix, thermally conductive additives, thermal management coatings, and continuous high-strength and high modulus structural fibers. The committees encourages the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology to analyze, design, manufacture, test, and invest in medium caliber barrels and muzzle brakes that utilize advanced composite technologies that would increase stiffness, optimize mass/center of gravity, and increase the life span of the system. The committee understands this capability could also provide for increases in accuracy, performance, and lethality of medium caliber weapon systems such as the M240 medium machine gun. Additionally, the committee encourages the continued development of advanced high-temperature resistant composite technologies for lightweight mortar tubes and recoilless rifles. The committee believes that with additional investment these advanced

technologies could provide light infantry units with mortar systems, such as the 81mm mortar system, with weight reduction, thermal performance, and longevity that will enable the military services to affordably maintain overmatch capability on the battlefield as well as provide growth capacity for these advanced weapon systems.

Detection and threat identification technologies

The committee is aware that the Defense Threat Reduction Agency continues to have a strong partnership with each of the military services, as well as with U.S. Special Operations Command, which has contributed to the development and fielding of technologies that reduce, counter, and eliminate the threat of chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and high-yield explosive materials. The committee remains concerned about credible threats posed by state and non-state actors in their attempts to acquire and weaponize chemical and biological materials for use against the United States and its allies. Therefore, the committee encourages the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to continue the genomic research and development of innovative and emerging detection, threat identification technologies and medical countermeasures to ensure prompt transition of validated capabilities to address the emerging infectious disease threats. The committee emphasizes the importance of advancing genomic research as a method to stay ahead of the changing emerging threats from highly infectious viruses.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 31, 2015, on its efforts to prioritize the prompt transfer of funding to the U.S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Disease to advance research as it relates to genomics and highly infectious threats, to include the potential for lightweight, handheld devices for diagnostics, detection, and analysis.

Fuel system survivability technology and standards

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Director of the U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineering Center (TARDEC) to provide a report to the congressional defense committees that detailed the status of the Army's evaluation of occupant centric survivability systems for combat and tactical vehicles. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Director of TARDEC to brief the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the advisability and feasibility of establishing objective and threshold survivability operational requirements for thermal injury prevention in ground combat and tactical vehicles. The Joint Explanatory Statement (Committee Print No. 4) accompanying the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 directed the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the congressional defense committees that addresses thermal injury prevention needs to improve occupant centric survivability systems

for combat and tactical vehicles against overmatching ballistic threats.

Based on information gathered from these required reports and briefings, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to develop operationally realistic survivable fuel system specifications, as well as develop standards for ground combat and tactical vehicles that would address fuel containment technology requirements consistent with vehicle survivability requirements.

Geo-Enabled Mission Command Enterprise

The committee is aware that the Geo-Enabled Mission Command Enterprise works to provide access to analytic tools for users in bandwidth-constrained environments, increasing the situational awareness of the operational environment in support of mission planning and operations. However, the committee also notes that there are currently concerns about the standardization of how geospatial information is displayed, creating the potential for confusion during mission planning and combat operations. The Army is seeking to improve the display of digital geospatial information in a common manner across various hardware platforms that are developed by different organizations in the Army and the committee is also aware that the Marine Corps is struggling with similar requirements to rapidly share all-source geospatial information across the Marine Corps in similar conditions. The committee encourages exploring potential further investment in competitively procured commercial geospatial products to provide a common operating picture and ensure the efficient exchange of information during critical operations across all echelons. The committee encourages the Army and the Marine Corps to work together to the extent practicable in order to jointly invest in technological solutions to satisfy those like requirements.

High-resolution 3–D topographic terrain data supporting tactical operations

The committee is concerned about the continuing lack of timely, high-resolution topographic terrain data and high resolution 3D imagery needed by combatant commanders and tactical operators to plan, train for, and conduct operations over complex, urban terrain, as well as in dense foliage. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense currently relies upon certain space-based capabilities to provide such data, but that there are limitations in the capacity of those assets, as well as technical limitations that significantly hamper collection in certain environments. The committee believes that in some permissive environments, manned or unmanned airborne collection could provide the necessary detail, capacity, timeliness and coverage needed to support tactical and operational planning. This has been demonstrated by operational experience in the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, as well as the Republic of Iraq, and is reinforced by the continuing requests for capability from joint urgent operational needs statements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct an analysis of the high-resolution 3–D topographic terrain data requirements to support tactical operations, and brief the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2015 on the

results. This assessment should determine the current requirements from the combatant commands, as well as a projection for the required needs across the future year's defense plan, and compare that to the ability of the current systems to meet those needs. In instances where the projected requirements are not being satisfied by the current capabilities, the Secretary should make recommendations about how to address such shortfalls.

Human performance research

The committee is aware that ongoing research on human performance, augmentation and cognitive enhancement is an important component of a soldier-centric Army strategy for the future warfighting force. During a time when the Army is being asked to do more with less, the committee supports initiatives that aim to improve warfighter's cognitive, physiological, physical, and nutritional performance. These human performance dimensions will ensure military overmatch against current adversaries and emerging threats and align with Army goals and future requirements for human-soldier performance and enhancement.

Improvement of human performance also supports the U.S. Army Capstone Concept's central idea of operational adaptability by providing a framework to maximize individual and team performance through the identification, development, and optimal integration of human capabilities. To this end, the committee is aware of Army efforts to design and build a research facility called the Soldier Squad Performance Research Institute to enhance soldier performance. The committee encourages the Army to consider locating that facility in a region containing the best research, development, test, and evaluation support system, including industrial, academic, and Federal facilities to support its mission with the necessary specialized talent in medical research, life science, human performance science, physical, nutritional, and psychological research.

Improved Turbine Engine Program

The budget request contained $51.2 million in PE 67139A for the Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP).

The committee continues to support the Army research and development budget request for ITEP, as well as the acquisition strategy included in the request. ITEP is a competitive acquisition program that is designed to develop a more fuel efficient and powerful engine for the current Black Hawk and Apache helicopter fleets. This new engine will increase operational capabilities in high/hot environments, while reducing operating and support costs. The committee acknowledges the benefits of improved fuel efficiencies through lower specific fuel consumption that the ITEP will bring to the battlefield. In addition, the committee encourages the Army to prioritize maintenance and sustainment cost savings for ITEP to ensure the continued affordability of the program.

The committee recommends $51.2 million, the full amount requested, in PE 67139A for the ITEP program.

Indirect Fire Protection Capability

The committee notes that the Army is planning on integrating only a single missile as part of the Indirect Fire Protection Capability (IFPC) Increment 2 Block 1 program. The committee is con-

cerned by the lack of funding to assess the suitability of other interceptors known to have significant capability to address rocket, artillery, and mortar threats, as well as other threat classes, to demonstrate the Multi-Mission Launcher can perform multiple missions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2016, the Alternate Interceptor Trade Study that was directed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology in 2014. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2016, that details the Army's plan and an estimate of required funding to potentially demonstrate and integrate alternate interceptors on the Multi-Mission Launcher before milestone B of the IFPC Increment 2 Block 1 program.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Analysis Tool

The committee is concerned that the Army decided not to field Joint Improvised Explosive Device Analysis Tool (JIST) software after spending more than $10.0 million developing it in conjunction with the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO). While the committee understands that the Army intends to use an existing software program currently resident in the Distributed Common Ground Station-Army (DCGS–A) program to partially meet the requirement for improvised explosive devices (IED) forensic analysis, the committee believes that the critical nature of the enduring IED threat likely demands a dedicated software analysis tool to fully meet intelligence analysis requirements. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Army to detail its plans for competition of selected DCGS–A components as part of the DCGS–A Increment 2 program. The committee expects the Army to include IED forensic analysis tools as part of any DCGS–A Increment 2 competition plans. In addition, the committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to deliver a report, not later than March 1, 2016, to the House Committee on Armed Services regarding JIEDDO's and the Army's processes and decisions that led to the development of JIST software and the subsequent decision not to field it.

Land-Based Anti-Ship Missile Program

The committee notes that the October 2014 Army Operating Concept, "Win in a Complex World," emphasizes the role for Army forces to project land based power into other domains and that, "Future Army forces will support joint force freedom of movement and action through the projection of power from land across the maritime, air, space, and cyberspace domains." The committee also notes in a technical report prepared for the U.S. Army entitled "Employing Land Based Anti-Ship Missiles in the Western Pacific" that the RAND corporation concluded that, "Land-based ASMs (Anti-Ship Missiles) are readily available on the world's arms markets, are inexpensive, and would provide significant additional capabilities to the United States if integrated into the Army or the Marine Corps force structure."

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, as to the feasibility, utility, and options for mobile, land-based systems to provide anti-ship fires. Such fires should be addressed within the total portfolio of land based fires against air and surface based threats, including total cost considerations such as research and development, procurement, sustainment, and force structure considerations.

Lethal Miniature Aerial Munition System

The committee notes the Army's goal of improving infantry squad capability through a variety of means, including precision weapons with increased ranges compared to current systems. The committee is aware of the effectiveness of the Lethal Miniature Aerial Munition System (LMAMS) currently fielded in the United States Central Command theater of operations and supports the potential distribution of this capability across Army infantry units. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2016 on potential transition of the LMAMS to a program of record. The report should include information on the performance of the system to date, the cost of expanding its issue to more units, and operational suitability and effectiveness issues with the system.

Lithium ion super-capacitors

The committee is aware of the investments the Army has made in lithium ion super-capacitor research, development, and demonstration. The committee encourages further investment in this important area, as super-capacitors are critical to current and future platforms. Recent advances in lithium ion super-capacitor technology may also mitigate or eliminate safety concerns that have slowed operational deployment of current and future platforms.

Material development, characterization, and computational modeling

The committee recognizes the importance of evaluation of materials and technologies, designs, and the development of methodologies and models to enable enhanced lethality and survivability. Methods such as computational research allow for the development of models that predict the mechanical properties of materials that are used in research and development at the U.S. Army Research Laboratory (ARL). These models and simulations provide a cost savings to the Department of Defense by simulating materials prior to testing them to ensure mechanical properties will work together. Additionally, these methodologies allow for the enhanced development of technologies such as lightweight armors, protective structures, kinetic energy active protection, ballistic shock and mine blast protection, helmet technologies to prevent traumatic brain injury, as well as numerous other uses. The committee encourages ARL to continue the utilization of computational modeling and simulations research to achieve greater cost savings.

Medical evaluation of anthropomorphic data on vehicle blast testing

The committee supports the Army's ongoing ground combat and tactical vehicle technology development and testing initiatives designed to mitigate the lethal effects from improvised explosive devices and the subsequent vehicle flight and rollover events. As the Army, along with industry, continues to evaluate emerging technologies, the committee recommends that medical research using anthropomorphic testing be included in ongoing Cooperative Research and Development Agreement test programs between the commercial sector and the Army on new sensors and active protection technologies. The committee believes that test reports should also consider including medical evaluation of anthropomorphic data germane to the analysis of new sensor technology and active protection response technology.

Mobile camouflage systems development

The committee is concerned that currently fielded camouflage netting systems do not afford adequate passive concealment against current battlefield threats, particularly by short-wave infrared sensors. The committee understands the Department of the Army is currently reviewing a Capability Development Document for an improved Ultra-Lightweight Camouflage Net System. The committee commends these efforts and encourages the Department to accelerate research, development, procurement, and fielding of this advanced camouflage net system. The committee recommends continued development in several two-sided, reversible camouflage patterns, including Woodland, Desert, Urban, and Arctic/Snow, in order to replace outdated systems currently in the field.

Next-Generation signature management system

The committee is aware that during Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, several U.S. allied partner nations employed mobile camouflage systems on their combat and tactical vehicles. The committee notes the success of our allies in using these camouflage protective nets to provide effective signature management protection, as well as reducing heat and temperature inside and around combat and tactical vehicles. The committee is not aware of any current official program of record to field mobile camouflage systems for U.S. military combat and tactical vehicles. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider evaluating mobile camouflage systems for U.S. military combat and tactical vehicles and, should the evaluation prove advisable and feasible, to begin resourcing such programs across the Future Years Defense Program.

Pacific Theater High Performance Computing capabilities

The Committee is aware that the Department of Defense's High Performance Computing Modernization Program provides the Department with a strategic tool to accelerate technology development through the application of high performance computing (HPC), networking, and computational expertise. The purpose of this program is to provide the application of high-end computing to increase productivity of the Department's research, development, test, and evaluation community. Moreover, the Committee recognizes that supercomputing resources provided by Department of Defense Supercom-

puting Resource Centers (DSRC) offer the Services and Combatant Commanders computing solutions that reduce cost, risk, and manpower requirements for in-theater demands.

To this end, the Committee is aware that the Maui High Performance Computing Center (MHPCC) is the only DSRC that offers computing at the TS/SCI classification level, as well as the ability to provide enhanced access to supercomputing resources to Department of Defense customers by secure access to Department of Defense software and computing services through a web browser. Therefore, the Committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM), to brief the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2015, on the in-theater capabilities offered by the MHPCC, the customer base for the MHPCC, and the value of maintaining flexible, low-latency, high bandwidth classified network access to complement PACOM activities in-theater.

Rotorcraft Degraded Visual Environment

The committee notes that the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2015 (division C of Public Law 113–235) appropriated an increase of $20.0 million above the budget request for the development or procurement of a Degraded Visual Environment (DVE) system for rotorcraft programs. The committee is aware of the Army's challenge of operating rotary winged aircraft in austere environmental conditions, including brown-out landings and marginal weather while operating in difficult terrain. The committee also believes that the Army's Medical Evacuation, Utility, and Cargo platforms face unique challenges operating in environments that levy significant risks to aircraft and crew members. However, the committee is concerned that the progress for pursuing these critical safety enhancements for rotorcraft programs is taking too long.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by August 31, 2015, that includes an update on the Army's plans to test and evaluate DVE sensors and provide a potential funding profile and fielding plan of a DVE system.

Simplified Army radio network

The committee notes that modernizing the tactical network remains a top priority for the Army, and that ease of use will be critical to the success of the deployed tactical network. The committee understands that feedback from deployed capability sets emphasizes the need to simplify tactical communications systems and make them easier for soldiers to operate with minimal training or intervention by industry or civilian field-support representatives. The committee supports the Army's drive to simplify the network and the goals of Force 2025, including efforts already underway to improve waveform configuration, loading, and unit-task reorganization. However, the plan to achieve the goals that the Army has set with regard to improving the network remains unclear.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the Army's current plan to enhance and simplify the network in order to meet the goals of the Simplified Tactical

Army Reliable Network, including key milestones and the resources needed.

Situational awareness prototype Constellation for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction

The Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (CWMD) situational awareness prototype Constellation is described as a next-generation information gathering, sharing, analysis, collaboration, and visualization system to improve situational awareness across the CWMD enterprise. The committee is supportive of efforts to improve coordination and situational awareness and recognizes the contribution of Constellation to a synchronized, informed whole-of-government response to the Ebola crisis. The committee is also aware of other efforts that have a similar function in tracking and analyzing CWMD threats and believes the Department of Defense should avoid duplication of efforts in this area. The committee further believes that a common platform must be successfully integrated with the other relevant Department of Defense and U.S. Government partners. The committee urges the Defense Threat Reduction Agency to continue to engage the interagency to ensure efforts are fully coordinated and not duplicative.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the status of the Constellation prototype and the activities for ensuring that it avoids duplication with other CWMD systems.

Soldier Enhancement Program

The budget request contained $10.5 million across multiple appropriations for the Army's Soldier Enhancement Program (SEP) initiatives.

The SEP was established to evaluate government-off-the-shelf, commercial-off-the-shelf, or non-developmental items to improve weapons and individual equipment for soldiers. The committee notes the SEP does not fund lengthy developmental programs or procure large numbers of major items for fielding, and recognizes the program's design enables evaluation of systems that have the potential to meet an urgent operational need or quickly close a capability gap.

The committee believes additional SEP funding could provide a substantial benefit to the industrial base and to the individual soldier. The committee recognizes that the Army relies heavily on the industrial base for innovation and new product development, and a more optimal funding profile for the SEP could facilitate greater small-scale procurement, more in-depth field evaluation opportunities, as well as the means to rapidly field validated technologies to the soldier in a more streamlined and timely manner. In order to remain responsive and execute the intent of SEP, the committee understands the optimal average SEP funding level is estimated by the Army to be at approximately $12.0 million to $14.0 million annually. The committee notes that sub-optimal funding levels would result in an inability to evaluate initiatives for lighter, more lethal weapons, munitions, and individual equipment for soldiers.

The committee recommends $15.5 million, an increase of $5.0 million in PE 64601A, for Army SEP initiatives.

Soldier Protection System and weight reduction technology

The Army's Soldier Protection System (SPS) provides a lighter weight modular, scalable integrated system of mission tailorable personnel protection equipment (PPE), while also improving the level of mobility, form, fit, and function for both male and female soldiers. The committee is aware the SPS includes subsystems such as protection for the head, eyes, extremities, torso, and other integrated sensor packages. The committee notes a low-rate initial production decision is expected in fiscal year 2015. The committee understands that the Army plans on fielding two to three brigade combat team sets per year and has programmed approximately $575.0 million for SPS across the Future Years Defense Program. While the committee commends the Army on their SPS effort, the committee encourages the Army to provide enough funding to maintain two vendors for competitive purposes, and also encourages the accelerated fielding of SPS to all soldiers as a way to sustain current systems through modernization.

The committee understands that body armor system weights have remained relatively constant over the last decade in spite of advances in materials technologies because protection levels have also increased in response to threats. The committee believes current body armor systems provide outstanding protection to the warfighter, but their weight contributes to the overburden issue and decline in performance. The committee commends the Army for addressing this challenge by shifting from a more discrete component level development strategy to a more systems engineering and system level approach to body armor and PPE development as a means to improve soldier capabilities. The committee has long championed the importance of reducing the weight of current body armor and personal protective equipment systems, as well as stressing the critical need for investment in weight reduction initiatives, along with technology insertions to improve performance and survivability. The committee believes the Department of Defense must maintain significant investment in near-term solutions that can effectively reduce the weight of body armor, while also investing in the development of revolutionary new material technologies that could provide for significant breakthroughs in weight and performance.

Technology for countering enemy unmanned aerial systems

The committee recognizes that enemy unmanned aerial systems represent a growing threat to U.S. and coalition forces. As unmanned aerial systems become more affordable and available, this technology has become increasingly available to non-state actors. The committee is aware of efforts by the Army Electronic Warfare division to develop technology that can recognize the uplinks between unmanned aerial vehicles and controllers on the ground to disrupt system communication to disable such threats and encourages the Army to continue its research into severing these control signals.

Ultra-light combat tactical vehicle test and evaluation

The committee understands the Army is proceeding forward to address the infantry brigade tactical mobility gap in accordance with a three-phased plan outlined in the operational need state-

ment (ONS) submitted by the 82nd Airborne Division and endorsed by 18th Airborne Corps and the U.S. Army Forces Command. The committee notes the ONS outlined immediate, interim, and long-term solutions to address this urgent capability gap for light infantry units.

The committee understands the immediate solution allows the 82nd Airborne Division to retain a tactical mobility set of high mobility, multi-purpose wheeled vehicles. The interim solution is the procurement of a commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) set of vehicles, and the long-term solution is the development of a programmatic solution through the traditional Army acquisition process. The committee is aware that the Army has addressed the immediate solution and has now authorized the interim COTS solution with the procurement of 33 ultra-light tactical vehicles in order to allow the execution of a proof-of-principle concept. The committee understands that additional vehicle procurement is contingent on the results from testing conducted by the 82nd Airborne Division.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the test results for the proof-of-principle for the interim solution. Should the test results prove favorable, the committee expects the briefing to provide details of the funding profile and acquisition strategy for the rapid acquisition and fielding of this interim solution, as well as the acquisition strategy for the proposed long-term solution.

Vehicle occupant protection technology development

The committee is aware of the development of technology to detect and autonomously respond in real time to vehicle underbody explosive incidents with an active response to counter vehicle flight, and reduce the physical effects on vehicle occupants through a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement between industry and the Army. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services within 45 days after the date on which the budget for fiscal year 2017 is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, on the results of the testing on this technology to date, as well as provide an assessment of the potential and prospective timing for this technology to be incorporated into vehicle occupant protection technology vehicle procurement programs.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

Overview

The budget request contained $17.88 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy. The committee recommends $16.65 billion, a decrease of $1.23 billion to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Advanced Low Cost Munitions Ordnance

The committee notes the Navy's efforts to develop an Advanced Low Cost Munitions Ordnance (ALaMO) for the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) by Fiscal Year 2020. The committee believes the LCS program should be equipped with the most affordable, lethal, defensive, and offensive capabilities across all mission areas. The committee supports the Navy's efforts to develop ALaMO, specifically a guided 57mm projectile to counter threats against small boat swarms and others. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition) to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by August 30, 2015 on the current status of the ALaMO program. The briefing should include, but not be limited to, an evaluation of the current funding profile and schedule for this program across the Future Years Defense Program, as well as discuss potential courses of action to accelerate or streamline the current program strategy.

Anti-Submarine Warfare Continuous Trail Unmanned Vessel

The committee is aware that the fiscal year 2016 budget request contains funding within research, development, testing, and evaluation, Defense-Wide, for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to continue work on the Anti-Submarine Warfare Continuous Trail Unmanned Vessel.

The committee is aware of and encouraged by recent at-sea tests demonstrating the success of the autonomous command and control software aboard a surrogate test vessel. The committee notes that these tests successfully demonstrated a fully autonomous capability in a manner fully compliant with international collision regulations. Furthermore, the committee is supportive of the growing interest in additional at-sea testing among various Navy commands for other missions.

The committee is further encouraged by the recently signed memorandum of agreement between DARPA and Office of Naval Research, and supports the funding being provided by both organizations for additional at-sea testing. The committee believes that additional testing should support flexibility of the autonomy design and application for additional future missions. The committee recommends continued collaboration between DARPA and the U.S. Navy to ensure the successful transition of this program.

Anti-surface warfare missile capability for Littoral Combat Ship

The committee is aware of the complex close combat environments that Navy surface combatants encounter when operating in the littorals. Characteristic of this environment is the irregular threat posed by clusters of swarming small boats intermingled with non-combatant vessels. As a result, the anti-surface warfare mission for vessels, such as the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) and Patrol Coastal (PC) ships, must possess positive-control missile capabilities that enable agile rules of engagement for applying decisive defensive countermeasures while minimizing the risks of collateral damage. Furthermore, it is critical that this balance of capabilities be fielded to the fleet as rapidly as possible.

The committee is also aware of the Navy's efforts to field an anti-surface warfare missile capability for the LCS that meets these criteria; however, the committee is concerned that the current development path will require significant engineering/test and integration work that impacts the initial operating capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2016, detailing the cost and schedule of current development efforts on anti-surface warfare missile capability for the LCS and PC ships. The briefing should evaluate comparative systems' speed of integration to the fleet, range, weight, In-Flight Target Update capability, and ability to leverage existing fielded systems.

Automated Test and Retest

The committee recognizes the value that the Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program provides to the Department of Defense in gaining access to new and innovative technologies that, when successful, can be integrated into new acquisition programs of record. As noted by the National Research Council in its most recent assessment of the Department of Defense SBIR program in 2014, these projects are highly successful at commercialization. Data from that study indicates that about 70 percent of Department of Defense Phase II projects reach the market. In addition, these projects "are in broad alignment with the agency's mission needs," and result in broader impacts on the innovation ecosystem, such as strong linkages with universities, support for graduate students, and licensing of technology from universities.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense is not fully utilizing the scope of the unique authorities embedded in the SBIR legislation. In addition to potentially shortening acquisition cycle time, SBIR can be useful in leveraging the innovation of the small business community and growing new technology areas. A good example of the benefits of the SBIR program is the Navy's Automated Test and Retest (ATRT) Initiative, which has demonstrated impressive results in reducing the time, reducing the cost, and improving the quality of fielding new capabilities by performing research, development, and application of automated testing technologies for the test and evaluation of Naval warfare systems. The committee believes that the valuable lessons from such activities as ATRT should be more widely leveraged across the Navy and the rest of the Department of Defense. The committee believes it is especially important to make sure that program managers and contracting officers are fully cognizant of the unique authorities SBIR provides, and are duly encouraged to be as flexible and creative as possible in utilizing those authorities.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2015, on the Department's plans for improving the use of SBIR authorities. This briefing should address how to better educate program managers and contracting officers on the special authorities of SBIR, any recommendations for how to improve or strengthen those authorities, metrics for assessing the use of SBIR authorities, and a process for integrating lessons learned from past successes like ATRT into fu-

ture acquisition program planning and workforce development for the relevant communities.

Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range

The budget request contained $39.1 million in PE 24571N for consolidated training systems. Of this amount, no funds were requested for research and development to upgrade the anti-submarine warfare (ASW) underwater range instrumentation needs at the Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range at the Pacific Missile Range Facility in Hawaii.

The committee recognizes that the military's ability to conduct advanced ASW training is a critical aspect of our military technological superiority. The Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range, which was designed, manufactured, and installed in 1994, is the largest underwater instrumented range in the world, and covers over 1,100 square nautical miles. However, the committee is very concerned that the current system is beyond its 20 year design life, and rapidly becoming difficult to operate, repair, and maintain. Senior leaders within the Nation's submarine community have been on record since 2012 calling for a range replacement to begin in order to maintain worldwide ASW fleet readiness and superiority. To support such efforts, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the Secretary's plan to meet this longstanding fleet requirement. The briefing should address the technology and instrumentation upgrade needs for the range with projected funding needs by fiscal year, a preliminary schedule of key milestones, and a fully competitive acquisition strategy to meet submarine fleet readiness requirements.

Additionally, the committee recommends $54.1 million, an increase of $15.0 million, in PE 24571N to support upgrading the ASW underwater range instrumentation needs at the Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range.

Continuation of Brimstone missile assessment

The Brimstone missile is an air-launched ground attack missile in use by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland's Royal Air Force. The committee notes that the Brimstone missile has a dual-mode seeker which is capable of both active radar homing and laser guidance which allows for precision attack against moving targets, and has been used in combat operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Libya, and in current operations in the Republic of Iraq.

The committee understands that defending against swarms of small enemy boats, known as fast inshore attack craft, from strike fighter aircraft, maritime patrol aircraft, and helicopters is a challenging mission for the Department of the Navy, and the committee believes that the Brimstone missile may be a solution to address this threat. Additionally, the committee believes that the Brimstone missile could be used for close air support missions.

The committee supports the use of funds authorized and appropriated for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 which are being used to provide the analysis needed to determine if the Brimstone missile is suitable for the F/A–18 aircraft carrier environment. If found suitable, the committee urges the Department of the Navy to use all

available funding options, including the use of prior year funds, to expedite integration and fielding of the Brimstone missile on F/A–18E and F Super Hornet aircraft. The committee also notes that on April 20, 2015, the Navy initiated a request for information (RFI) as a market survey tool to solicit industry input to support possible future acquisition planning for a direct-attack, fire-and-forget weapon for F/A–18E/F Super Hornet aircraft. The committee understands the RFI indicates a planned initial operational capability in 2023, with a possible planned funding start for the multi-mode missile in fiscal year 2017. The committee encourages full and open consideration of all suitable solutions to meet this proposed planned schedule as part of the RFI.

F414 engine noise reduction research and development

The committee supports Department of Defense efforts to reduce noise-related injuries and conditions that impact significant numbers of active-duty and former members of the military. Specifically, the committee supports ongoing Navy research and development efforts related to the F414 engine, which is used in the F/A–18 E/F Super Hornet and EA–18G Growler aircraft. The committee notes, however, that testing conducted by the Navy in October 2014 using chevron engine nozzle attachments did not achieve the hoped for noise reduction results. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing not later than September 30, 2015 to the House Committee on Armed Services on the status of F414 engine noise reduction research and development activities. The briefing should include details on recent F414 engine noise reduction efforts and other Navy noise reduction research and development activities and programs.

Five-inch precision guided projectile development for naval surface fire support

The budget request included $0.9 million in PE 63795N for Land Attack Technology, but contained no funding for 5-inch guided projectile development and demonstration.

The committee understands the Navy has recognized that current surface Navy gunnery requirements are outdated and that new technologies such as railgun and directed energy weapons are nearing readiness for technology transition. The committee commends the Navy for initiating a review of naval surface fires requirements and for establishing the Advanced Naval Surface Fires (ANSF) initiative. The committee understands the ANSF initiative would conduct a capabilities assessment and review of all surface Navy requirements related to self-defense, anti-surface warfare, naval surface fires support, strike warfare, counterintelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, and integrated air and missile defense.

The committee is particularly interested in the ANSF efforts related to naval surface fires support. The committee notes the ANSF is assessing options for providing a near-term 5-inch guided munition capability. The 5-inch guided munition would be used for improved and extended range naval surface fire support. The committee is aware the Navy has issued a request for information to industry regarding this capability and has received several responses that could create the environment for a full and open com-

petition. The committee believes this technology could significantly improve naval surface fires support capability and could potentially be quickly introduced into the fleet given potential mature technology readiness levels.

The committee recommends $10.9 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63795N to accelerate the development and demonstration of 5-inch guided projectile technology for naval surface fires support.

Fully homomorphic encryption

The committee is aware of the work done by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) in the Programming Computation on Encrypted Data (PROCEED) program to develop methods that allow computing with encrypted data without first decrypting it. One such method, fully homomorphic encryption, could theoretically allow for that, but is limited by impractically slow computational speeds. The DARPA PROCEED program, as well as other work being done by the Navy through the Office of Naval Research and the Space and Naval Warfare Command, is pursuing methods to make such cyber security methods more practical and implementable. As a result of these efforts, new approaches for secure cloud computing and cybersecurity are maturing and moving into practical use. The committee recognizes that these design, development, and implementation activities are costly, yet necessary for forward progress. The committee is also aware that the Navy and Marine Corps have identified the need to develop and apply fully homomorphic encryption, particularly for protecting safety-critical cyber systems and reducing leakage of information to our adversaries. Such goals are critical not only to properly securing our nation's computers, but also to protecting sensitive data. Therefore, the committee encourages the Navy and Marine Corps to continue research into fully homomorphic encryption and to examine additional areas related to implementation, integration, and software tooling support.

National Sea Based Deterrence Fund

The committee notes that the National Sea Based Deterrence Fund (NDSF) was created by the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to address a congressional determination that the recapitalization of the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine was a national strategic imperative. The committee also notes that the recapitalization of this strategic asset is currently estimated at $95.77 billion. The committee believes that this acquisition program will have an extraordinary and detrimental impact to investments in the shipbuilding and construction, Navy, account if traditional funding levels of this account are sustained. The committee also believes that the entirety of the Department of Defense investment capabilities need to be used to recapitalize this strategic asset.

Therefore, the committee recommends the transfer of $1.39 billion for the Navy *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine replacement program from the research, development, test, and evaluation, Navy, account to the National Sea Based Deterrence Fund, Department of Defense account.

Navy communications experimentation

The committee is aware that the Commander, Navy 7th Fleet is testing a broadband system that provides cellular-based, fourth generation long-term evolution (4G LTE) and broadband satellite communications to Navy ships. This Navy broadband effort could potentially improve the communications capabilities of naval platforms and promote information sharing and real-time collaboration in an emergency situation. Since this capability is built on commercial technologies, it could be rapidly fielded to improve the readiness, tactical communications, and morale, welfare, and recreation capabilities of the Navy. In light of the results from the recently completed Trident Warrior 15 Experimentation, the committee encourages the Navy to continue to examine the continued and expanded use of mobile broadband 4G LTE technology.

Requirements maturation and developmental planning

The committee is aware that the Air Force maintains a program element line within its science and technology (S&T) budget for Requirements Analysis and Maturation. This activity is used to fund developmental planning and integrated simulation and analysis capabilities that are used to inform programs before they formally enter the acquisition process. Such activities might include: early systems engineering to comprehend capability needs, formulate and evaluate viable concepts, define trade space, assess technical risks, and identify technology needs. The committee recognizes that such work is very useful in providing a solid analytic basis for cost and capability trades that inform weapon systems requirements, acquisition milestones, decision points, and other phases. The committee believes that such support, which is at a small funding level at this stage, can provide huge benefits in risk reduction and cost avoidance for programs once they mature. The committee encourages the Navy to pursue similar developmental planning efforts, including dedicated S&T funding lines, to support such activities to inform programs of record.

Service life extension program for Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research

The budget request contained $42.2 million in PE 62435N for the Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research program.

For academic research, the Navy operates and maintains Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research (AGOR) vessels. Three of these vessels require a mid-life overhaul, partial funding for which was provided in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113–235). The committee notes that funding provided to date does not fully support all of the items that the Navy has determined are necessary to fully extend the life of these AGOR ships to 40–45 years.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $62.2 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 62435N for Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research, to procure the entirety of a mid-life overhaul. The committee notes that the inclusion of this authorization of appropriations is predicated on the Navy's use of merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures, to conduct these overhauls.

The committee continues to believe that oceanographic research is a core function of the Navy, and remains committed to ensuring the ability of the Navy to sustain its research priorities, even in the face of fiscally constrained budgets. The committee is concerned that the Navy has been decreasing funding in oceanographic research, especially sea-going research, and is concerned about the negative long-term implications these trends are likely to have on areas like anti-submarine warfare and battlespace awareness. Navy science and technology funding also plays a key role in information stewardship, including ocean mapping, oceanographic and meteorological data, that supports Navy, national, and international scientific goals.

Spectral Warrior

The committee understands that U.S. Navy surface combatants are experiencing a significant increase in friendly and adversary satellite communications (SATCOM) interference events that could result in a degraded fleet mission capability. Ensuring the protection and connectivity of satellite communications for command and control, navigation, and ship protection should be an operational priority. The committee commends the Navy for fielding systems like Spectral Warrior that detect, characterize, and report all SATCOM interference events, although the committee is concerned that the quantity of systems being fielded may not meet the operational need. The committee encourages the Navy to develop requirements and fund a program of record that leverages currently fielded Spectral Warrior technologies to meet critical SATCOM assurance requirements.

Tactical Combat Training System program

The budget request contained $39.1 million in PE 24571N for Consolidated Training System Development. Of this amount, $19.3 million was requested for the Tactical Combat Training System (TCTS) program.

The committee notes that the TCTS Increment II is a Navy program that will address important training range capability gaps. The committee also notes that as part of a separate, earlier Department of Defense program, the Department has developed the Common Range Integrated Instrumentation System (CRIIS) to provide a joint test and evaluation system. While the requirements for the systems are not identical, the committee understands that the CRIIS may require only minimal software and hardware changes to meet the requirements for the TCTS Increment II training system. As a result, the committee encourages the Department of the Navy to consider adapting the CRIIS program, if it has the potential to meet requirements and affordability targets, to provide the capability the Navy is seeking to field through the TCTS Increment II program.

The committee recommends $39.1 million, the full amount requested, in PE 24571N for Consolidated Training System Development, including $19.3 million for the Tactical Combat Training System program.

Unmanned carrier aviation

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense has initiated an intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) portfolio review to assess the merits of the entirety of Department of Defense assets that may be available to support combat operations. This review is being augmented by a U.S. Navy tactical aviation analysis to determine the characteristics and quantities of carrier based ISR unmanned aviation systems (UAS) necessary to optimize the overall carrier air wing. The committee also notes that section 217 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) included:

(1) A limitation on funding associated with the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) air vehicle until the Secretary of Defense certifies that a review of requirements associated with the UCLASS air vehicle is complete and submits the results of such a review to the congressional defense committees; and

(2) A requirement for the Secretary of the Navy to prepare a report to assess the overall carrier air wing composition to include UCLASS, the support offered by non-organic naval aviation forces such as MQ–4C Triton, and the intended capabilities offered by FA–XX, which is the replacement aircraft for the F/A–18 E/F aircraft.

The committee believes that sea-based, long-range strike capabilities have incontrovertible merit and have been an integral element of U.S. carrier air wings in the past. Looking ahead, this capability may be the most important capability that the aircraft carrier can provide in contested environments and anti-access/area-denial scenarios. The committee believes that pursuit of a long-range penetrating strike capability should therefore be a critical focus of naval investments. The committee also believes that the capabilities offered by unmanned aviation may be the only capability that can support this mission requirement.

The committee notes that the majority of naval aviation missions do not require the same high-end characteristics required for long-range penetrating strike missions. The committee recognizes that an unmanned aircraft with not all of the attributes of a high-end UAS may be a more economical and sustainable means of conducting persistent ISR, aerial refueling, and strike missions in low-to-medium threat environments. The committee also recognizes that the Navy has a validated capability gap in regard to ISR and encourages the Department of Defense to meet this requirement in an economical and efficient manner.

Considering all of the options available to the Navy to augment the future carrier air wing, the committee believes that the continued development of the UCLASS program as a long-range penetrating strike capability best meets the future carrier air wing requirements and will address a much needed capability deficiency in the current carrier strike design.

Finally, the committee notes that the budget request included continued development of the UCLASS program, but does not include funds for the air vehicle. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to expeditiously complete the ISR portfolio analysis review and provide the proposed UCLASS Capabilities Devel-

opment Document (CDD) to the congressional defense committees. If the CDD is not provided by August 31, 2015, the committee directs the Secretary of the Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2015, as to the terms of reference and an assessment that the Navy has the resources available and a strategy to deliver those required UCLASS capabilities. At a minimum, this brief should also include:

(1) An updated cost estimate;

(2) A schedule for holding a milestone B review and establishing an acquisition program baseline before initiating system development;

(3) Plans for new preliminary design reviews or delta preliminary design reviews and technology maturation if more demanding requirements are validated; and

(4) What consideration is being given to adopting an evolutionary acquisition approach.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

Overview

The budget request contained $26.47 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force. The committee recommends $25.95 billion, a decrease of $515.7 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Adaptive engine transition program

The budget request contained $246.5 million in PE 64858F for the adaptive engine transition program (AETP).

The committee supports the continued emphasis on research and development in the next generation of turbine engine technology. AETP is a competitive acquisition program that builds upon current research efforts and is designed to mature adaptive turbine engine technologies for next-generation propulsion systems. In addition to goals for significant fuel savings, the committee understands that AETP offers improvements in range and persistence, increased thrust, and improvements in thermal management capacity that cannot be achieved by improving existing engines. The committee believes that the program will leverage existing adaptive turbine engine science and technology demonstrations to develop an adaptive engine built around a broad suite of technologies. Many of these technologies share commonality with the latest commercially developed engines, which will enable multiple follow-on high confidence competitive acquisition programs. The committee notes that there are potential applications of this technology to both legacy and future combat aircraft. The committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to continue to make the necessary investments in these critical technologies to maintain technological superiority over any potential adversary.

Therefore, the committee recommends $246.5 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64858F for the AETP program, and en-

courages the Air Force to explore acquisition strategies to accelerate the program.

Advanced manufacturing for low-cost sustainment

The budget request contained $42.6 million in PE 63680F for the Air Force manufacturing technology program, but contained no funding to mature advanced additive manufacturing technologies to address the cost and sustainment challenges for aerospace applications.

The committee is aware that the defense sustainment community has identified additive manufacturing as a means to dramatically lower the cost of maintaining aging weapon platforms. Additive manufacturing, more commonly known as 3D printing, allows the manufacture of a part with speed, flexibility, and little waste of materials. Currently, the Air Force uses additive manufacturing for design iteration, prototyping, tooling and fixtures, and for some noncritical parts. However, the committee recognizes that in the future the Air Force hopes to use additive manufacturing for building actual aerospace parts, such as fuel nozzles and heat exchangers. The committee believes that additional research needs to be done to validate the flight safety and integrity of such 3D printed parts to be able to reap the full benefits of this technology.

Therefore, the committee recommends $52.6 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63680F to support the maturation of advanced manufacturing for low-cost sustainment that meets the performance requirements of aerospace applications.

Advanced pilot training family of systems

The budget request contained $11.34 million in PE 65223F for the advanced pilot training (T–X) program.

The committee supports the direction the Department of the Air Force is taking with the acquisition of a new trainer aircraft. Specifically, the committee supports the Department's approach to bundle the advanced pilot training system which would keep the aircraft, simulator, and courseware together, providing significant cost savings to the warfighter and taxpayer. Given the Department's planned retirement of the T–38 in the late 2020s, the committee urges the Department of the Air Force to maintain a stable schedule, including potential initial operational capability in 2023.

The committee recommends $11.34 million, the full amount requested, in PE 65223F for the advanced pilot training (T–X) program.

Air Force Minority Leaders Program

The committee is aware that the Air Force maintains a program called the Air Force Minority Leaders Program, which partners a small disadvantaged business with students, teachers, and professors from historically black colleges and universities and minority institutions (HBCU/MI) to perform Air Force research tasks. The Air Force Minority Leaders Program is the largest Department of Defense research program that works with historically black colleges, and has been successful at promoting valuable research for the Department, as well as increasing the pipeline of minority scientific talent for future Air Force jobs and strengthening the scientific and educational infrastructure in the minority community.

The committee encourages the Air Force to continue investing time, personnel, and resources in supporting research activities that can be conducted by the Air Force Minority Leaders Program to meet critical defense capabilities, science and technology, future workforce, and technical program objectives for the Air Force. Additionally, the committee urges the Air Force to find ways to expand the research areas in which the Air Force Minority Leaders Program can participate, as well as the ways in which to leverage the knowledge, skills, and expertise of those minority scientists and engineers engaged with that program.

Airborne sensor data correlation

The budget request contained $68.3 million in PE 64759F for major test and evaluation investment, but contained no funding for development of airborne sensor data correlation.

Airborne sensor data correlation is a research project to prototype fusing unmanned aerial system electro-optical and infrared full motion video to support accurate over-water weapons impact scoring. The committee understands that future testing for hypersonic and long-range weapons will require large test areas and larger hazard areas that could require dynamic re-planning and monitoring, and that current range instrumentation systems are limited to small target test areas, fixed sensors, and environmental restrictions. The committee believes that an airborne sensor data correlation project can support dynamic test measurement requirements over large target areas as range footprints are expanded to support the testing of longer range weapons.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $73.3 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 64759F for airborne sensor data correlation.

B–52 radar modernization program

The budget request contained $74.5 million in PE 11113F for B–52 squadrons, but contained no funding for the B–52 radar modernization program (RMP).

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee encouraged the Secretary of the Air Force to begin the B–52 RMP, then known as the B–52 strategic radar replacement program, and is disappointed to note that the Secretary has opted not to include funds for this purpose for fiscal year 2016. Based on a Department of the Air Force report to the congressional defense committees in 2013, the committee continues to believe that a B–52 RMP is a lower cost option than sustaining the current radar over the projected service life of the B–52, especially in light of the prospect that sustainment costs for the B–52's legacy radar system are likely to significantly increase after 2017 based on obsolescence and diminishing manufacturing sources.

Accordingly, the committee continues to encourage the Secretary of the Air Force to include funding in the fiscal year 2017 budget request that would begin replacement of the B–52 legacy radar system, and expects that B–52 budget briefings for fiscal year 2017 to the congressional defense committees will address the Department of the Air Force plan to replace the B–52 radar.

Conformal phased array antennas

The committee notes that there have been recent substantive improvements in antenna technology, providing enhanced capabilities to aircraft and unmanned aerial systems. Additionally, the committee is aware that these same platforms face environments where it would be useful for antennae to operate on different frequency bands and to be reconfigurable while in flight. The committee believes that these enhanced capabilities could be critically important in improving sensing in constrained or contested aerial environments. The committee encourages the Air Force to examine research opportunities to develop the fundamental theory, modeling, and demonstration of super-adaptable conformal phased array antennas.

Digital polarimetric radar development

The committee notes that there have been major advances in the field of radar development with respect to incorporating both polarimetric and phased array radar technology in an all-digital design. The committee considers the development of this technology as a critical enabler for the Air Force in the development of increased weather sensing, as well as discrete object tracking capabilities. The committee encourages the Air Force to examine research opportunities to create an all-digital polarimetric phased radar for future use in discrete object sensing and tracking and concurrent use for weather observations.

Experimentation program

The committee is aware that the Army, Navy, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense have all begun to implement funded program element lines to support increasing developmental and operational experimentation. The committee believes that such activities are extremely valuable to iron out technology challenges, identify areas of risk, refine operating concepts, and gain warfighter trust and confidence in untested systems. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee is aware of numerous historical examples where experimentation with new technologies in peacetime paved the way for their adoption and effective use in wartime. The committee believes that increasing experimentation can be pivotal in laying the foundations for successful technology adoption by the warfighting community. Therefore, the committee encourages the Air Force to establish a similar program element funding line for experimentation to allow for greater flexibility to conduct such experimentation in the future and support transition of technology from the laboratory to the operational force.

F–16 active electronically scanned array radar upgrade

The budget request contained $148.3 million in PE 27133F for F–16 squadrons, but contained no funding to conduct integration and testing for an F–16 active electronically scanned array (AESA) radar upgrade.

The committee notes that, despite the termination of the combat avionics programmed extension suite (CAPES), the Department of the Air Force is considering a new effort to upgrade F–16 radars from the current APG–68 system to a modern AESA radar system. Further, the committee understands that this potential radar up-

grade program is based upon a developing joint operational urgent need (JOUN) that specifically requires an AESA radar upgrade to the F–16 aircraft that perform the aerospace alert control mission. The committee supports taking all appropriate steps to meet this JUON as soon as possible.

The committee expects the Department of the Air Force to minimize program concurrency between development, testing, and production for any such F–16 AESA radar upgrade. Specifically, the committee expects the Department to proceed in a manner that ensures proper integration and testing of radar upgrades so that the AESA upgrades meet requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $198.3 million, an increase of $50.0 million, in PE 27133F to conduct integration and testing for an F–16 AESA radar upgrade, and encourages the Department of the Air Force to budget for development and procurement of this upgrade in the Future Years Defense Program.

F–35 dual-capable aircraft development program

The Department of the Air Force budget request contained $518.0 million in PE 64800F for development of the F–35A, of which $5.0 million was for dual-capable aircraft development. As a dual-capable aircraft, the F–35 would be capable of performing both the conventional and nuclear weapons delivery missions.

The committee notes that the F–35 dual-capable aircraft development program is part of the F–35 block 4 software program which will be completed subsequent to the conclusion of the system development and demonstration program, and will be released in increments known as blocks 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 with initial operational capability dates of each of those four blocks planned to occur between 2019 and 2025. The committee understands that the dual-capable F–35 aircraft would be included in block 4.3 or 4.4 to replace the aging F–16 aircraft which is currently performing the dual-capable aircraft mission.

The committee recommends $5.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64800F for the F–35 dual-capable aircraft development program, and encourages the Department of the Air Force to accelerate the completion of the F–35 dual-capable aircraft development program in future budget requests.

Fifth generation tactical data link enterprise

The committee notes that the data links for the Department of the Air Force's two fifth generation aircraft, the F–22 and the F–35, are proprietary, and are not interoperable, rendering these data links incapable of sharing data between these two types of aircraft. The committee understands that the Department of the Air Force intends to address this problem by using a separate data link, known as Link 16, which is currently in use by fourth generation aircraft. The committee further understands that Link 16 could be vulnerable in higher threat, anti-access and area denial environments.

The committee believes that over the long term, the Department of the Air Force will need to upgrade the propriety data links to a non-proprietary next-generation waveform, or provide the industry associated with developing and producing data links the technical data packages for the current waveforms so that competition

and innovation can be sustained. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to pursue competitive development and production of data links to provide for a future robust and innovative data link industrial base.

KC–135 auto throttles

A KC–135 auto throttle system would allow a pilot to automatically set aircraft throttle settings to maximize fuel consumption for a given power setting to attain a specific indicated airspeed, instead of manually doing so. The committee understands that installation of a KC–135 auto throttle system would reduce cockpit workload, increase crew situational awareness, and result in a 3 percent fuel savings. The committee further understands that based on fuel savings, investment in such an auto throttle system could be recouped in as few as 4 years. The committee notes that other Air Mobility Command aircraft such as the KC–10, C–17, C–5, and KC–46 are also equipped with similar auto throttle capability.

Therefore, the committee urges the Department of the Air Force to begin a program for the development and production of a KC–135 auto throttle system.

KC–46 aerial refueling tanker aircraft program

The budget request contained $602.4 million in PE 65221F for KC–46 tanker development and $2.35 billion for procurement of 12 KC–46 tanker aircraft. The KC–46 tanker aircraft is being developed and procured to replace the aging Department of the Air Force KC–135 and KC–10 aerial refueling tanker fleets.

The committee continues its long-standing support of the KC–46 tanker aircraft program, and believes that the KC–46 tanker aircraft is necessary to meet current and future warfighter requirements for aerial refueling and airlift. However, the committee notes that Government Accountability Office (GAO) identified $200.0 million of funds authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 2015 for KC–46 development that have been determined excess to need because engineering change orders planned for fiscal year 2015 have not occurred, and these funds could be used to meet fiscal year 2016 requirements. The committee further notes that the GAO has also identified $24.0 million of fiscal year 2015 KC–46 procurement funds that are excess to need for a similar reason, which could also be used to meet fiscal year 2016 requirements. Department of the Air Force KC–46 program officials have verified that the GAO's determination is correct.

Consequently, the committee recommends $402.4 million, a decrease of $200.0 million, in PE 65221F for KC–46 tanker development, and $2.32 billion, a decrease of $24.0 million, for KC–46 procurement.

Long-range strike bomber

The Department of Defense has indicated that it intends to pursue the acquisition of future long-range strike capabilities for operating in anti-access/area denial environments. According to the budget request for fiscal year 2016, the Secretary of Defense expects to significantly increase annual investments in long-range strike development over the next 5 years, with investments from fiscal year 2016–20 projected to total nearly $14.00 billion. The ac-

quisition of a new bomber is one of the key elements in the Department's planned long-range strike investments.

Given the size of the planned investments and the strategic importance of successfully acquiring a new bomber, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the U.S. Air Force bomber acquisition program and to provide a briefing to all appropriately cleared Members and Professional Staff of the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the findings of the review. Specifically, the Comptroller General shall include an examination of the bomber program's technology maturity in comparison with other Air Force acquisition programs at similar milestone events. This brief should also include an examination of the Air Force's: (1) overall acquisition strategy; (2) technology, design, and production readiness; (3) development, testing, and fielding progress; (4) cost and schedule implications; and (5) technical performance.

The committee expects the Secretary of the Air Force shall ensure timely access to the necessary program information including, but not limited to, cost and budget information, detailed schedules, contractor data, program management reports, decision briefings, risk and technology readiness assessments, and technical performance measures.

We encourage the Comptroller General to consider providing, when practical and feasible given security limitations, an annual unclassified summary of the program's status and risks.

Long-range strike bomber program

The budget request contained $1.25 billion in PE 64015F for the long-range strike bomber (LRS–B) program. The LRS–B program is developing a new bomber aircraft that will be a long-range, air-refuelable, and highly survivable aircraft with significant nuclear and conventional stand-off and direct-attack weapons payload.

The committee continues its long-standing support of the LRS–B program and believes that the LRS–B aircraft is required to address future threats. However, the committee notes that selection of a contractor to begin the LRS–B engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program has been delayed 4 months. The committee further notes that, according to program officials, this delay has resulted in an excess of $360.0 million of funds authorized and appropriated for fiscal year 2015 that could be used to meet requirements for fiscal year 2016, and an excess of $100.0 million budgeted for fiscal year 2016 that will not be used due to a slower spend rate in the EMD program during fiscal year 2016.

Consequently, the committee recommends $786.2 million, a decrease of $460.0 million, in PE 64015F for the LRS–B program.

Next Generation Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System Electro-Optical, Infrared Sensor Capability

The committee believes that the Air Force should consider, as part of the requirements for the Next Generation Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), an integrated electro-optical/infrared (EO/IR) search capability. The committee notes that such a system could assist with precise identification of targets at extended ranges, which would provide tactical advantages to deployed forces. The committee further notes that EO/IR capa-

bility is already in very high demand and that adding this capability to Next Generation JSTARS may enable the platform to provide additional intelligence support capability. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the potential utility of an integrated EO/IR capability on Next Generation JSTARS aircraft. The briefing should also include the potential cost and schedule impacts of adding such a capability to the Next Generation JSTARS development program.

Next Generation Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System operational concepts

The budget request contained $44.3 million in PE 37581F for the Next Generation (NextGen) Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) program.

The committee is aware that the Department of the Air Force has a requirement for a new manned command-and-control/intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance aircraft given that the current, high-demand E–8C JSTARS aircraft are facing low availability rates, end-of-life issues, and growing sustainment costs. The committee encourages the Air Force to take into consideration a platform that is able to grow and adapt for unknown future threats and game-changing technologies.

In addition, the committee would like to better understand the relationship between the system requirements and how the Department of the Air Force intends to employ JSTARS in the future. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 29, 2016, detailing the planned operational mission concepts for the NextGen JSTARS. This briefing should include, but not be limited to, how the aircraft and mission system will be employed in various phases of peacetime and combat operations. Additionally, the briefing should explain concepts for mission training, aircraft maintenance, force protection, aircraft security, crew manning, and future sustainability and modernization to include growth margin.

The committee recommends $44.3 million, the full amount requested, in PE 37581F for the NextGen JSTARS program.

Technology transfer

The budget request contained $3.5 million in PE 64317F to facilitate the transfer of technology from the Department of Defense to industry for both commercial and military use.

The committee is aware that the technology transfer program was devolved from the Office of the Secretary of Defense to the Air Force in 2012 in an effort to achieve efficiencies and increase the effectiveness of the program. Technology transfer is a critical strategy for the Department that allows it to license or patent government laboratory developed technologies to leverage the manufacturing, production, and marketing economies of scale of the private sector.

The committee believes that the Air Force should increase its investment in technology transfer efforts in order to improve the commercialization of intellectual property developed by the defense laboratories in support of critical cross-service technological needs

such as human performance, cybersecurity, autonomous systems, unmanned vehicles, and rapid prototyping. The committee believes additional funding could expand the efforts to actively promote and broker cooperative research and development agreements (CRADAs) and partnership intermediary agreements (PIAs) between Department of Defense laboratories and industry, with a focus on non-traditional defense contractors.

The committee recognizes that one challenge to supporting this technology transfer process is the administrative support needed for development of CRADAs and PIAs and the protection of intellectual property for both the government and industry. The committee notes that the Air Force is particularly challenged by the need to periodically engage experienced patent attorneys with expertise in specific technology areas. The committee believes that the Air Force should consider establishing one or more PIAs as a mechanism capable of making adjustments to surges in work, or handling new and emerging technology areas where there may be little or no expertise within the government.

Therefore, the committee recommends $13.5 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 64317F to support increased technology transfer activities within the Air Force, as well as the Department of Defense writ large.

Three-Dimensional Expeditionary Long-Range Radar

The budget request contained $14.9 million in PE 27455F for the Three-Dimensional Expeditionary Long-Range Radar (3DELRR) program.

While the committee is aware that the 3DELRR program has been delayed by more than a year due to a protest of the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) contract award, the committee still believes this is a critical program that will provide a much-needed upgrade to current Department of the Air Force long-range radar systems. As a result, the committee urges the Department of the Air Force to keep the program on its new schedule that should require a significant increase in funding for the EMD phase in fiscal year 2017.

The committee recommends $14.9 million, the full amount requested, in PE 27455F for the 3DELRR program.

Wide area surveillance

The budget request contained $50.2 million in PE 35206F for development of airborne reconnaissance systems, but contained no funding for development of wide area surveillance. The committee notes that persistent day and night wide-area motion imagery (WAMI) capability is flying in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, being readied to support operations in the Republic of Iraq, and is considered by operational commanders to be a critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance program for combat units that has contributed to saving U.S. and allied soldiers' lives.

The committee notes the Department of the Air Force's November 2014 decision to designate WAMI capability as a program of record. However, the committee understands that this designation late in the calendar year did not allow the Department of the Air Force to program funds for fiscal year 2016. As a result of this situation, the committee is concerned that without funding in fiscal

year 2016 to continue development of the multi-intelligence capable wide-area surveillance system, engineering teams will be reduced or disbanded, technical support to deployed systems will be impacted, and program improvement efforts will be reduced or terminated.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $60.2 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 35206F for further development of WAMI.

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

Overview

The budget request contained $18.32 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide. The committee recommends $18.54 billion, an increase of $217.2 million to the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 research, development, test, and evaluation, Defense-Wide program are identified in division D of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Advanced semiconductor platform

The committee is aware that a technology capability gap potentially exists for full integration capabilities to manufacture the next generation of advanced semiconductor materials platforms for military systems. The committee recognizes that keeping a viable manufacturing production line of advanced semiconductor material platforms in the United States may be increasingly necessary because of its integration into wide-ranging capabilities such as military electronic, photonic, and energy systems for unmanned aerial vehicles, satellites, soldier equipment capabilities and other defense applications. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider investing in manufacturing capabilities for advanced semiconductor materials platform technology that are critical to our national defense, through direct investment or potentially as part of the Defense Production Act Title III program.

Assessment of the directed energy industrial base

The committee is aware of the growing importance of directed energy systems to future Department of Defense missions and operational concepts. As developmental programs continue to progress, and the potential for acquisition programs of record increases, the committee believes that it is important to have a better understanding of the industrial base for directed energy systems to understand if that sector can accommodate future growth in these areas. The committee recognizes that the ability of this sector to support future demand in the event that programs of record scale up could be a limiting factor to the expansion of these technologies. Though there are areas where the technology still needs to be tested and validated, the committee supports analysis of this area to ensure industry can meet the future needs of this emerging technology area.

Recognizing that the Department is required by section 2503 of title 10, United States Code, to have a program for industrial base

analysis and under section 2505 to perform periodic defense capability assessments, the committee believes that the process exists to ascertain the strengths and weaknesses in this part of the industrial base. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to conduct an assessment of the directed energy industrial base and brief the results of this assessment to the House Armed Services Committee by February 1, 2016. This assessment should include the following:

(1) A review of the technical domestic and international industrial capacity for components or subsystems for directed energy systems, including solid-state or fiber lasers; high quality optics, including large aperture optics and beam directors; components required for atmospheric compensation systems, including wavefront sensors and deformable mirrors; pulsed power and other energy systems; and power electronics, or other electronic subsystems.

(2) An assessment of current or planned research efforts of acquisition programs to determine if their technology needs can be met by the current directed energy industrial base; and

(3) Recommendations for ways of strengthening or otherwise supporting the directed energy industrial base.

Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office

The budget request included $71.2 million in PE 63122D8Z for the Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office (CTTSO).

The CTTSO identifies capabilities to combat terrorism and irregular adversaries and delivers these capabilities to geographic combatant commanders, the military services, the interagency, and international partners. The committee notes CTTSO's track record of success in demonstrating the effectiveness of technology when applied to combating terrorism and irregular warfare requirements, and that the CTTSO has most recently developed several capabilities to counter the growing threat being posed by Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). The committee remains concerned with the success of ISIL's messaging and propaganda, and its ability to persuade, inspire, and recruit from across the globe. ISIL's continued success on the battlefield depends on this messaging, and the group's propaganda attracts recruits and other support that enables the organization to persist. Consequently, the committee believes that the campaign to degrade and defeat ISIL on the battlefield must be coupled with a comparable effort to degrade and defeat ISIL's message in the minds of potential supporters. The committee believes that the CTTSO is uniquely positioned to help counter ISIL's narrative and battlefield successes, and to enhance U.S., allied, and international partner Information Operations capabilities to mitigate and marginalize ISIL's ability to influence and inspire. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would provide additional authority for a pilot program to support information operations and strategic communications capabilities.

The committee urges the CTTSO to work with the combatant commands to provide technological and operational capabilities to support the tactical, operational, and strategic requirements of the combatant commanders. Further, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later

than July 30, 2015, on additional counter-ISIL activities and initiatives being conducted by the CTTSO.

The committee recommends $96.2 million, an increase of $25.0 million, in PE 63122D8Z for the Combating Terrorism Technical Support Office for distinct and focused counter-ISIL efforts, global in nature, including support for geographic combatant commander information operations requirements.

Comptroller General review of advanced semiconductors and microelectronics

The committee recognizes that the development and delivery of critical capabilities of the Department of Defense, Intelligence Community, and other Government organizations are dependent, in part, on incorporating rapidly evolving, leading-edge semiconductors and microelectronic devices into their systems, including technologies for which there is no commercial demand. Once dominated by domestic sources, today's microelectronics manufacturing is largely conducted outside of the United States.

The committee is aware that foreign dependence on microelectronics may increase security risks, such as introduction of corrupt technologies into weapon systems, loss of national security-related intellectual property, and disruption of supply of critical microelectronics. For more than a decade, the Government has relied heavily on a single, U.S.-owned company for sensitive, leading-edge trusted microelectronics through the Trusted Foundry Program. However, the proposed acquisition of this firm's microelectronics fabrication facilities and related intellectual property by a foreign-owned entity creates uncertainty about the Government's future access to leading-edge trusted microelectronics and other advanced semiconductor materials and presents risk for Department of Defense programs that rely on these microelectronics.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the Department of Defense's actions and measures to address the risk of losing access to the source of trusted leading-edge microelectronics, and to submit a report on the findings to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016. The report shall address the following:

(1) What efforts have been made to identify the potential impacts to defense research and weapon systems' acquisition programs;

(2) What actions, if any, have been taken by Department of Defense programs to mitigate the potential risk;

(3) What actions, if any, have been taken to identify and acquire alternative sources of trusted leading-edge microelectronics, or to create new sources through Government investments, such as Defense Production Act investments; and

(4) The use of new or innovative manufacturing techniques, such as split manufacturing, or other emerging capabilities.

Comptroller General review of technology transition efforts of the Department of Defense

The Department of Defense's science and technology enterprise is responsible for identifying, pursuing, and developing new and advanced technologies to improve and enhance military capabilities. The committee continues to be concerned, however, about the lack of technology transition that occurs between the Department's

science and technology activities and acquisition programs of record. Previous studies by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and others have identified a number of factors that contribute to this situation, including insufficient processes and mechanisms within the Department to conduct technology demonstration and testing, prototyping, and generally ensure that high-value technologies are mature and available to be incorporated into weapon system programs. In the past, the committee has expressed concern that the Department has not put sufficient emphasis on technology transition, but the renewed focus on warfighting experimentation to support transition and the effective use of the Rapid Innovation Program indicate that some progress may have been made. The committee also believes that funding for up-front acquisition activities, such as operational analysis to support requirements definition and maturation, modeling and simulation for trade space analysis, and funding to support technological maturation to get some activities through the "valley of death" also make potentially valuable contributions to supporting technology transition, though the impact of these activities needs to be better understood and the return on investment quantified.

The committee last asked the Department to assess its technology transition activities in 2008, but it took more than 3 years for that report to be completed. The committee believes that the landscape for technology transition has changed significantly in the intervening period, and a review by the GAO would provide a better understanding of the factors that affect successful technology transition, and what recommendations might be made to improve the Department's return on investment for technology transition.

The committee continues to be concerned that the way in which the Department of Defense funds technology transition activities, including funding for advanced component development and prototyping, as well as system development and demonstration activities, may be hampering the effective and timely transition of mature technologies into acquisition programs. Therefore, the committee directs Comptroller General of the United States to review how the Department's research and development funds are used and whether this approach to funding effectively supports technology risk reduction activities, operations analysis, prototyping, experimentation, and technology transition. The Comptroller General should submit a report on the review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016. In addition, the Comptroller General should include recommendations for better ways for the Department to support the delivery of mature technologies to acquisition programs.

Computational Research and Engineering Acquisition Tools and Environment

The committee is aware of a program within the Office of the Secretary of Defense called the Computational Research and Engineering Acquisition Tools and Environment (CREATE). This program has developed and deployed multi-physics engineering software applications with increasingly capable high-performance computing systems, as well as existing simpler software tools, to accurately predict the performance of weapon systems in much shorter timeframes. CREATE's ultimate goal is to move the Department of

Defense away from building and testing physical prototypes as the sole means to validate the performance of a system, to also include very robust virtual prototype design and evaluation, followed by the physical prototype validation needed to verify actual weapon performance and safety. The committee notes that tools such as these can be used to identify and help eliminate design defects and integration problems much earlier in weapon systems design and test processes, before major schedule and budget commitments are made, resulting in reduced acquisition time, cost, and risk. In separate studies, the Department has documented that each dollar invested in high-performance computing results in a return on investment at 7 to 13 times that investment. The committee supports such activities, and encourages the Department to continue investing in resources needed to develop the necessary software tools, as well as the integration of such tools into existing and new acquisition programs.

Corrosion control and prevention

The budget request included $1.5 million in PE 64016D8Z for the Department of Defense Corrosion Program.

The committee continues to be concerned that the Department has consistently underfunded the Corrosion Program since fiscal year 2011 despite the fact that the Department estimates that the negative effects of corrosion cost the Department more than $20.00 billion annually to prevent and mitigate corrosion of its assets, including military equipment, weapons, facilities, and other infrastructure. The committee is further concerned that the Department continues to under-resource this program despite clear congressional support as demonstrated by multiple fiscal year adjustments to the program's funding.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $6.5 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 64016D8Z for the Department of Defense Corrosion Program.

Department of Defense infectious disease research and development

The committee recognizes the importance of the role of the Department of Defense in responding to a pandemic disease and training and protecting Department personnel deployed in a theater of operations consumed by infectious disease. In addition to response, the Department also plays a critical role in funding appropriate research, development, and technology efforts to treat and prevent the spread of infectious diseases, in coordination with other relevant government agencies. Many infectious diseases are spread through human-to-human contact and through animal-to-human contact known as zoonosis. Historically, the Department has focused efforts on preventing human-to-human transmission of infectious diseases which pose a national security risk or a risk to deployed forces. The committee believes it is also important to understand zoonosis. The committee urges the Department to update efforts to identify emerging and expanding zoonotic infectious diseases around the globe which pose a national security risk or a risk to deployed forces and utilize competitive extramural research and existing national biosafety laboratories to enhance the Department of Defense's capabilities to prevent and respond to future global outbreaks or epidemics.

Electronic Warfare Executive Committee

The committee is aware that the Defense Science Board recently completed a report on electronic warfare (EW) that found "the Department of Defense has lost focus on electronic warfare at the programmatic and strategic level and should recreate the mechanisms needed to develop EW strategies, synchronize programs, and advise the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defense on EW matters." As a result, the Deputy Secretary of Defense has recently established an Electronic Warfare Executive Committee (EXCOM) to provide strategic focus and oversight on EW programs, especially at the points where EW and cyber are converging. The EW EXCOM will be co-chaired by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, with an initial focus on EW strategy, acquisition, operational support and security. The committee commends the Department of Defense for making such a strong move to improve oversight of all EW activities, and looks forward to hearing more from the Department about how it will operate and key recommendations it plans to make.

Enhancing situation awareness for military aircraft

The committee notes that there have been recent developments in commercial technologies that could enhance the situational awareness in aircraft by improving displays and implementing real-time information distribution, both inside and outside of the aircraft. These technologies can combine three-dimensional (3D) visualization using camera, thermal and satellite imagery, recording and networking capabilities into a single cockpit platform that could facilitate mission planning and execution. The committee believes that these additional capabilities could be critically important in the types of high-risk, high-difficulty missions executed by Special Operations. The committee encourages evaluation of these enhanced cockpit technologies for future use in Special Operations aircraft.

High Power Directed Energy research

The budget request included $30.3 million in PE 63178C for Directed Energy research.

The committee is strongly in support of directed energy program development. The committee is aware of efforts under review by the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), including the Diode Pumped Alkali Laser and the Fiber Combining Laser. The committee notes that these programs are at different technology readiness levels, including some still requiring significant research and development to reach required power levels to be effective against certain threats.

The committee notes a significant increase, more than double, the amount requested by MDA in its fiscal year 2015 budget request. The committee also believes High Power Directed Energy programs would receive attention better focused on delivering anti-ballistic missile capability at the earliest practical date if they were reorganized within MDA. The committee recommends these activities be realigned under the MDA Director of Engineering and recommends a new program element for that purpose.

The committee recommends $30.3 million, the amount of the budget request, in PE 63XXXC for Weapons Technology, High Power Directed Energy.

Language translation technology

The committee acknowledges that the work of the U.S. defense community integrally involves the ability to efficiently and accurately translate large volumes of documents and data, and to communicate and interact with multinational partners, security forces, and local indigenous populations in their native languages. The best available foreign language support services and technology products used by the relevant agencies in these communities can be critical factors to mission success, and the Department of Defense should ensure these services and technology products are available to servicemen and women who require translation technologies to perform their important missions. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2015, on the Department's language translation requirements and programs, including the use of commercial language translation technology.

Multiple-Object Kill Vehicle

The budget request for concept development and technology development related to the Multiple-Object Kill Vehicle was $12.0 million in PE 63178C for the Weapons Technology program and $44.6 million in PE 63294C for the Common Kill Vehicle Technology program.

The committee supports development of a Multiple-Object Kill Vehicle as part of the long-term improvement of the homeland ballistic missile defense of the United States. The committee also believes these efforts would be given the attention they need to successfully transition to a program of record and a deployable capability if they were realigned and reorganized within the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and it recommends funding in a new program element to accomplish those goals. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would establish a Multiple-Object Kill Vehicle program of record within MDA.

The committee recommends $86.5 million, an increase of $30.0 million, in PE 63XXXC for the Multiple-Object Kill Vehicle program.

Report on the United States Special Operations Command development of directed energy

The committee recognizes that directed energy solutions have the potential to provide warfighters with an array of options beyond the strict limitations of kinetic systems. The committee believes that the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) should continue to examine procuring or developing directed energy technology through their unique acquisition authorities. As the Special Operations Forces (SOF) community looks to utilize those special acquisition authorities, the committee recognizes that USSOCOM may need to utilize tailored or SOF-peculiar test and evaluation capabilities to support their urgent requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of Special Operations Command to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act on the command's need for a USSOCOM directed energy test and evaluation program. The briefing required should include:

(1) An overview of the current structure, processes and requirements used to test and evaluate directed energy programs and a measure of performance in meeting time-sensitive warfighter requirements;

(2) Recommendations for how to enable testing and evaluation of time-sensitive operational needs and mission requirements as part of the USSOCOM acquisition processes;

(3) Recommendations for the requirements for a capable lab or testing entity to carry out such testing; and

(4) An inventory of the tools and facilities that can meet the test and evaluation needs of USSOCOM for its directed energy programs.

Research and development work with biosafety facilities

The committee recognizes that the biosafety level 4 (BSL 4) facilities are critical to medical and viral research, and provide advanced research opportunities that help protect warfighters from biological threats, and investigate outbreaks and threats to public health. These facilities, which include partnerships with non-profit entities, can assist in research to help prevent viral outbreaks such as Ebola, influenza and other similar biological threats.

While the committee understands that the most recent Ebola outbreak now appears to be contained, constant vigilance is still required. The Department of Defense's work in West Africa was critical in containing the spread of Ebola. The committee further recognizes that non-profit applied research institutes have unique capabilities and expertise in areas important to the Department of Defense, such as, rapid small drug down-selection, formulation and supply under the appropriate regulatory controls housed in BSL 4 facilities, and capability required for ultimate delivery to the affected population, both military and civilian. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services on their research and developmental work, to include partnerships with non-profit research facilities regarding potential renewed viral threats of especially dangerous pathogens by January 31, 2016.

Ribonucleic acid technology research

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense faces significant challenges with infectious diseases, which hospitalize more service members each year than those wounded in combat. The recent outbreak of Ebola in Africa highlights the challenging environment that military forces will be faced with when operating in an environment of highly infectious diseases. The committee is encouraged by the progress the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has made to address the treatment for infectious diseases that can benefit our warfighters, as well as affected civilian communities throughout the world, based on techniques utilizing ribonucleic acid (RNA). The committee encourages the Director of DARPA to find new opportunities for expanding its

research into new areas specifically for research and equipment that enable RNA target characterization, software development for in silico screening of molecule libraries against RNA targets, and assay development for in vitro high throughput screening and validations.

Simulation training for emerging health threats

The committee believes that new emerging threats in the form of highly infectious diseases such as the Ebola outbreak in West Africa highlight the need for new forms of training for military and civilian responders to mitigate the spread of these infectious diseases. The committee understands that Department of Defense-sponsored simulation training technologies can provide a full continuum of training methods that range from full-immersion to mixed-reality simulation, to distance-learning technologies and formats. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to look into viable simulation training platforms that are portable, enable a full range of realistic training, and foster an in-depth experience that replicates real-world environments.

Special Operations Forces Combat Diving Program

The committee understands that U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) included within the budget request for fiscal year 2016 a new-start program called Special Operations Forces Combat Diving. The committee strongly supports inclusion of this program which is designed to provide for the modernization and advancement of engineering, manufacturing, testing, development, and transition of special operations-peculiar diving technologies for special operations and combat divers. The committee encourages the aggressive and timely development of commercial and developmental underwater breathing technologies, diver thermal regulations systems, diver communications, tracking and monitoring systems, diver propulsion systems and devices, advanced concept breathing mixtures, and next-generation combat diver life supports systems and technologies.

The committee also encourages the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to develop next-generation diver technologies, to ensure that these individual diver systems are matured in coordination with the development of USSOCOM's broader Undersea Mobility strategy, and in particular, the dry combat submersible platforms and prototypes currently being developed by USSOCOM. The committee also expects USSOCOM to leverage commercial technologies and advancements in this area when practical, and to continue coordination with similar research and development efforts underway within the Department of Defense. As such, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the development of technologies and capabilities within the Special Operations Forces Combat Diving Program.

Strategic Capabilities Office transitions of technology

The committee continues to monitor with interest the efforts of the Strategic Capabilities Office (SCO) to identify, analyze, and demonstrate promising concepts and capabilities to counter stra-

tegic adversaries. With technologies from SCO maturing and beginning to transition from demonstration to operation, the committee needs to have a better understanding of how those transitions are planned for and executed. The Joint Explanatory Statement (Committee Print No. 4) accompanying the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 recommended the development of more robust processes to tie these efforts "to the needs, requirements and priorities of the combatant commands," as well as "an estimated cost to field the capability, if the demonstration proves successful, to support transition planning activities."

Recognizing that such investments are still in the demonstration phase, the committee believes it is important to do as much as possible to plan concurrently for the possibility of transition into a program of record for fielded capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2016, on the technology transition process for SCO activities. As part of the briefing, the Under Secretary should address the following issues:

(1) The status of transition agreements with operational sponsors or service programs of record, including the threshold for performance for objective fielded capabilities needed to trigger or ensure transition;

(2) The process for doing analysis of alternatives (AOA) for those demonstration capabilities to support proposed transition;

(3) Cost estimation procedures to determine the funding benchmarks for objective fielded capabilities; and

(4) Examples of programs currently transitioning or transitions planned for fiscal year 2016, including any supporting documentation, like transition agreements, AOAs, or cost estimation, which may be used for decisions to proceed beyond engineering and manufacturing development stage.

Technology supporting information operations and strategic communications

The budget request contained $33.5 million in PE 63699D8Z for emerging capabilities technology development, including for concept development of emerging irregular warfare technology needs, and demonstrations that have joint and interagency applicability.

The committee remains particularly concerned with the success of Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) messaging and propaganda, and ISIL's ability to persuade, inspire, and recruit from across the globe. ISIL's continued success on the battlefield depends on this messaging, and the group's propaganda attracts recruits and other support that enables the organization to persist. Consequently, the committee believes that the campaign to degrade and defeat ISIL on the battlefield must be mated with a comparable effort to degrade and defeat ISIL's message in the minds of potential supporters. The committee believes that there is a critical need for technologies and strategies to help counter ISIL's narrative and battlefield successes, and to enhance U.S., allied, and international partner information operations capabilities to mitigate and marginalize ISIL's ability to influence and inspire. Elsewhere in this report, the committee provides additional authority

for a pilot program to support information operations and strategic communications capabilities. The committee urges the Department of Defense to work with the combatant commands to provide technological and operational capabilities to support the tactical, operational, and strategic requirements of the various combatant commanders.

The committee is aware that the Emerging Capabilities Technology Development (ECTD) program and its predecessors have been instrumental in assessing the technology needs of the strategic communication and information operations communities, and have pursued successful demonstration of some of those capabilities. For example, the Information Operations Assessment Foundation effort identified best practices in the Department, industry, and academia to help develop and refine processes and tools for information operations assessments, and transitioned to the Joint Information Operations Warfare Center. ECTD has also developed an influence assessment training capability project for use in both influence assessment and Theater Campaign Planning, as well as a Web-based counter-messaging prototype tool that was delivered to the interagency Center for Strategic Counterterrorism Communications at the Department of State and is being considered for transition to other potential combatant command users.

Therefore, the committee recommends $43.5 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63699D8Z to support the development and demonstration of technologies supporting information operations and strategic communications. Of that, $5.0 million should be applied to countering Russian Federation propaganda, and $5.0 million should be applied to countering the propaganda of ISIL.

U.S. Special Operations Command Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar program for MC–130J aircraft

The budget request contained $35.4 million for procurement of the MC–130 Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar program.

The committee notes that U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) recently conducted an analysis of alternatives for MC–130J Commando II aircraft, and that this analysis led to the decision to discontinue development of the APN–241 radar and to transition to the AN/APQ–187 Silent Knight Radar. The committee understands that during contractor flight tests of the APN–241 modified for terrain following, operators and testers deemed the APN–241 unsafe and ineffective for Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance (TF/TA) flight, and that any modification to the current APN–241 would require extensive redesign and result in a new radar system. As such, the committee supports the USSOCOM Commander's decision to accelerate transition to the AN/APQ–187 Silent Knight Radar program, and based on the justification provided to the committee from USSOCOM, recommends transferring available funding from the MC–130 Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar procurement program to higher priority programs in other budget appropriations. The committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the TF/TA radar program for MC–130J aircraft.

Further, the committee recommends no funding, a decrease of $35.4 million, for procurement of the MC–130 Terrain Following/

Terrain Avoidance Radar program. In lieu of these procurement funds, the committee recommends $42.3 million, an increase of $15.2 million, in PE 60403BB for continued development of the MC–130 Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar Program. In addition, the committee recommends $23.2 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 1105219BB for Medium Altitude Long Endurance Tactical (MALET) MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle development. Finally, the committee recommends $26.9 million, an increase of $15.2 million, for the continued procurement of the MALET MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Overview

The budget request contained $170.5 million for operational test and evaluation, Defense. The committee recommends $170.5 million, full funding of the budget request.

The committee recommendations for the fiscal year 2016 operational test and evaluation, Defense program are identified in division D of this Act.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4201 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Extension of Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program

This section would amend section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) by extending the authorization for the Department of Defense to execute activities for the Rapid Innovation Program through 2020.

Section 212—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Medical Countermeasures Program

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of 50 percent of the funds made available for the Department of Defense Medical Countermeasures program within the Chemical-Biological Defense Program until the Secretary of Defense provides a report to the congressional defense committees that validates the requirements and conducts an independent cost-benefit analysis to justify funding and efficiencies. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a review of the certification to the congressional defense committees within 60 days after the date on which the Secretary submits his report.

The committee is concerned that the Advanced Manufacturing and Development (ADM) program within the Medical Counter-

measures Program has experienced a program delay of 16 months and an increase in cost of more than $52.0 million. The committee expects the Department of Defense to conduct this review and assessment of the ADM program in order to determine the future of the program, and whether continuing it in a fiscally constrained environment is in the best interests of the Department of Defense and the U.S. Government.

Section 213—Limitation on Availability of Funds for F–15 Infrared Search and Track Capability Development

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for F–15 infrared search and track capability to not more than 50 percent until a period of 30 days has elapsed following the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits a report to the congressional defense committees. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit such report not later than March 1, 2016, detailing the requirements and cost estimates for the development and procurement of infrared search and track capability for F/A–18 and F–15 aircraft of the Navy and the Air Force. The report would include: a comparison of the requirements between the F/A–18 and F–15 aircraft infrared search and track development efforts of the Navy and the Air Force; an explanation of any differences between the F/A–18 and F–15 infrared search and track capability development efforts of the Navy and the Air Force; a summary of the schedules and required funding to develop and field such a capability; an explanation of any need for the Navy and the Air Force to field different F/A–18 and F–15 aircraft search and track systems; and any other matters the Secretary determines appropriate.

Section 214—Independent Assessment of F135 Engine Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a federally-funded research and development center to conduct an assessment of the F135 engine program and to submit a report containing such assessment by March 16, 2016. The assessment would include an assessment of the reliability, growth, and cost reduction efforts with respect to the F135 engine program, including a detailed description of the reliability and cost history of the engine, the identification of key reliability and cost challenges to the program as of the date of the assessment, and the identification of any potential options for addressing such challenges. Additionally, the assessment would include a thorough assessment of the F135 engine failure and subsequent fire on June 23, 2014, including the identification and definition of the root cause of the incident, the identification of potential actions or design changes needed to address such root cause, and the associated cost, schedule, and performance implications of such incident to both the F135 engine program and the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter Program. The federally-funded research and development center selected to carry out the assessment would do so by analyzing data collected by the F–35 Joint Program Office, other elements of the Federal Government or contractors, and the conduct of such assess-

ment would not affect the Secretary's plans to dispose of the aircraft involved.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 221—Expansion of Education Partnerships To Support Technology Transfer and Transition

This section would modify the authority for education partnerships in section 2194 of title 10, United States Code, by allowing institutions that support technology transition or transfer activities, such as business schools or law schools with technology management programs, to participate.

The committee is aware that the current statute authorizing educational partnership agreements (EPA) limits the educational institutions that can participate to "local educational agency, colleges, universities, and any other nonprofit institutions that are dedicated to improving science, mathematics, and engineering education." Historically, law schools and business schools that might have technology-focused concentration areas have been deemed ineligible to participate. By permitting defense laboratories to form an EPA with a business school, it would allow the laboratories to work with students who can examine technology for its commercial potential, provide for early market assessments, and evaluate market strengths and weaknesses. Likewise, by allowing law schools to participate in an EPA, the laboratory could work with law students on patent assessments and legal issues involving technology transfer. The committee also believes that these kinds of arrangements would create opportunities for business students to enhance their skills related to commercializing technology using real-world inventions, helping to ensure a future workforce skilled in entrepreneurship and the creation of high-tech companies. Law students would gain experience related to intellectual property development and protection that would also be valuable in business development.

Section 222—Strategies for Engagement with Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority-Serving Institutions of Higher Education

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to each develop a strategy for engagement with and support of the development of scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics capabilities with historically black colleges and universities and minority-serving institutions, and to submit such strategies to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy that encompasses the strategies developed by the military departments and to submit this strategy to the congressional defense committees not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 223—Plan for Advanced Weapons Technology War Games

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop a plan for integrating advanced technologies, such as directed energy weapons, hypersonic strike systems, and autonomous systems, into

broader title 10 war games to improve socialization with the warfighter and the development and experimentation of various concepts for employment by the Armed Forces. The Secretary would be required to submit the plan to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee believes that there are a number of emerging advanced weapons systems, like directed energy, electromagnetic railguns, hypersonics, and autonomous systems, that have the potential for dramatically enhancing the military effectiveness of U.S. forces. The committee has been concerned in the past with the transition of some of these science and technology concepts into fielded systems, and recognizes that there are a number of factors that can inhibit this transition. The committee believes that a significant factor is the lack of experimentation, concept development and war gaming that can be helpful in ironing out the technology, refining operating concepts and gaining warfighter trust and confidence in untested systems. The committee is aware of numerous historical examples in which experimentation with new technologies in peacetime have paved the way for their adoption and effective use in wartime. The committee believes that increasing integration of these new, advanced technology weapons systems into existing exercises, either as tangible prototypes or as conceptual excursions, could be valuable in promoting the experimentation needed to lay the foundation for successful technology adoption by the warfighting community.

Section 224—Comptroller General Review of Autonomic Logistics Information System for F–35 Lightening II Aircraft

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an analysis of the autonomic logistics information system (ALIS) element of the F–35 program, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2016 on the analysis. The committee intends this review to address issues of performance, cost, and suitability with ALIS software that will inform committee action on the F–35 program in the future. The committee supports the F–35 Lightening II aircraft program as a critical component required to maintain future air superiority and global strike capability. The committee also notes that the F–35 Joint Program Office and the prime contractor have taken steps to address maintainability and reliability issues with the F–35 that have the potential to significantly improve performance in those areas.

However, the committee is concerned that continued problems with the performance of the ALIS element of the F–35 program may put the program at significant risk of cost increases and performance shortfalls. The committee notes that section 218 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) required the Department of Defense to conduct an independent detailed review of F–35 software, including the ALIS system, and that the subsequent report highlighted the potential risks that challenges with the ALIS program could create. The committee further notes that as part of oversight visits to facilities where F–35 is being operated, the committee received numerous complaints and concerns by F–35 maintenance and operational per-

sonnel regarding the limitations, poor performance, poor design, and overall unsuitability of the ALIS software in its current form. Finally, in testimony provided by Department of Defense officials at a hearing before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on April 14, 2015, that Government witnesses confirmed the same problems observed by members at field locations.

Section 225—Briefing on Shallow Water Combat Submersible Program

This section would require a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the U.S. Special Operations Command Shallow Water Combat Submersible prior to program acceptance of the first article delivery on the account of schedule delays and a reduction of final basis of issue from 14 to 10 platforms.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

Overall readiness has improved across the military services from lows experienced in the wake of fiscal year 2013 sequestration when only 2 Army non-missioned brigade combat teams were ready, the Navy could not deploy a carrier strike group, the Air Force grounded 31 squadrons, and the Marine Corps reduced its maintenance of barracks, facilities, and training ranges to roughly 16 percent of the required "bare minimum" to protect readiness for rapid deployment. However, the committee notes that recovery from these ebbs in readiness has taken time, with most military services reporting a return to pre-sequester levels of readiness only in recent months. The budget request for fiscal year 2016 calls this recovery "fragile."

The committee is concerned that the ongoing high operational tempo being experienced by all of the military services continues to challenge this fragile readiness. Many of the military services have seen little to no change in their day-to-day mission requirements, even with the drawdown of combat forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. New missions, such as the response to Ebola in West Africa, advise-and-assist operations in the Republic of Iraq, air sorties in Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic, infantry and armor deployments to reassure and train European allies, and support to embassy evacuation in the Republic of Yemen, among others, have kept operational tempos at elevated levels, what the Department of Defense calls "severe deployment demands."

The committee is also concerned that Department of Defense officials have begun to warn that while current force structure and readiness levels allow the military departments to meet the day-to-day demand for forces, they would be constrained in their ability to provide forces to respond to an unforeseen contingency. The committee notes that this is especially true in meeting the time-phased requirements of the most "stressful" operational plans. In some cases, due to a lack of sufficient ready and available forces or key capabilities, the combatant commanders have assessed that they are unable to meet some wartime requirements. As a result, the risk to the U.S. military's ability to respond to unforeseen contingencies has increased.

To continue reducing areas of acute risk, and improve the readiness of the force, this Act would provide additional budget authority for multiple unfunded priorities of the military departments, to include the restoration of funding for operational tempo, flying hour programs, critical skill training, and facilities sustainment. This Act also would provide additional budget authority for readiness initiatives, such as corrosion prevention, control, and mitigation.

This Act also would make several policy changes to enhance readiness and improve oversight. Specifically, it would enhance property accountability by requiring a strategic plan for excess defense articles, require investment in technologically improved replacement parts that would significantly reduce long-term ownership costs, and improves the process for coordination between the Department of Defense and private renewable energy developers to ensure future projects are compatible with military operations.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

Air Force Remotely Piloted Aircraft Training and Operations

Since 2008, the Air Force has more than tripled the number of its Active Duty pilots flying remotely piloted aircraft (RPA). The committee is aware that due to increases in demand, RPA pilots have had a significant increase in workload going back to 2007. The committee is concerned that the Air Force continues to experience critical shortfalls in RPA pilots despite historical trends indicating continued growth in demand for RPA combat air patrols (CAPs) and remains concerned about the practice of involuntarily retaining pilots from other communities to fill RPA shortages. Most concerning is the committee's belief that the Air Force still lacks a viable and comprehensive corrective action plan to address critical and growing operational and training shortfalls within the RPA community as well as the manning challenges mentioned elsewhere in this report.

The committee notes that it has, on multiple occasions, tasked the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to examine this issue, and the GAO reviews have resulted in a number of recommended corrective actions. Despite these recommendations and internal Air Force assessments, the committee believes the Air Force has not been proactive enough in correcting known deficiencies and, in some cases, has disregarded alternative recommended approaches that could help alleviate some of the most immediate and critical shortfalls. As an example, in its report, "Actions Needed to Strengthen Management of Unmanned Aerial System Pilots," published in April 2014, the GAO recommended that the Air Force evaluate using alternative personnel populations such as civilians or enlisted personnel to conduct RPA missions; the Air Force did not concur, citing a year-and-a-half-old assessment.

The committee believes the Air Force's reluctance to properly resource the RPA community, despite clear indications that the intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and strike capability of RPA systems is likely to continue to increase, as is the scope of tasks

RPA units are expected to complete, has resulted in an unsustainable operational and personnel tempo.

To ensure the Air Force is properly addressing this critical training and operational aspects of this issue, in conjunction with the plan required elsewhere in this Act, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to:

(1) Assess the viability of using non-rated, civilian, contractor, or enlisted pilots to execute RPA missions;

(2) Develop a comprehensive training plan aimed at increasing the throughput of Undergraduate Remotely Piloted Aircraft Training (URT) without sacrificing quality and standards;

(3) Establish optimum and minimum crew ratios and, to the maximum extent possible, conduct missions in accordance with optimum ratios; and

(4) Identify any resource, legislative, or Departmental policy challenges impeding the corrective action needed to reach sustainable RPA operations tempo.

The Secretary shall brief the House Committee on Armed Services on these requirements by February 1, 2016.

Further, the committee recommends $145.1 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in Flight Training, Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, to increase URT capacity.

Base Realignment and Closure 2017

The budget request included $10.5 million, in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, to support a request to conduct a new round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) to align infrastructure with planned force structure changes. The requested funds would be used to develop recommendations and to manage BRAC efforts.

The committee recommends no funds to support the development of infrastructure recommendations prepared in the context of a new BRAC authorization.

Energy Issues

Analysis for Additional Uses of Energy Savings Performance Contracts

The committee notes that the military departments have utilized Energy Savings Performance Contracts (ESPC) to fund energy conservation projects for military facilities with no upfront costs to the Federal government. The committee notes that these contracts have led to a reduction in energy consumption and cost savings in installation energy costs. While the committee recognizes that the application of ESPCs is currently limited by statute to federal facilities, the committee believes there may be potential benefits to leveraging ESPCs in non-facility applications. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to provide the congressional defense committees, by March 1, 2016, a cost-benefit analysis for the potential use of Energy Savings Performance Contracts in non-facility applications. The analysis should consider a case study for each of the following categories of non-facility applications: aircraft, maritime, and ground vehicles. The analysis should evaluate whether ESPCs could be

successfully utilized in these non-facility applications to achieve energy efficiency and financial savings through a decrease in fuel and maintenance costs.

Briefing on Energy Performance Initiatives

The committee is aware that in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee on March 29, 2012, that the then-Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs stated that "we are integrating energy considerations into the acquisition process by including requirements for energy performance in contracts." The Assistant Secretary included examples in testimony that included energy factors in the life cycle cost calculations, to include fuel efficiency, in the competition for the next-generation aerial refueling tanker and provisions included in the Logistics Civil Augmentation Program (LOGCAP) contract. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to, not later than March 1, 2016, brief the House Committee on Armed Services on energy performance and efficiency initiatives. The briefing should address the following issues:

(1) How the energy efficiency language included in the next-generation aerial refueling tanker competition and subsequent control have been incorporated into other acquisition programs, and any additional plans to include energy-efficiency requirements into future acquisition programs; and

(2) How energy performance provisions in LOGCAP contracts have been implemented and whether new LOGCAP contracts include such provisions, and if not, the reason for no longer including these provisions.

Briefing on Military Installation Readiness

The committee is aware that in 2014, the Pentagon released a report claiming that changing conditions, including expected increased water shortages and instances of wildfire with increased drought, in addition to flooding due to sea level rise and coastal erosion from storm surges, pose risks to the United States' national security. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to, not later than March 1, 2016, provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the Department's strategy and initiatives to mitigate the impact of these changes to ensure optimal military readiness. At minimum, the briefing should address the following issues:

(1) How are changing conditions affecting operations and military readiness at U.S. installations?

(2) How are best practices being disseminated and implemented across the U.S. installations?

(3) Is the Department of Defense facing any challenges in carrying out preparedness and resilience initiatives? If so, what are these obstacles and do they require congressional action to increase security on installations?

(4) What opportunities exist for effective public private partnerships or contracts with industry to address and mitigate the effects of these changing conditions?

Collaboration on Operational Energy

The committee acknowledges that the military departments have undertaken a number of initiatives in the area of operational energy to increase combat capability, reduce energy consumption, and strengthen the energy security of deployed military forces. The committee believes the military departments should collaborate more closely on operational energy initiatives to ensure that innovative technologies, best practices, and lessons learned can be quickly and easily shared among the military departments. The committee believes that increased collaboration among the military departments will help align and advance operational energy initiatives, reduce costs, and provide greater combat capability to deployed military forces.

The committee notes that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment is responsible for providing leadership, facilitating communication, and coordinating activities regarding the operational energy plans and programs of the Department of Defense and the military departments. Therefore, the committee encourages the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment to work with the military departments to implement policies and procedures to encourage additional collaboration, realize efficiencies, and prevent duplication of efforts related to operational energy.

Progress and Savings from Net Zero Installation Initiatives

The Department of Defense requires sufficient, sustainable, and reliable supplies of energy and water to meet its mission needs. To facilitate this, the Department has assessed its energy security via increased energy efficiency and optimized use of renewable energy. Moreover, the Department has stated plans to reduce its energy and water use at its installations. To that end, the Department plans to increase the degree to which it has "net zero" installations, or installations that produce as much energy as they consume, and limit consumption of freshwater resources and return an equivalent amount of water back to the same watershed, so as not to deplete groundwater.

In 2011, the Army launched its Net Zero Initiative, which it sees as a holistic approach to energy, water, and waste management that directly supports the Army's energy security and sustainability objectives. In fiscal year 2012, the Navy began efforts to determine which installations would have the best opportunity to cost-effectively achieve net zero goals. Ultimately, the Navy's stated goal is for half of Navy installations to be net zero for electricity consumption by 2020. Also, the Air Force plans to achieve a net zero posture for installation water, energy, and solid waste management, intending to build upon and complement other Air Force strategic sustainability policy and goals.

The committee notes that legislation has been enacted to significantly improve the federal government's energy management, water efficiency requirements, and waste management in order to save money, reduce emissions that contribute to air pollution, and enhance national security. The committee is also aware of the Department's need for energy security and reliability to support its critical missions, and is supportive of its net zero efforts that en-

hance mission security and effectiveness, achieve financial savings, and ensure a return on investment. To understand the degree to which the Department has identified benefits, as well as challenges, from its net zero initiatives, and any areas where improvements are needed, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by May 15, 2016, on the following:

(1) To what extent has the Department of Defense developed an integrated net zero strategy for energy, water, and waste management at its military installations?

(2) What impact do net zero initiatives have on maintaining mission capability, if any?

(3) What challenges have installations encountered in implementing net zero initiatives or meeting net zero goals?

(4) What lessons have been learned from the military services' and Department's net zero initiatives and how, if at all, are those lessons being shared and optimized?

(5) What have been the costs and benefits of net zero initiatives and how are those costs and benefits being identified, tracked, and validated?

(6) How successful have the military departments and installations been in implementing the net zero initiative?

Tubular Light-Emitting Diode Technology

The committee recognizes that the Department of the Navy is replacing fluorescent lightbulbs aboard U.S. Navy vessels with tubular light-emitting diodes (T–LEDs). The committee notes that these fixtures may consume less energy, realize life-cycle cost savings, and provide a return on investment. Should the Secretary of the Navy determine that further investment in this technology will lead to consistent return on investments across the fleet and ashore, the committee encourages the Secretary to fully develop an approved products list for T–LEDs that is broadly available for use in vessels and facilities. In addition, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to request updates to the Unified Facilities Criteria and other related Department of Defense regulations, to include new lighting technologies as an option for vessels and facilities.

Logistics and Sustainment Issues

Auxiliary Personnel Lighter Barracks Ships

Self-Propelled Barracks Ships, otherwise known as Auxiliary Personnel Lighters (APLs), provide housing for some of the Navy's ship companies as their ships undergo repair, maintenance, and upgrades. The oldest APL craft, built during the 1940s, have significant health, safety, and quality-of-life deficiencies. The committee believes that many of the APL berthing barges are unfit for current and future naval service because these craft have well exceeded their service life and provide substandard living conditions for naval personnel.

To help Congress better assess future courses of action to address quality-of-life, health, and safety issues associated with the continued use of aging APLs, the committee directs the Secretary

of the Navy to perform a cost-benefit analysis of alternative ashore berthing options, in conjunction with, or in lieu of, the continued use of APLs, including recapitalization or replacement. The committee further directs the Secretary to report the results of this analysis to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2016. The committee directs the Secretary to include in his report an assessment of the current and Future Year Defense Program projected APL maintenance and overhaul costs, current habitability conditions aboard APLs, and any other information he deems relevant.

Combat Footwear for Female Service Members

The committee notes that in January 2013, the Secretary of Defense announced a new policy regarding the eligibility of female service members to serve in certain previously prohibited combat positions. The committee is concerned that despite the reality of female service members serving in combat for many years, the military services have been slow to field individual equipment that is properly sized, weighted, and designed for use by female service members.

The committee believes it is important the Department of Defense ensure that female service members have equipment and clothing tailored to the physical requirements of women in order to operate effectively and not be hampered by equipment that is ill-fitting, uncomfortable, and potentially harmful during operations in the field. The committee commends the June 2014 study conducted by the Department of Defense on Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment for Female Military Members. The committee notes, however, that this report did not evaluate combat boots worn by female service members.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2016, detailing the availability of combat boots that are properly sized, weighted, and designed to accommodate use by women across all of the military services. In particular, the report should include, but not be limited to, plans to provide a greater range of boot sizes and types for women service members as well as the advisability and feasibility of developing combat boots specifically designed for female service members.

Continuous Technology Refreshment

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) provided expanded authority to the Department of Defense to foster use of technology-enhanced maintenance capabilities with working-capital funds. The conference report (H. Rept. 112–705) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 specifically discusses Continuous Technology Refreshment (CTR), which is a proven post-production sustainment acquisition strategy to acquire technologically improved replacement parts and to significantly reduce long-term ownership costs. Despite proven cost savings within the U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Command, the committee is concerned that other military departments, and even other Army life-cycle man-

agement commands, have been slow or resistant to implement robust CTR programs.

The original CTR concept provided a path for industry to provide an industry investment solution through a business case analysis (BCA) that included a technical description and analysis and a comparison of the existing cost of ownership with the proposed replacement unit cost, improved repair cost, and projected reliability. This BCA serves as the funding justification to use working-capital funds for all BCAs that show a savings over 10 years. The committee is concerned that a departure from this concept in favor of an approach using logistics operations surcharges or proceeds from working-capital fund investment sales has yielded limited return on investment. The committee believes that any allocation of funding from any funding account or working-capital source should face the same BCA rigors and processes and should incur progress reviews on status and results.

Accordingly, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require each military department to initiate a pilot program in fiscal year 2016 for CTR product improvement under the authority provided in section 330 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). It also would require each military department to spend at least $5.0 million in working-capital funds in fiscal year 2016 in support of a product improvement initiative as described in section 330(b) of Public Law 110–181.

Decision Analysis Using Readiness Cost Analysis Tool

The committee is encouraged by the Naval Aviation Enterprise's commitment to utilizing the Readiness Cost Analysis Tool (RCAT) as outlined in the 2014 Naval Air Systems Command Commander's Guidance. Given the potential value of this tool in simultaneously increasing readiness and reducing costs, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to present a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2015, on progress toward those objectives through utilization of RCAT and other potential uses of this tool, particularly any progress toward understanding differences between conventional measures of readiness and combat proficiency.

Defense Personal Property System

The committee recognizes the difficult task the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command has in managing the permanent change of station moves of thousands of military families each year. The committee notes that in 2013, representatives from the moving industry and Department of Defense met to discuss a complete redesign of the Defense Personal Property System (DPS) online module in an effort to make it easier for service members to more accurately track household goods and file claims for damaged items, as the module has for years been characterized as cumbersome and problematic.

The committee notes that a contract was awarded in 2013 to improve the functionality and usability of the Web-based DPS system. However, the committee remains concerned about the lack of progress in reforming the functionality of the system and that the

DPS program management office has not issued the fiscal year 2015 development schedule to implement system enhancements and efficiencies.

The committee encourages the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command to press for greater accountability and responsiveness in the development and execution of improvements to the Defense Personal Property System.

Defense Supply Single Point of Failure Assessment

The committee has become aware of an increasing number of single points of failure within the defense supply chain for critical parts, assemblies, and sub-assemblies. While the committee recognizes that the lack of a diverse production and supply system for specialized parts is largely driven by the cost-prohibitive nature of maintaining multiple lines of supply and the low profitability of low-volume production, it remains concerned about the fragility of the supply chain in some areas. This concern is especially acute within the lines of supply supporting the growing number of aging weapons systems in the U.S. inventory, many facing parts obsolescence challenges. To better assess the risk to these critical lines of supply and to assist with its oversight responsibilities, the committee believes a thorough analysis of single points of failure is warranted.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess and brief the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than April 1, 2016, on any single sources of supply in support of a major defense acquisition program. At a minimum the assessment shall include:

(1) The identification of any single sources of supply for parts, assemblies, and sub-assemblies required for life-cycle management;

(2) Identification of systems that are at high risk of having a single source of supply within the timeframe covered by the Future Years Defense Plan; and

(3) Any recommended mitigation or corrective measures.

Department of Defense Corrosion Control Efforts

The committee continues to be responsive to providing the Department of Defense the tools and resources required to address the long-term effects of corrosion on the service life of U.S. military equipment. The committee is encouraged by Department of Defense efforts to address the preventable costs of corrosion and encourages the Department to continue to pursue low-cost, commercially available items that have demonstrated an ability to significantly reduce corrosion. The committee continues to support efforts by the Department to review and standardize anti-corrosion policies in order to mitigate the negative impacts of corrosion on U.S. military equipment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2015, on efforts by the Department to make low-cost anti-corrosion solutions available to the military departments and the Department's progress in developing and integrating anti-corrosion policies, directives, and standards for all items protecting De-

partment of Defense equipment in-use and awaiting storage from the effects of corrosion caused by exposure to the environment.

Depot Maintenance Capability

The Department of Defense maintains many complex weapon systems, such as aircraft and ships, and equipment, such as generators and radars, that require regular and emergency maintenance by both military depots and contractors to continue being available to meet national security goals. The committee notes that Department of Defense components are in the process of assessing the critical skills and competencies needed by the depot maintenance civilian workforce to support current and future national security requirements by projecting trends in the workforce based upon expected losses due to retirement and other attrition.

The committee recognizes the growing challenge to maintain both a healthy commercial depot maintenance industrial base and meet the organic core maintenance capability in compliance with section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, which requires the Department to maintain a core maintenance capability involving a combination of personnel, facilities, equipment, processes, and technology that is government-owned and government-operated and needed to meet mobilization, contingency, and emergency requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by June 15, 2016, that evaluates to what extent the Department of Defense:

(1) Uses core capability requirements to manage current and future depot maintenance workloads;

(2) Is able to provide information that identifies trends in core capability workloads at selected military depots, and the effects, if any, they are having on capability;

(3) Engages in agreements such as public-private partnerships with contractors and the impact these agreements have on the Department of Defense in meeting core capability requirements;

(4) Resources core requirements; and

(5) Adequately captures core depot-level maintenance capability requirements in the biennial core report required under subsection 2464(d) of title 10, United States Code, and any changes to subsection 2464(d) the Comptroller General would recommend to increase transparency within the report.

The Comptroller General may also include other related matters as deemed appropriate in order to provide a comprehensive examination of core depot maintenance capability.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than January 31, 2016, on preliminary findings of the Comptroller General's evaluation.

Humidity-Controlled Shelters and Temporary Buildings

The committee notes that greater use of semi-permanent humidity-controlled shelters by the U.S. military services, Special Operations Command, and defense agencies could reduce humidity, dust, and other environmental factors that damage military equip-

ment, reduce operational readiness, and increase maintenance costs. While widely used by foreign militaries, the Department of Defense does not have a single, comprehensive military specification for such protective shelters.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committees on Armed Services, not later than March 15, 2016, on a plan to develop specifications for semi-permanent humidity-controlled shelters that could be used by the military services, Special Operations Command, and the defense agencies to protect assets such as fixed-wing aircraft systems, missiles, radar systems, and other equipment with sensitive electronics that are vulnerable to corrosion across the range of environments in which assets could operate and be housed, from tropical climates and extremely cold weather regions to desert and extremely low-humidity areas. The plan shall include an assessment of the availability and potential use of commercially produced shelters.

In preparing the plan, the Secretary, through the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight and the corrosion executives of the military services, shall coordinate with the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness and the Defense Logistics Agency.

Laser Ablation of Coatings

The committee is aware that the Air Force has been utilizing robotic laser systems such as the Laser Automated De-Coating System and the Advanced Robotic Laser Coating Removal System, to ablate coatings as part of routine weapon system sustainment. The committee notes that use of such systems has resulted in cost savings by reducing the time required to remove coatings from aircraft components such as F–16 radomes. These savings have led the Air Force to expand the use of these systems to ablation work on a wider range of components across multiple types of fighter and cargo aircraft.

Further, the committee recognizes the Navy's Metalworking Center has successfully laser ablated steel and has the laser, coatings, materials characterizations, robotics experience, and subject-matter experts to further develop laser ablation technologies and determine return on investment.

The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to leverage the synergy, joint technical problem solving, and learning-curve efficiencies of the Center's co-location with design test and laboratory facilities to determine if laser systems could produce cost savings at Fleet Readiness Centers, weapons depots, and shipyards similar to those experienced by the Air Force.

Marine Corps Systems Command Engineering Support

The committee is aware that Marine Corps Systems Command (MARCORSYSCOM) has determined that a number of engineering functions at its headquarters are inherently governmental in nature and has taken steps to in-source these previously contracted services. While the committee supports the proper alignment of functions that are inherently governmental in nature, as required by law, it is concerned that after this particular determination was

made and engineering services were consolidated at the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command's (SPAWAR) Atlantic Center, these same engineering services that were deemed inherently governmental were subsequently re-outsourced by SPAWAR to contractor performance. The committee is concerned about the inconsistent classification of these positions and, if not inherently governmental in nature, the potential for inefficiencies and increased contract oversight costs associated with the geographic separation of MARCORSYSCOM and the contractors providing engineering services. The committee notes the Department of the Navy could potentially achieve greater synergy and avoid these inefficiencies by leveraging the Government's localized engineering capacities resident within the Navy's Surface Warfare Center system.

The committee directs the Commandant of the Marine Corps to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, on the status of engineering support functions, both governmental and contracted, that support MARCORSYSCOM.

Planning for Critical Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment Innovation

The committee recognizes that modern organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE), including handwear, provides soldiers with a distinct combat advantage, but the Army's record of using Overseas Contingency Operations funding is not ideally suited to the innovation of next-generation soldier equipment. The committee notes that the Army currently lacks a single glove system that is effective in environments from minus-50 degrees to 100-plus degrees, and the Army's Soldier Enhancement Program is presently evaluating an integrated glove system with advanced raw materials and new manufacturing processes for the next generation of Army handwear.

As a means of providing greater visibility of programming, planning, and budgeting for critical OCIE programs such as handwear, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2016, detailing efforts to program, plan, and budget for fielding of next-generation Army handwear systems.

Report on Asset Tracking

The committee is in receipt of the congressionally mandated comprehensive strategy for improving asset tracking and in-transit visibility. The committee supports the Department's goal of enhancing asset visibility through item-unique identification (IUID), automatic identification (AIT), and automatic identification and data capture (AIDC) processes but is concerned that only 47 percent of contracts include the IUID Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement (DFARS) clause and only 16 percent of items across all classes of supply have been marked. Any successful asset visibility or AIT/AIDC strategy requires continuous identification, integration, and monitoring of efforts. The committee urges the Department and the services to increase their oversight of the implementation of IUID and other AIT/AIDC policies and directs the service secretaries to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 15, 2015, on efforts to improve asset

tracking, including specific steps taken by each military service to ensure the use of the IUID DFARS clause in contracts.

Service Life Extension of Emergency Vehicles

The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy utilizes a depot-level maintenance strategy to extend the service life of fire, rescue, and emergency vehicles. The committee understands that the depot-level maintenance is conducted typically 8–10 years into a vehicle's life cycle and this service life extension program can extend the life of fire, rescue, and emergency vehicles by 10 years and results in significant cost savings over the purchase of new equipment. The committee is encouraged by the Navy's pursuit of greater efficiencies in the fire and emergency service vehicle maintenance process and the promise it holds for achieving savings and a higher rate of vehicle readiness across the fleet. As such, the committee encourages the other military services to pursue similar sustainment strategies to increase life-cycle savings across the Department of Defense.

READINESS ISSUES

Advanced Foreign Language Proficiency Training Systems

The committee believes that foreign language proficiency is an essential component of military readiness that enables U.S. military personnel to provide strategic warning and critical response capability. The committee is concerned that changes in advanced foreign language proficiency training programs may have an impact on the ability of civilian and military personnel at the Department of Defense to support combatant commanders and possibly lead to gaps in readiness. Specifically, the committee is concerned that linguists at the Department of Defense and supporting agencies may be unable to perform their job functions properly if they are unable to access advanced language and cultural training modules, as these personnel are required to interact, speak, and write in multiple dialects and social registers of a given language in order to adequately perform their varied missions.

To better understand any potential shortfalls arising from planned changes in advanced foreign language proficiency training programs, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2015, on any capability gaps in advanced foreign language proficiency training within the Department of Defense. The Secretary shall also note any shortfalls that may arise within agencies that support the Department of Defense.

Air Combat Training Range Upgrades

The committee is concerned by the proliferation of more advanced threats to U.S. Armed Forces and potential capability gaps in air combat training range instrumentation and equipment able to support newer, more advanced technologies, and concepts of operations that are being fielded to address these threats. The committee also notes the constraints on near- and long-term budgets to support high-cost live flight training. The committee recognizes, as referenced elsewhere in this report, that the Navy is seeking a

new range capability to address these gaps and shortfalls and recommended full funding at the requested level to continue development and deployment of an updated system. To improve the committee's oversight of the recommended funding's execution and ensure the Department of Defense is expending resources in the most cost-effective manner, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2015, on efforts to develop and employ new, updated range instrumentation systems and leverage previous investments.

Analysis of Continuous Bomber Presence on Guam

The committee recognizes that the rotational deployment of B–52, B–2, and other bomber aircraft to Guam is an important component of U.S. Air Force strategy in the Asia-Pacific region. This continuous bomber presence since March 2004 acts as a deterrent to aggressive actions of nations in the region and serves as a reminder of the United States' commitment to its allies and a recognition of operational requirements. Given the current fiscal environment, the committee has encouraged all military services to evaluate current operational plans for potential efficiencies and greater measures of effectiveness. The committee recognizes the potential for cost savings on Guam through the permanent establishment of a squadron or detachment of bombers at Andersen Air Force Base (AAFB).

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to review the feasibility of, and requirement for, establishing a permanent bomber presence on Guam and report the outcome of this review to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016. The review should evaluate the impact on operation and maintenance accounts and potential military construction investments for operations and increased military personnel at AAFB, to include an analysis of the cost associated with temporary duty stationing of aircraft and crews compared to the cost of permanently stationed aircraft and crews. The analysis also should consider the impact on aircraft maintenance.

Army Explosive Ordnance Disposal

The committee has been closely monitoring proposed changes to the Army's Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) force structure and proponency. The committee recognizes the importance of the Army EOD force as a unique and highly technical enabler in meeting combatant commander operational requirements and force presence for counterterrorism and irregular warfare, defense support of civilian law enforcement authorities, and support to major operations and in contingency scenarios. The committee remains concerned that the Army has not clearly identified future capacity and capability requirements for its EOD force and may eliminate too much of its EOD capacity without making needed investments in EOD capabilities to meet the enduring needs of combatant commanders. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2015, on the Army's EOD force. At a minimum, the briefing shall include:

(1) Any proposed changes to EOD force structure planned over the Future Years Defense Plan, including any costs, efficiencies, or cost avoidance to include the active and reserve components;

(2) An assessment of demand for Army EOD capabilities over the past 5 years, including by geographic combatant commanders, for national security special events, and in support of civilian law enforcement agencies;

(3) A list of Army EOD systems program(s) of record, and EOD program elements and levels of funding for the Army's unique requirements for EOD in research, development, test and evaluation; operation and maintenance; and procurement over the Future Years Defense Plan; and

(4) A cost-benefit analysis on any proposed realignment or relocation of EOD organization, force structure, training, and branch proponency.

Aviation Support to the Joint Readiness Training Center

The committee recognizes the importance of the training conducted at the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC) through U.S. Air Force Green Flag East exercises done in conjunction with U.S. Army brigade rotations. These exercises sustain critical, high-demand skill sets, such as those provided by joint terminal attack controllers, and allow both pilots and ground units to exercise in a realistic, high-threat representative environment. The committee notes that with the increasing focus on the Pacific area of operations, JRTC exercises have also incorporated maritime training to improve the integration of Air Force assets into U.S. Navy command-and-control structures, and the Army has increased the duration and complexity of unit rotations at JRTC.

While the committee commends these developments, it is concerned about the availability of air assets necessary to support the increased complexity and duration of Green Flag East and JRTC exercises. The committee is concerned that these challenges will become even more acute with the Air Force's decision to eliminate the fighter squadron at Barksdale Air Force Base that has regularly provided air support to Green Flag East and the JRTC when other air units were unavailable for training.

In order to better assess the adequacy of planning, programming, and resourcing of JRTC training activities, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to assess the Air Force's ability to provide aviation support to JRTC rotations and exercises, to include an accounting of any instances in which the Air Force has been unable to support JRTC activities. The committee further directs the Secretary to report his findings to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016.

Comptroller General Assessment of Army and Air Force Training Requirements

For more than a decade, the Army and Air Force focused the training of their forces on supporting operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Commanders established a range of resource-intensive training requirements deemed necessary to conduct missions in these locations and de-prioritized training in other areas. In the coming years, both the Army and

Air Force will confront an increasingly complex security environment that will demand a wider range of missions, such as defeating terrorist organizations and responding to other emerging threats. To accomplish a broader set of missions, both military departments have established plans to refocus their training to conduct the full spectrum of military operations. However, they face an environment of constrained budgetary resources until at least 2021. For example, in fiscal year 2013, the Department of Defense's operation and maintenance accounts were reduced by approximately $20.00 billion under sequestration. Due to these reductions, the Army curtailed training for all units except those deployed, preparing to deploy, or stationed overseas; and the Air Force ceased flight operations from April through June 2013 for about one-third of Active Duty combat units and reduced the number of larger training exercises. The services face the possibility of sequestration-level funding again in fiscal year 2016.

The committee is concerned about the Army's and Air Force's ability to balance training investments with available resources and believes the services will need to fundamentally re-examine the requirements for training their forces. It further believes the military departments should explore whether they can achieve additional efficiencies or cost savings in their training approaches, such as by increasing reliance on simulator technologies to meet some training tasks. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide to the congressional defense committees a report, by April 1, 2016, that evaluates Army and Air Force training requirements and includes an assessment of the following:

(1) The extent to which the Army and Air Force have established readiness goals, plans, and timeframes to train their forces for full-spectrum operations;

(2) The extent to which the Army and Air Force have adjusted training plans and identified resource needs in light of their experiences preparing forces for contingency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan;

(3) The extent to which the Army and Air Force have considered options for increasing the use of simulated training and other technologies to achieve efficiencies or other cost savings in their training programs; and

(4) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to Army and Air Force training.

The committee also directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings.

Comptroller General Assessment of Plans to Rebuild Readiness

For more than a decade the Department of Defense has maintained a high pace of operations, and supporting those operations has had a severe impact on the readiness of the overall force. Today, relatively few non-deployed forces could assemble quickly to perform their full mission should a large-scale crisis occur. In recent months, the service chiefs have begun to sound an increasingly shrill alarm about the impacts this pace has had on their units and the personnel in them. The service chiefs have raised questions about their ability to maintain the current pace and re-

build readiness, especially if budgets are reduced to sequestration levels. Steady-state combatant command demands are high and growing, with some key current demands going unmet. Looking forward, demands are not likely to recede, as forces are now needed to stabilize emerging crises in the Middle East and Eastern Europe. According to the service chiefs, it will be at least 5 to 8 years (2020 to 2023) before their respective services can rebuild acceptable overall readiness levels.

Amid declining budgets and force structure, the committee is growing increasingly concerned about the Department's ability to rebuild readiness while meeting the persistent demands of the combatant commands. To inform its oversight, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2016, that provides a comprehensive, independent assessment of the Department of Defense's efforts to rebuild readiness.

The reviews that support this assessment should consider historical readiness trends and focus on assessing the plans of the military services going forward including:

(1) The force structure planned to meet strategic guidance;

(2) The goals for rebuilding required readiness and the underlying assumptions and analysis behind those goals;

(3) The departmental or military service efforts to set interim goals and assess progress toward those goals; and (4) The barriers, if any, facing the military services in reaching their readiness goals and plans to mitigate those barriers.

The review should consider how the Department and military services will identify and address key capability and capacity gaps across the Department for major combat units as well as low-density units and personnel who are in perennially high demand. In assessing the plans, the Comptroller General should also consider how the Department intends to balance the demands of the combatant commands in the future with the need to provide a more sustainable pace for service members.

Given the key role of the military services in rebuilding readiness, the Comptroller General should, at a minimum, provide reports that assess the plans of the Departments of the Army, Air Force, and Navy. The Comptroller General may, at his discretion and in consultation with the committee, provide additional reports that address recurrent themes across the Department, cross-cutting issues, or other issues deemed appropriate.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2016, on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings.

Initial Flight Training

The committee recognizes the Air Force has implemented a cost-efficient and mission-effective Initial Flight training (IFT) program over the past 9 years for Air Force pilot and combat system operator candidates. The committee notes the value in program screening and initial training before the commencement of more expensive stages of aviation training. The committee also recognizes that the Air Force's current approach to the IFT program has resulted in a safety record that exceeds many industry standards. However, the committee also recognizes the significant investments, which

are correctly levied on industry, that must be made in aircraft, simulators, maintenance, highly experienced instructors, co-location at military installations, and student support infrastructure to enable this approach to Initial Flight Training. Given the significant investments required for the program to be successful, the committee acknowledges the need for program predictability, open competition, and the need to explore a similar approach to IFT within other military departments.

For example, the committee believes that the adoption of such a program by the Navy could provide the Navy cost efficiencies and training benefits similar to those experienced by the Air Force. The committee recognizes the Navy sent an initial cadre of naval aviator candidates through the Air Force IFT program in 2014.

Therefore, the committee urges the continuation of the IFT program within the Air Force with a continued focus on the safe production of competent pilots, and directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives with a briefing by March 31, 2016, on the performance of the Navy's cadre of participants in the Air Force's IFT program and the costs and benefits associated with the adoption of a similar program by the Navy.

Marine Corps Search and Rescue

The committee is aware that the Marine Corps has divested its two remaining search and rescue (SAR) units at the Marine Corps Air Stations in Yuma, Arizona, and Cherry Point, North Carolina, in an effort to reduce manning and funding requirements. The committee is concerned that the divestiture and resulting transition of SAR functions to a combination of U.S. Coast Guard units and contracted SAR services has not been adequately assessed and could result in increased risk and increased cost.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by August 1, 2015, on the Department of the Navy's divestiture plans and actions taken to ensure adequate search and rescue capability resides at Marine Corps Air Stations. The briefing shall include information on specific roles and responsibilities of Marine Corps units, Coast Guard units, and private contractors; plans for land-based search and rescue; and the cost analysis conducted that led to the decision to divest organic Marine Corps SAR capabilities.

Optimizing National Guard Training

The committee is concerned about the burden of temporary duty (TDY) and travel-dependent training regimes on some National Guard service members, including those Guard members requiring specialized certifications. The committee notes that many National Guard members have demanding civilian employment in addition to military service. The committee believes that the National Guard should optimize training regimes to minimize the amount of TDY and travel required to retain certifications and currency. Increased use of virtual and constructive training, including simulation, may help alleviate some of the burden on Guard members by reducing time away from families and civilian employment. In order for the committee to better understand this issue, not later

than September 30, 2015, the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on options for better optimizing National Guard training regimes.

Performance and Effectiveness of Department of Defense's Joint Exercise Program

Each year, the Department of Defense's combatant commands participate in more than 120 training, exercise, and engagement events that range from small-scale, unilateral events to major joint and multilateral exercises. According to the Department, joint exercises are a means for commanders to maintain trained and ready forces, exercise contingency and theater security cooperation plans, and achieve joint and multinational training. These exercises have a primary purpose of training U.S. forces, but can also help build partner-nation capacity and strengthen alliances. Joint exercises are also designed to integrate and synchronize interdependent capabilities, such as intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, electronic warfare, and special operations forces between multiple services and commands. Further, participation in joint exercises enables the military services to build trust and relationships with one another, U.S. allies, and potential partners, while developing the skills necessary to operate in the joint environment. However, several factors, such as the availability of U.S. forces and access to host-country forces and territories, can affect the desired outcome of joint exercises.

Given current fiscal pressures and budgetary constraints facing the Department, the committee believes that the Department must improve efficiency and obtain cost savings where possible and demonstrate a return on its investment in training and exercise programs. In doing so, it is paramount that the Department balance its ongoing strategic and operational challenges with constrained resource levels and prioritize training investments, such as those in joint exercises. In order to better understand the performance and effectiveness of the Department's joint exercise program, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, to be completed by April 30, 2016, that assesses the following:

(1) The guidance and processes the Department of Defense uses to determine requirements for joint exercises;

(2) The factors, if any, the Department has identified that affect the combatant commands' ability to conduct joint exercises;

(3) The extent to which assessments of joint exercises are conducted to determine if combatant command and other departmental goals and objectives are achieved; and

(4) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to the Department's joint exercise program.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing by March 1, 2016, to the House Committee on Armed Services on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings.

Review of the Navy's Optimized Fleet Response Plan

Over the past decade of war, high operational tempo reduced predictability of ship deployments for sailors, their families, and the industrial base that supports ship repair and maintenance. In addi-

tion, deployment lengths did not allow for the training and maintenance needed to support fleet readiness and maximize ships' operational availability to combatant commanders. Further, the Navy has not executed its ship maintenance and modernization on time or within budget.

To address these issues, the Navy began implementing in November 2014 a revised operational schedule for its carrier strike groups referred to as the Optimized Fleet Response Plan (OFRP). The OFRP seeks to provide a more sustainable force-generation model for Navy ships, as it reduces deployment lengths and injects more predictability for maintenance and training into ship schedules. The Navy also foresees that better scheduling will increase the efficiency of its deployments and increase predictability for sailors and the repair industrial base. According to Navy officials, this new force-generation model is designed to achieve a number of benefits, including driving down costs, increasing readiness, and maximizing operational availability to combatant commanders. The Navy plans eventually to roll out the schedule to all U.S. Navy assets from the amphibious ready groups to expeditionary units and submarines.

Given the persistent requirements of the combatant commanders, the committee is concerned about the viability of the OFRP, especially in light of the growing maintenance requirements being encountered as ships are brought into the public and private shipyards. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States, by March 1, 2016, to review the following:

(1) To what extent has the Navy identified interim benchmarks and made progress toward implementing the Optimized Fleet Response Plan?

(2) To what extent has the Navy established outcome-related goals for the Optimized Fleet Response Plan in terms of forward presence provided to combatant commanders, personnel and operational tempo, sailor retention, training, maintenance, readiness, and ship repair costs? What other goals does the Navy have, if any?

(3) To what extent does the Optimized Fleet Response Plan provide adequate time for ships to meet ship maintenance requirements? What impact, if any, have deviations from planned maintenance schedules had on the ship-repair industrial base?

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide to the House Committee on Armed Services, by November 1, 2015, a briefing on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings and a final report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016. The Comptroller General may also include other related matters as deemed appropriate in order to provide a comprehensive examination of the OFRP.

Synthetic Training for Small Arms Weapons Skills and Combat Readiness

The committee recognizes that synthetic training has become a key element in enhancing small-arms weapons skills training for U.S. military personnel, while reducing direct- and indirect-training time and costs. The committee also acknowledges that many synthetic training systems enable the collection and analysis of data and metrics that facilitate after-action reviews and can lead

to improved training results while ensuring overall system reliability and success.

The committee notes that several communities, such as the Navy Expeditionary Combat Command, the Navy Special Warfare Command, and the U.S. Army Special Warfare Center, have implemented synthetic small-arms weapons training systems that have proven useful in developing a wide range of individual service member skill levels. The committee also recognizes that synthetic training systems which utilize science-based human performance and cognitive agility programs of instruction and techniques can improve precision under stress, reaction time, and decisionmaking skills in complex threat scenarios.

The committee encourages other schools, commands, and military departments to adopt more cost-effective training systems, such as synthetic training programs, to the maximum extent practicable. The committee also encourages the continued exploration of neuroscience and resiliency-focused human performance training programs in addressing other areas of concern, including escalation-of-force challenges.

U.S. Army Pacific Pathways Program

In December 2013, the commander of the U.S. Army Pacific unveiled the Pacific Pathways initiative, an effort to make the Army more flexible and expeditionary in responding to the needs of U.S. Pacific Command. Among other things, this concept envisions assigning key elements of U.S.-based infantry brigades to Asia and keeping them there for several months as they rotate from country to country, conducting training exercises and other security force assistance activities. These forces would also be available to respond to humanitarian crises or security threats in the region. Estimates indicate that executing this concept would represent a significant increase over currently planned Army spending on military exercises in the Pacific. Moreover, U.S. Pacific Command currently has other existing capabilities that are potentially similar to those envisioned for Army units under the Pacific Pathways program.

The committee would benefit from independent analysis of the utility of the Pacific Pathways initiative. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, by April 30, 2016, on the Pacific Pathways initiative that assesses the following:

(1) U.S. Pacific Command's plans for the use of forward-deployed Army forces under the Pacific Pathways initiative, including roles, responsibilities, goals, and objectives;

(2) The unique benefits of using Army units under the Pacific Pathways initiative in executing those roles, responsibilities, goals, and objectives;

(3) Any duplication or overlap of effort between, or among, the Pacific Pathways program and other existing capabilities in the region;

(4) The identified equipment, training, and other requirements needed to enable the execution of the Pacific Pathways initiative, including estimated costs; and

(5) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to the Pacific Pathways initiative.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings.

Use of Service Contracts for Simulated Training and Associated Equipment

The committee supports ongoing efforts by the Department of Defense to streamline and modernize combat arms training. Further, the committee recognizes that in some cases, simulated training provided on a contract basis has the potential to offer a more cost-effective alternative to organically provided training or traditional equipment procurement. However, the committee acknowledges that contracting processes remain cumbersome and inefficient and could undermine possible financial efficiencies of contract solutions.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to explore the use, where appropriate, of service contracts that can reduce cost. While the use of a services contract may not always be appropriate for the acquisition of complex, military-unique simulation capability, the committee encourages the Department to examine opportunities where this approach could reduce the cost for simulated training and associated support equipment and increase training capability, especially in commercial-off-the-shelf and non-developmental simulation capability.

Uses of Modeling and Simulation

The committee recognizes the important contributions of the modeling and simulation industry in training warfighters. The committee believes modeling and simulation is particularly effective and efficient in providing platforms and replicating real-world challenges to prepare warfighters for decision-making at the tactical, operational, and strategic level, and inform the development of tactics, operational concepts, and the making of Defense acquisition and management decisions. The committee, therefore, encourages the Department of Defense to make greater use of modeling and simulation technology as a substitute for more expensive forms of training and directs the Secretary of Defense by March 31, 2016, to provide the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives with a briefing on current uses of modeling and simulation and potential areas for further utilization.

OTHER MATTERS

Arctic Investments and Capabilities

The committee notes that as one of seven Arctic nations, the United States has a vested interest in the security and stability of the Arctic region. With the Arctic becoming increasingly accessible and more broadly transited in the coming decades by both Arctic and non-Arctic nations, it is imperative that the United States be prepared to operate in the Arctic region when needed. To that end, the committee notes that the Department of Defense released a document outlining its Arctic Strategy in November 2013 and the Department of the Navy released its updated "Arctic Roadmap" in

February 2014. The committee commends the Department for its focus on the Arctic region as its activity in the region increases.

In order to meet the strategic objectives in the region, the committee believes it is important for the Department to continue to invest in training exercises, partnerships, infrastructure, and capabilities necessary to support potential operations in the Arctic region. The committee also encourages the Department to continue research efforts to develop security capabilities and strategies for the Arctic region. The committee notes that the Navy's "Arctic Roadmap" provided a plan to identify the requirements for an Arctic Center of Excellence in Fiscal Year 2015. Once the Navy has established the requirements for the Arctic Center of Excellence, the committee encourages the Navy to establish the center in a timely manner.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2016, that identifies the formal requirements that have been established for this center and a timeline for standing up the initial capabilities of the center. In establishing this center and determining a suitable location, the committee encourages the Navy to coordinate with other government agencies, academic institutions, and existing polar research efforts that can provide support and promote the United States security interests.

Briefing on Retirement and Storage of Air Force One (VC–25)

Not later than April 1, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on its plan to retire and subsequently place into storage the current fleet of Air Force One (VC–25) aircraft. The briefing should include an overview on the plan to move one of both aircraft to a museum owned by the Department of the Air Force.

Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle

The committee notes that the coconut rhinoceros beetle is native to Southeast Asia and can cause extensive vegetation damage, primarily to coconut and other palms. The committee is aware that the coconut rhinoceros beetle was first detected in Guam in 2007 and in Hawaii in 2013, and is considered an invasive species to both of these locations. In coordination with Federal and local agencies, Joint Region Marianas and Navy Region Hawaii have developed programs focused on discovery, monitoring, controlling, and, to the extent practicable, eradicating the coconut rhinoceros beetle populations from military facilities and installations. The committee is aware that in fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Department of the Navy contributed $3.7 million related to coconut rhinoceros beetle response in Guam and Hawaii. In addition, other Federal agencies have contributed resources in support of the response. The committee encourages the Department of the Navy to continue supporting efforts to discover, monitor, control, and, to the extent practicable, eradicate coconut rhinoceros beetle populations.

Deep Water Unexploded Ordnance

The committee notes that section 314 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the Secretary of Defense to review historical records to determine the number, size, and probable locations of ocean disposal sites and the types of military munitions disposed of at the sites. Under the provision, the Secretary was also required to conduct research on the effects on the ocean environment, and those who use it, of military munitions disposed of in coastal waters. The committee is concerned that not all of the ocean disposal sites have been identified or fully studied.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2016. The report should discuss the status of the Department of Defense's research to date with regard to the effects of ocean-disposed munitions on the ocean environment and the feasibility of removing or otherwise remediating sea disposal sites. The report should provide recommendations with regard to the need for additional research and the remediation of such ocean disposal sites, including an outline of ongoing or planned future research initiatives, a timeline for completion of such research, and efforts to remediate such sites.

Flame Retardant Military Uniform Safety

The committee notes with interest an increasing movement toward prohibiting halogenated flame retardants in commercial products because of health and safety concerns and believes that the men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces should be provided the same protections against potential toxic exposure as the civilian population. As such, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to explore the potential of utilizing non-halogenated flame retardants in military uniforms, through access to American-made products.

United States Special Operations Command Global Inform and Influence Activities

The budget request included $24.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for U.S. Special Operations Command global inform and influence activities. The committee notes that this program will resource the geographic combatant commanders military information support operations, as well as inform and influence activities. The budget request includes increases that are directly attributed to military information operational gaps.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee expresses concern with the information operations being conducted by the Federation of Russia in Ukraine and Eastern Europe, and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), and provides additional authority for a pilot program to support information operations and strategic communications capabilities. The committee urges U.S. Special Operations Command to leverage this authority to enhance information-related and strategic communications capabilities to support the tactical, operational, and strategic requirements of the various combatant commanders, including urgent and emergent oper-

ational needs, and the operational and theater security cooperation plans of the geographic and functional combatant commanders.

Therefore, the committee recommends $54.7 million, an increase of $30.0 million, for U.S. Special Operations Command global inform and influence activities to expand activities against the Russian Federation and ISIL. The committee further directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than July 30, 2015, on global inform and influence activities, with an emphasis on efforts to counter Russian and ISIL propaganda.

Weather and Geographic Impacts on Aerospace Control Alert Missions

The committee recognizes the importance of the Aerospace Control Alert (ACA) mission and its role in protecting the homeland. The committee also believes that ensuring ACA assets can respond rapidly is essential to mission effectiveness. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force, when making decisions affecting the ACA mission, to consider both geographic and meteorological limitations on ACA operations. The committee believes such considerations should include weather impacts on safety of flight, launch and recovery of aircraft, mission degradation, and the impact geographical location of aircraft has on alert response times.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Authorization of Appropriations

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

SUBTITLE B—ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Section 311—Limitation on Procurement of Drop-In Fuels

This section would amend subchapter II of chapter 173 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit Department of Defense funds to be used for bulk purchases of drop-in fuel for operational purposes, unless the cost of that drop-in fuel is cost-competitive with traditional fuel, subject to a national security waiver.

Section 312—Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas

The section would add a new section to chapter 631 of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the conservation needs of the Southern Sea Otter while continuing the protections for military readiness activities at important offshore islands in the Southern California Bight.

Section 313—Revision to Scope of Statutorily Required Review of Projects Relating to Potential Obstructions to Aviation so as to Apply Only to Energy Projects

This section would amend section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to expand coverage of the Siting Clearinghouse to requests for informal reviews by Indian tribes and landowners, clarify that information received from private entities is not publicly releasable, eliminate categories of adverse risk, and limit applicability of section to only energy projects.

Section 314—Exclusions from Definition of "Chemical Substance" under Toxic Substances Control Act

This section would modify section 2602(2)(B) of title 15, United States Code, to add to the exclusions any component of any article, including shot, bullets and other projectiles, propellants when manufactured for or used in such an article, and primers.

Section 315—Exemption of Department of Defense from Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement

This section would amend section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) to exempt the Department of Defense from the requirements related to contracts for alternative or synthetic fuel in that section.

Section 316—Limitation on Plan, Design, Refurbishing, or Construction of Biofuels Refineries

This section would require the Department of Defense to obtain a congressional authorization before entering into a contract for the planning, design, refurbishing, or construction of a biofuels refinery.

SUBTITLE C—LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT

Section 321—Assignment of Certain New Requirements Based on Determinations of Cost-Efficiency

This section would amend Chapter 146 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a section that would require the Department of Defense to assign performance of new requirements to member of the Armed Forces, civilian employees, or contracts based on a determination of which sector of the Department's workforce can perform the new requirement in the most cost-efficient manner, based on an analysis of the costs to the Federal Government in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction 7041.04 or successor guidance.

Section 322—Inclusion in Annual Technology and Industrial Capability Assessments of a Determination about Defense Acquisition Program Requirements

This section would amend section 2505 of title 10, United States Code, to include in the required periodic assessment of defense capability an additional requirement for the Secretary of Defense to also determine the extent to which the requirements associated

with defense acquisition programs can be satisfied by the present and projected performance capacities of industries supporting the sectors or capabilities in the assessment and evaluate the reasons for any variance from applicable preceding determinations.

Section 323—Amendment to Limitation on Authority to Enter into a Contract for the Sustainment, Maintenance, Repair, or Other Overhaul of the F117 Engine

This section would amend section 341 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to require the senior acquisition executive of the Air Force to make a determination that the Air Force has obtained sufficient data to establish that the Air Force is paying a fair and reasonable price for F117 engine sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul.

The committee notes that section 341 was not intended to affect any existing contract or options under an existing contract that was concluded prior to the date of enactment of Public Law 113–291.

Section 324—Pilot Programs for Availability of Working-Capital Funds for Product Improvements

This section would require each of the service acquisition executives of the military departments to initiate a pilot program in fiscal year 2016 for product improvement under the authority provided in section 330 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). It also would require each military department to spend at least $5.0 million in working-capital funds in fiscal year 2016 in support of a product improvement initiative as described in section 330(b) of Public Law 110–181.

Section 325—Report on Equipment Purchased from Foreign Entities that Could be Manufactured in United States Arsenals or Depots

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to deliver, concurrent with the budget request for fiscal year 2017, a report to the congressional defense committees on equipment purchased from foreign entities that could be manufactured in U.S. arsenals or depots.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 333—Improvements to Department of Defense Excess Property Disposal

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a plan for improved management and oversight of the systems, processes, and controls involved in the disposition of excess non-mission essential equipment and materiel by the Defense Logistics Agency Disposition Services.

The committee remains concerned about the improper disposition of excess equipment, especially equipment returning from the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) area of responsibility. Despite 14 separate reports in 5 years by the Government Accountability Office, the Army Audit Agency, and the Department of Defense In-

spector General (DODIG) on retrograde and disposition operations in CENTCOM, the DODIG in November 2014 again found improper disposition of usable equipment and a lack of proper guidance and adherence to policy. In the unclassified findings of Report Number DODIG–2015–012, "The DOD Retrograde Process in Afghanistan Needed Improvement," the DODIG noted that the Department lacks "additional controls [needed] to improve procedures governing the disposal of services items" and "as a result, serviceable items were disposed of that could be re-utilized." The DODIG noted in the report that of the 134 improperly disposed items, 10 items were subsequently repurchased by the Department of Defense. Further, the DODIG noted that improper disposition occurred at sorting facilities that were staffed with seven times the number of personnel "needed to accomplish the retrograde mission."

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

OVERVIEW

The "Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Overview" states that the President's request is guided by the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) strategy. However, the QDR does not reflect the breadth or complexity of the ongoing, simultaneous security challenges and crises, which further exacerbates the mismatch between the threat, strategy, and resources. This means a smaller Active Duty force, with a Reserve Component capable of continuing to operate as an operational reserve to maintain strategic depth, which is reflected in the President's request. The requested funding levels would allow the military to protect and advance U.S. interests and execute the updated defense strategy, but with somewhat increased levels of risk for some missions. The budget included further reductions in the Active Component end strength in the Army and the Marine Corps, while increasing the Navy's and the Air Force's end-strength levels to preserve capability. The committee notes the services plan for more drastic reductions in end strength and force structure in fiscal year 2017 absent a change to the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25).

The Reserve Components will make minor reductions in fiscal year 2016. The Department has continued to commit to funding an Operational Reserve Component, but the discretionary caps established in Public Law 112–25 will impact the size of the Reserves. Based on the fiscal year 2020 end state, the continued use of the Reserve Components will remain an integral part of the strategy and force. As the Active Components reduce end strength, the committee encourages the military services to ensure the proper force structure and resourcing is provided to the Reserve Components in order to preserve an operational reserve. The committee also recommends that as missions, such as cyber security, space operations, and unmanned aerial systems, continue grow, the military services incorporate the Reserve Components into these force structure requirements to capitalize on the expertise of the Reserve Component members.

The committee is aware of the constraints that the Army and Marine Corps face in the current budget environment, and remains concerned with the planned force reductions for the Army and Marine Corps, as well as with the Navy's continued challenges manning the fleet while combat and contingency commitments continue. This continued stress on the force, coupled with potential further reductions as a result of the discretionary caps established in Public Law 112–25, may have serious implications on the capacity and capability of the All-Volunteer Force and the ability for the military services to meet the National Defense Strategy.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Active Duty personnel of the Armed Forces as of September 30, 2016:

Service	FY 2015 Authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2016 Request	FY 2015 Authorized
Army	490,000	475,000	475,000	0	–15,000
Navy	323,600	329,200	329,200	0	5,600
USMC	184,100	184,000	184,000	0	–100
Air Force	312,980	317,000	320,715	3,715	7,735
DOD	1,310,680	1,305,200	1,308,915	3,715	–1,765

Section 402—Revisions in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum Active Duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as of September 30, 2016. The committee recommends 475,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Army, 329,200 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Navy, 184,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 317,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Air Force.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Selected Reserve personnel, including the end strength for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves, as of September 30, 2016:

Service	FY 2015 Authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2016 Request	FY 2015 Authorized
Army National Guard	350,200	342,000	342,000	0	–8,200
Army Reserve	202,000	198,000	198,000	0	–4,000
Navy Reserve	57,300	57,400	57,400	0	100
Marine Corps Reserve	39,200	38,900	38,900	0	–300
Air National Guard	105,000	105,500	105,500	0	500
Air Force Reserve	67,100	69,200	69,200	0	2,100
DOD Total	820,800	811,000	811,000	0	–9,800
Coast Guard Reserve	7,000	7,000	7,000	0	0

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves as of September 30, 2016:

Service	FY 2015 Authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2016 Request	FY 2015 Authorized
Army National Guard	31,385	30,770	30,770	0	–615
Army Reserve	16,261	16,261	16,261	0	0
Navy Reserve	9,973	9,934	9,934	0	–39
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,260	2,260	0	–1
Air National Guard	14,704	14,748	14,748	0	44
Air Force Reserve	2,830	3,032	3,032	0	202
DOD Total	77,414	77,005	77,005	0	–409

Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2016:

Service	FY 2015 Authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2016 Request	FY 2015 Authorized
Army National Guard	27,210	26,099	26,099	0	–1,111
Army Reserve	7,895	7,395	7,395	0	–500
Air National Guard	21,792	22,104	22,104	0	312
Air Force Reserve	9,789	9,814	9,814	0	25
DOD Total	66,686	65,412	65,412	0	–1,274

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2016 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish the maximum end strengths for the Reserve Components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status technicians as of September 30, 2016:

Service	FY 2015 Authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2016 Request	FY 2015 Authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of Reserve Component personnel who may be on Active Duty or full-time National Guard duty during fiscal year 2016 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by section 401 or section 412 of this Act unless the duration on Active Duty exceeds the limitations in section 115(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

Service	FY 2015 Authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2016 Request	FY 2015 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—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in the funding table in section 4401 of division D of this Act.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to be concerned with the Department of Defense's efforts to effectively manage the force but also understands the difficult budget environment in which the All-Volunteer Force must remain viable. Therefore, the committee would provide authority for the Secretaries of the military departments to develop pilot programs to provide additional recruitment incentives and to expand career flexibility programs to enhance retention of service members in order to recruit and retain the best qualified service members. Also, the committee would provide the authority, as recommended by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, to streamline and consolidate the number of Reserve Component status authorities under which Reserve Components members may be called to Active Duty.

In support of military members and their families, the committee would provide assistance to local educational agencies that are impacted by the enrollment of dependent children of military members and Department of Defense civilian employees. In addition, the committee would include students with a parent who is a member of the Armed Forces on Active Duty with those for which States must include separate measurable annual objectives for continuous and substantial improvement, as recommended by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

To further improve sexual assault prevention and response, the committee would direct the development of a strategy to prevent retaliation against members of the Armed Forces who report or intervene on behalf of a victim of sexual assault. The committee would make improvements to the Special Victim's Counsel Program, including authority to provide Special Victim's Counsel to Department of Defense civilian employees who are victims of sexual assault. The committee would further require improvements to sexual assault prevention and response when victims of sexual assault are male members of the Armed Forces.

To continue the committee's focus on assisting military personnel who are transitioning out of the military services, the committee would establish a Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee within the Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Joint Executive Committee.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Air Force Remotely Piloted Aircraft Manning Issues

The committee is concerned about the Air Force's management of critical shortfalls in training remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) pilots and system operators. Demand for combat air patrols continues to increase, resulting in an unsustainable operation tempo and exodus from the service of trained RPA pilots and operators. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2016, with a complete human capital plan detailing the measures taken to mitigate the shortfalls in manning of RPA weapon systems. Specifically, the briefing shall address: (1) strategies and

actual programs in place to increase manning in training, increase retention of RPA operations personnel, increase crew ratios, and maintain a sustainable recruiting and retention program; and (2) a projected date by which the Air Force believes it will have mitigated the manning shortfall challenges that reside in the RPA community today.

Alcohol Abuse Prevention Programs

The committee commends the Department of Defense and the military services for the robust programs available to service members and their families to prevent as well as treat alcohol abuse. The committee is aware that innovations to assist with prevention programs, such as personal breath alcohol monitoring devices, are available to further enhance the effectiveness of prevention programs. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the military services to continually assess innovative methods to increase the effectiveness of alcohol abuse prevention programs.

Assistance to Local Education Agencies

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its commitment to assist local education agencies over the past 10 years as the military services made significant changes to force structure affecting many installations and communities. Section 574 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the Secretary of Defense to create a plan to provide assistance to local educational agencies that experience growth in the enrollment of military dependent students as a result of any force structure changes, the relocation of a military unit, or the closure or realignment of military installations pursuant to defense base closure and realignment under the base closure laws. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and Secretaries of the military departments to continue to follow that plan since force structure changes and unit relocations will continue for the foreseeable future.

Commissary Transportation Costs

The committee is aware of ongoing efforts by the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) to reduce commissary costs. The committee is concerned that these efforts will raise costs for military families, especially for junior officers and enlisted troops, and will also adversely affect military readiness.

The committee urges DeCA to find alternative methods to control costs, and the committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to submit, not later than October 1, 2015, a written report to the congressional defense committees on the effects that DeCA's current proposal to limit second destination transportation funding and transport volume will have on the rates charged by the Transportation Working Capital Fund for transportation, especially to the Pacific region, as well as USTRANSCOM's ability to maintain surge airlift capability through the Defense Transportation System. The Secretary shall also include a review of possible efficiencies that could be realized in air transportation contracts dealing with second destination transportation funding.

The committee strongly encourages DeCA to maintain current sourcing policies at commissaries in Asia and the Pacific until these and other investigations into different commissary reform ideas have been completed.

Comptroller General Report on Nutrition Assistance for Active Duty Service Members and Their Families

The Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission recommended in its January 2015 report that the Department of Defenses' Family Subsistence Supplemental Allowances program be disbanded for service members located in U.S. States and territories, and replaced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. However, the committee is concerned that there may be a continued need for nutritional assistance among service members and their families.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the nutritional programs available to Active Duty service members and their dependents. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2016, on preliminary findings, with a report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of the briefing. The review should address the following:

(1) An assessment of the nutritional assistance programs available to service members and their families.

(2) An assessment of the extent to which service members and their families rely upon nutritional assistance programs to supplement their nutritional needs.

(3) An assessment of whether changes are needed to the system of nutritional assistance programs available for service members and their families' nutritional needs.

Comptroller General Review of the Federal Voting Assistance Program

The committee notes that the purpose of the Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP) is to ensure that military personnel, their dependents, as well as overseas citizens are guaranteed the right to vote by absentee ballot in federal elections, in accordance with the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act (UOCAVA).

The committee applauds the great strides that have been made improving overseas and military voting, especially with the enactment of the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment (MOVE) Act in 2009, which significantly improved many parts of the voting process for military and overseas voters. However, the committee believes that continued management and attention to FVAP still remains a priority and routine oversight should continue. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives, no later than March 1, 2016 that addresses the following questions:

(1) To what extent has the Department of Defense implemented previous GAO recommendations pertaining to the Department of Defense's efforts to facilitate registration, voting options, and ballot transmission methods for UOCAVA voters?

(2) To what extent has the Department of Defense evaluated its absentee voting program and achieved the goals of the Federal Voting Assistance Program?

(3) To what extent do challenges remain regarding the effectiveness and efficiency of the Department of Defense's absentee voting program?

(4) Recommend, if any, additional legislative authorities to address the challenges facing the Federal Voting Assistance Program.

DACA Impact on Military Readiness

The committee is concerned with the increasing challenge of recruiting eligible people to enlist in the military and believes an evaluation of how recent Executive Actions regarding Deferred Action and prosecutorial discretion for undocumented immigrants currently residing in the U.S. may impact the ability of the Department of Defense to recruit new military enlistments. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate whether allowing those who are considered Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals could expand the pool of potential recruits, and an estimation of how making eligible for enlistment of DACA applicants would impact military readiness. The Secretary of Defense shall provide the results of the evaluation in a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representative no later than December 1, 2015.

Diversity in Department of Defense Advertising

The committee continues to support efforts by the services to ensure diversity among the force. The committee remains concerned that the efforts by the services to ensure that our Nation's military is reflective of American society are being reduced by the use of advertising that does not adequately target minority communities. The committee understands the challenges that the services are facing, but urges the services to maintain, and where possible, increase their advertising within minority communities, to support their commitment to ensuring a strong diverse force. To adequately reach minority communities, the services are encouraged to use minority owned media outlets and advertising agencies that have demonstrated an ability to connect with minority communities. Recruitment advertising within minority communities is an important avenue toward building interest and understanding in serving our Nation in uniform. The committee urges the services and the Department of Defense to maintain a commitment to diversity recruiting and retention. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing, by March 1, 2016, to the House committee on Armed Services on the efforts undertaken by the Department to increase marketing and advertising efforts to adequately reach minority communities.

Improvements to the Transition Assistance Program

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its commitment to help service members and their families prepare for a successful transition to civilian life. In particular, the committee commends the Department's partnership with the Department of Labor, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Small Business

Administration to maintain the transition assistance program, known as Transition GPS (Goals, Plans, Success).

In order to further improve the services provided through Transition GPS, the committee encourages the Department to review the core curriculum for the program to reevaluate whether the curriculum accurately addresses the needs of transitioning service members. The committee also encourages State One-Stop Career Center employees to attend Transition GPS classes to improve their personal connections with veterans in order to better serve that population. In addition, the committee believes that coordination between State Departments of Labor and Veteran Affairs is important to the successful implementation of the Jobs for Veterans State Grant program which provides, among other things, specialized services to veterans with significant barriers to employment. Further, the committee encourages State-level departments to work together in the administration and implementation of the program to better utilize the unique expertise for understanding the challenges veterans face that the State Veterans Affairs office may offer.

Increasing Diversity in Military Academies

The committee is encouraged by the advancements made by Department of Defense to improve diversity representation at our military academies and is encouraged to continue efforts to increase minority participation at military academies. The committee is concerned regarding current under-representation of minorities in our military academies and officer corps, and directs the Secretary of Defense to evaluate how efforts and guidance to improve minority officer recruitment across all military academies can be improved to increase diversity in the military at the officer level and brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by October 1, 2015.

Inspector General Report on Separation of Members Who Made a Sexual Assault Report

The committee is concerned about early discharges of service members who have made a report of sexual assault. The committee directs the Department of Defense Inspector General to conduct a review of all separations of service members who have made an unrestricted report of sexual assault since January 1, 2002. This review should address the type of separation, in cases where the member was separated on the grounds of having a personality or adjustment disorder, whether the separation was carried out in compliance with Department of Defense Instruction 1332.14 and any other applicable Department of Defense regulations, directives, and policies. The committee directs the Inspector General to submit a report on the findings of its review to the congressional defense committees by May 1, 2016.

Installation Access for Regular College Student Counseling

The committee recognizes the importance of education opportunities for service members and their families and the ability of service members to use their earned education benefits. However, the committee is concerned that military students using their edu-

cation benefits to attend college or take classes on-line may need more timely face-to-face access to their school counselors on military installations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by March 1, 2016, on a review of the instructions, policies, and agreements regarding installation access for representatives of institutions whose students receive tuition assistance funding, in order to enable student access to regular face-to-face counseling from their school representatives. The briefing shall include the results of the review of installation access policies and whether the Department of Defense installation access policies are consistent across the armed services.

National Military Dependent Student Identifier

The committee notes the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission recommendation to establish a national military dependent student identifier to enable consistent reporting on attendance and academic performance of military dependent students. The committee understands that H.R. 5, Student Success Act, currently pending consideration by the House, includes a provision that would address the commission's recommendation. The committee strongly supports inclusion of a national military dependent student identifier in H.R. 5.

O–6 Command Selection Board Processes

The committee recognizes that the selection of commanders in the military is intended to place the best qualified individuals into command positions. The committee also recognizes that the officer promotion process is governed by law to ensure it selects the best qualified leaders to fight and win the nation's wars and is fair, meritocratic, transparent, and accountable. Additionally, the opportunity to command at the 0–6 level is often an important assignment making an O–6 competitive for further promotion. The O–6 command select process is not a promotion board, but the outcomes can have a similar effect by opening or closing the door for O–7.

The services have different processes for 0–6 command and the committee understands those processes may have changed over the last few decades. The committee is interested in the current processes used by the services to identify and select the best qualified officers for O–6 command, particularly in operational billets, and the objectivity, merit based approach, fairness, and transparency of those processes. The committee goal is to reinforce the intent that the best qualified are chosen to command. The committee is further interested in the criteria that defines best qualified.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit an unclassified report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 31, 2015 on the specific procedures and standards by which each of the services select individuals for O–6 level command.

The report should provide details on: selection criteria for O–6 command; procedures/processes for placement of selected candidates into command billets; how is selection criteria crafted; how is it approved; what guidance is given to board evaluators; an as-

sessment of objective and subjective standards; whether O–6 command candidates are ranked based on a list of qualification; ratios of selected to available command billets; alternate procedures, if any; under what criteria would a specific command list be bypassed and another officer chosen; are there exceptions to selecting candidates who are not on the command list; and the report will also include the number of eligible women and minorities who participated in the O–6 command select process in the last 10 years and their rate of earning an 0–6 command assignment vs the rate of male, non-minority candidates.

The report should also discuss the transparency of explanations for selections and non-selections, the mechanics and time length of appeals processes, and a review of commonly applied statutes which inform the selection process.

Protection of Child Custody Arrangements for Parents Who Are Members of the Armed Forces

The committee notes that the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) included section 566 which amends title II of the Service Members Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C. app. 521) to require a court that issued a temporary custody order based solely on the deployment or anticipated deployment of a service member to reinstate the custody order that was in effect immediately preceding the temporary order, unless the court finds reinstatement is not in the best interest of the child, in addition to prohibiting a court from using deployment or the possibility of deployment as the sole factor when determining the best interest of a child. To ensure full dissemination of these protections, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to notify all State attorneys general of the United States regarding the passage and implementation of the Act. Additionally, the committee strongly encourages the Department of Defense to educate service members on the above changes in federal law and their parental rights as members of the armed forces.

Recognizing the Value of the Military Commissary Benefit

The committee recognizes that commissary and exchange benefits have substantial value to Active Duty and retired military personnel. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to note the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission's conclusion that "commissaries and exchanges are considered by many to be a relevant and important contributor to military quality of life." The committee also encourages the Department to take into consideration the recommendations of the Commission and the Review of Management, Food, and Pricing Options for the Defense Commissary System report required by section 634 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) and find ways to improve the commissary and exchange system without increasing the prices of groceries and other items sold at cost or reducing commissary hours of operation.

Religious Accommodations in the Armed Forces

The committee acknowledges the amendments made by the Department of Defense to Department of Defense Instruction 1300.17 to implement the conscience protections passed in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) and to amend the accommodation process for service members seeking an accommodation for religious reasons.

The committee urges the Department of Defense to ensure that the review and determination of religious accommodation requests are made quickly, efficiently, and in the least restrictive manner to the service member requesting the accommodation. Unless there is a demonstrated, unavoidable, and immediate impact on compelling government interests in military readiness, unit cohesion, and good order and discipline, the free exercise of a service member seeking an accommodation must not be substantially burdened as a condition of seeking an accommodation or while an accommodation request is pending. Once granted, an accommodation should presumptively remain in place unless continuing to accommodate the specific service member will have a demonstrated and unavoidable impact on compelling government interests in military readiness, unit cohesion, and good order and discipline.

Report on Female Muslim Garb Policy

Section 563 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2003, (P.L. 107–314) prohibits requiring or encouraging United States military servicewomen to wear traditional female Muslim garb called an abaya or abaya head scarf when stationed in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Current law also prohibits any funds from being used to purchase abayas and abaya head scarves.

The committee recognizes that in the last 13 years, there is an increased United States military presence in nations where women are not treated equally and/or wear traditional Muslim clothing and/or headscarves. Additionally, Department of Defense civilians and contractors may be assigned in Saudi Arabia and not covered by the current prohibitions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2015 detailing the current policies, instructions, and practices regarding the wearing of Muslim garb by female members of the Armed Forces and female civilian and contractor employees of the Department of Defense when serving overseas. This report should include: the policy or instruction given for each individual country or region for which a policy exists; details on how and when the instructions are given; whether the garb is optional; the intended purpose of wearing the garb; what level of authority directs the policy; if not a policy or instruction, what practices are allowed or encouraged pertaining to wear of the garb, and whether taxpayer money was used to procure any of these garments. If required, the Secretary can submit a classified supplement to this report.

Report on Performance and Efficiency of Incorporation of Community-based Transition Programs in the Department of Defense Transition Assistance Program

The committee notes that some installations have partnered with local non-profit and community based transition support organizations to enhance the Transition Assistance Program curriculum with great success, especially for those leaving the service and remaining in the local area. Therefore the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2016, on the feasibility of expanding this model of partnering with local community based support organizations department-wide to enhance the Transition Assistance Program.

Report on Prisoner of War and Missing in Action Declassification Procedures

The committee is encouraged by the progress the new Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency (DPAA) has made in integrating the former accounting agencies, the Joint Prisoner of War/Missing in Action Accounting Command and the Defense Prisoner of War/Missing Personnel Office. In its effort to streamline the personnel accounting community and provide more transparency to the families of those missing, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to pay particular attention to how DPAA communicates and shares information with family members, regardless of whether the family member is a part of a formal organization, and the declassification procedures for documents more than 25 years old that have a reasonable expectation of aiding in the location of persons missing in action.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, as part of the reorganization of the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency, to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2016, identifying specific inefficiencies with regard to the process for the declassification of documents that if addressed, could better guide recovery efforts.

The report shall include the identification of challenges in current declassification procedures; recommendations to expedite procedures for interagency declassification; recommendations for procedures to declassify redacted portions of previously released documents; recommendations of safeguards to prevent the declassification of documents where such declassification may be harmful to national security; recommendations for an expedited procedure for private citizens to request an explanation of documents that will remain classified; and recommendations for procedures to facilitate communication with foreign agencies responsible for the recovery of persons missing in action.

Rulemaking Under the Military Lending Act

The committee recognizes the progress that Department of Defense has made since consumer protections for service members and their dependents against predatory lending were enacted in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) and codified in section 987 of title

10, United States Code, better known as The Military Lending Act (MLA). The committee also recognizes that although the law has been largely effective in curbing predatory lending to covered borrowers, some predatory lenders have modified their products to avoid coverage by the Department's rules implementing section 987. The committee commends the Secretary of Defense for maintaining vigilance in a continuing effort to eliminate predatory lending practices that target service members and their families.

The committee acknowledges the Department's efforts as outlined in the April 2014 Department of Defense Report, Enhancement of Protections on Consumer Credit for Members of the Armed Forces and their Dependents, which was requested in the conference report (H. Rept. 112–705) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013. However, the committee is concerned with the current rule-making the Department is undertaking under the MLA. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report by March 1, 2016, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, concerning any rule-making with regard to the MLA, section 987 of title 10, United States Code, and the implementing regulation, part 232 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations. The report shall include:

(1) A summary of the comments and an analysis of the disposition of the comments submitted to the Federal Register concerning part 232 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, during the rule-making comment period for the document entitled "Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents; Proposed Rule."

(2) The impact to military readiness, if any, objectively outlining the impact that has resulted from service member access to or use of various financial products including payday loans, vehicle title loans, bank deposit advances, pawn shop, and/or installment loans since the implementation of the MLA.

(3) The adequacy of current staffing levels of the Defense Manpower Data Center, future projections for increased staffing levels, current and future funding requirements, and what steps are being taken to ensure data security to maintain and increase the accuracy, reliability and integrity of the Center's database systems.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense not to implement any final rule-making related to the MLA, or its implementing regulation, and no final rule may take effect until 60 days after the date on which the report is transmitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Support Ongoing Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps Programs and Encourage Existing Participation

The committee finds that the Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) program in high schools has a significant and important benefit to the readiness and recruitment efforts of the United States Armed Forces. The committee encourages the military services to maximize the number of JROTC opportunities available in high schools; or, if a JROTC program is not feasible, the opportunity for a National Defense Cadet Corps program.

The Reverent Treatment of Remains

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue its policy of treating any remains of missing American service members discovered during the excavation or construction of infrastructure, in particular on the island of Saipan, with the proper reverence and respect by immediately coordinating with the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency to properly secure and identify the remains.

Timely Access to Child Care on Military Installations

The committee is aware of the challenges some military families face in accessing child care services on military installations. The committee understands that the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission has recommended several initiatives to improve child care services available to military families. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider the recommendations and implement those recommendations that will improve timely access to child care services. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to reduce the backlog of children waiting to receive child care services on military installations by 50 percent by October 1, 2017. Further, the committee directs the Secretary to brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the plan by March 31, 2016.

Tracking for Non-Disability Mental Conditions

The committee is encouraged by the progress the Department of Defense has made in accounting for non-disability mental conditions but is still concerned that these conditions are not properly documented as a service member transitions from service. The committee believes that the Department of Defense needs to improve the identification of service members separated for non-disability mental conditions, and to provide reasonable assurance that service members, including Reserve Component members, separated for non-disability mental conditions are separated appropriately and in accordance with standard Department of Defense procedures and documentation requirements. Therefore, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense shall:

(1) Develop methods to uniformly track separations due to non-disability mental conditions in an easily retrievable manner and conduct a comprehensive review of separation program designator codes, as well as any information shown on the Department of Defense Form 214.

(2) Take steps to ensure there is an appropriately staffed process to identify administratively separated enlisted National Guard members who are unable to function effectively in the National Guard because of a non-disability mental condition.

(3) Direct the military services to update their administrative separation policies to be consistent with Department of Defense regulations for those service members separated for all non-disability mental conditions.

(4) Ensure the military services implement processes to oversee separations for non-disability mental conditions, such as reinstituting the requirement of annual compliance reporting of a sample of administrative separations, using current Department of Defense

policy requirements as review criteria for service members of all military services and their Reserve Components.

(5) Ensure that the military services planned oversight of separations for non-disability mental conditions is implemented and incorporates Reserve and National Guard members separated for such conditions, or that the services implement other processes to oversee such administrative separations using current Department of Defense policy requirements as review criteria for all service members, including Reserve and National Guard members.

(6) Direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to review any processes used by the military services to oversee such administrative separations to ensure compliance with Department of Defense policy requirements.

Transfer of Post-9/11 GI Bill Education Benefits

The committee is aware that the Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits under certain conditions can be transferred by an eligible service member to a spouse or children. The committee understands that such transfer can be made after a service member serves 6 years and commits to an additional 4 years of service. The committee is concerned that, for a variety of reasons, a service member who has elected to transfer all or part of their education benefit may retire or leave the service before serving the additional 4 years as required. In such cases, the service member is no longer eligible to transfer the benefit and may be subject to recoupment of funds leading to a hardship for the service member and their family. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military departments to provide information to service members during pre-separation and pre-retirement counseling, as well as during the Transition Assistance Program to ensure service members who transfer GI Bill benefits to dependents, and then transition from the military without completion of the required service, receive information on the effect of the separation on their transfer benefit.

U.S. Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force and Families Program

The budget request includes $55.9 million from Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for the U.S. Special Operations Command Preservation of the Force and Families (POTFF) program. The committee is pleased with the holistic balance of programs and activities across all elements of the POTFF program, including Human Performance, Social Performance, Spiritual Performance, and Psychological Performance programs. The committee remains very supportive of, and notes the renewed emphasis on, suicide prevention efforts for Special Operations Forces, and notes increased funding within the budget request for the Psychological Performance program of POTFF. The committee understands that the increase in requested amounts of funding for this important element of POTFF will continue resourcing for the operational embedded behavioral health care providers, and support specialized suicide prevention training, screening, and assessments. The committee is supportive of these programs and activities and urges continued coordination with the Defense Health Program to ensure continued

and holistic care for U.S. Special Operations Forces and their families.

The committee notes that sections 582 and 586 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) directed reviews and assessments of suicide prevention efforts across U.S. Special Operations Command and Special Operations Forces. The committee looks forward to examining the outcomes of those reports and continuing to work with the Department of Defense on implementing forthcoming recommendations. Elsewhere in this report, the committee also provides a 2-year extension of authority for U.S. Special Operations Command to continue pilot family support programs for immediate family members of members of the Armed Forces assigned to Special Operations Forces, as originally provided in section 554 of the the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), until 2018. The committee encourages continued coordination of these pilot programs that should be integrated into the larger Preservation of the Force and Families program and activities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than July 30, 2015, on the status of the Preservation of the Force and Families program, to include additional authorities and the coordination with the Defense Health Program.

United States Government Accountability Office Study on Gambling and Problem Gambling in the Armed Forces

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense does not currently have treatment programs for members with problem gambling behaviors, while it does operate treatment programs for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction. The committee is aware that The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (Fifth Edition, published in May 2013) includes gambling addiction as a behavioral addiction, which reflects research finding that gambling disorders are similar to substance-related disorders in clinical expression, brain origin, comorbidity, physiology, and treatment. Individuals with problem gambling behavior have higher incidences of bankruptcy, domestic abuse, and suicide. Moreover, people who engage in problem gambling have high rates of co-occurring substance abuse and mental health disorders.

The committee believes that an assessment of gambling problems and factors related to the development of such problems (including co-occurring disorders such as substance use, post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic brain injury, stress, and sensation seeking), and the social, health, and financial impacts of gambling on members is needed by incorporating questions on problem gambling behavior into ongoing research efforts as appropriate, including restoring them into the Health Related Behaviors Survey of Active Duty Military Personnel.

Therefore, the committee directs the United States Government Accountability Office, not later than March 1, 2016, conduct and submit a study to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and

the House Committee on Armed Services, on the number, type, and location of gambling installations (including bingo) operated by each military department, the total amount of cash flow through the gambling installations, the amount of revenue generated, and how the revenue is spent. The study shall include an assessment of the prevalence of problem gambling in the Armed Forces, including recommendations for military policy and programs to address such prevalence.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Section 501—Equitable Treatment of Junior Officers Excluded from an All-Fully-Qualified-Officers List Because of Administrative Error

This section would amend section 624(a)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to specify that if the Secretary of a military department determines that one or more officers or former officers were not placed on an all-fully-qualified-list for promotion under this section because of administrative error, the Secretary may prepare a supplemental all-fully-qualified-officers list for promotion containing the names of any such officers for approval in accordance with this section.

Section 502—Authority to Defer Until Age 68 Mandatory Retirement for Age of a General or Flag Officer Serving as Chief or Deputy Chief of Chaplains of the Army, Navy, or Air Force

This section would allow the Secretaries of the military departments to defer, until age 68, the mandatory retirement age of general and flag officer chaplains of the Army, Navy, or Air Force appointed as Chief or Deputy Chief of Chaplains. The authority would expire in 2020 in order to encourage the military departments to develop a plan, within the personnel management of their chaplains, to eliminate the need for continuing age waivers.

Section 503—Implementation of Comptroller General Recommendation on the Definition and Availability of Costs Associated with General and Flag Officers and their Aides

This section would implement the Comptroller General's recommendation on the definition and availability of general and flag officer costs and require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report by June 30, 2016 to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives describing such costs.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Clarification of Purpose of Reserve Component Special Selection Boards as Limited to Correction of Error at a Mandatory Promotion Board

This section would amend section 14502(b) of title 10, United States Code, concerning Reserve Component special selection boards and whether an officer or former officer could request a special selection board based on having not been selected by a previous

special selection board vice being considered by a mandatory promotion board convened under section 14101(a) of title 10, United States Code. This section would better align the statutory language regarding Active Duty and Reserve Component special selection boards.

Section 512—Ready Reserve Continuous Screening Regarding Key Positions Disqualifying Federal Officials from Continued Service in the Ready Reserve

This section would amend section 10149 of title 10, United States Code, to include members who occupy key Federal positions to the individuals who must be screened for continued service in the Ready Reserve.

Section 513—Exemption of Military Technicians (Dual Status) from Civilian Employee Furloughs

This section would amend section 10216(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, and exempt military technicians (dual-status) from civilian employee furloughs.

Section 514—Annual Report on Personnel, Training, and Equipment Requirements for the Non-Federalized National Guard to Support Civilian Authorities in the Prevention and Response to Non-Catastrophic Domestic Disasters

This section would amend section 10504 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to submit to the congressional defense committees and a list of other officials by January 31 of each calendar year from 2016 through 2022, an annual report on the personnel, training, and equipment requirements for the non-Federalized National Guard to support civilian authorities in the prevention and response to non-catastrophic domestic disasters.

Section 515—National Guard Civil and Defense Support Activities and Related Matters

This section would amend chapter 1 of title 32, United States Code, to codify the Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System mission under this title.

SUBTITLE C—CONSOLIDATION OF AUTHORITIES TO ORDER MEMBERS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS TO PERFORM DUTY

Section 521—Administration of Reserve Duty

This section would amend chapter 1209 of title 10, United States Code, by consolidating the number of Reserve Component status category authorities under which Reserve Component members may be called to duty from 30 to 6 and would direct the Secretaries concerned to develop policies and procedures to carry out these changes.

Section 522—Reserve Duty Authorities

This section would amend chapter 1209 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President and the Secretary of Defense to

call a member of the Reserve Component, under their jurisdiction, to Active or Inactive duty and provide authorities on activation timeline limitations and compensation requirements.

Section 523—Purpose of Reserve Duty

This section would amend chapter 1209 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the mobilization and limitations to mobilization as well as the call-up to Active Duty or Inactive duty of the Ready Reserve, Selected Reserve and certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve and would describe the purpose and limitations of such duty. This section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to organize and administer the Reserve Components and would describe the authorities and limitations of such authorizations.

Section 524—Training and Other Duty Performed by Members of the National Guard

This section would authorize the required training, field exercises and other duty performed by members of the National Guard and would additionally authorize the purpose, restrictions, and limitations of a call to order of the National Guard.

Section 525—Conforming and Clerical Amendments

This section would authorize clerical and conforming amendments to the appropriate titles of the United States Code related to amendments made by this subtitle.

Section 526—Effective Date and Implementation

This section would establish the implementation date of the amendments made by this subtitle as October 1, 2017, and would require the Secretaries concerned to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2016, a report containing a plan, including a draft of legislation that may be necessary, to implement the amendments made by this subtitle.

SUBTITLE D—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

Section 531—Temporary Authority to Develop and Provide Additional Recruitment Incentives

This section would provide temporary authority for the Secretary of a military department to develop a program and provide not more than three recruitment incentives, not otherwise authorized by law, to encourage individuals to accept an appointment as a commissioned or warrant officer or to enlist in an Armed Force under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. The Secretary concerned may not provide a recruitment incentive until the Secretary submits a plan to the congressional defense committees regarding the recruitment incentive, and the congressional 30-day notice and wait requirement is expired. The incentives may not be provided for longer than a 3-year period, unless the Secretary concerned requires additional time to evaluate the use of the incentive, and the Secretary concerned shall submit to the congressional defense com-

mittees a report describing and assessing the impact of the incentive. The authority provided by this section would expire on December 31, 2020.

Section 532—Expansion of Authority to Conduct Pilot Programs on Career Flexibility to Enhance Retention of Members of the Armed Forces

This section would extend and enhance the authority to conduct programs authorized under section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), informed by lessons learned to date from Navy and Air Force implementation of the Career Intermission Pilot Program. Section 533 authorizes the Secretaries of the military departments to inactivate certain service members from active duty in order to meet personal or professional needs and be returned to active duty at the end of such period of inactivation from active duty. Extension and enhancement of this authority would afford the Secretaries of the military departments greater flexibility to test and evaluate alternative career retention options in specialties and skills in which monetary incentives alone have not produced required long-term retention results.

Section 533—Modification of Notice and Wait Requirements for Change in Ground Combat Exclusion Policy for Female Members of the Armed Forces

This section would amend the waiting period in section 652 of title 10, United States Code, regarding a change to the ground combat exclusion policy.

Section 534—Role of Secretary of Defense in Development of Gender-Neutral Occupational Standards

This section would amend section 524 of the Carl Levin and Howard "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public-Law 113–291) to add combat readiness to the criteria for gender-neutral occupational standards.

Section 535—Burdens of Proof Applicable to Investigations and Reviews Related to Protected Communications of Members of the Armed Forces and Prohibited Retaliatory Actions

This section would include the use of burdens proof specified under title 5 in investigations conducted by an Inspector General, reviews performed by a board of correction of military records, and reviews conducted by the Secretary of Defense related to protected communications of members of the Armed Forces.

Section 536—Revision of Name on Military Service Record to Reflect Change in Gender Identity After Separation from the Armed Forces

This section would allow veterans to change their name on a certificate of discharge or an order of acceptance of resignation in order to reflect change in gender identity and a different name.

Section 537—Establishment of Breastfeeding Policy for the Department of the Army

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to establish a breastfeeding policy for female members of the Army.

Section 538—Sense of the House of Representatives Regarding Secretary of Defense Review of Section 504 of Title 10, United States Code, Regarding Enlisting Certain Aliens in the Armed Forces

This section would express the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Defense should review section 504 of title 10, United States Code, to determine whether individuals with Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals may enlist in the Armed Forces.

SUBTITLE E—MILITARY JUSTICE, INCLUDING SEXUAL ASSAULT AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

Section 541—Improvements to Special Victims' Counsel Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a policy to standardize the training and the timeframe of the training for Special Victims' Counsel, establish performance measures and standards for the Special Victims' Counsel programs, and direct the Secretary of each military department to require an individual selected to be a Special Victims' Counsel have adequate criminal justice experience and to ensure that Special Victims' Counsel are assigned to locations that maximize the opportunity for face-to-face interactions between counsel and clients.

Section 542—Department of Defense Civilian Employee Access to Special Victims' Counsel

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department to provide Special Victims' Counsel services to a civilian employee of the Department of Defense who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense.

Section 543—Access to Special Victims' Counsel for Former Dependents of Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces

This section would modify section 1044e(a)(2) of title 10, United States Code, to include, under certain circumstances, former dependents of a service member or former service members among those eligible for access to special victims' counsel.

Section 544—Representation and Assistance from Special Victims' Counsel in Retaliatory Proceedings

This section would allow victims of alleged sex-related offenses to receive representation and assistance from special victims' counsel in any retaliatory proceedings related to the victim's report of the offense.

Section 545—Timely Notification to Victims of Sex-related Offenses of the Availability of Assistance from Special Victims' Counsel

This section would require notification to a victim of a sex-related offense of the availability of Special Victims' Counsel prior to interviewing or requesting a statement from the victim.

Section 546—Participation by Victim in Punitive Proceedings and Access to Records

This section would allow a victim to submit written matters for consideration by a commanding officer prior to imposing punishment, mitigating punishment, or considering an appeal under nonjudicial punishment proceedings. This section would also allow the victim to submit written matters for consideration related to a separation proceeding, and requires the separation authority to consider impact on the victim prior to making a decision.

Section 547—Victim Access to Report of Results of Preliminary Hearing under Article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice

This section would require the victim of an offense to receive a copy of the Article 32 report at the same time the report is delivered to the accused.

Section 548—Minimum Confinement Period Required for Conviction of Certain Sex-Related Offenses Committed by Members of the Armed Forces

This section would modify the mandatory minimum sentence for certain sex-related offenses to require a minimum of 2-years confinement.

Section 549—Strategy to Prevent Retaliation Against Members of the Armed Forces Who Report or Intervene on Behalf of the Victim in Instances of Sexual Assault

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a comprehensive strategy to prevent retaliation against members who report or intervene on behalf of the victim in instances of sexual assault. The strategy would include bystander intervention programs, policies and requirements to ensure protection from retaliation, and training for commanders on methods and procedures to combat attitudes and beliefs that lead to retaliation. The Secretary would be required to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the comprehensive strategy.

Section 550—Improved Department of Defense Prevention and Response to Sexual Assaults in which the Victim is a Male Member of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretaries of the military departments, to develop a plan to improve sexual assault prevention and response when the victim is a male member of the Armed Forces. The plan would include training to address the incidence of sexual assault of male service members, an evaluation of the medical and mental health

needs of male victims as compared to female victims, goals and metrics to address sexual assault of male service members, information about male victimization in communications to raise awareness of sexual assault, and guidance to medical and mental health providers for care of male service members who are victims of sexual assault.

Section 551—Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Training for Administrators and Instructors of the Junior and Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps

This section would require the Secretary of a military department to ensure that commanders of Junior and Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps units and other individuals of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps receive regular sexual assault prevention and response training and education, as well as information regarding the availability of legal assistance and the sexual assault prevention and response program.

Section 552—Modification of Manual for Courts-Martial to Require Consistent Preparation of the Full Record of Trial

This section would modify the Manual for Courts-Martial Rule 1103 to require a complete record of trial in any general or special court-martial proceeding.

Section 553—Inclusion of Additional Information in Annual Reports Regarding Department of Defense Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

This section would require the Department of Defense to include additional data in its annual sexual assault prevention and response report, including reporting cases under the Family Advocacy Program, adding data related to sexual harassment, and additional retaliation data.

Section 554—Retention of Case Notes in Investigations of Sex-Related Offenses Involving Members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps

This section would require the Department of Defense to retain all elements of the case file in investigations of sex-related offenses for no less than 50 years.

Section 555—Additional Guidance Regarding Release of Mental Health Records of Department of Defense Medical Treatment Facilities in Cases Involving any Sex-related Offense

This section would prohibit Department of Defense treatment facilities from releasing mental health records of alleged victims of sex-related offenses without an order from a military judge or Article 32 officer.

Section 556—Public Availability of Records of Certain Proceedings under the Uniform Code of Military Justice

This section would require the Department of Defense to make records of court-martial proceedings available through a public website.

Section 557—Revision of Department of Defense Directive-Type Memorandum 15–003, Relating to Registered Sex Offender Identification, Notification, and Monitoring in the Department of Defense

This section would require the Department of Defense to create a database to track sex offenders.

Section 558—Improved Implementation of Changes to Uniform Code of Military Justice

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to examine the Uniform Code of Military Justice review process to develop options for streamlining this process.

SUBTITLE F—MEMBER EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND TRANSITION

Section 561—Availability of Preseparation Counseling for Members of the Armed Forces Discharged or Released After Limited Active Duty

This section would exclude any day on which a member performed full-time training or annual training duty and attendance at a school designated as a service school from the calculation of continuous days of Active Duty for the purpose of preseparation counseling.

Section 562—Availability of Additional Training Opportunities under Transition Assistance Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to permit a member of the Armed Forces eligible for the Transition Assistance Program to receive additional training in preparation for higher education or training, career or technical training, or entrepreneurship.

Section 563—Enhancements to Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program

This section would amend section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to expand eligibility for the program; add quality of life to the services for which the Secretary of Defense may enter into partnerships to provide services and grants under the program; provide flexibility in the number and timing of information, events, and activities provided under the program; and require the Office for Reintegration Programs to assist in the collection and analysis of best practices regarding suicide prevention.

Section 564—Appointments to Military Service Academies from Nominations Made by Delegates in Congress from the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

This section would amend sections 4342(a), 6954(a), and 9342(a) of title 10, United States Code, to add one additional nomination for appointment to each military service academy by a delegate from the territory of Guam, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Section 565—Recognition of Additional Involuntary Mobilization Duty Authorities Exempt from Five-Year Limit on Reemployment Rights of Persons who Serve in the Uniformed Services

This section would exempt two additional involuntary mobilization duty authorities from the 5-year limit on reemployment rights under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act: (1) orders of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force Reserve to active duty to provide assistance in response to a major disaster or emergency; and (2) orders of the Selected Reserve to active duty for preplanned missions in support of the combatant commands.

Section 566—Job Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee

This section would establish a Job Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee within the Department of Veterans Affairs-Department of Defense Joint Executive Committee established pursuant to section 320 of title 38, United States Code.

Section 567—Direct Employment Pilot Program for Members of the National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members of the National Guard and Reserves.

Section 568—Program Regarding Civilian Credentialing for Skills Required for Certain Military Occupational Specialties

This section would add six military occupational specialties to the pilot program established under section 558 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to assess the feasibility and advisability of permitting enlisted members of the Armed Forces to obtain civilian credentialing or licensing for skills required for military occupational specialties or qualification for duty specialty codes.

SUBTITLE G—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION AND MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS

Section 571—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would authorize $30.0 million for the continuation of the Department of Defense assistance in fiscal year 2016 to local educational agencies that are impacted by the enrollment of dependent children of military members and Department of Defense civilian employees.

Section 572—Extension of Authority to Conduct Family Support Programs for Immediate Family Members of Members of the Armed Forces Assigned to Special Operations Forces

This section would extend the family support program authority provided for immediate family members of members of the Armed

Forces assigned to Special Operations Forces in section 554 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) by 2 years, from 2016 to 2018.

Section 573—Support for Efforts to Improve Academic Achievement and Transition of Military Dependent Students

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make grants to non-profit organizations that provide services improve academic achievement of military dependent students.

Section 574—Study Regarding Feasibility of Using DEERS to Track Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees Who are Elementary or Secondary Education Students

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to report to the House and Senate Armed Services Committees a report on a study regarding the feasibility of using the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System to track dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees who are elementary or secondary education students.

Section 575—Sense of Congress Regarding Support for Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces Attending Specialized Camps

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should support dependents of members of the Armed Forces in attending specialized camps to support children.

SUBTITLE H—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Section 581—Authorization for Award of the Distinguished-Service Cross for Acts of Extraordinary Heroism During the Korean War

This section would waive the statutory time limitation under section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to award the Distinguished-Service Cross to Edward G. Halcomb, who served in the United States Army during the Korean War. The committee takes this action based on the written confirmation by the Secretary of the Army that the actions of Edward G. Halcomb merit the award of the Distinguished-Service Cross.

Section 582—Limitation on Authority of Secretaries of the Military Departments Regarding Revocation of Combat Valor Awards

This section would remove the ability of the Secretaries of military departments to revoke a service member's award unless the conduct of the service member during the time of the distinguished act was not honorable.

Section 583—Award of Purple Heart to Members of the Armed Forces who were Victims of the Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Bombing

This section would extend the criteria of awarding the Purple Heart to include the six Active Duty service members who were

killed during the April 19, 1995, bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

SUBTITLE I—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 591—Authority for United States Air Force Institute of Technology to Charge and Retain Tuition for Instruction of Persons Other Than Air Force Personnel Detailed for Instruction at the Institute

This section would amend section 9314a of title 10, United States Code, relating to enrollment at the Air Force Institute of Technology of persons other than Air Force personnel, including the authority to charge and retain tuition for such persons. It would extend the reimbursement and tuition provisions to a new category of students: non-detailed persons, including non-detailed members, non-detailed civilians, and Federal scholarship recipients. This section would also make organizational and conforming changes to section 9314 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 592—Honoring Certain Members of the Reserve Components as Veterans

This section would create a new section 107A of title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service, in the Reserve Components, of certain service members by honoring them with status as veterans. This section would honor as a veteran any person who is entitled under chapter 1223 of title 10, United States Code, to retired pay for nonregular service or who, but for age, would be entitled under such chapter to retired pay for nonregular service, but would not create an entitlement to any benefit by reason of this section.

Section 593—Support for Designation of 2015 as the Year of the Military Diver

This section would express the sense of Congress that reaffirms support for sacrifices made by military divers, recognizes the sacrifices of those who have volunteered as military divers, and encourages the Department of Defense to designate 2015 as the Year of the Military Diver.

Section 594—Transfer and Adoption of Military Animals

This section would amend section 2583 of title 10, United States Code, regarding the adoption of military animals. Specifically, this section would alter the priority order of authorized recipients of adopted military animals and would require the Secretary of the military department concerned to make animals available for adoption under certain circumstances.

Section 595—Coordination with Non-Government Suicide Prevention Organizations and Agencies to Assist in Reducing Suicides

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a policy to coordinate the efforts of the Department of Defense and non-governmental suicide prevention organizations. This section would also require such policy to be submitted to the Committees

on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

OVERVIEW

The committee continues to believe that robust and flexible compensation programs are central to maintaining a high-quality, all-volunteer, combat-ready force. Accordingly, the committee supports a 2.3 percent military pay raise for fiscal year 2016, in accordance with current law, in order for military pay raises to keep pace with the pay increases in the private sector, as measured by the Employment Cost Index.

The committee is once again concerned with the raft of compensation and benefit changes proposed in the President's request, including the reduced pay raise and the reduced basic allowance for housing and the effects of the totality of such proposals on service members and their families, particularly junior enlisted personnel. The committee recognizes that the fiscal environment is challenging and the Department of Defense continues to face greater pressure each year under sequestration-level budget caps but believes that proper compensation levels must be maintained to preserve the current high-quality, All-Volunteer Force.

As the committee continues to assess the impact of the recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission will have on the All-Volunteer Force, it believes that there are recommendations that are important to adopt. The committee includes a retirement modernization provision that would allow for changes to the current 20-year, cliff-vested retirement system to allow for a more flexible blended system that adds a defined contribution, Government matching Thrift Savings Plan, to the current defined benefit. Additionally, the provision would provide for a separate mid-career continuation pay to further enhance retention of service members. To help service members make the important financial decisions inherent in the modernized retirement system, the committee includes a provision that would provide for improved, robust, financial literacy preparedness training programs that will enhance service members overall financial readiness. Additionally, in order to help sustain the current All-Volunteer Force, the committee continues to support authorities for a wide array of bonuses, special and incentive pays, and other compensation benefits for an additional year.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Military Allotment Prohibition Briefing to Congress

The committee understands that an amendment to the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation, effective January 1, 2015, now prohibits Active Duty service members from establishing new allotments for certain purposes, such as the purchase, lease, or rental of personal property. The committee is concerned with the method by which the decision to prohibit certain allotments by military members was reached. Therefore, the com-

mittee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2016, on the process and justification associated with the amendment to the Department of Defense Financial Management Regulation. The briefing shall include, but not be limited to, the timing and format of the public notice and comment period prior to issuance of the amendment; a summary of public comments submitted for the record; a summary of hearings and workshops held; a list of stakeholders consulted and the timing, manner, and results of such consultation; a summary of all comments and views expressed by stakeholders and how those comments and views were addressed; the justification for the amendment with supporting documentation; an analysis, with case studies, of the nexus between predatory lending and the allotment system; and all studies, data, methodologies, analyses, and other information relied on by the Department.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances

This section would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the rates of basic allowance for housing in areas impacted by natural disasters or experiencing a sudden influx of personnel.

Section 602—Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reductions Based on the Duration of Temporary Duty Assignment or Civilian Travel

This section would amend section 474(d)(3) of title 37, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretaries concerned from altering the amount of per diem allowance, or the maximum reimbursement for a locality for members of the uniformed services and civilian employees based on the duration of the temporary duty or travel.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority, through December 31, 2016, for the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, income replacement payments for Reserve Component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for Active Duty service, and the authority to reimburse travel expenses for inactive duty training outside of normal commuting distance.

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals

This section would extend for 1 year the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, the accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, the special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties, until December 31, 2016.

Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending a period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until December 31, 2016.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, the special bonus and incentive pay authority for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities, the special health professions incentive pay and bonus authorities, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, contracting bonus for Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets and midshipmen, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high-priority units, until December 31, 2016.

Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the incentive pay for members of precommissioning programs pursuing foreign language proficiency, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between Armed Forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates until December 31, 2016.

Section 616—Increase in Maximum Annual Amount of Nuclear Officer Bonus Pay

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to increase, from $35,000 per year up to $50,000 per year, the maximum Nuclear Officer Bonus payable under section 333 of title 37, United States Code, if the Secretary of the Navy considers it nec-

essary to address declining nuclear officer retention and growing retention uncertainty.

Section 617—Modification to Special Aviation Incentive Pay and Bonus Authorities for Officers

This section would assist the Department of Defense in meeting the congressionally mandated timeline to fully transition from the legacy pay authorities in subchapter I of chapter 5 of title 37, United States Code, to the consolidated pay authorities in subchapter II of chapter 5 of such title, and, in particular, the aviation pay authority provided in section 334 of such title. Specifically, this section would provide the authority for a Secretary of a military department to define in regulation, guidelines allowing the Secretary concerned to pay aviation incentive pay to an officer while the officer is not engaged in the performance of operational flying duty or proficiency flying duty, but serving in positions vital to the service. This section would also give the Secretaries of the military departments the ability to continue to provide aviation incentive pay to flight surgeons and other medical officers while assigned to operational flying duty. Finally, this section would increase the statutory limits for the aviation incentive pay and retention bonus and would allow the Department of Defense the flexibility to increase the aviation incentive pay limit set forth in regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 618—Repeal of Obsolete Special Travel and Transportation Allowance for Survivors of Deceased Members of the Armed Forces from the Vietnam Conflict

This section would amend section 481f of title 37, United States Code, to provide equal travel benefits to eligible family members regardless of location of death or connection to a specific conflict.

SUBTITLE C—MODERNIZATION OF MILITARY RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Section 631—Full Participation for Members of the Uniformed Services in Thrift Savings Plan

This section would modernize the current military retirement system by blending the current defined benefit, cliff-vesting retirement plan with a defined contribution plan allowing service members to contribute to a portable Thrift Savings Plan account with a Government contribution matching program.

Section 632—Modernized Retirement System for Members of the Uniformed Services

This section would modernize the current uniformed services retirement system by blending the current defined benefit, cliff-vesting retirement plan with a defined contribution plan, lump sum career continuation pay, and retention bonuses paid at defined career milestones, while continuing a 20 year defined annuity.

Section 633—Continuation Pay for Full TSP Members with 12 Years of Service

This section would modernize the current military retirement system by adding a mandatory lump sum career continuation pay at 12 years of service with an agreement by the service member to continue in service for 4 more years.

Section 634—Effective Date and Implementation

This section would require the Secretaries concerned to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Natural Resources and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report by March 1, 2016, containing a plan to ensure full and effective implementation of the sections of this subtitle. This section would also direct the date of implementation of the amendments made by this subtitle to be October 1, 2017.

SUBTITLE D—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

Section 641—Preserving Assured Commissary Supply to Asia and the Pacific

This section would protect the commissary benefit by requiring a comprehensive review of the Asia-Pacific produce supply chain before any changes are made to regional second destination policy. This section would also require the submission of the review to Congress.

Section 642—Prohibition on Replacement or Consolidation of Defense Commissary and Exchange Systems Pending Submission of Required Report on Defense Commissary System

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from taking any action to replace or consolidate the defense commissary and exchange systems before the submission of the report on the defense commissary system required by section 634 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 651—Improvement of Financial Literacy and Preparedness of Members of the Armed Forces

This section would express the sense of the Congress regarding the need to improve financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces. This section would also amend section 992 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense and the military service chiefs to increase the frequency and strengthen the financial literacy and preparedness training of members of the Armed Forces. This section would detail the specific periods during a service member's career that this training shall be provided.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee remains dedicated to ensuring that the military health system provides high-quality health care to its 9.6 million beneficiaries, including service members, retirees, and their eligible family members. The committee believes that ensuring every wounded service member has access to the care and support they need during their recovery is paramount. The committee would take steps to continue close oversight of the programs that support recovering service members by requiring the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate whether there are systemic mistreatment issues in the Army Warrior Transition Units, as well as the Army's plan to maintain the Warrior Transition Units capability with fewer soldiers and resources. The committee also seeks to ensure that the Military Health System is structured to hire and retain high-quality personnel to meet their critical capability needs and that the Department takes every opportunity to evaluate its current capability needs. Specifically, the committee encourages the Department to utilize the direct hire authority to fill critical health occupational shortages.

In addition, the committee continues its focus on reforming the military health system to gain efficiencies through its medical command structure by increased sharing of resources, use of common operating processes, and reduction in duplicative functions and organizations. Specifically, the committee directs the Department to establish a unified medical command to provide the medical services to the Armed Forces and their beneficiaries, as well as medical readiness, through a joint structure.

Lastly, the committee remains committed to ensuring that the collaboration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs is strengthened to provide the best service to veterans. In that regard, the committee would require that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veteran Affairs work together to establish a joint uniform formulary for pharmaceutical agents relating to psychiatric conditions, sleep disorders and pain management, as an individual transitions from one Department to the other.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Access to Mental Health Care

The committee is aware that some Active Duty service members may be reluctant to seek mental health care from health care providers on military bases or by referral from a military provider to civilian mental health care due to perceived stigma associated with seeking mental health services. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense Military OneSource program provides access to confidential mental health services for Active Duty service members upon request. However, the committee is concerned that many Active Duty service members may be unaware that confidential mental health services are available through Military OneSource. Therefore, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to provide information on the confidential mental

health services available through Military OneSource to each Active Duty service member.

Alcohol Prevention and Monitoring Programs

The committee believes that including new tools for the personal monitoring of breath alcohol levels would result in an increase in the effectiveness of current and future alcohol prevention programs. The committee strongly encourages the department to deploy these new tools for the personal monitoring of breath alcohol levels to ongoing alcohol safety and abuse prevention programs to measure and increase the program's effectiveness.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military services, by June 30, 2016, to submit to the House Committee on Armed Services, a briefing on alcohol abuse prevention programs to include a cost benefit analysis detailing the most effective methods for preventing alcohol, and a means for continual monitoring of the effectiveness of these programs.

Compound Drug Prescriptions

The committee understands that the Department of Defense has identified the recent escalating prices and claims for compound drug prescriptions as a concern. The committee is aware of the Department of Defense's efforts to control the cost of the compound drug prescriptions to the Department and protect the safety of the beneficiary. Therefore the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services no later than October 1, 2015 on initiatives to decrease claims of high cost compound drug prescriptions and educate beneficiaries on the importance of working with their primary care provider to ensure they are receiving safe medications.

Comptroller General Report on Army Warrior Transition Units

The committee is concerned about allegations of mistreatment over the past year in some Army Warrior Transition Units (WTUs). The committee is also concerned about how the Army will maintain the robust capability it has created since 2008 as the number of soldiers requiring the use of WTUs continues to decrease.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2016, evaluating whether there are systemic mistreatment issues in the Army WTUs, as well as the Army's plan to maintain the Warrior Transition Units capability with fewer soldiers and resources. The evaluation shall include but is not limited to:

(1) The current system to respond to and address complaints by wounded warriors in Warrior Transition Units and whether the system is effective and fair;

(2) The process for selecting commanders and cadre assigned to the Warrior Transition Units and how involved the Surgeon General of the Army and the installation commanders are in the process;

(3) The effectiveness of the Triad of Care;

(4) The Army's plan, if any, to consolidate WTUs based on the projected number of service members that could be assigned to the WTUs in the future; and

(5) Any proposed changes to criteria for assigning a wounded warrior to a WTU and whether the criteria is consistent between the Active Component and the Reserve Component.

Dietary Guidelines for Military Nutrition Programs

The committee supports efforts by the Secretary of Defense to implement nutritional standards based upon the best available and most scientifically sound nutrition evidence to enhance the physical and cognitive health and performance of military and civilian personnel, while maximizing their readiness and warfighting capabilities. As such, the committee is concerned about recommendations contained in the Scientific Report of the 2015 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee that focus on issues outside of nutritional health, such as those to incorporate sustainability, climate change, and other environmental factors and agricultural production practices into the criteria for establishing the final 2015 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (DGA). Therefore, should the Secretary of Defense utilize the DGA recommendations, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include in military nutrition programs only those DGA recommendations that fall within the scope of health and wellness.

Direct Hire Authority for Critical Health Care Occupational Shortages

The committee is concerned that the Secretary of Defense has not taken action to fully maximize military treatment facilities, particularly through the use of the direct hiring authority provided under section 1599c of title 10, United States Code. The authority provided to the Secretary allows great flexibility in order to access and maintain necessary medical skills within the military health care system. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has yet to implement the authority provided, which has had an adverse impact on the services' ability to recruit civilian health care professionals. Civilian medical professionals, like other Department of Defense civilians, have experienced several years of pay freezes as well as a furlough, which has resulted in numbers of health care professionals leaving the military health care system. The Army alone saw thousands of health care professionals leave during this time and seek employment with other Federal agencies that were not affected by the furlough. Yet the direct hiring authority available to the Secretary has not been utilized to help the services appropriately staff their facilities.

Maximizing care at military treatment facilities reduces cost to the military health care system and, ultimately, to the Department's budget. The committee urges the Secretary to work with the Secretaries of the military departments to ensure that the authorities provided under section 1599c of title 10, United States Code, are effective in meeting the health care hiring requirements of the services. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2015, on how the Department plans to implement the authorities under sec-

tion 1599c of title 10, United States Code, in order to support the services' efforts to recruit and hire critical health care professionals.

Medical Readiness

The committee recognizes that sustaining military medical readiness during peacetime has long been a challenge. As noted in the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission Final Report, beneficiary care alone may not provide the volume and case mix necessary to "maintain and sustain the military medical capabilities developed during the last 13 years of war." Thus, with the war winding down and fewer troops being deployed, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military services to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by June 30, 2016, on the current status of medical readiness and trauma capabilities.

Meeting the Needs of Female Service Member Amputees

The committee is encouraged by the quality of care the Department of Defense is providing to service member amputees. However, as the committee has noted in the past, female service members have unique physical attributes that often require tailored approaches to meet female-specific equipment and health care needs. Moreover, the committee recognizes scientific literature that finds that women are less likely to be successfully fitted with a prosthetic limb at the time of their discharge from hospital than men. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the Department's current ability to meet the needs of female service members who require prosthetics. This brief should take into account the ability of the Department of Defense to provide female amputees with prostheses specifically designed to meet the needs of women. It should also include an assessment of whether the Department is able to meet the multidisciplinary amputee care needs of female service members including seeing an appropriate physician, prosthetist, and occupational or physical therapist.

Military Doctors of Podiatric Medicine

The committee understands that the role of podiatrists in the military has evolved as the profession itself has grown in size and training. The committee is aware that because of this, the clinical role of the podiatric surgeon may not fit within the Medical Service Corps, and that being in the Medical Service Corps may limit career progression and opportunities for leadership positions for podiatrists within the military services. Further, it is the committee's understanding that deployments have offered limited opportunities for podiatrists to serve in leadership positions that would otherwise be restricted to members of the Medical Corps. To better understand the role and responsibilities of military podiatrists, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by July 1, 2016, on the utilization of podiatrists within the Military Health System.

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder

The committee continues to support Department of Defense efforts to identify and treat post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) occurring in members of the Armed Forces as a result of combat. Untreated PTSD can lead to long-term mental health issues and possibly suicide. The committee recognizes the importance of having a measurement system to evaluate current and future PTSD programs to help ensure the effectiveness of treatment and increase the likelihood of completion by the service member. The committee encourages the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration to continue to work with research entities to ensure that proper measurement systems are used to evaluate PTSD treatment programs.

In addition, the committee encourages the Department to institute programs that have demonstrated preliminary evidence of effectiveness in reducing symptoms of post-traumatic stress and the issues that occur due to readjustment to civilian life, such as programs that utilize paradigm shift, holistic approach, and experiential learning as part of the continuum of care. The committee also recognizes the utility of alternative cognitive behavioral therapy approaches to combat PTSD in service members.

The committee recognizes the importance of continued research into the use and effectiveness of new variations of treatment options for PTSD. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to collaborate with State organizations and research entities to assess the utility of treatment programs being researched, including use of wearable sensors to help individuals undergoing behavioral therapy treatments and advances in proton therapy to pinpoint and alleviate pain which may exacerbate symptoms of PTSD. In addition, the committee encourages the Department to explore the use of novel cognitive therapies such as Attention Bias Modification training, magnetic resonance therapy, or sports therapy programs that could be used in conjunction with other therapies and medication for treatment of military personnel diagnosed with PTSD.

Screening, Prevention and Treatment of Hepatitis A, B and C

The committee notes that although the prevalence for infection of Hepatitis A, B, and C has significantly decreased, there are still service members at risk for contracting the viruses. The committee is also aware that improved screening, vaccination and treatment protocols are readily available to protect service members. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives no later than January 1, 2016 on its procedures and policies for screening, prevention and treatment of Hepatitis A, B, and C.

Status and Impacts of Reductions in TRICARE Prime Service Areas

In October 2013, more than a hundred thousand TRICARE Prime beneficiaries across the United States living outside 40 miles from a Military Treatment Facility lost access to TRICARE Prime due to the Department of Defense's change in Prime Service Area coverage. The committee notes that Section 701 of the Fiscal Year

2014 National Defense Authorization Act provided for a one-time election opportunity for individuals who elected to remain in TRICARE Prime, should the individual reside in an affected ZIP code and within 100 miles of a Military Treatment Facility. However, the committee understands that many beneficiaries live more than 100 miles from a Military Treatment Facility, and therefore were ineligible to participate in TRICARE Prime election.

The committee believes that access to quality healthcare services is a benefit earned through prior service to our nation and that the Department of Defense should continue to provide top-level healthcare to beneficiaries removed from TRICARE Prime as a result of the Prime Service Area changes. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense is required in Section 723 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to submit a report to the Congress on the status of the reduction in TRICARE Prime Service areas. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services no later than July 30, 2015, on efforts to ensure access to affordable healthcare due to changes in TRICARE costs for affected beneficiaries as a result of the reductions in Prime Service Areas.

Study and Report on the Use of Equine Therapy

The committee is aware that active duty service members and veterans seek out and use additional forms of therapy, such as equine therapy, which provides physical, psychological, and emotional therapy to individuals through personal interaction with trained service horses in a safe and structured environment. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the use of equine therapy to treat members of the Armed Forces to the House Committee on Armed Services by June 30, 2016. The report shall include an assessment of the effectiveness of using equine therapy techniques to treat members of the Armed Forces with post-traumatic stress disorder and other psychological or emotional conditions; the effectiveness of using equine therapy techniques to prevent suicide; the effectiveness of using equine therapy as a form of physical therapy; the prevalence of using equine therapy to treat members of the Armed Forces with post-traumatic stress disorder or other psychological or emotional conditions; the prevalence of using equine therapy as a form of physical therapy; and the potential for organizations in the private sector that offer equine therapy and the Department of Defense to form partnerships to treat members of the Armed Forces with physical, psychological, and emotional conditions.

Transport Telemedicine

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is exploring telemedicine solutions successfully used in a deployed environment to better enhance medical care provided to soldiers deployed or operating at home station. Telemedicine can increase efficiency and reduce health care cost by projecting medical care to multiple locations, thus avoiding transportation delays.

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense currently lacks a technical solution that captures and communicates

patient care/condition information beginning at the point of injury and continuing until arrival at a medical facility. The committee believes the lack of an effective telemedicine architecture represents a critical capability gap for the Department of Defense medical care. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to support and expand the development and deployment of telemedicine across the Military Health System.

The committee also notes that the Army has successfully demonstrated the airborne portion of its telemedicine concept and is currently writing its telemedicine Concepts Development Document. The committee encourages the Army to consider the most expeditious method to further develop the requirements for telemedicine techniques, capabilities and processes, including a Limited User Evaluation and the exploration of commercial off-the-shelf technologies that may exist today and would effectively work with existing radios and patient care devices.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2016, on the plan for pursuing technical telemedicine capabilities.

Trauma Care

The committee continues to support the Department of Defense in its efforts to further advance trauma care. However, the committee is concerned that with the end of the recent military conflicts, these advances and skills may degrade and have a negative impact on the readiness of military medicine.

The committee understands that the Department is creating a coordinated, multi-institution, clinical research network of civilian and military trauma centers to address the military relevant priorities and gaps in trauma care and trauma systems. The committee recognizes that the Department is initiating this program in fiscal year 2015 and encourages the Secretary of Defense to continue to properly resource this research effort. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by no later than January 31, 2016 on the Department's efforts to create a clinical research network of civilian and military trauma centers.

Wounded Warrior Recovery Care Coordination

Section 1614 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110–181) required that, "the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly develop and implement processes, procedures, and standards for the transition of recovering service members from care and treatment through the Department of Defense to care, treatment, and rehabilitation through the Department of Veterans Affairs."

The committee is concerned that rather than having joint programs to advocate on behalf of wounded warriors and ensure a comprehensive and seamless rehabilitation, recovery and transition; two separate programs exist—the Department of Defense Recovery Coordination Care Program and the Department of Veterans Affairs Federal Recovery Coordination Program.

The committee is aware of initial efforts to update Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs policies authorized by Section 1614

of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110–181). Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs jointly to brief the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs jointly by August 1, 2015 on the status of programs authorized by Section 1614 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (P.L. 110–181) as well as provide a briefing within 30 calendar days of an announcement of an update of policy of a program authorized by Section 1614.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—TRICARE AND OTHER HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Section 701—Joint Uniform Formulary for Transition of Care

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly establish a joint uniform formulary for use by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs that would include pharmaceutical agents critical for the transition of an individual from treatment furnished by the Secretary of Defense to treatment furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. The pharmaceutical agents selected for inclusion on the joint uniform formulary shall be related to the control of pain, sleep disorders, psychiatric conditions, and other conditions determined appropriate by the Secretaries. This section would also require the Secretaries to submit a report to certain congressional committees by July 1, 2016, on the joint uniform formulary established by the Secretaries.

Section 702—Access to Broad Range of Methods of Contraception Approved by the Food and Drug Administration for Members of the Armed Forces and Military Dependents at Military Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that every military medical treatment facility has a sufficient stock of Food and Drug Administration approved methods of contraception.

Section 703—Access to Contraceptive Method for Duration of Deployment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a sufficient supply of prescription contraception to a female member of the Armed Forces prior to deployment.

Section 704—Access to Infertility Treatment for Members of the Armed Forces and Dependents

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide uninterrupted access to infertility treatment for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents.

SUBTITLE B—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

Section 711—Unified Medical Command

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a unified medical command to provide medical services to the Armed Forces and other health care beneficiaries of the Department of Defense as defined in chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code. This section would also require the Secretary to (1) develop a comprehensive plan to establish a unified medical command; (2) notify the congressional defense committees of the time line to establish the unified medical command by not later than the date that is 30 days before establishing such command; and (3) submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after providing such notification on the establishment of the unified medical command.

Section 712—Licensure of Mental Health Professionals in TRICARE Program

This section would establish criteria under which licensed mental health counselors may be reimbursed under the TRICARE program.

Section 713—Reports on Proposed Realignments of Military Medical Treatment Facilities

The section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from realigning or restructuring a military medical treatment facility until 90 days following the date the Secretary submits a report to the congressional defense committees on the military medical treatment facility. The report would include data on the demographics supported by the military medical treatment facility, average daily inpatient census, top five diagnoses, civilian medical care in the surrounding area, and whether the facility supports a training base, along with other data.

Section 714—Pilot Program for Operation of Network of Retail Pharmacies Under TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program to evaluate whether operating a network of preferred retail pharmacies will generate cost savings for the Department of Defense. The pilot program would include but not be limited to best practices from non-TRICARE health plans that use preferred retail pharmacy networks and allow retail pharmacies participating in the network of preferred retail pharmacies to purchase prescription medication for beneficiaries at rates available to the Federal Government. The pilot program would commence by May 1, 2016, and terminate on September 30, 2018. The Secretary would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the implementation plan for the pilot program, an interim report semiannually during the period the program is being carried out, and a final report after the program terminates.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 721—Extension of Authority for DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund

This section would extend the authority for the DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund for 5 years, until September 30, 2020.

Section 722—Extension of Authority for Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund

This section would extend the authority for the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund by one year, until September 30, 2017.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

OVERVIEW

Over the past 50 years, acquisition reform efforts focused primarily on identifying the failures of the acquisition system: a complex system which includes requirements setting, funding, and acquisition activities. While some progress has been made, the conditions in the early 1980s described by Dr. J. Ronald Fox in his seminal work on acquisition reform, "Defense Acquisition Reform 1960–2009: An Elusive Goal," still describe the system today:

"Congressional critics, for example, blasted the services for rampant cost growth and schedule slippages. Aggressively pushing the frontiers of technology prompted cost overruns, they argued, while fierce inter-service competition for funds encouraged overly optimistic program cost estimates. The services, meanwhile, complained about excessive paperwork and reporting procedures required by the . . . milestone reviews; micromanagement of weapons programs by the [Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD)] and Congress; and unrealistic demands for accurate cost estimates, especially when unknowns existed in the early stages of weapons program planning. Program managers directed similar criticisms at both OSD and the services, while OSD criticized the services for failing to restrict the number of weapon systems competing for limited resources. Other service shortcomings, according to OSD, included inadequate support and readiness for fielded weapons systems and lengthy acquisition cycles. Industry directed its frustrations across the board—at OSD, Congress, and the services. Program instability—caused by sudden production starts and stops, program stretch-outs, redirections, and long decision times—threatened the bottom line and risked financial ruin, while micromanagement and excessive surveillance of programs by OSD and the services disrupted efficient contractor performance. Industry representatives also believed that OSD's emphasis on increasing price competition among contractors resulted in poor cost realism."

The committee is concerned that the incentives of the current acquisition system lead to too many defense acquisitions concurrently chasing finite dollars. This is reflected in the fact that there remains a vast difference between Department of Defense budgets

and the reality of the cost of the weapon systems those budgets acquire. To keep weapon system programs alive, the Department continues to develop, and Congress continues to accept, fragile acquisition strategies that downplay technical issues and assume only successful outcomes to high risk efforts. As a result, the Nation often ends up with too few weapons, delivered late, at too high of a cost, with performance that falls short, and that are difficult and costly to maintain.

In addition to challenges in weapon systems procurement, the committee notes that Department of Defense expenditures for contracted services have grown in magnitude and face many management and oversight challenges. The Department currently spends more than half of its contracted dollars on services. However, departmental leadership, to include the Department's own Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), have limited insight into the services being acquired and even less awareness of the services that may need to be acquired in the future. The Department currently lacks accurate and reliable data on contracted services, and the military departments and defense agencies have failed to develop processes to use available data to inform workforce planning, workforce mix, and budget decision making. Budget planning and congressional decision-making continue to be hampered by poor data, a failure to analyze data that has been acquired, and a lack of general transparency.

Furthermore, the conventional acquisition process is not sufficiently agile to support warfighter demands. Congress and the Department have consistently expressed concern that urgent warfighting requirements for hardware, as well as services, are not being met. As a result, several authorities have been put in place for rapid acquisition practices as a means to work around the conventional acquisition processes. However, many still argue that the current processes are so rigid and time-consuming that the Department is often not able to effectively tap into the innovation occurring in the commercial marketplace, thereby losing opportunities to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of both its business operations and warfighting capability.

The committee recognizes one of the Department's greatest challenges is ensuring that the Department's workforce has the training, qualifications, and experience needed to make the decisions on acquiring goods and services. According to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics in testimony before the House Committee on Armed Services in January 2015, One of the dominant characteristics of defense acquisition is its scope and complexity. There are no simple solutions to all the myriad problems acquisition professionals have to solve. There is no short "rule set" that tells us all we need to know; it is all about hard work, professionalism, and continuous improvement based on data and analysis of past experience. Our acquisition professionals must be able to think critically on many levels, integrate inputs from many perspectives, balance competing needs, make sound business and technical decisions, and satisfy many stakeholders and customers."

The committee also notes that information technology (IT) systems are critical enablers for the Department of Defense. As the IT budget represents nearly $32.00 billion of the Department of De-

fense's total budget, it also represents a major investment area requiring the same rigorous planning, analysis, and oversight as any other complex major weapon system. The Department recognized this area as a source of greater efficiency and has managed to reduce spending in IT by several billion dollars across the Future Years Defense Program. It remains to be seen if these reductions are driving any real change in how the Department does business, or whether those reductions are made with any strategic plan in mind.

The committee will continue to review the Department's IT investment planning and review processes, as well as specific acquisitions, to improve the ability to identify and reduce unwarranted duplication and eliminate programs of little value to the warfighter. The committee will pay particular attention to how the Department leverages the commercial marketplace, as well as the various IT systems of the Department where egregious programmatic failures have been made, to provide lessons for future acquisitions. The committee also plans to focus on how the IT investments of the Department will contribute to future warfighting capability, and support a defensible architecture that is resilient to cyber-attacks, while maintaining the command and control to support mission needs.

The committee's ongoing acquisition improvement efforts seek to enhance oversight in these areas and to improve processes through a different approach from previous efforts. The committee seeks to improve the environment (i.e., human resources, culture, statutes, regulations, and processes) driving acquisition choices in the Department, industry, and Congress. As part of this ongoing effort, the committee solicited input from industry, academia, and the Department, as well as others during the 113th Congress, and will continue to engage these stakeholders during the 114th Congress. In addition, the committee held a series of hearings in the 113th Congress in order to gather testimony from key acquisition leaders and experts. While the committee recognizes that there are no "silver bullet" reform packages that can immediately fix the current acquisition system in a holistic manner, the committee intends to take the inputs it has received to make progress in the 114th Congress. This effort will be an iterative process that will result in direct oversight and will be embedded in the committee's regular work throughout the 114th Congress.

The committee applauds the efforts of the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to reform defense acquisitions. We are encouraged by the Department's rigorous review of statutory provisions and submission to the Congress of well thought out proposals for positive change that balance the need for critical information necessary for oversight. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee addresses each of the Department of Defense's proposals with some modification. The committee pledges to continue to work collaboratively with the Department where possible.

Therefore, the committee is proposing legislation elsewhere in this Act which would address some of these problems with the recognition that many of these issues require a persistent, continuous, and iterative long-term effort in order to identify root causes, gen-

erate potential solutions, and address incentives driving undesirable outcomes.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Additions to the Department of Defense's Small Business Policy Website

The committee recognizes the importance of the ability of small businesses to identify, communicate, and receive assistance from the appropriate sources as an integral part of supporting and maintaining a diverse industrial base, improving competition, driving better value to the taxpayer, and sparking innovation. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, no later than September 30, 2015, to include on the Department of Defense's Office of Small Business Policy website a link to and information on the Small Business Administration's procurement center representatives directory.

Contracting Activities to Employ Disabled Persons

The committee is concerned that disabled Americans, many of whom are veterans, want to work but need assistance in finding employment. The committee is aware that the AbilityOne Program, authorized by the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (41 U.S.C. 8501) provides employment opportunities for Americans who have significant disabilities through Federal contracts with qualified, community-based, nonprofit agencies across the country. The committee recognizes that the AbilityOne Program currently provides diverse products and services, such as manufactured equipment for the warfighter, supply-chain management, and other essential services at military installations and offices. The committee believes that the AbilityOne Program network of nonprofit agencies could have the capability and capacity to fulfill additional requirements for the Department of Defense while also providing valued employment opportunities to disabled Americans.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the opportunities for the Department of Defense to increase contracting with organizations such as the AbilityOne Program or similar organizations that prioritize the hiring of disabled Americans. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 15, 2016, on the findings of this examination, along with recommendations to improve Department of Defense efforts to leverage the skills and capabilities of such workforce.

Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund

In 2008, Congress established the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (DAWDF) to provide a dedicated source of funds for recruiting, training, and retaining the acquisition workforce. Through fiscal year 2013, the fund provided about $2.8 billion and current legislation provides another $3.0 billion through fiscal year 2018. In 2012, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the ability of Department of Defense components to effectively plan for and execute efforts supported by DAWDF was hindered by delays in the Department's funding proc-

esses and an absence of clear guidance on the availability and use of funds. As such, GAO found that the Department was not collecting and distributing funds within the time frames established by the legislation, which contributed to high carry-over balances. GAO recommended that the Department revise its guidance to clarify for all stakeholders when and how DAWDF funds should be collected, distributed, and used.

While the committee supports the continuance of the DAWDF and is aware of the positive effects garnered since its implementation, the committee remains concerned that the Department continues to fail to submit the statutorily required report in a timely manner and also continues to struggle to provide timely collection and distribution of funds related to the DAWDF. The committee also remains concerned that the Department has been unable to reduce the amount of funds that are carried over to future years and slow to take the steps necessary to improve workforce planning and budgeting. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would make the DAWDF and the associated expedited hiring authority permanent. The committee will continue to work with the Department to address the remainder of the outstanding concerns regarding execution and reporting on the DAWDF.

Department Management of Unobligated Funds

The committee is concerned that the current planning, programming, budgeting, and execution (PPBE) process of the Department of Defense has created an environment in which personnel are incentivized to spend, not save, in procuring products and services to meet the needs of the warfighter.

The committee is aware that on September 10, 2012, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) issued a joint memorandum to the military departments, the combatant commands, and other defense agencies addressing long-standing Department of Defense issues regarding the way the Department manages unobligated funds. In the memorandum, the Under Secretaries stressed the importance of spending money in a manner that maximizes value to the Department and to the taxpayer. The memorandum attempted to address the existing culture which measures program execution against established obligation benchmarks. In the memorandum, they wrote, "We will continue to hold our Program/contracts teams accountable for executing to their planned schedules, but we have to stop measuring only benchmark execution as the dispositive method of determining whether funds are available for higher priorities."

On August 20, 2014, the two Under Secretaries issued a follow-up memorandum to reaffirm their commitment to improve the way the Department manages unobligated funds. This memorandum stated that the following tenets should be adopted and enforced at all levels of the chain of command and by acquisition and financial managers throughout the Department:

(1) Taxpayer funds should be obligated and ultimately expended only in the taxpayers' interest and if best value is received for the money in support of the warfighter.

(2) While they can be useful indicators, obligation rates slower than established benchmarks should not be the determinative measuring stick for program execution and must not be regarded as a failure.

(3) Late obligation of funds should not be presumed to imply that the funds are not needed or that future budgets should be reduced unless there is other evidence to support that conclusion. It may, however, indicate a need to examine whether rephasing funding is appropriate to more properly align with actual program execution.

(4) Providing savings to the organization, military service, or Department of Defense component as early in the fiscal year as possible should be encouraged and rewarded, professionally and visibly.

(5) Savings will not be reallocated at any higher Department of Defense level than necessary to fulfill shortfalls in priority requirements.

(6) Managers who release unobligated funds to higher priorities will not automatically be penalized in their next year's budget with a lower allocation and may be candidates for additional funding to offset prior year reductions.

The committee supports these efforts. However, the committee continues to be made aware of anecdotes that the culture inside the Department is to continue to obligate funding regardless of necessity in order to either prevent those funds from expiring or being reallocated, or as a methodology to substantiate the future year's budget request. Therefore, the committee directs each of the Under Secretaries of the military departments to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than August 31, 2015, on the current progress achieved and challenges remaining in regards to the execution of the direction sent in the memo from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) on August 20, 2014.

Department of Defense Oversight of Non-Major Defense Acquisition Programs

The committee notes that the military services manage many hundreds of acquisition category II and III programs each year. These programs range from multi-billion dollar aircraft radar modernization efforts to soldier clothing and protective equipment programs worth tens of millions of dollars. Many of these programs represent complex critical warfare capabilities.

At the committee's request, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) undertook a review of these programs (GAO–15–188) to determine the extent to which information is available on the number of these programs and their cost and schedule performance. The committee is concerned by GAO's conclusion that the military services' management information was too unreliable to assess these programs. The committee is also concerned by GAO's conclusion that the military services may lack sufficient cost and schedule metrics to assess performance trends. The committee notes that the military services have taken some steps to improve the reli-

ability of the data and considered ways to improve the cost and schedule metrics. The committee encourages the military services to take additional steps to address the management and oversight issues identified by GAO as rapidly as possible.

The committee directs the Secretaries of the military departments to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 15, 2015, on their respective services' efforts to improve the reliability of management information and to develop sufficient cost and schedule metrics for non-major defense acquisition programs.

Education and Training Related to Commercial Item Procurements

The committee is concerned that current education and training programs in the Department of Defense are insufficient to fully prepare military and civilian personnel to skillfully establish requirements, develop solid acquisition and contracting strategies, and conduct market research related to commercial item procurements. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, to complete a review by October 1, 2015, of the Department's programs established to develop qualified acquisition, requirements, and contingency professionals as well as other professional military education curricula, and to identify areas where such efforts could be enhanced to improve workforce skills and knowledge related to commercial item procurements. The committee further directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, on the findings and recommendations of the review.

Education and Training Related to Setting of Requirements

The committee notes that, in accordance with section 801 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, in consultation with the Defense Acquisition University, developed a training program to certify military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense with responsibility for generating requirements for major defense acquisition programs. Despite this progress, the committee remains concerned that the currently established education and training programs in the Department of Defense are insufficient to prepare the requirements workforce to fully define operational requirements, ensure trade-offs are fully assessed, and ensure the approved requirements are essential, technically feasible, and affordable. In too many cases, the committee continues to observe programs that are initiated without sound fundamentals and that result in "requirements creep."

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the effectiveness of Department's program established to develop requirements management certification training and the competency requirements for the personnel undergoing the training program by October 1, 2015. The Secretary of Defense

should also include other education and training curricula to identify areas where such efforts could be enhanced to improve the workforce skills, training, and tools related to the setting of requirements for major defense acquisition programs, major systems, major automated information systems, contingency program management, and contracted services. The review should also examine how these education and training programs address systems engineering analyses and cost estimating as part of the requirements development process. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, on the findings of the review along with any recommendations to improve the Department's requirements-setting skills, training, and tools.

Education and Training Related to the Conduct of Market Research

The committee is concerned that the currently established education and training programs in the Department of Defense are insufficient to fully prepare the military and civilian workforce to conduct market research in a manner sufficient to ensure confidence in the development of requirements and acquisition strategies, and the determination of cost/price reasonableness. Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide mandatory training for members of the Armed Forces and employees of the Department of Defense responsible for the conduct of market research required under section 2377(c) of title 10, United States Code, and would also require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to ensure that such training requirements are incorporated into the requirements management certification training mandate of the Joint Capabilities Integration Development System. Furthermore, elsewhere in this report, the committee directs a review of the Department's program to improve workforce skills and knowledge related to commercial item procurements.

Enabling Systemic Review of Acquisition Laws and Regulations by Establishing Sunset Dates for Acquisition Statutes

The committee is concerned that the current approach to developing, enacting, and implementing acquisition laws and regulations has not been done in a holistic fashion, to a large degree because of the enormity and complexity of the statutory and regulatory framework. The committee notes that in its November 14, 2014, official response to the committee's request for its views on how to improve the defense acquisition system, the National Defense Industrial Association (NDIA) stated that, "The layering of compliance and reporting requirements on the acquisition process without subsequent review inhibits improvements to the Defense Acquisition System and the culture of its workforce, both of which gradually become increasingly bureaucratic. Reviews, when they occur, are infrequent, ad hoc, and lack consistent standards of evaluation or predictable paths to implementation." NDIA went on to recommend that a formalized, rolling review of statutory requirements and mandates that add costs to the defense acquisition system, in terms of time and manpower, should be conducted.

NDIA further recommended that rather than attempt to tackle the entire system in a singular review, consideration should be given to methodically establishing expiration dates on current statutes in order to allow for a detailed review of a manageable set of statutes each year. The committee is interested in examining this approach in more detail and looks forward to working with all stakeholders to identify potential benefits as well as unintended consequences, such as instability or uncertainty in the legal framework, resultant contractual changes and burdens, increased overhead and costs to the Department of Defense, and other factors.

Ethics Awareness and Training

The committee is aware that Government-wide ethics regulations for the executive branch (5 C.F.R. Sect. 2638.703–705) require: (1) an initial ethics orientation for newly hired employees; (2) annual ethics training for senior executive employees and others who are required to file public financial disclosure reports; and (3) annual ethics training for persons designated by their agency to file confidential financial disclosure reports because of acquisition-related duties, etc.

The content of this required training is specified in the regulations noted above, and is common not only within the Department of Defense but also across the entire executive branch. While many members of the acquisition workforce are required to complete annual ethics training consistent with the regulatory requirements associated with their positions, the committee is aware that on January 15, 2014, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics issued a memo requiring 100 percent of the Department's acquisition workforce to receive annual ethics training. While this Department of Defense-specific requirement did not generate new ethics training content or ethics courses, it did expand the number of Department of Defense personnel who must receive the annual ethics training commonly given across the entire executive branch.

The committee is also aware that the Defense Acquisition University includes ethics content in many of its courses and the National Defense University's Eisenhower School includes ethics lesson for all students in its Defense Strategy and Resourcing course. The Eisenhower School also includes an ethics case review in its Senior Acquisition course. However, the committee notes that many of these educational opportunities are provided only at mid- and senior-levels of professional development.

The committee applauds the efforts by the Under Secretary to ensure that the entire acquisition workforce is fully aware of Government-wide ethics standards and requirements, and to have taken an active leadership role in furthering the trust in, and credibility of, the acquisition workforce. The committee encourages the Under Secretary to continue to enhance ethics training and awareness, to include identifying opportunities to increase Department of Defense-specific ethics training and awareness for new hires and junior members of the acquisition workforce.

Exchanges with Industry

The committee applauds efforts by the Secretary of Defense to provide opportunities for military officers and defense civilian personnel to conduct exchanges with industry, such as the Secretary of Defense Corporate Fellows Program (SDCFP). The committee is aware that the SDCFP was established by the Secretary of Defense in 1994 to become a long-term investment in transforming U.S. military forces and capabilities and was intended to play a key part of the Department of Defense strategy to achieve its transformational goals. While fellows have been assigned to such diverse and innovative businesses, such as Amgen, Boeing, CNN, Caterpillar, Cisco, Citicorp, DuPont, FedEx, General Dynamics, Honeywell, Hewlett-Packard, IBM, Lockheed Martin, McKinsey, Merck, Microsoft, Northrop Grumman, Oracle, Pfizer, Raytheon, Sears, Southern Company, Sun, 3M, and United Technologies, the committee notes that only 16 individuals are allowed to participate in the program on an annual basis. The committee also notes that at its inception over 20 years ago, the then-Secretary of Defense stated that the SDCFP was not intended to "produce better technologists or acquisition specialists." However, the committee believes that this program could be leveraged to enhance the professional development of the uniformed and civilian workforce of the Department of Defense.

The committee believes that the Department could benefit from a comprehensive review of this program, along with other fellowship programs and professional development exchanges. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the SDCFP and other fellowship programs and professional development exchanges, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 15, 2015, on the findings and associated recommendations for strengthening the workforce. As part of the review, the Secretary should examine the potential effects on career progression and retention rates of participants in such programs and provide recommendations necessary to promote early, frequent, and ethical dialogues between all stakeholders on matters such as rules, acquisition policies, and contracting practices.

Foreign Military Sales Procedural Improvements

The committee is aware that although decisions on Foreign Military Sales (FMS) involve several interagency steps, internal Department of Defense processes for considering arms transfers remain a significant part of the time frame for decision-making. The committee is concerned that there have been long delays continue to occur in approving some FMS cases and is pleased that the senior management of the Department of Defense has been focused on this issue. The current reform effort began in August 2008, when the Deputy Secretary of Defense established a Defense Senior Steering Group on Arms Transfers and Technology Release to review and improve the Department's decision-making on arms transfers and release of sensitive technology. In July 2010, the Deputy Secretary issued a memorandum to revise the Department's Technology Security and Foreign Disclosure processes, pursuant to the Steering Group's recommendations and Presidential Study Directive 8, issued in December 2009. Nevertheless, long

delays continue to occur in some cases. The committee therefore directs the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy to provide the committee and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs with a briefing on the results of the Deputy Secretary's initiative and memoranda to streamline the FMS procedures and additional steps that can be taken to reduce the FMS decision-making time frame not later than November 1, 2015.

Impact of Rescinded Solicitations on Efficiency and Innovation

The committee notes that companies incur substantial costs to prepare and submit bids in response to Department of Defense solicitations. The committee is concerned that cancellation of these solicitations after the preparation of bids can be a significant waste of time and money by both the Department and the prospective offerors. In addition, to the extent companies put considerable time and effort into preparing bids for solicitations that are subsequently canceled, these efforts may have diverted funding and critical contracting talent that could have been better used to advance our technological edge through independent research and development.

The committee therefore directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 31, 2016, on the resources committed to Department of Defense solicitations that were subsequently canceled between fiscal year 2010 and 2014 after bids were received. Specifically, the Comptroller General should determine: (1) the number of solicitations that were canceled after bids were received, (2) whether these cancellations are increasing or decreasing and their distribution by Agency or military service and contracting command, (3) the bid and proposal incurred costs by the companies and the government resources committed to these solicitations, (4) the extent to which, if any, the bid and proposal costs for these solicitations have reduced the funding available for independent research and development, and (5) the reasons for the cancellation of the solicitations.

Importance of the North American Defense Industrial Base

The committee acknowledges the vital role played by the defense industrial base in supporting the Armed Forces of the United States, noting that a cost-effective, healthy base that is responsive to U.S. military requirements is essential to achieving U.S. national security objectives. The committee further notes that in light of robust trade relations, a shared interest in the defense of North America, and responsibilities as the only North American allies within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, both the United States and Canada benefit from the North American Defense Industrial Base relationship.

Therefore, the committee is supportive of the strong, integrated, and widely dispersed industrial base in North America reflecting the economical use of research, development, and production resources, as laid out in the Department of Defense Instruction 2035.01 dated February 27, 2006. As stated in that instruction, "the Department of Defense shall maintain and strengthen defense cooperation with Canada" and "recognizes the differences in capabilities and capacities of the defense-oriented industries in the two

countries" with the understanding that "the policy is based on the recognition that the United States and Canada have a mutual interest in the defense of North America."

Improvements in Accountability for Contracted Services Spending

The committee notes that in a December 2014 report, "DOD Contract Services: Improved Planning and Implementation of Fiscal Controls Needed" (GAO–15–115), the Government Accountability Office made a number of recommendations to improve the control mechanisms for contracted services spending within the Department of Defense, and the Department concurred with those recommendations. The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 15, 2015, on the Department's efforts to implement effective control mechanisms for contracted services spending.

Improving the Acquisition of Contracted Services

The committee has been concerned for years with the Department of Defense's acquisition of contracted services. Proper management of the acquisition of contracted services is critical to the proper functioning of the Department. Services contractors support the daily missions of the Department, whether in the United States or abroad.

Proper management of the acquisition of contracted services begins with acknowledgment of the level of services being contracted and identification of the functions that are contracted. To that end, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) mandated an inventory of contracts for services. The committee remains disappointed that after 8 years, the Department of Defense has failed to produce an inventory that is accurate and reliable and that facilitates the Department's strategic workforce planning, workforce mix, and budget decisionmaking processes, as required by law.

The committee notes that in July 2014, the Department issued its annual report, "Performance of the Defense Acquisition System." For the first time, this report included information on its contracted services, including obligations for each service portfolio group, competition rates, and small business participation. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics also created an Acquisition of Services Functional Integrated Product Team to coordinate actions and further develop training. The committee is encouraged that the Department is close to finalizing a new department-wide governing regulation for the acquisition of contracted services to improve the process for developing requirements for individual service acquisitions and to enhance training. The committee is also encouraged that improving the acquisition of contracted services is included in the Department's ongoing acquisition reform effort, called "Better Buying Power."

The committee wants to ensure that these efforts will be continued and strengthened in the future. However, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense cannot assess its progress, including defining what progress means and measuring it. Elsewhere in this report, the committee includes directives for the De-

partment to: (1) report on options to improve the transparency of contract services in the budget requests it submits to Congress; (2) brief the committee on its efforts to establish contracted services goals and metrics; (3) report on how it intends to coordinate the roles, responsibilities, authorities, and resources of the offices involved in the acquisition of contracted services; and (4) brief the committee on its progress in implementing control mechanisms on contract services spending.

Improving the Efficiency of the Defense Contract Audit Agency

The committee continues to believe that more must be done to improve the efficiency of the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA). In 2012, the committee learned that DCAA had not been subject to a peer review since 2006, despite the fact that according to generally accepted government auditing standards (GAGAS), a peer review of government audit agencies should be conducted at least every 3 years. As a result, the committee included section 1614 in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), which assigned responsibility to the Inspector General of the Department of Defense for conducting peer reviews of Department of Defense audit agencies, including DCAA, in 2014.

As a result of that peer review, the Inspector General released a report on August 21, 2014, which found that 11 of 92 DCAA engagements reviewed during a 6 month period did not contain sufficient evidence for Inspector General reviewers to understand DCAA's auditing decisions. The Inspector General attributed these findings to an "absence of effective control measures in DCAA's policies and procedures" for compliance with GAGAS. Additionally, the Inspector General found that DCAA had yet to correct its performance despite being aware of issues identified in a September 2009 Government Accountability Office report (GAO–09–468) and, previously, by DCAA's own quality assurance procedures.

Furthermore, the committee is aware that the Inspector General released a report on September 8, 2014, on its review of audits issued by DCAA in fiscal years 2012–13. In conducting this review, the Inspector General examined a cross section of 16 DCAA audits completed between October 2011 and February 2013, including 5 audits of forward-pricing proposals and 11 audits of incurred costs and other audit types. The Inspector General identified 1 or more significant inadequacies on 13 of the 16 selected DCAA audits and found deficiencies in compliance with GAGAS in the areas of audit planning, evidence, working paper documentation, and supervision. Furthermore, the Inspector General review uncovered instances of auditors not obtaining adequate cost or pricing data. In addition to these findings, the committee continues to be concerned by the slow audit processes and extensive backlog at DCAA, which, according to the DCAA's annual Report to Congress dated March 24, 2014, included roughly 23,000 incurred cost submissions at the end of fiscal year 2013.

The committee recognizes that the DCAA has taken steps to improve its performance. However, the committee believes that its substandard performance impairs the defense acquisition process by incurring avoidable delays and by raising costs for the Government. The committee believes that much work remains to be done

to ensure that DCAA is capable of fully meeting applicable standards and of promoting the smooth and transparent functioning of the defense acquisition system.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to take immediate steps to address substandard performance by DCAA, to reduce its audit backlog, and to minimize costs and other harmful consequences for the Federal Government and defense industry contractors that are the result of DCAA delays. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2016, on the steps taken to address DCAA deficiencies, along with recommendations for any changes to statutory or regulatory guidance that may enable the DCAA to satisfy all applicable Federal and professional audit standards, to complete audits within a reasonable period of time, and to avoid placing unnecessary burdens on the Government or industry.

Improving the Financial Auditability of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service

The Department of Defense is responsible for more than half of the Federal Government's discretionary spending. However, according to a Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report (GAO–14–10), dated June 23, 2014, it remains one of the few major Federal entities that cannot sufficiently account for all its spending or assets, and remains the only major Federal agency that has been unable to receive an audit opinion on a complete set of its department-wide financial statements. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) mandated that the Department develop and maintain a Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Plan that describes the specific actions to be taken to be ready for audit by September 30, 2017. It also required the Plan to describe the costs associated with correcting the Department's financial management deficiencies and validating that the Department's consolidated financial statements are ready for audit by 2017. The FIAR Plan is intended to be a strategic plan and management tool for guiding, monitoring, and reporting on the Department's ongoing financial management improvement efforts and for communicating the Department's approach to addressing its financial management weaknesses and achieving financial statement audit readiness.

The committee notes that the Department's financial management processes and operations remains a "high risk" area according to the 2015 Government Accountability Office's High Risk Report. The GAO found that significant weaknesses in the Department's financial and related business management systems and processes have adversely affected the Department's ability to control costs, ensure basic accountability, anticipate future costs and claims on the budget, measure performance, maintain funds control, prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse, address pressing management issues, and prepare auditable financial statements.

The GAO further reported that the Department needs to gain assurance that the service components have implemented their financial improvement plans effectively prior to asserting audit readiness. GAO issued the aforementioned report (GAO–14–10) with recommendations to help the Department fully implement its FIAR

guidance with respect to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) contract pay. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than August 31, 2015, on the corrective actions taken within the Department to address the GAO recommendations to improve DFAS in support of producing auditable financial statements.

Improving the Goals and Metrics for Contracted Services

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has taken a number of steps to improve its planning for and management of contracted services. Because of the billions of dollars the Department spends each year on services and the constrained fiscal environment, it is crucial for the Department to identify how it can best utilize its financial resources and acquire contracted services more efficiently and effectively. The committee commends the recent actions taken by the Office of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy to establish leadership responsibilities and clarify management oversight for contracted services.

The committee also notes that in spite of failing to produce an effective inventory of contracts for services, as required by section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, the Department is taking action to obtain better contracted services data by improving and linking data within its contract and financial systems. The Government Accountability Office, while recognizing this progress, recommended in 2013 that the Department take steps to establish specific and measurable goals and metrics to assess progress. The committee is aware that the Department is developing and intends to approve contracted services goals and metrics in 2015, and supports these efforts.

The committee directs the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 15, 2015, on the Department's progress in establishing contracted services goals and metrics.

Improving the Requirements Development for and Acquisition of Contracted Services

The Department of Defense obligated $284.0 billion for goods and services in fiscal year 2014, more than half of which was for contracted services. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee noted that Congress has provided new tools and capabilities intended to improve the Department's processes for and oversight of the acquisition of contracted services. These include requiring the establishment of a management structure and review process for high-dollar services and the designation of senior managers responsible for contract services approval and oversight within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the military departments.

Additionally, the committee is encouraged that the Department has taken several steps to improve its requirements development for and the acquisition of contracted services. Most notably, these actions include:

(1) Developing a departmental instruction focused on the acquisition of contracted services;

(2) Designating the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics as the Department's focal point for the acquisition of contracted services;

(3) Appointing senior contracted services managers within each of the military departments;

(4) Establishing functional domain experts for each portfolio of contracted services the Department acquires; and

(5) Creating a Services Requirements Review Board.

However, it is not clear to the committee how each of these offices and positions will coordinate with one another and with the requirements community, and whether these offices and positions have been, or will be, provided sufficient authorities and resources to carry out their responsibilities. Further, it is not clear whether these offices and positions will have the ability to: review ongoing and future requirements for the acquisition of contracted services to assess them against the Department's strategic priorities; recommend changes to acquisition strategies; or establish metrics to monitor contract services outcomes and identify risks.

Additionally, the committee notes that the Department has failed to produce the inventory of contracts for services required in section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, which would facilitate the Department's strategic workforce planning, workforce mix, and budget decision-making processes.

Consequently, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy on how the Department intends to coordinate the roles, responsibilities, authorities, and resources of the offices and positions involved in the requirements development for and the acquisition of contracted services, and to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than January 29, 2016, identifying the roles, responsibilities, authorities, and resources of each office and position, as well as a description of how each office and position will coordinate with one another and with the requirements community. The strategy also should address how the Department will incorporate the outputs of the inventory of contract services into the Department's strategic workforce planning, workforce mix, and budget decision-making processes.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to complete an examination of the decision authority related to acquisition of services by September 15, 2015, and to develop and promulgate guidance to strengthen services contracts requirements development, source selection, and contract oversight and management. The committee expects that the conclusions from this examination of decision authorities and any related guidance will inform the development of the strategy for coordination of the activities of the offices and positions involved in the requirements development for and the acquisition of contracted services.

Improving Transparency of Defense Contracted Services Budget Information

The committee remains concerned about the lack of transparency in the Department of Defense's spending and budgeting for con-

tracted services. Most contracts for services are funded through Department of Defense operation and maintenance accounts in major categories of services, such as knowledge-based or information technology services. The President's annual budget request and supporting budget documentation, however, provide limited insights into how requested funds will be spent on these major categories of services. In September 2014, the committee received the Department of Defense Report on the Civilian Personnel Workforce and Contracted Services Reductions in the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget, provided in accordance with section 955(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). The committee is concerned that, as noted in the report, the Department of Defense does not project the number of service contractors beyond the current budget year. Further, the committee is concerned that the Department will be unable to develop an effective strategy for contracted services if it cannot forecast its future needs and determine what changes, if any, need to be made. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 15, 2016, on options to enhance the level of detail on contracted services in the Department of Defense's budget requests and future years defense planning documentation.

Increased Transparency in Non-Appropriated Fund Contracting

Department of Defense Non-Appropriated Fund (NAF) activities directly support the operations of the military exchange services; morale, welfare, and recreation programs; and military lodging programs. The committee is aware the Department of Defense routinely enters into contracts with private-sector vendors in order to provide service members with the goods and services that are a critical component of quality-of-life and morale, welfare and recreation programs, and more than half of these contracts are awarded to small businesses.

The committee is concerned about the lack of a uniform, credible process for the pre- and post-award bid protest and appeal of contract awards involving NAF contracts. Under current policies, bid protests are afforded only limited internal review within the applicable activity, and there is no consideration by any outside, objective third party. In contrast to protests of appropriated fund contracts, once a protest of a NAF contract is filed, there is no requirement for the NAF activity to suspend award of the contract or to take other action regarding ongoing performance until the protest is resolved. There is no process analogous to the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) role in appropriated-fund contract bid protests, and if an unsuccessful bidder seeks external review of a disputed contract award, the only recourse is in Federal District Court, which may become a lengthy, time-consuming, and costly process that, as a practical matter, is unaffordable for many small businesses.

The committee is aware that NAF contracting is governed by Department of Defense Instruction 4105.67, which requires only that NAF contracts be awarded to "responsible offers offering the best value" as determined by the contracting officer. That same contracting officer makes the initial decision to sustain or deny a protest. If the protester is dissatisfied with the contracting officer's de-

cision, further appeal is limited to the "final authority assigned within the Department of Defense component for resolution." The committee is concerned this situation has created a perception that the NAF bid protest process may not be subject to fair adjudication.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the adjudication processes of pre- and post-award protests of NAF contract decisions and provide a briefing, not later than December 1, 2015, to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the findings of the review and any recommendations to reform current processes to enable transparent, objective, and timely consideration of concerns raised by contractors competing for award of NAF contracts.

Inspector General Review of Requirements for Senior Department of Defense Officials Seeking Employment With Defense Contractors

The committee wishes to be apprised of the Department of Defense's record of compliance with section 847 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), regarding the requirement for certain senior officials of the Department of Defense to obtain written opinion regarding the applicability of post-employment restrictions. Therefore, the committee directs the Inspector General (IG) of the Department of Defense to conduct a review of the database, or other electronic or paper records, created pursuant to section 847 and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, in a manner that ensures protection of confidential, personal, or proprietary information, by December 31, 2015, on the findings of that review. The report should include the following:

(1) The findings of any previous IG reviews to assess whether written opinions are being provided and retained in accordance with section 847;

(2) A review of the written ethics opinions that have been requested and provided pursuant to section 847 and a determination as to whether they comply with section 847;

(3) A summary, by Department of Defense organization, of the total number of opinions issued and total number of opinions retained pursuant to section 847;

(4) A summary of any referrals to, and/or complaints received by, the IG or the Department of Justice regarding potential violations of post-employment restrictions, including the final disposition of such cases;

(5) The status of any pre-2012 records established pursuant to section 847 of Public Law 110–81; and

(6) Any other matters the IG deems relevant to a comprehensive assessment of compliance with section 847.

Joint Exercises in Operational Contract Support

The committee applauds efforts by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to emphasize the importance of operational contracting in support of the missions of the Department of Defense. The committee notes that the Chairman began an annual exercise series to assess and train Department of Defense personnel on the operational contract support capabilities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, service components and com-

mands, and other Federal agencies in a variety of exercise scenarios. The committee recognizes that special emphasis is being placed on understanding the overall socioeconomic and political impacts of contracting support to Department of Defense operations, particularly in those conducted overseas. The committee supports this ongoing approach to developing the workforce involved in contingency contracting and encourages continued support and resourcing for such exercises.

Mentor-Protege Program

The committee recognizes the importance of the Department of Defense Mentor-Protege Program (MPP) and encourages the Secretary of Defense to provide strong incentives to designated Mentor Department of Defense contractors to assist protege firms in enhancing their capabilities to satisfy Department of Defense contract requirements and foster successful long-term business relationships between Protege and Mentor firms. In pursuit of these goals, the committee encourages the Secretary to utilize all traditional and non-traditional incentives available unless specifically prohibited by public law.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2015, on the Department's plans for improving the use of MPP authorities. This briefing should address how to better educate program managers and contracting officers on the special authorities of MPP, any recommendations for how to improve or strengthen those authorities, metrics for assessing the use of MPP authorities, and a process for integrating lessons learned from past successes in program planning and workforce development for the relevant communities.

Operational Test and Evaluation Processes and Activities of the Department of Defense

The committee remains concerned that some of the unforeseen increases in cost and schedule in major defense acquisition programs are a result of requirements changes or other matters that arise during operational test and evaluation (OT&E). In the committee report (H. Rept 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee directed the Comptroller General of the United States to review the OT&E processes and activities of the Department of Defense. As part of the review, the committee requested the Comptroller General to specifically examine the criteria established by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation for determining measures of effectiveness and analysis, and the processes established to measure suitability and survivability of programs subject to OT&E.

The committee looks forward to receiving the Comptroller General's report of findings and recommendations, and will continue to work with the Department to enhance OT&E activities to ensure that such activities are conducted in a manner that does not unnecessarily drive cost and schedule delays. Additionally, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would encourage the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to consider the po-

tential for increases in program cost estimates or delays in schedule estimates in the implementation of policies, procedures, and activities related to OT&E, and to take appropriate action to ensure that the conduct of OT&E activities do not unnecessarily impede program schedules or increase program costs.

Report on the Effect of Delays in First-Article Testing

The committee is concerned that small business suppliers to the Department of Defense are experiencing interruptions in capital and cash flow when the time required to fully evaluate first-article test results is extended. The committee is aware that Federal Acquisition Regulations allow the contracting officer, before approval of the first article, to authorize the contractor to acquire specific materials or components, the costs of which may be reimbursed through progress payments. The committee believes that this situation may be further complicated by Federal Acquisition Regulations which do not allow progress payments for contracts valued at less than $150,000.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review: (1) the extent to which delays, if any, in first-article testing have negatively affected the capital and cash flow of contractors; (2) the extent to which delays, if any, in first-article testing have affected contracts valued at less than $150,000; (3) the reasons for delays in first-article testing, including whether the relevant Departmental testing agencies are adequately staffed to perform first-article testing in a timely manner; and (4) any additional items the Comptroller General deems relevant to the review. The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the above review, with a follow-on report delivered not later than May 15, 2016.

Requirements Process

While constructive statutory and policy changes have been applied to the Department of Defense's acquisition process in recent years, the committee remains concerned that a primary cause of cost and schedule growth in defense acquisition programs continues to be a lack of discipline and rigor in the requirements process. The committee has received testimony that "requirements creep" continues to occur after requirements are finalized by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council and handed off to the acquisition community. The committee has also received testimony that this cost growth can be attributed to a lack of upfront systems engineering and requirements trade-off analysis.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to examine the defense requirements process and to submit a report on any findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2016. The Comptroller General's review should determine: (1) whether requirements creep occurs during product development; (2) the role that systems engineering and requirements trade-off analysis, or lack thereof, plays in the development of top-level and derived requirements; (3) whether the knowledge gap between validated requirements and

weapon systems specifications is the cause of cost growth; and (4) ways to improve the requirements-setting process.

Secretary of Defense Review of Implementing Guidance and Regulation

In the committee's oversight and review of the defense acquisition system, it has identified factors that contribute to a less efficient and less responsive system, and found several cases in which the Department of Defense's implementation of congressionally-directed policy was inaptly applied. For example, while the committee required the Department to establish plans for mitigating corrosion over the life-cycle of weapon systems, recognizing that hardware such as ships, planes, and vehicles should be appropriately protected against the known effects of corrosion, the Department applied this requirement to the procurement of items such as software. This overreaction created an undue burden of reporting and approval processes throughout the acquisition system.

In another case, Congress mandated an annual report on the Department's spending on contracts for services because the relevant data aggregated in the budget justification documents was insufficient for congressional oversight and for enabling defense officials to make informed decisions with respect to contracting for services. However, the Department responded to this requirement by submitting an enormous spreadsheet of disaggregated data that is time consuming and resource intensive to produce and that provides little value to consumers, rather than working with Congress to develop a product that could benefit decision-makers in the Department and in Congress.

In both of these cases, the committee believes the policy guidance is sufficient, but it is concerned that the Department's implementation efforts ultimately lead to greater inefficiencies and increased costs in the acquisition system. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and the Senior Acquisition Executives of the military departments, to initiate a targeted review of Department of Defense guidance and regulations.

The goal of such a review should be to identify areas in which the guidance or regulation is causing unnecessary reporting, delays in decision-making, or other harmful consequences, and to take necessary steps to improve such guidance or regulation. While the committee expects such review may take many months, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2016, on initial findings of the review along with recommendations at that time for changes to guidance, regulation, or statute that may be needed to clarify congressional intent and to streamline implementation of congressionally-directed policy.

Shared Savings through Value Engineering

The committee notes that the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) issued final revisions to OMB Circular No. A–131, "Value Engineering" in December 2013. Value engineering encourages contractors to identify ways to reduce the cost of performance on exist-

ing contracts for goods and services and to share with the Government any savings produced. According to OMB, value engineering has generated billions of dollars of savings and cost avoidance. However, the committee is aware that the use of value engineering has waned in recent years and applauds OMB's efforts to reinvigorate its use where appropriate. The committee sees great potential for shared savings in the Department of Defense's current and future acquisitions to the extent tools such as value engineering are effectively implemented.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to complete a review not later than January 30, 2016, on the extent to which the Department is taking advantage of the opportunities for shared savings through greater use of value engineering in the acquisition of goods and services, the benefits it has achieved, barriers to effective implementation, and any unintended consequences. The committee further directs the Under Secretary to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2016, on the findings of the review along with any recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the Department's implementation of value engineering.

Small Business Implications of the Department of Defense Use of OASIS Contract Vehicle

The committee is aware of recent decisions by the Air Force and Army to move professional service contracts on to the General Service Administration's One Acquisition Services for Integrated Services (OASIS) contract vehicle. The committee understands that low overhead rates make the OASIS contract vehicle an affordable and attractive option to the Department of Defense. However, the committee is also aware of a number of small businesses who are currently executing professional services contracts for the Army and Air Force who do not believe they will be able to compete for OASIS contracts. The committee is concerned that the use of the OASIS contract vehicle by the Department of Defense may preclude some small businesses from competing for some of the same contracts they are executing today. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Small Business by October 15, 2015, on how small businesses will be affected by the OASIS contract vehicle, including a discussion of entry requirements which may be higher on OASIS than most other small business acquisition efforts.

Strategic Minerals Domestic Production Research

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Department of Defense to mitigate the risks associated with its dependence on foreign-sourced strategic minerals. The committee is also concerned that techniques used to extract and refine these materials are costly, inefficient, and utilize hazardous chemicals. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to make it a priority of the Department of Defense to identify, develop, document, and evaluate processes to domestically produce in-

dustrially viable quantities of strategic minerals in an affordable, energy-efficient, and environmentally safe manner.

Streamlining Acquisition Reviews by Reducing Unnecessary Documentation

The committee remains concerned that the process used to manage the acquisition of weapon systems is inefficient, cumbersome, and bureaucratic, and that an over-focus on processes and procedures takes time away from conducting day-to-day core program management tasks such as contractor oversight, engineering, and risk management. As a result, section 824 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) directed the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the Department of Defense weapon systems acquisition process to identify processes or procedures with little or no value added. The GAO completed the review (GAO–15–192) on February 24, 2015, and found that an extensive process has built up in which program offices and other Department of Defense organizations spend an enormous amount of time and effort preparing and reviewing documentation that does not appear to correspond to the value gained through that effort.

The committee notes that in April 2013, the Department proposed a pilot program to conduct streamlined acquisition reviews to reduce the burden of preparing and reviewing documentation for select acquisition programs. The Department set forth three criteria for programs to qualify: (1) have well defined requirements, (2) a strong relationship with industry, and (3) a highly qualified and appropriately staffed Government team that can remain with the program until the weapon system is delivered. However, the committee notes that in the almost two years since undertaking this effort, the Department has not identified programs which meet these criteria and is disappointed that the Department has been unable to conduct streamlined acquisition reviews. The committee considers this lack of progress as a symptom of the fundamental problems in the current acquisition system. The committee encourages the Department to redouble its effort to select appropriate acquisition programs for this important effort and looks forward to reviewing the Department's progress.

Elsewhere in this Act, in part at the request of the Department, the committee includes several provisions that would reduce and consolidate reporting requirements in order to help reduce this burden. The committee's goal is to reduce or eliminate documentation and levels of review where possible when they add little or no value.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to review how the Department is implementing acquisition statutes and regulations and, based on that review, take action within the Under Secretary's existing authorities to reduce and eliminate unnecessary documentation and reviews. The committee further directs the Under Secretary to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 25, 2015, on the Department's progress streamlining acquisition reviews, selecting programs to pilot test streamlined acquisition reviews and recommendations for revision or repeal of statutes that preclude streamlined acquisition reviews.

Study and Report Related to Mandates regarding Suitability for Selection as a Senior Official in the Acquisition Workforce

The committee is concerned that current processes and practices for recruiting, evaluating, and hiring senior officials in the acquisition workforce unnecessarily create hiring delays and limit the pool of highly qualified candidates that would otherwise be willing to accept a position in Government service. Therefore, the committee directs the Chair of the Defense Business Board to conduct a study of the effects of current mandates and processes regarding the determination of suitability for the selection of senior officials in the acquisition workforce. At a minimum, the assessment should examine the following:

(1) Nomination and confirmation processes;

(2) Inference of the need for, or specific direction to, potential candidates to divest themselves of financial holdings or other assets;

(3) Post-employment restrictions; and

(4) Any other statutory, regulatory, or cultural barriers that may have an unnecessarily detrimental effect on the ability of the Department of Defense to recruit, develop, and retain highly qualified senior acquisition personnel.

The committee further directs the Chair of the Defense Business Board to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2016, on the findings of the study and provide recommendations to improve the Department's ability to recruit, develop, and retain highly qualified senior acquisition personnel while appropriately mitigating real or perceived conflicts of interest.

Tracking of Contractor Personnel During Contingencies

The committee is aware that a February 2015 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report (GAO–15–250) found that the Department of Defense has "not updated its life-cycle cost estimate or fully defined and assessed its plans to determine all resources" needed to sustain and modernize the tools it uses to serve as a repository of information on contracts and contractor personnel in contingency operations. The committee notes that the Department currently uses the Synchronized Predeployment and Operational Tracker-Enterprise Suite for this purpose but has not updated its life-cycle cost estimate since 2010, despite changes in cost and schedule. The committee is aware that the Department concurred with the GAO recommendations in GAO–15–250 and encourages the Secretary of Defense to move forward in its implementation of the GAO recommendations in an expeditious manner.

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics Assessment of the Value, Feasibility, and Cost of Greater Utilization of HALT/HASS Testing

The committee remains concerned about issues of reliability in the design and development of critical military system components and subcomponents. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to assess the value, feasibility, and cost of greater

utilization of highly accelerated life testing and highly accelerated stress screening (HALT/HASS) methodology for ballistic missile defense systems and components and to report to the congressional defense committees on his findings and recommendations. This report served as a useful review of the potential benefits and limitations of employing this rigorous testing methodology.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, in consultation with the acquisition executives of each service, to assess the value, feasibility, and cost of greater utilization of this methodology to shorten design and development timelines, reduce system and component testing and lifecycle costs, and enhance reliability of critical military system components and subcomponents. The committee further directs the Under Secretary to submit a report no later than March 15, 2016, to the congressional defense committees on the findings of this assessment, including a description of any plans regarding the use of such methodology in on-going or future defense programs, along with any recommendations to improve the Department of Defense's efforts.

Use of Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable Source Selection Processes

The committee applauds recent efforts by the Department of Defense to cut costs and save taxpayer dollars in defense procurements. These efforts, such as the "Better Buying Power" initiatives, seek to achieve greater efficiencies through affordability, cost control, and the elimination of unproductive processes or bureaucracy. Such efforts also seek to promote competition. However, the committee is concerned that this well-intentioned effort by the Department to lower procurement costs has frequently resulted in the use of a lowest price, technically acceptable (LPTA) methodology when a best-value trade-off approach may have been in the best interests of the Government.

According to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, the goal of the acquisition system is to "deliver on a timely basis the best value product or service to the customer, while maintaining the public's trust and fulfilling public policy objectives." The committee is aware that regulations allow Department of Defense officials to elect to use the LPTA process in cases where the requirement is clearly defined and the risk of unsuccessful contract performance is minimal. In such cases, the Department may determine that cost or price should play a dominant role in the source selection. However, regulations also provide the Department of Defense the flexibility to use a trade-off process in acquisitions where the requirement is less definitive, more development work is required, or the acquisition has a greater performance risk. This approach allows for consideration of non-cost evaluation factors, such as technical capabilities or past performance.

The committee remains concerned that despite statutory and regulatory authorities which allow for flexibility in contracting approaches, Department of Defense personnel may be using LPTA strategies when mission performance is essential, or when requirements are not clearly defined or are emerging due to operational demands. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to take the necessary steps to ensure that contracting offi-

cials use LPTA contracting approaches only in appropriate circumstances such as those in which the requirement is clearly defined and the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to the mission is minimal.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 800—Sense of Congress on the Desired Tenets of the Defense Acquisition System

This section would express the sense of Congress that past acquisition reform efforts have not significantly changed the acquisition of military equipment and services. The committee proposes a different approach from previous efforts by seeking to improve the environment driving acquisition decisions in the Department of Defense, industry, and Congress. This section would identify key acquisition tenets that should govern the Department's acquisition system once reforms are implemented.

SUBTITLE A—ACQUISITION POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

Section 801—Report on Linking and Streamlining Requirements, Acquisition, and Budget Processes within Armed Forces

This section would require the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps to each submit a report to the congressional defense committees on their efforts to leverage their existing statutory authorities in a manner that links and streamlines their services' requirements, acquisition, and budget processes in order to foster improved outcomes. These reports will inform the committee's consideration of recommendations that the statutory authorities of the senior military officers should be expanded to provide additional influence on the acquisition system.

The committee is concerned that the requirements process, the acquisition system, and the budget process are not sufficiently aligned to provide a desirable outcome. Moreover, the committee believes that previous efforts to reform the defense acquisition system have failed to consider the role of the individuals and leaders, who are not a formal part of the acquisition workforce, in the outcomes generated by the system. The committee believes the senior military officer of each service, as well as military personnel who are not formally considered part of the acquisition workforce, are a critical part of the entire acquisition chain from requirements determination to the sustainment of a fielded system.

Furthermore, the committee is concerned that many uniformed personnel are placed in roles that require them to make decisions related to, or to provide oversight of, defense procurements, yet they are not considered part of the acquisition workforce and not subject to required training on these matters. Therefore, these personnel are generally not provided dedicated training to enable them to be successful in these duties. While many of these individuals have primary duty responsibilities in roles such as surface warfare officers, artillery officers, pilots, or infantrymen, they also have pivotal roles in requirements development, contract award or renewal, contract management and oversight, and budget processes. The committee believes there may be gaps in training and

preparation of these personnel, but is also aware that with high operational tempo and other professional military education requirements, the levying of additional training and education related to requirements, acquisition, and budget processes may not be feasible or could harm the career progression of these personnel by taking them away from their primary duties.

The committee notes that while the senior military officer of each service may not have broad authorities with respect to the acquisition process, the senior military officer has significant authority and influence with respect to the requirements and budgeting processes, as well as authority over all uniformed personnel, including those not considered part of the acquisition workforce, who are assigned to roles that require them to make decisions related to defense procurements. As a result, the committee believes that the senior military officers of each of the services are uniquely empowered to promote integration among the requirements, acquisition, and budget processes. This includes the training and development of all personnel to have a basic understanding of these complex matters.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee also includes a provision that would require the military service chiefs to review current authorities related to defense acquisitions for the purpose of developing such recommendations that the Chief concerned or the Commandant considers necessary to further or strengthen the role of the Chief concerned or the Commandant in the development of requirements, acquisition processes, and the associated budget practices of the Department of Defense.

Section 802—Required Review of Acquisition-related Functions of the Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps to review their current authorities provided in sections 3033, 5033, 5043, and 8033 of title 10, United States Code, and other relevant statutes and regulations related to defense acquisitions for the purpose of developing such recommendations that the Chief concerned or the Commandant considers necessary to further or strengthen the role of the Chief concerned or the Commandant in the development of requirements, acquisition processes, and the associated budget practices of the Department of Defense. This section would also require the Chief concerned and the Commandant to each submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2016, with recommendations developed as a result of the review and a description of the actions the Chief concerned or the Commandant is taking within the Chief's or Commandant's existing authorities to implement those recommendations.

Section 803—Independent Study of Matters Related to Bid Protests

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract, within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, with an independent research entity that is a not-for-profit entity or a federally funded research and development center with appropriate expertise and analytical capability to carry out a com-

prehensive study of factors leading to bid protests. The study shall examine the variable influences on the net benefit (monetary and non-monetary) to contractors either filing a protest or indicating intent to file a protest. This section would also require that not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent entity shall provide the results of the study along with any recommendations it may have to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees.

Section 804—Procurement of Commercial Items

This section would amend chapter 140 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain a centralized capability with the resources and expertise to oversee the making of commercial item determinations for Department of Defense procurements and to provide public access to Department of Defense commercial item determinations.

This section would also amend section 2306a(b) of title 10, United States Code, to allow the contracting officer to presume that a prior commercial item determination made by a military department, Defense Agency, or other component of the Department of Defense shall serve as a determination for subsequent procurements of such items. If the contracting officer instead proceeds with a procurement of an item previously determined to be commercial using procedures other than those authorized for commercial item procurement, this section would require the contracting officer to request a review of the prior commercial item determination by the head of the contracting activity. The section would require the head of the contracting activity to, within 30 days of receiving a request for review, either confirm that the prior determination was appropriate or issue a revised determination. The committee expects that in conducting such a review, the head of the contracting activity would consult with the centralized capability, required to be established by the Secretary of Defense under this section, to inform such determinations. Nothing in this section or the amendments made by this section shall affect the meaning of the term "commercial item" under subsection (a)(5) of section 2464 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 805—Modification to Information Required to be Submitted by Offeror in Procurement of Major Weapon Systems as Commercial Items

This section would amend section 2379 of title 10, United States Code, by striking the requirement that in making a determination that an item is a commercial item, the contracting officer shall determine in writing that the offeror of the item has submitted sufficient information to evaluate, through price analysis, the reasonableness of the price for such item.

Section 806—Amendment Relating to Multiyear Contract Authority for Acquisition of Property

This section would amend section 2306b(a) of title 10, United States Code, to allow the head of an agency to enter into multiyear contracts for the acquisition of property if there is a reasonable ex-

pectation that the use of a multiyear contract would result in lower total anticipated costs of carrying out the program than if the program were carried out through annual contracts. This section would strike the existing requirement that the head of an agency must determine that substantial savings would be achieved before entering into a multiyear contract.

Section 807—Compliance with Inventory of Contracts for Services

This section would limit the expenditure of funds authorized for the operation of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness until certain conditions are met regarding the Department of Defense's compliance with the requirement for an inventory of contracts for services.

The committee notes that the Under Secretary has not fully implemented the plan for documenting the number of full-time contractor employees required by section 8108(c) of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112–10), and has not fully complied with the requirement in section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, to establish a data collection system to provide management information with regard to each purchase of services by a military department or defense agency.

The committee further notes that in a May 9, 2014, letter to the Congress, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness stated that the Department of Defense had adopted "the reporting tool and successful processes that the Army has used for the past several years with its centralized Contractor Manpower Reporting Application (CMRA)" and that the CMRA software had been made available for all components. However, in January 2015, the Under Secretary's office briefed the committee that a "single application [is] less than ideal" and that the Under Secretary is now seeking to develop additional hardware, software, network, application, and user interface solutions for each component of the Department of Defense.

Additionally, the Under Secretary stated that "in [fiscal year] 2015 the Department will have additional dedicated resources in this area" by establishing a Total Force Management Support Office "to comprehensively implement [Enterprise] CMRA across the Department." However, the committee is aware that little has been done to establish such an office or otherwise define business processes for compiling, reviewing, and using inventory data to inform decision-making.

Furthermore, the committee is also aware that the Department's lack of progress on the inventory was confirmed by the Department of Defense Inspector General who reported on April 15, 2015, that of the 33 Components that submitted an inventory, only 10 Components included all 8 required elements in their certification letters.

The committee continues to believe an inventory of contracts for services is a fundamental tool for assisting an agency in better understanding how contracted services are being used to support missions and operations and whether contractors' skills are being utilized in an appropriate manner.

SUBTITLE B—WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED MATTERS

Section 811—Amendments to Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund

This section would amend section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority for both the Defense Acquisition Workforce Develop Fund and the associated expedited hiring authority.

Section 812—Dual-Track Military Professionals in Operational and Acquisition Specialties

This section would amend section 1722a of title 10, United States Code, by reinstituting a dual-tracking system of primary and functional secondary career fields for officers and noncommissioned officers serving in acquisition positions by dual-tracking such personnel in operational and acquisition career fields under the shared accountability and responsibility of the military service chiefs and component acquisition executives for career path management and selections. This section would create a needed balance of experience between acquisition and operations.

Section 813—Provision of Joint Duty Assignment Credit for Acquisition Duty

This section would amend section 668 of title 10, United States Code, by adding to the term "joint matters'" the inclusion of acquisition matters addressed by military personnel. This section would enable military acquisition professionals to broaden their promotion and career opportunities by making it easier for them to receive joint professional credit. It would also result in an end to the double experience requirement for military acquisition professionals who must meet the joint duty assignment requirement for promotion in addition to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code) certification requirement. Lastly, it would result in the award of joint duty assignment credit to officers who serve in acquisition positions, thus precluding acquisition assignments from impeding career progression.

Section 814—Requirement for Acquisition Skills Assessment Biennial Strategic Workforce Plan

This section would amend section 115b of title 10, United States Code, which requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a biennial strategic workforce plan on critical skills and competencies of the civilian employee workforce of the Department of Defense, to include an additional assessment of new or expanded critical skills and competencies needed by the civilian employee workforce to address new acquisition process requirements established by law or policy.

Section 815—Mandatory Requirement for Training Related to the Conduct of Market Research

This section would amend section 2377 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a requirement that the Secretary of Defense shall

provide mandatory training for members of the Armed Forces and employees of the Department of Defense responsible for the conduct of market research required under subsection (c) of section 2377 of title 10, United States Code. Such mandatory training shall, at a minimum:

(1) Provide comprehensive information on the subject of market research, and the function of market research in the acquisition of commercial items;

(2) Teach best practices for conducting and documenting market research; and

(3) Provide methodologies for establishing standard processes and reports for collecting and sharing market research across the Department.

Furthermore, this section would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to ensure that such training requirements are also incorporated into the requirements management certification training mandate of the Joint Capabilities Integration Development System.

Section 816—Independent Study of Implementation of Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Efforts

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, within 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to enter into a contract with an independent research entity that is a not-for-profit entity or a federally funded research and development center with appropriate expertise and analytical capability to carry out a comprehensive study of the Department of Defense's strategic planning related to the defense acquisition workforce. The study would provide a comprehensive examination of the Department's efforts to recruit, develop, and retain the acquisition workforce, to include: a specific review of the implementation of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (including chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code); the application of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund (as established under section 1705 of title 10, United States Code); and the effectiveness of professional military education programs, including fellowships and exchanges with industry.

This section would also require that the independent research entity provide a report to the Secretary, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, containing the results of the study and recommendations to improve the acquisition workforce. Furthermore, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the report, along with any additional views or recommendations of the Secretary, to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after the date of the Secretary's receipt of the report.

Section 817—Extension of Demonstration Project Relating to Certain Acquisition Personnel Management Policies and Procedures

This section would amend section 1762 of title 10, United States Code, by extending the demonstration project relating to certain acquisition personnel management policies and procedures through 2020.

SUBTITLE C—WEAPON SYSTEMS ACQUISITION AND RELATED MATTERS

Section 821—Sense of Congress on the Desired Characteristics for the Weapon Systems

Acquisition System This section would express the sense of Congress on the acquisition tenets needed to improve weapon system acquisitions. This section includes a series of findings that the current weapon systems acquisition system, despite significant and repeated attempts at acquisition reform, continues its track record of too many cancellations, schedule slippages, cost overruns, and failures to deliver timely solutions to meet the needs of the Armed Forces. This section would also propose that any new system should be characterized by highly disciplined program initiation, agile program execution, and balanced oversight.

Section 822—Acquisition Strategy Required for Each Major Defense Acquisition Program and Major System

This section would establish a new section in chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, that requires an acquisition strategy for each major defense acquisition program and each major system approved by a Milestone Decision Authority (MDA). This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to issue and maintain requirements for the content of these acquisition strategies as well as the review and approval process for these strategies. This section would also require the Under Secretary to ensure that each strategy addresses several considerations, including: the proposed business, technical management, and sustainment approaches; how it will be implemented with available resources; industrial base considerations; risk management approaches; contract strategies; and other considerations as required in current statute. Additionally, this section would require the MDA to review and approve, as appropriate, these acquisition strategies at key decision points in the acquisition process.

This section is intended to consolidate various existing requirements by allowing other statutory reporting requirements to be met with this single acquisition strategy requirement and to streamline the acquisition strategy approval process. This section also repeals section 803 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) that established specific requirements for spiral development strategies, many elements of which will now be met with this single acquisition strategy requirement.

Section 823—Revision to Requirements Relating to Risk Management in Development of Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Systems

This section would establish a new section in chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code, that requires the program acquisition strategy for each major defense acquisition program or major system to include an identification of major program risks and a risk management and mitigation strategy. This section would also provide acquisition programs with greater flexibility in the ways pro-

grammatic risk can be addressed beyond the competitive prototyping requirement in section 203 of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23).

Competitive prototyping remains an acquisition best practice, particularly as a means to reduce risk during technology development and the period leading up to the critical design review. However, the committee recognizes that prototyping may not be appropriate for all defense acquisition programs.

Finally, this section would repeal section 203 of Public Law 111–23.

Section 824—Modification to Requirements Relating to Determination of Contract Type for Major Defense Acquisition Programs and Major Systems

This section would amend section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new subsection, and repealing the requirements in certain subsections of section 818 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), relating to the modification of Department of Defense regulations. The committee expects the Department to adjust regulations and guidance as appropriate. The new subsection of section 2306 of title 10, United States Code, would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that an acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program, major system, or a major automated information system includes: an identification of and justification for the type of contract proposed; an explanation of how the contract type relates to the level of program risk; an explanation of how the use of incentives in the contract supports the objectives of the program; and an explanation of how the plans for the program or system to reduce risk enable the use of fixed-price elements in subsequent contracts.

The committee has observed that, over time, the Department has encouraged the use of one contract type over another and believes that Department should select appropriate contract types best suited to the program objectives and the level of program risk. Therefore, this section would also enable the Secretary of Defense to establish in guidance that the use of incentives in contracts can be appropriate.

Section 825—Required Determination before Milestone A Approval or Initiation of Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would amend section 2366a of title 10, United States Code, to require the Milestone Decision Authority to make a written determination, in lieu of a certification, before approving milestone A. This section would also require an explanation of the basis for the determination to be submitted to a congressional defense committee upon request.

The committee remains concerned that the process used to manage the acquisition of weapon systems is inefficient, cumbersome, and bureaucratic, and that an over-focus on paperwork and legal reviews takes time away from conducting day-to-day core program management tasks such as contractor oversight, engineering, and risk management. While the substantive program management work necessary to support a determination remains consistent with

that needed to support a certification, a determination requires less bureaucratic reviews of documentation than a certification. Because the Department would be required to make the basis for the determination available to the committee upon request, the committee would retain access to the information needed for oversight and accountability, while enabling a reduction in the time and effort the Department spends on processes that do not appear to provide much added value.

Section 826—Required Certification and Determination before Milestone B Approval of Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would amend section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, to require the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) to make a written determination, instead of a certification, for some of the existing certification requirements before approving milestone B. This section would also require an explanation of the basis for the determination to be submitted to a congressional defense committee upon request.

The committee remains concerned that the process used to manage the acquisition of weapon systems is inefficient, cumbersome, and bureaucratic, and that an over-focus on paperwork takes critical time away from conducting day-to-day core program management tasks such as contractor oversight, engineering, and risk management. The committee believes that requiring a determination by the MDA, instead of a legal certification, in certain cases could increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Department of Defense's acquisition review process, while reducing the time and effort the Department spends on processes that do not appear to provide much added value.

Because the milestone B approval represents a major commitment of resources by the Department, this section retains certain certification requirements, including of the business case itself, that the business case is supported by a preliminary design review, and that the technology to be used has been demonstrated. However, the committee believes some areas, such as market research, may only need a determination by the MDA. In those areas requiring a determination, the committee would retain access to the information needed for oversight and accountability because the Department would be required to make the basis for the determination available to the committee upon request.

SUBTITLE D—INDUSTRIAL BASE MATTERS

Section 831—Codification and Amendment of Mentor-Protege Program

This section would revise and codify section 831 the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510).

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense Mentor-Protege Program was established in 1991 to allow small businesses, or proteges, to partner with large companies, or mentors, under individual, project-based agreements to position those proteges to better compete for prime contract or subcontract awards. Mentors benefit by expanding their sourcing plans to these small firms; proteges benefit by developing needed business and technical

capabilities to diversify their customer base. Past reviews by the Government Accountability Office have indicated that "the Mentor-Protege Program was a valuable experience and enhanced business development" and that "[n]inety-three percent of responding proteges reported the Mentor-Protege Program enhanced, at least to some degree, their firms" overall capabilities." The committee believes that the Mentor-Protege Program is a valuable tool for the Department of Defense and is helpful in creating a strong foundation to see it used more broadly by the military services and agencies, and improve linkages between small, non-traditional contractors and larger, mainstream defense contractors.

Section 832—Amendments to Data Quality Improvement Plan

This section would amend section 15(s) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(s)) to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to annually provide to the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate certification of the accuracy and completeness of data reported on bundled and consolidated contracts. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the aforementioned committees not later than the first day of fiscal year 2019 on the effectiveness of the certification process and an assessment of whether contracts were accurately labeled as bundled or consolidated.

Section 833—Notice of Contract Consolidation for Acquisition Strategies

This section would amend section 44(c)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657q(c)(2)) to require the senior procurement executive or chief acquisition officer to announce through a public website that a determination has been made to bundle or consolidate contracts within 1 week of making the determination, but no later than 1 week prior to the issuance of a solicitation.

This section would also amend section 15(e)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(e)(3)) to require the head of a contracting agency to announce through a public website that a determination has been made regarding a substantial bundling of contracts for a proposed procurement plan no later than 1 week after such a determination is made, and at least 1 week prior to the publication of any solicitation.

Section 834—Clarification of Requirements Related to Small Business Contracts for Services

This section would amend section 8(a)(17) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(17)) to clarify that the statute applies to contracts for goods, but not services or construction. The committee notes that the non-manufacturer rule (NMR) was established to ensure that, when competition for a contract for goods is restricted to small businesses, the goods ultimately purchased were indeed the product of a small business. However, the committee is concerned that the NMR is being applied to services and construction contracts and could limit small business participants contracting for services and construction to the Federal Government. Therefore,

the committee believes this clarification to section 8(a)(17) is necessary.

Section 835—Review of Government Access to Intellectual Property Rights of Private Sector Firms

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with an independent entity with appropriate expertise to conduct a review of Department of Defense regulations and practices related to Government access to and use of intellectual property rights of private sector firms. In conducting the review, the independent entity shall consult with the National Defense Technology and Industrial Base Council. This section would require the Secretary to submit a report on the findings of the independent entity, along with a description of any actions that the Secretary proposes to revise and clarify laws or that the Secretary may take to revise or clarify regulations related to intellectual property rights to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2016.

Section 836—Requirement that Certain Ship Components be Manufactured in the National Technology and Industrial Base

This section would amend section 2534(a) of title 10, United States Code, and would require certain auxiliary ship components to be procured from a manufacturer in the national technology and industrial base.

Section 837—Policy Regarding Solid Rocket Motors Used in Tactical Missiles

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that every tactical missile program of the Department of Defense that uses solid propellant as the primary propulsion system shall have at least one rocket motor supplier within the national technology and industrial base (as defined in section 2500(1) of title 10, United States Code), and would allow the Secretary to waive this requirement in the case of compelling national security reasons.

Section 838—FAR Council Membership for Administrator of Small Business Administration

This section would amend section 1302 of title 41, United States Code, by adding the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council.

Section 839—Surety Bond Requirements and Amount of Guarantee

This section would amend chapter 93 of subtitle VI of title 31, United States Code, to increase the amount of surety bond guarantees from the Small Business Administration from 70 percent to 90 percent. It would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to study the surety bond program and to examine, among other issues, the impact of this amendment on such program.

Section 840—Certification Requirements for Procurement Center Representatives, Business Opportunity Specialists, and Commercial Market Representatives

This section would amend section 15 and section 4 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644 and 633, respectively) to set certification requirements for Commercial Market Representatives and to modify the current certification requirements for Procurement Center Representatives and Business Opportunity Specialists.

Section 841—Including Subcontracting Goals in Agency Responsibilities

This section would amend section 1633(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to include consideration of success in attainment of small business subcontracting goals as part of agency responsibilities.

Section 842—Modifications to Requirements for Qualified HUBZone Small Business Concerns Located in a Base Closure Area

This section would amend section 152(a)(2) of title I of division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (15 U.S.C. 632 note) to extend the length of time covered base closure areas may participate in the Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone) program to either eight years or until the Small Business Administration announces which areas will qualify for the HUBZone program after the next decennial census data is released. This section would also amend section 3(p)(5)(A)(i)(l) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(5)(A)(i)(I)) to include allowed covered base closure area HUBZone participants to meet the program's employment requirements by hiring 35 percent of their employees from any qualified HUBZone, and would amend section 3(p)(4)(D) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(p)(4)(D)) to extend physical boundaries of the covered base closure area, for purpose of the HUBZone program, to include lands within a 25 mile radius of the base.

Section 843—Joint Venturing and Teaming

This section would amend section 15(e)(4) and 15(q)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(e)(4) and 15 U.S.C. 644(q)(1), respectively) by requiring agencies to give due consideration to the capabilities and past performances of the small businesses that submit offers as teams or joint ventures when the contract is bundled, consolidated, or for a multiple award contract. The committee expects that the Administrator of the Small Business Administration will issue any regulations necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 851—Additional Responsibility for Director of Operational Test and Evaluation

This section would amend section 139 of title 10, United States Code, by including a new subsection that would require the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to consider the potential for increases in program cost estimates or delays in schedule estimates in the implementation of policies, procedures, and activities related to operational test and evaluation, and to take appropriate action to ensure that the conduct of operational test and evaluation activities do not unnecessarily impede program schedules or increase program costs.

Section 852—Use of Recent Prices Paid by the Government in the Determination of Price Reasonableness

This section would amend section 2306a of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new paragraph that would require a contracting officer to consider evidence provided by an offeror of recent purchase prices paid by the Government for the same or similar commercial items in establishing price reasonableness if the contracting officer is satisfied that the prices previously paid remain a valid reference for comparison after considering the totality of other relevant factors such as time elapsed since prior purchase and any difference in quantities purchased or applicable terms and conditions.

Section 853—Codification of Other Transaction Authority for Certain Prototype Projects

This section would make permanent the other transactions authority (OTA) for contracting established in section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160), as modified most recently by section 812 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). This section would also make changes to the authority to use such contracting mechanisms to clarify that all participants to the contract be small business or nontraditional defense contractors, unless exceptional circumstances exist that require innovative business arrangements that are not feasible under another contract type.

OTA has been an effective tool for research and development contracts, particularly for innovative organizations like the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency. Due to the ability to tailor the contracting language and thus eliminating many aspects of the Federal acquisition regulations that may not be pertinent, OTA requires some discretion to allow for effective and seamless execution. The benefits of this flexibility have been recognized most recently by the Air Force, which would like to extensively rely on OTA contracting vehicles to more rapidly acquire information technology systems. The committee supports the Department of Defense in using flexible tools for its contracting and believes such permanence will give the Department additional confidence in the type of experimentation and organizational learning that is necessary if the Department is to remain competitive in the commer-

cial marketplace. The committee will continue to review efforts utilizing such contracting mechanisms to prevent abuse or misuse by the Department.

Section 854—Amendments to Certain Acquisition Thresholds

This section would amend section 134 of title 41, United States Code, by raising the simplified acquisition threshold from $100,000 to $500,000. The committee is aware that section 807 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375) requires an adjustment every 5 years of acquisition related thresholds for inflation, except for Davis-Bacon Act, Service Contract Act, and trade agreements thresholds, using the Consumer Price Index for all urban consumers. The committee notes that the current adjusted simplified acquisition threshold is $150,000. However, the committee believes changing the simplified acquisition threshold to $500,000 will further enable Federal agencies to buy products and services more quickly, more economically, and with a focus on small businesses.

In order to maintain parity with other established thresholds, this section would also amend section 1902 of title 41, United States Code, by raising the micro-purchase threshold from $3,000 to $5,000. Furthermore, this section would also amend section 1903 of title 41, United States Code, by raising the special emergency procurement authority threshold for purchases inside the United States from $250,000 to $750,000 and raising the threshold for such authority for purchases outside the United States from $1.0 million to $1.5 million.

Finally, this section would amend section 15(j)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(j)(1)) by raising the small business reservation threshold from $100,000 to $500,000.

Section 855—Revision of Method of Rounding When Making Inflation Adjustment of Acquisition-Related Dollar Thresholds

This section would amend section 1908(e)(2) of title 41, United States Code, to change the rounding method that is used when scheduled adjustments are made to certain acquisition-related dollar thresholds, such as the simplified acquisition threshold. Specifically, this section would apply the rounding to the dollar threshold calculated after the adjustment is made based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for all-urban consumers. The current method rounds the value of the threshold on the day before the adjustment is calculated and then applies the adjustment based on CPI. Further, this section would provide additional guidance for rounding increments for acquisition-related thresholds that are $10.0 million or more up to more than $1.00 billion.

The committee notes that section 1908 of title 41 provides for an inflation adjustment every 5 years of acquisition-related dollar thresholds that are specified in law as a factor in defining the scope of the applicability of the policy, procedure, requirement, or restriction to the procurement of property or services by an executive agency, as determined by the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council. However, the committee is concerned that the current rounding procedures can, in some circumstances, lead to an inconsistent and inappropriate level of rounding.

Section 856—Repeal of Requirement for Stand-Alone Manpower Estimates for Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would consolidate the statutory requirement for a detailed manpower estimate prior to approval of development or production and deployment of a major defense acquisition program as established by section 2434 of title 10, United States Code, with the independent estimate of the full life-cycle cost of the program also required by section 2434.

The committee notes that the planning, inventory, and reporting requirements of section 129a of title 10, United States Code, may also assist in fulfilling the intent of the requirement for manpower estimates for major defense acquisition programs, which is to ensure the life-cycle cost of the program, including sustainment, is considered early in the acquisition process and so personnel decisions and training requirements can be identified in time to take appropriate action.

Section 857—Examination and Guidance Relating to Oversight and Approval of Services Contracts

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to complete an examination by March 1, 2016, of the decision authority related to acquisition of services and to develop and promulgate guidance to improve capabilities related to services contracts requirements development, source selection, and contract oversight and management.

Section 858—Streamlining of Requirements Relating to Defense Business Systems

This section would revise section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify responsibilities for the management of defense business systems. As a result, this section would repeal the current reporting requirement contained in section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, and insert a new annual reporting requirement through the year 2020 on the revised requirements of section 2222.

Section 859—Consideration of Strategic Materials in Preliminary Design Review

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to ensure that Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02 and other applicable guidance receive full consideration during preliminary design review for strategic materials requirements over the life cycle of the product.

Section 860—Procurement of Personal Protective Equipment

This section would ensure the Secretary of Defense uses best value contracting methods to the maximum extent practicable when procuring an item of personal protective equipment.

Section 861—Amendments Concerning Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts

This section would amend section 818(c)(2)(B) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81)

to expand the eligibility for covered contractors to include costs associated with rework and corrective action related to counterfeit electronic parts as allowable costs under Department of Defense contracts.

The committee expects that, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense will revise the Department of Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation to conform with the changes made by this section.

Section 862—Revision to Duties of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering

This section would amend section 139b of title 10, United States Code, to strengthen the authority of the Milestone Decision Authority (MDA) by clarifying that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation and the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering advise the MDA regarding review and approval of developmental test plans and systems engineering plans. Under existing statute, both these positions review and approve or disapprove those plans. The committee is proposing this change to streamline decision-making authority and strengthen accountability by ensuring that the MDA is fully responsible for determining whether a program is ready to proceed into the next phase of acquisition.

Section 863—Extension of Limitation on Aggregate Annual Amount Available for Contract Services

This section would amend section 808 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as most recently amended by section 813 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. Buck McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), by extending for 1 year the temporary limitation on the aggregate annual amounts available for contract services for the Department of Defense.

Section 864—Use of Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable Evaluation Method for Procurement of Audit or Audit Readiness Services

This section would state a series of findings related to the use of the lowest price, technically acceptable (LPTA) evaluation method for the procurement of audit or audit readiness services. It would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish values and metrics for the services being procured and review the offeror's past performance before using an LPTA evaluation method for the procurement of such services.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Improving Agility in Shaping the Workforce

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should strive for balance when managing the total workforce in response to significant financial constraints. As such, the committee believes that, commensurate to military end strength reductions occurring in response to the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) and to sequestration-level funding, reductions in Department of Defense civilian and contractor personnel should be part of a sensible approach to personnel management. However, the committee also believes that any personnel reductions should be done smartly and aim to retain high-performing personnel with the requisite talents, multidisciplinary knowledge, and up-to-date skills to help the Department remain agile in addressing the growing array of diverse threats facing the country and missions assigned to the Department.

However, the committee notes that managing employee performance has been a longstanding Government-wide issue and the subject of numerous reforms since the beginning of the modern civil service. A February 2015 report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO–15–19) indicated that without effective performance management, agencies run the risk of losing or failing to utilize the skills of top performers, and also risk failing to recognize and correct or remove poor performers. The GAO also reported that even a small number of poor performers can negatively affect employee morale and the capacity of agencies to meet its mission requirements.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has struggled in the past with building a system aimed at performance management. It recognizes the Department's continued focus on personnel management and supports the Department's ongoing efforts to improve its performance management system and appraisal process. However, in the current fiscal environment, the committee believes that the Department may need additional flexibility to manage the workforce. The committee seeks to provide the Secretary of Defense with the necessary authority and support to exercise such flexibility. The committee will continue working with the Department to enable it to make the tough decisions necessary for shaping and managing the workforce and to provide the Department with the tools necessary to recruit, hire, develop, and retain the best and brightest men and women to serve and support the Nation.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than June 30, 2015, on any legislative authority or regulatory policies in place that limit the Secretary of Defense's ability to appropriately balance the military, civilian, and contractor personnel within the Department. As part of this briefing, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide an evaluation of the Federal regulations governing the credit for performance that the Department

uses in its determination of personnel retention standing, with a specific focus on how it impacts the Department's ability to retain high-quality personnel.

Productivity Goals

The committee is aware that the Defense Business Board (DBB) completed the report "Transforming Department of Defense's Core Business Processes for Revolutionary Change" in January 2015. The review took a rigorous, data-driven view of Department of Defense business operations to help identify a potential for $125.0 billion in savings over the next 5 years. In its findings, the DBB identified several institutional reforms that could provide significant savings to the Department, including early retirements and reductions in service contractors. It also noted that key enablers to realizing those savings will be focused, concerted efforts to retain institutional memory, as well as addressing key technology obsolescence challenges.

The committee believes that it is important to further explore the recommendations of the DBB's review in order for Congress to fully debate the merits, as well as the potential pitfalls, of each of the DBB's suggestions. Much like the push to achieve auditability, the committee believes that such institutional reform will be necessary to maximize productivity from the Department's funds so that "saved" dollars can be redirected to important training, readiness, and modernization challenges facing the warfighter.

In particular, the committee believes that the Department should use the Defense Business Board's analysis of productivity goals as a valuable metric that should be institutionalized. Such productivity metrics may provide a more useful analytical measure of workload output than some goals that have traditionally been used by the Department, such as reductions in the number of personnel billets or reductions in funding levels. Not only will this be helpful to continue to inculcate an attitude of measurable efficiency in the culture of the workforce, but it will provide a useful analytic tool for making cost-benefit tradeoffs on workforce levels, facilities, and other areas of the budget traditionally considered overhead or support functions.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 901—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps, and change the title of its Secretary to the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps. This section would formally recognize the responsibility of the Office of the Secretary of the Navy over both the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Marine Corps' status as an equal partner with the Navy.

Section 902—Change of Period for Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Review of the Unified Command Plan

This section would amend section 161(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, by modifying the requirement for the Chairman of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff to review the Unified Command Plan (UCP), including the missions, responsibilities, and force structure of each combatant command, from not less than every 2 years to not less than every 4 years. This modification would better align the UCP review with the Defense Strategy Review, required by section 118 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

Section 903—Update of Statutory Specification of Functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Relating to Joint Force Development Activities

This section would amend section 153 of title 10, United States Code, relating to functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to reflect additional joint force integration functions already overseen by the Chairman resulting from the disestablishment of United States Joint Forces Command on August 31, 2011, and the subsequent deletion of that command from the Unified Command Plan.

Section 904—Sense of Congress on the United States Marine Corps

This section would express a series of findings regarding the global security environment and the importance of the United States Marine Corps, as recognized by the 82nd Congress. This section would also express a sense of Congress reaffirming the Marine Corps' composition and functions as codified in section 5063 of title 10, United States Code, and reaffirming its responsibility as the nation's expeditionary, crisis response force.

The committee notes that similar to the duties of the other military service chiefs, the Commandant of the Marine Corps is charged with significant responsibilities to organize, train, and equip Fleet Marine Forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet. The committee believes the Secretary of the Navy should recognize the particular interests of the Marine Corps and should continue to fully enable the Commandant to represent those interests in the same manner as the other military service chiefs.

In this regard, the committee appreciates that particular care must be taken by the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that the Marine Corps, which has fewer personnel to devote to staff duty than the Navy, receives evenhanded treatment in organizing, manning, establishing work priorities, and otherwise structuring and operating within the consolidated Department of the Navy. The committee believes the Secretary's office, and those of the assistant secretaries, should include appropriate numbers of Marine generals and other Marine officers to ensure that the interests of the Marine Corps will be represented and that the Commandant will receive appropriate support from these offices. Finally, the committee also intends that the Headquarters, Marine Corps, shall have an appropriate share of the total number of general officers, other members of the Armed Forces, and civilian employees of the Department of the Navy for the Office of the Secretary of the Navy, the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Headquarters, Marine Corps.

Section 905—Additional Requirements for Streamlining of Department of Defense Management Headquarters

This section would express a series of findings and the sense of Congress on the commitment of the Department of Defense to reduce its headquarters budgets and personnel by 20 percent and to achieve $10.00 billion in cost savings over 5 years. It would also amend section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), which requires the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for streamlining Department of Defense management headquarters, by requiring an accurate baseline accounting of defense headquarters budgets and personnel, and more specific information on actual and planned reductions in management headquarters. In addition, this section would further modify section 904 of Public Law 113–66 to require the Department to implement its planned reduction in management headquarters budgets and personnel for certain organizations in the National Capital Region. Lastly, it would clarify that civilian employees funded from working-capital funds are not subject to the reduction requirement.

The committee notes that the Department has already claimed the savings associated with these reductions in the budget requests provided since the 20 percent goal was established in 2013. While the committee is interested in ensuring that true cost savings result from these efficiencies, the committee also desires to ensure that any reductions are taken in a manner that increase the performance, accountability, and agility of the Department. Moreover, the committee encourages the Department to take the actions necessary to establish accurate baselines and plans against which progress can be measured.

Section 906—Sense of Congress on Performance Management and Workforce Incentive System

This section would express a series of findings on the efforts by the Department of Defense to institute a performance management and appraisal system for employees, named "New Beginnings," as required by section 1113 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). It would also express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should proceed with the collaborative work with employee representatives on the new system and implement it at the earliest possible date.

Section 907—Guidelines for Conversion of Functions Performed by Civilian or Contractor Personnel to Performance by Military Personnel

This section would amend section 129a of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section that establishes guidelines for the conversion of functions performed by civilian or contractor personnel to performance by military personnel.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Counter-Drug Authority Regarding Support to Certain Foreign Governments

The committee notes the importance of the counter-drug authority (the section "1033" authority), which allows the Department of Defense to provide equipment for the counter-drug activities of designated foreign governments. This authority originated in section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) and, at the time, designated two South American governments as eligible to receive support with an annual funding cap of $9.0 million. Since then, the number of designated countries eligible for support under this authority has grown to 39 foreign governments over 4 continents, and the annual funding cap has grown to $125.0 million. This growth reflects the expanding reach and threat of drug traffickers and the globalization of transnational organized crime.

The committee believes consideration should be given as to whether this authority should remain a country-by-country authority or become a global authority. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, on the status of the section "1033" authority. The briefing should include an assessment of the following: the historical use of the authority and of the authority as it currently stands; the evolution of requirements behind the expansion of countries; the evolution of requirements behind the expansion of the funding cap; how countries and regions are prioritized; the advantages and disadvantages of a country-by-country versus global authority; and the funding challenges associated with a country-by-country versus global authority. Finally, the Secretary is directed to make the briefing available, upon request, to the other congressional defense committees.

Counternarcotics and Global Threats Strategy

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is updating its Counternarcotics and Global Threats Strategy, which was last updated in 2011, to ensure that it has an up-to-date strategy that meets current and emerging threats and security challenges.

While the 2011 strategy effectively laid out the goals that the Department of Defense seeks to achieve, the committee is concerned that it did not articulate a sound strategy to achieve those goals. Given the growing demand for increasingly limited resources, the committee is interested in ensuring that the Department of Defense has specific strategic plans, which are country and regionally based, that utilize authorities and resources in an effective and sustainable way to achieve measurable goals.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide an addendum to the Department of Defense's Counternarcotics and Global Threats Strategy. The Department of Defense shall include the following components in its updated strategy:

(1) An assessment of the historical use of counternarcotics authorities and how well-suited these authorities are to address current and emerging threats;

(2) An analysis of the evolution of the expansion of the number of countries touched by each authority and what is driving the expansion;

(3) An analysis of the authorities as they stand currently, while identifying strengths and weaknesses of each authority; and

(4) An analysis of funding challenges.

The strategy should also include specific plans for each country where counternarcotics authorities are utilized, as well as regional strategic plans. For both the country and regional plans, the strategy shall include the following:

(1) Specific goals for each country and region and metrics to measure progress towards achieving each goal;

(2) How each counternarcotics authority fits into each strategic plan and the limitations of each authority; and

(3) How training and/or equipment provided under each authority provides a sustainable and lasting effect.

The committee further directs the Secretary to provide the addendum to the Department of Defense's Counternarcotics and Global Threats Strategy to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives upon completion of the strategy.

National Guard Counterdrug Programs

The committee acknowledges the continued contributions of the National Guard to domestic counterdrug programs. The National Guard, working with law enforcement agencies and community-based organizations, performs interdiction and anti-drug activities to counter illicit drug trafficking. It also operates regional counterdrug training centers across the country to provide education and training to local, State, and Federal law enforcement in counternarcotics and global threat reduction efforts.

For the past 5 fiscal years, the budget request for National Guard Counterdrug Programs has not included sufficient funds to meet program requirements. Recognizing this shortfall in funding, Congress has consistently provided additional funds to enable the Guard to meet its requirements. However, this additional funding has been made available for execution by the Guard in the third or fourth quarter of the fiscal year, making it difficult for the Guard to execute it by the end of the fiscal year. The committee recognizes that this is not the most efficient or effective way to plan for and execute a successful program. The committee continues to encourage the Department of Defense to submit an accurate budget request for National Guard Counterdrug Programs consistent with its requirements.

However, the committee also believes that, with appropriate planning, the National Guard should be able to obligate and expend additional funds, if made available, for its counterdrug programs even if received late in the fiscal year. Therefore, the committee directs the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to brief the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than October 1, 2015, on the Guard's plan for how it can improve its execution of additional funding should the program receive it.

Lastly, as the tight fiscal environment continues, the committee continues to encourage the National Guard, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, to refine its priorities and missions.

Unaccompanied Alien Children

In calendar year 2014, approximately 65,000 unaccompanied alien children (UAC) from Central America traveled through Mexico and crossed over the U.S. southern border. This number has grown exponentially over the past 3 years. In 2014, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) was overwhelmed with the rate at which these children were crossing the border. At the request of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Defense entered into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with HHS to provide vacant facilities on Department of Defense installations to temporarily house up to 7,700 children until they could be placed in the care of a relative or other sponsor while their immigration status was determined. The Department of Defense made available facilities at three military installations across the country and the committee acknowledges the efficiency with which the Department performed these tasks.

The Department of Health and Human Services estimates that the number of UACs crossing the southern border in calendar year 2015 is expected to be similar to 2014. In February 2015, HHS and the Department of Defense entered into a second MOU for continued Department of Defense support, if the need arises, to house UACs while they are being processed and placed. The committee commends the interagency for its cooperation on this matter but also recognizes the need for the Department of Defense to maintain its readiness and support its primary missions. The committee recognizes the efforts of the Department of Defense, in its calendar year 2014 review of facilities capable of housing UACs, to coordinate with installation commanders to ensure that the use of facilities in support of HHS would not disrupt scheduled facility maintenance, training activities, or military operations.

The committee encourages both the Departments of Defense and HHS to be as transparent as possible and to improve communications with communities and Congress when a facility is being considered for use. The committee believes the Secretary of Defense should evaluate many factors when determining which facilities can be made available to support HHS under the MOU. The committee expects that any Department of Defense assistance to HHS should not impact any scheduled maintenance, training, housing plans, or exercises to be executed by the Department during calendar year 2015.

Western Hemisphere Maritime Intelligence

The committee notes that the U.S. Navy has reduced its maritime security operations in the Western Hemisphere and, as a result, the U.S. Coast Guard has been increasingly relied upon to conduct such operations. However, neither the Navy nor Coast Guard have sufficient assets or capabilities in the Western Hemisphere to provide accurate and timely maritime intelligence information to support these operations.

The committee believes that the unique assets of the Department of Defense, specifically those operated by U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) and U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM), may be able to provide this intelligence information, but the committee lacks a full understanding of the maritime security intelligence gaps in the Western Hemisphere, the specific intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities that could be brought to bear against these gaps, and the options for improving intelligence sharing with the Coast Guard.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2015, on the following:

(1) The maritime intelligence requirements in the Western Hemisphere and the extent to which they are being fulfilled or planned to be fulfilled;

(2) An assessment of ISR assets and capabilities that NORTHCOM and SOUTHCOM could employ to fulfill unmet requirements;

(3) Options for how to improve maritime intelligence sharing with the Coast Guard to assist with maritime security operations; and

(4) The planned U.S. Navy presence in the SOUTHCOM area of responsibility in fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017.

OTHER MATTERS

Adequacy of Support Assets for Asia

The committee notes that in his January 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance, the President announced that while the U.S. military would continue to contribute to security globally, it would of necessity rebalance toward the Asia-Pacific region since U.S. economic and security interests were inextricably linked to development in the region. Further, the Defense Strategic Guidance stated that the maintenance of peace, stability, the free flow of commerce, and U.S. influence in the Asia-Pacific region would depend in part on an underlying balance of military capability and presence.

In light of the direction provided by the Defense Strategic Guidance, the March 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) posited that the United States will maintain a robust footprint in Northeast Asia while enhancing U.S. presence in, Southeast Asia, and the Indian Ocean. Specifically, the QDR called for 60 percent of U.S. Navy assets to be stationed in the Pacific by 2020; an increase in the size of Navy, Air Force, and Marine contingents on Guam; an increased U.S. military presence in Australia; and the maintenance of a viable, substantial U.S. Army presence on the Korean peninsula and in Northeast Asia. Finally, in February 2014, the President underscored the country's continued commitment to rebalancing the U.S. military toward the Asia-Pacific region in his National Security Strategy, while also noting that the security dynamics of the region, including contested maritime territorial claims and a provocative North Korea, risk escalation and conflict.

The committee also notes that this rebalancing follows almost 70 years of United States primary strategic focus on defense of Western Europe and almost 13 years of conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan

that have, in large measure, eroded the U.S. military's ability to conduct full-spectrum operations. Moreover, this rebalancing will occur in a period of increasing fiscal constraint. Nevertheless, in order to support the rebalance to Asia and the Pacific, it is important that U.S. Pacific Command and its subordinate commands have access to the correct mix of support assets, especially given the vast distances that define the theater as well as the range of potential threats in the theater.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 30, 2016, that evaluates the Department of Defense's support capabilities for current and future operations in the Asia-Pacific region, including an assessment of the following:

(1) The extent to which the Department of Defense has identified support asset requirements, including related funding needs, to enable current and future operations in the region. Such support assets could include, but are not limited to, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; sea and air lift; command and control; logistical sustainment; pre-positioned stocks; and any other assets commanders in the region think necessary for the accomplishment of missions across the range of military operations;

(2) The adequacy of the existing support assets to meet operational requirements given the enlarged U.S. presence in the region; and

(3) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to support capabilities in the Asia-Pacific Region.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings.

Attendance at Professional and Technical Conferences

The committee is concerned that many organizations within the Department of Defense have either eliminated or severely restricted temporary duty travel for professional and technical conferences. While the committee supports efforts to reduce non-essential costs, the committee believes such conferences provide value by enabling Department of Defense engineers, scientists, and other technical personnel to share research, learn about cutting-edge innovations, and interact with their peers from across the country and the world. Furthermore, the committee recognizes that the formal presentation of one's own research to the broader technical community is often a requisite for professional advancement within that technical community.

The committee is aware that in a February 2014 memorandum, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics directed the Secretaries of the military departments, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, and the directors of the defense science and technology agencies to "give appropriate consideration to the importance of attendance at technical symposia and conferences that enhance communication between Department of Defense acquisition professionals and their industry counterparts." The memo went further to provide the Under Secretary's "support [for] properly justified attendance by

Department of Defense personnel to the extent possible, subject to the availability of resources, including travel funds."

The committee supports the Under Secretary's guidance on this matter but is concerned that the lengthy and complex approval processes to enable conference attendance by Federal employees is unduly hampering the ability of academic and scientific personnel in the Department of Defense to perform their jobs, may inhibit career progression, and could discourage personnel with highly technical skills and competencies from entering the workforce.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the Department of Defense policies related to professional travel and to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2015, on findings and recommendations necessary to further enable professional development of the workforce.

Comptroller General Review of Drawdown Authority

Since 1961, the President has had special authority to order the "drawdown" of defense articles and other services or military education and training from the Department of Defense and military service inventories and transfer them to foreign countries or international organizations. This authority, as outlined in section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–195), as amended, allows the President to provide this assistance without first seeking additional authority or appropriations from Congress.

The committee has observed what appears to be an increasing use of such authority in recent years to provide defense articles and services to such countries as Ukraine, the Republic of Iraq, the French Republic (for its operations in the Republic of Mali), and those supporting the African Union-led Central African Republic International Support Mission. While the committee does not dispute the merits of providing defense articles and services to such countries, it is concerned about the use of such authority as a way to circumvent Congress and the impact it may have on U.S. military stockpiles and readiness.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office last examined this issue in 2002, as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107). Its 2002 report (GAO–02–1027) noted that drawdowns had been used with greater frequency and that the Department was unable to systemically track and accurately report to Congress on the status of these drawdowns. The committee believes that an updated examination of the drawdown authority is warranted, including whether the use of the authority is achieving its intended purposes, and the impact, if any, on U.S. defense inventories (military stockpiles and readiness), as well as U.S. Government resources.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of drawdown authority and submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, not later than December 8, 2015, to include the following:

(1) To what extent has the authority to drawdown U.S. defense inventories been utilized to assist foreign countries or international organizations in addressing security threats, and what parameters were used to determine whether to provide assistance through this

special drawdown authority or other security assistance authorities;

(2) The types of requirements that were met through this assistance, including the extent to which U.S. assistance provided through inventory drawdowns supported U.S. efforts to build partner capacity and supported the efforts of other nations to undertake operations that are in the U.S. interest;

(3) To what extent the executive branch has managed this drawdown authority to ensure that it is used appropriately, including the extent to which other authorities are considered and duplication of other U.S. or international efforts is minimized; and

(4) To what extent have drawdowns affected the readiness of the military services, to specifically include whether such drawdowns reduce the availability of defense articles (e.g., weapon systems) and spare parts needed for the military services to complete their missions; require the use of operation and maintenance funds to support drawdowns (e.g., refurbishing or repairing items and providing spare parts); and to what extent mechanisms exist for the military services to provide input regarding potential effects on readiness when decisions regarding drawdowns are under consideration.

Comptroller General Review of Homeland Response Forces

The National Guard has completed fielding 10 regionally aligned Homeland Response Forces to assist civil authorities in responding to disasters, including Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and Explosives (CBRNE) incidents. The Homeland Response Forces are also meant to serve as a bridge between initial National Guard response to an incident and the arrival of assistance from Federal military forces. Each Homeland Response Force is designed to provide life-saving, command and control, and security capabilities and is expected to plan, train, and exercise within its designated region with the goal of establishing links between local, State, and Federal authorities. Previous Government Accountability Office work identified personnel, training, equipment, and command and control challenges with related National Guard response forces that could materially affect the preparedness or operational effectiveness of the Homeland Response Forces.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the preparedness of the Homeland Response Forces to accomplish their mission. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing on preliminary results of the assessment to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016. The assessment should address the following:

(1) The current state of readiness of each Homeland Response Force with respect to personnel, training, and equipment on hand, and their capability to respond to CBRNE events.

(2) The extent to which the Department of Defense has integrated the Homeland Response Forces operationally with other Federal and State-level response forces, including the National Guard's Civil Support Teams and CBRNE Enhanced Response Force Packages, and the Defense CBRNE Force.

(3) Any related matters the Comptroller General finds appropriate.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide the Comptroller General's final results to the House Committee on Armed Services at a subsequent date and format to be agreed upon at the time of briefing.

Comptroller General Review of Pandemic Civil Support Planning

Planning activities across Federal Government agencies, including the Department of Defense, are key to responding to a potential outbreak in the United States of a pandemic disease. The Federal Government anticipates an influenza pandemic would occur in multiple waves over a period of time, rather than as a discrete event. During the peak weeks of an outbreak of a severe influenza pandemic, an estimated 40 percent of the U.S. workforce may not be at work due to illness, the need to care for family members who are sick, or fear of infection.

The Department of Defense would play a key role in responding to a domestic outbreak of a pandemic disease by supporting domestic civil authorities in accordance with the National Response Framework. Coordination with Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial authorities, as well as private sector partners, to plan, train, and exercise a coordinated response may prove essential. This coordination and support would be complicated, because a large number of Department of Defense personnel could potentially be affected by an influenza pandemic, which could adversely affect the military's readiness.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department of Defense's planning to support civil authorities in the event of a pandemic disease outbreak and to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2016, on the preliminary results. The review should address the following:

(1) To what extent has the Department of Defense planned for supporting civil authorities in the event of a domestic outbreak of a pandemic disease?

(2) To what extent has the Department of Defense coordinated with Federal, State, local, tribal, and territorial authorities, and the private sector, in preparation for a domestic outbreak of a pandemic disease?

(3) To what extent has the Department of Defense conducted or participated in training exercises with civil authorities and private sector emergency medical response teams in preparation for a domestic outbreak of a pandemic disease?

(4) Any related matters the Comptroller General finds appropriate.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide the Comptroller General's final results to the House Committee on Armed Services at a subsequent date and format to be agreed upon at the time of briefing.

Comptroller General Review of Transferring Improvised Explosive Device Knowledge and Technology Gained by Department of Defense to Civil Authorities

The committee is aware that the Comptroller General of the United States is conducting a review of Federal Government coordi-

nation efforts to counter improvised explosive devices (IEDs) in the United States.

The committee encourages the Comptroller General to continue this review and to include within its analysis a review of Department of Defense support to civil authorities for counter-IED activities. The committee believes that there are considerable amounts of expertise, technologies, and capabilities resident within the Department of Defense for the counter-IED mission that could now be leveraged for domestic use and to assist Federal, State, and local authorities charged with counter-IED missions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the status of the ongoing review of Federal Government coordination efforts to counter improvised explosive devices in the United States.

Congressional Review of Federal Acquisition Regulation Rulemaking

The committee is concerned about the often lengthy rulemaking process associated with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). The FAR Operating Guide, which details the process, states that the standard timeline for FAR cases is 16 months from the time a report is submitted with a draft proposed or interim rule to the final publication of the rule. A variety of stakeholders have expressed concerns to the committee that the FAR Council often fails to publish these rules in a timely manner or even meet this standard 16 month timeline goal.

The committee is aware that the FAR rulemaking process is unique in that it does not follow the typical Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (OIRA) processes. Such rulemaking begins by going through the FAR Council process, which includes several layers of approval that include the Defense Acquisition Regulatory Council (DARC), Civilian Agency Acquisition Council (CAAC), General Services Administration (GSA), Office of Federal Procurement Policy (OFPP), and OIRA. After the FAR Council process, rules are then sent for a final check through the OIRA clearance process before publication as a final rule. The committee notes that the FAR Council, CAAC, and DARC all have members representing various agencies and are all expected to reach consensus on these rules, which can be very complex.

The committee believes that the FAR rulemaking process should be reviewed with the goals of improving the timeliness of this process and identifying efficiencies which could improve the process. Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy to conduct such a review and provide a briefing to House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform not later than September 30, 2015, on the findings of the review. The briefing should include recommendations for improving the FAR rulemaking process.

Counter Threat Financing and Analytic Tools

The committee recognizes that illicit financial networks are critical enablers to destabilizing networks and transnational criminal

organizations, including terrorist, narco-traffickers, human smugglers, proliferators and actors seeking to avoid sanctions. The Department of Defense invested heavily in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to create counter threat finance capabilities to detect and combat such illicit activity.

With the draw-down in Afghanistan and the pivot to Asia, the committee is concerned that budget constraints may result in divestiture of such counter-threat finance capabilities in favor of traditional military capabilities. However, the committee believes such capabilities will continue to be of value to combat threats to our national security, including state actors avoiding sanctions or maintaining black market economic activities. The committee also believes such capabilities can be useful in supporting surveillance and indications and warning for national economic threats, such as attempts to perpetrate economic warfare or sabotage. Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to continue to sustain Department of Defense counter-threat finance programs and capabilities as planned.

Defense Innovation Initiative

In November 2014, the Secretary of Defense announced the Defense Innovation Initiative (DII) as a department-wide effort to develop "game changing" technologies, new operating concepts, and more innovative leaders to "maintain and advance the competitive advantage of America and its military allies." The Secretary also announced, as part of this Initiative, the development of a third offset strategy, a new Long-Range Research and Development Planning Program, and a new Advanced Capability and Deterrence Panel.

Since then, DII and its related efforts have been cited by senior Department of Defense officials in speeches and referenced in the Department's fiscal year 2016 budget request documentation. However, despite repeated requests for information, the Department has provided little detail on DII and its related efforts to the committee. While the speeches and budget documentation suggest these could be promising efforts, the committee is unable to oversee and assess their merits because it lacks detailed information from the Department.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the House Committee on Armed Services with a briefing on the Defense Innovation Initiative and its related efforts not later than July 30, 2015. The briefing should include a discussion of the objectives of and plans for DII and its related efforts, how such efforts interrelate, and the organizations involved.

Defense Strategy

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense's assessment of the security environment shapes its decisions on geographic and mission priorities, force sizing, and posture. The committee notes that the security environment has changed considerably since the Department of Defense released its Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) in early 2014. Although the Department recognizes that the security environment is "growing more volatile" and "unpredictable" with an expanding array of potential threats, the

committee questions whether certain assumptions about the security environment contained in the QDR remain valid and therefore, whether the defense strategy contained in the QDR remains viable.

Most notably, the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, growing instability across the Middle East and Africa, and a revanchist Russian Federation, led the bipartisan National Defense Panel (NDP), in its July 2014 report, to call for a "reevaluation of U.S. military posture in this critical region [the Middle East]," and to "no longer simply assume that Europe will be a net security provider. Europe will require more attention and a higher sense of priority from U.S. defense planners." Furthermore, the NDP recommended that, "given the worsening threat environment, we believe a more expansive force sizing construct . . . is appropriate."

The committee believes that the Department should revisit the assumptions underpinning its defense strategy and make adjustments to the strategy as necessary. Furthermore, the committee urges caution as the Department contemplates any force sizing and posture changes as it recognizes that, once implemented, such changes are difficult to reverse.

Department of Defense Installation Security

Since the tragic events at Fort Hood, the Washington Navy Yard, and the USS *Mahan*, the Department of Defense has conducted several reviews of its programs, policies, and procedures to improve security at military installations. The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense provided the committee a briefing on the Department of Defense and military departments' efforts related to physical access controls, physical security infrastructure capabilities, and force protection systems as directed by the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The committee also notes that other reports have been requested by Congress related to installation security, including the committee report (S. Rept. 113–211) accompanying the Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee report (S. Rept. 113–176) accompanying the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and the Joint Explanatory Statement (Committee Print No. 4) accompanying the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. While the committee recognizes efforts to improve the programs, policies, procedures, and infrastructure supporting the physical security of military installations, the committee believes that continued emphasis is needed. The committee looks forward to receiving the additional reports directed by Congress on installation security and conducting oversight of the current programs and future initiatives in the areas of physical access control systems, physical security infrastructure capabilities, and force protection aimed at enhancing the security of military installations.

Electromagnetic Spectrum Roadmap

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has been examining ways to better utilize the electromagnetic spectrum (EMS) in the future. Spectrum is a finite resource that provides

necessary capabilities for both the Federal sector, including the military and national security establishment, and commercial interests. As noted by the President's Council of Advisers for Science and Technology in 2012, "If the Nation instead expands its options for managing Federal spectrum, we can transform the availability of a precious national resource—spectrum—from scarcity to abundance . . . The essential element of this new Federal spectrum architecture is that the norm for spectrum use should be sharing, not exclusivity."

The committee recognizes the significant effort that the Department of Defense has made to improve its responsiveness to changes in the technological and regulatory environment. For example, the Department issued an Electromagnetic Spectrum Strategy in February 2014 to address how the Department will manage increased spectrum access risks, develop more effective solutions, and focus on technological innovation and sharing. That has led to an EMS Roadmap and Action Plan that is expected to be issued in the coming months, which would implement the goals and objectives of the EMS Strategy, and address everything from systems acquisitions to operations to spectrum management policy. The committee looks forward to seeing the results of this roadmap, including how it will leverage the government-industry-academia partnership of the National Spectrum Consortium to bring together stakeholders, and the S&T Roadmap, which is developing a technology roadmap for ensuring a spectrally efficient and dynamic system in the future.

Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account

The General Accounting Office (now the Government Accountability Office, or GAO) noted in a 1986 report (NSIAD–86–173) that the purpose of the Foreign Currency Fluctuation, Defense (FCF,D) account is to provide a mechanism for stabilizing the portion of operation and maintenance (O&M) and Military Personnel funding used for purchasing foreign goods and services. The FCF,D provides funds to O&M when foreign exchange rates are unfavorable (when losses occur) and receives funds from O&M when the rates are favorable (when gains occur). This ensures, as GAO stated, that "any given O&M appropriation for the purchase of foreign goods and services will purchase the budgeted amount of goods and services, regardless of the gains and losses of the dollar caused by currency fluctuations." Based on the rationale for the genesis of the FCF,D account, the committee believes that when foreign currency rates are determined by the Department of Defense, the current balance of funds in the FCF,D account should be considered.

When the FCF,D account has a balance close to or at the cap of $970.0 million, the committee believes the budgeted rates should be adjusted to generate losses within the account, thereby drawing down the FCF,D account balance. This would reduce the O&M budget requirement for foreign goods and services, allowing excess funds to be allocated to other readiness programs without changing the budget topline. However, as the FCF,D account realizes a net gain, these gains remain in O&M and are used for purposes not originally requested in the annual budget submission to Congress. Without visibility on these transactions through a reprogramming request, the committee cannot determine whether funds remaining

in the FCF,D account are being used to reduce current readiness shortfalls.

The committee notes that GAO estimates the O&M accounts will realize a net gain of $587.4 million and the Military Personnel accounts will realize a net gain of $304.0 million in fiscal year 2016 when comparing the rates used to develop fiscal 2016 budgetary needs to cover foreign currency fluctuations with projected needs based on current exchange rates.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee recommended the Department of Defense take into consideration the current balance within the FCF,D account when determining foreign currency levels in upcoming budget submissions. The committee observes there has been no such change to how foreign currency rates are calculated. Accordingly, the committee recommends both a reduction in the O&M budget for fiscal year 2016 as shown in section 4301 of this Act and a reduction in the Military Personnel budget for fiscal year 2016 as shown in section 4401 of this Act, and realigns those funds to support higher priority defense requirements throughout the Department.

Importance of the Department of Defense Meeting Audit Deadlines

The committee stresses the importance of the Department of Defense's financial management and audit efforts, and notes that the Department has 2 fiscal years remaining to complete its audit readiness work in preparation for meeting its goal of full financial statement auditability by September 30, 2017.

However, the committee is concerned about the capability and capacity of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) to fully support the financial requirements of the Department and the military services. For example, the Department of Defense Inspector General recently withdrew its audit opinion of the U.S. Marine Corps fiscal year 2012 financial statements due to DFAS's failure to properly maintain its suspense accounts. The committee is further concerned that, absent near-term corrective actions by DFAS, the Department and the military services may be at risk of failing to achieve their audit readiness objectives by September 2017.

The committee also believes that it is important for the Department to continue hiring qualified financial management personnel, including certified public accountants, to address these challenges. The committee further believes that the military services should have greater influence in the DFAS process for selecting independent public auditors for the military services, and that communications between the military services and DFAS must be improved to ensure that the services' financial requirements are better understood by DFAS.

Lastly, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) to continue prioritizing the Department's Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness plan, and continues to emphasize the need for the Department to improve its accountability for how defense dollars are spent.

Navy's Proposed Transition to an Evolved Contracting Strategy

The Department of the Navy has briefed the congressional defense committees on an "evolved contracting strategy" to change the existing contracting methodology to procure non-nuclear surface ship maintenance and modernization, a critical function in the readiness-generation process. The committee notes that this change would generally, with some exceptions for emergent repairs, move the overall ship repair vehicle from a cost-plus type contract to fixed-price.

The Comptroller General of the United States in the March 17, 1982, report "Actions Needed to Reduce Schedule Slippages and Cost Growth on Contracts for Navy Ship Overhauls (PLRD–82–29)" found that "overhauls were delayed an average of 64 days and that contract cost growth over the award price was averaging about 62 percent for frigates, 55 percent for auxiliary ships, and 29 percent for amphibious ships." The Comptroller General also indicated that "contract cost growth is of special concern because contract additives are price-based on sole-source negotiation with the enterprise awarded the basic contract. Under these conditions, the Navy is at a great disadvantage in trying to assure that the best price is being negotiated with the contractor. Furthermore, contract changes often contribute to overhaul delays." The committee believes that the Comptroller General's concerns of March 1982 may be applicable to the "evolved contracting strategy" that the Navy is planning to implement in the near future. Specifically, the committee is concerned these contracting methodology changes could induce availability delays and cost growth, especially as change orders are identified and adjudicated between the Navy and industry.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, on the risks and benefits of the proposed "evolved contracting strategy" to include the following aspects of ship material readiness:

(1) The ability of the evolved contracting strategy to reduce availability costs, shorten schedule, and improve quality;

(2) The ability of third-party advance planning for ship repair availabilities to develop stable, well-defined requirements;

(3) The stability and viability of the ship repair industrial base, including the ability to invest in and retain critically skilled workers and safe, efficient facilities and to provide insight and continuity across the industrial base;

(4) The ability of the Navy to retain ships in their respective homeport locations during availabilities and the applicability of section 7299a of title 10, United States Code, and Secretary of the Navy "Ship Depot Maintenance Solicitation Policy" memorandum dated June 16, 1995;

(5) The opportunities for small-business participation and for industry teaming within the ship repair industrial base;

(6) The ability to support the Navy in meeting service-life objectives for non-nuclear surface ships; and

(7) The ability to meet operational availability requirements of the Navy Optimized Fleet Response Plan.

(8) The extent to which Navy installation and personnel security protocols, procedures, and policies have been streamlined to mini-

mize impacts to contract personnel supporting Navy sustainment while meeting force protection requirements.

Notifications of Changes to the Defense Federal Acquisition Supplement to Congress

The committee notes that the Department of Defense maintains a well-established and actively maintained website and also uses other electronic media to provide timely publication notices of changes to the Defense Federal Acquisition Supplement. However, the committee continues to also receive hard copies of these publication notices. The committee believes that, should the Department continue to actively maintain a publicly available website, and sufficiently archive the notices, there is no need for hard copies of the notices to also be provided to the committee. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to review current processes and, in coordination with the congressional defense committees, take such steps as necessary to streamline the delivery of publication notices to Congress not later than March 1, 2016.

Pacific Command Operational Plans

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is updating many of its operational and contingency plans, including those within the U.S. Pacific Command's (PACOM) area of responsibility. The committee seeks a greater understanding of the factors driving the changes in these plans and the implications for PACOM's posture, force structure, and capability requirements, so that it can better assess the alignment of requirements and resources within the Department.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2015, on the factors influencing and the implications of the updates to PACOM's operational and contingency plans. Specifically, the briefing shall include a discussion of the following:

(1) Changes in assumptions related to the threat and strategic environment;

(2) Changes in assumptions related to Department-wide policy, strategy, and defense planning guidance;

(3) Changes in strategic theater objectives; and

(4) The implications for the posture, force structure, and capability requirements of the U.S Armed Forces within the PACOM area of responsibility (AOR) and for U.S. forces outside of the AOR that would be required to support the execution of plans.

Proposed Retirement of Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 84 and 85 Aircraft

The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy plans to retire Helicopter Sea Squadron (HSC) 84 and 85 aircraft beginning in the third quarter of fiscal year 2015. These aircraft are currently providing organic and inherent special operations-peculiar rotary wing capabilities to Naval Special Warfare training and operational components, and Theater Special Operations Commands within U.S. Central Command and U.S. Pacific Command.

The committee understands that the retirement of these aircraft could cause a considerable capability gap particularly for maritime interception operations, personnel recovery, helicopter visit, board, search and seizure (HVBSS) operations, and the countering weapons of mass destruction mission sets. As such, Naval Special Warfare Command expects a major degradation in capability and readiness for its forward deployed crisis response units.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by July 30, 2015, on the planned retirement of HSC–84 and 85. The briefing should include but not be limited to: plans for retirement of HSC–84 and 85 including any cost-benefit analyses conducted to justify retirement; plans to field replacement capabilities to meet all operational requirements including special operations-peculiar requirements of the geographic combatant commanders and U.S. Special Operations Command; capability gaps and limitations identified as a result of the potential retirement; any other matters deemed appropriate by the Secretary of Defense.

Recreational Off-Highway Vehicle Briefing

The committee understands the Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) has proposed more restrictive vehicle handling requirements for recreational off-highway vehicles (ROVs). The committee notes the military services procure ROVs in limited quantities for specific military applications and missions, and further notes these new regulations may have potential impacts on current Department of Defense ROV programs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 9, 2015 on the potential implications and impacts these new vehicle handling requirements posed by the CPSC could have on current Department ROV programs.

Strategic Vision and Plan for an Effective Global Response Force

The committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services within 180 days of enactment, on the strategic vision and plan for an adequately resourced, trained, equipped, and manned effective global response force (GRF). This report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The committee believes that the GRF is a top priority and having a fully resourced and supported GRF is critical to our national security if ever needed. The committee strongly believes that the GRF can serve the purpose of deterrence and provide leverage in diplomatic negotiations. This was reinforced by Secretary Carter, who stated the GRF has the greatest deterrent value because of its global reach during his testimony to the House Committee on Armed Services on "The President's proposed Authorization for the Use of Military Force against ISIL and the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense."

The committee directs that the Chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff shall include in his report: a description of current operational requirements and capability gaps for an effective global re-

sponse force to ensure that a fully developed joint operational concept emerges that supports the National Military Strategy; a description of any shortfalls in joint capacity; an assessment of the ability of the Department of Defense to meet current global response force requirements; an assessment whether each of the military departments is meeting expectations with respect to the global response force; a discussion of what each of the military departments is doing to address any concerns; an assessment of all supporting elements of the global response force, including special operations, air defense, capability to conduct logistical resupply, follow-on forces, and other elements the Chairman determines appropriate; and an assessment of the current capacity and readiness of aircraft lift and maritime ships to transport the global response force and additional forces in support of war plans, including a description of how readiness maneuverability and frequency in which maneuverability capacity is assessed.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—General Transfer Authority

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense, with certain limitations, to make transfers between amounts authorized for fiscal year 2016 in division A of this Act. This section would limit the total amount transferred under this authority to $5.0 billion. This section would also require prompt notification to Congress of each transfer made.

Section 1002—Authority to Transfer Funds to the National Nuclear Security Administration to Sustain Nuclear Weapons Modernization and Naval Reactors

This section would provide the Secretary of Defense the authority to transfer up to $150.0 million to the nuclear weapons and naval reactor programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) if the amount authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the weapons activities of the NNSA is less than $8.9 billion (the amount specified for fiscal year 2016 in the report required by section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84)).

Section 1003—Accounting Standards to Value Certain Property, Plant, and Equipment Items

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to coordinate with the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board to establish accounting standards for large and unordinary general property, plant, and equipment items.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1011—Extension of Authority to Provide Additional Support for Counter-drug Activities of Certain Foreign Governments

This section would extend, by 1 year, the authority to provide support for counterdrug activities of certain foreign governments,

originally authorized by subsection (a)(2) of section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), and most recently amended by section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

Section 1012—Statement of Policy on Plan Central America

This section would express a series of findings and a statement of policy on a Plan Central America to address the threatening levels of violence, instability, illicit trafficking, and transnational organized crime that challenge the sovereignty of Central American nations and security of the United States. This section would specifically state that it shall be the policy of the United States to increase Department of Defense efforts to support this plan.

In the past 10 years, violence and instability in Central America has grown due to an increase in transnational organized crime, a constant demand from the United States and other nations for narcotics and illicit products, and a decrease in illicit trafficking in Colombia, which has contributed to the rise in illicit trafficking in Central America. The committee recognizes the Administration's support of regional efforts to address this violence and instability, including its fiscal year 2016 request for $1.00 billion in Department of State funds to provide assistance to Central America, focused on promoting prosperity and regional economic integration, enhancing security, and promoting improved governance. However, the committee notes that the request contained no funding for the Department of Defense to support these efforts, despite its responsibility as the lead U.S. Government agency for directing illicit trafficking detection and monitoring activities.

The committee believes that any whole-of-government approach for a Plan Central America should also include the Department of Defense, and leverage the unique capabilities the Department of Defense can provide in areas such as aerial and maritime capabilities, building partnership capacity, and the detection and monitoring of illicit trafficking. Therefore, to complement this statement of policy, elsewhere in this Act the committee recommends an increase of $50.0 million for Department of Defense Central American programs within the Drug Interdiction & Counter-drug Activities appropriation. This funding should be focused on aerial and maritime interdiction capabilities, building partnership capacity, and increasing detection and monitoring of illicit trafficking in Central America, and complement the Department of State efforts. The committee expects the Department of Defense to provide the committee with details on the execution of these additional funds.

The committee commends the work of the U.S. Government, and particularly the Department of Defense, in addressing the security challenges emanating from Central America. The committee is dedicated to addressing these issues in the Western Hemisphere and protecting U.S. national security.

SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1021—Restrictions on the Overhaul and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards

This section would amend section 7310 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from beginning in a shipyard outside the United States or outside a territory of the United States any work that is scheduled to be for a period of more than 6 months for the overhaul, repair, or maintenance of a naval vessel whose homeport is not in the United States or Guam. This limitation does not apply to emergency or voyage repairs required during an overseas homeporting period. This change would be effective on October 1, 2016, or upon enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, whichever comes later.

The committee notes that a covered naval vessel does not include vessels unable to complete a maintenance availability in the United States or a territory of the United States due to mechanical, hull, or propulsion limitations.

Section 1022—Extension of Authority for Reimbursement of Expenses for Certain Navy Mess Operations Afloat

This section would extend the authority originally provided by section 1014 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), which authorizes the Department of Defense to fund from Navy operation and maintenance accounts the cost of meals on United States naval and naval auxiliary vessels for non-military personnel, for five years through September 30, 2020.

Section 1023—Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the retirement, inactivation, or storage of *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers and *Whidbey Island*-class amphibious ships. This section would also require the modernization of two *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers to begin in fiscal year 2016 only after sufficient materials are available to begin the modernization period. Finally, the modernization period would be limited to 2 years with the ability of the Secretary of the Navy to extend the period for another 6 months.

Section 1024—Limitation on the Use of Funds for Removal of Ballistic Missile Defense Capabilities from Ticonderoga Class Cruisers

This section would prohibit the removal of ballistic missile capabilities from any of the *Ticonderoga* class cruisers until the Secretary of the Navy certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Navy has obtained the ballistic missile capabilities required by the most recent Navy Force Structure Assessment or determined to upgrade such cruisers with an equal or improved ballistic missile defense capability.

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Section 1031—Permanent Authority to Provide Rewards through Government Personnel of Allied Forces and Certain Other Modifications to Department of Defense Program to Provide Rewards

This section would modify section 127b of title 10, United States Code, to make permanent the authority to make rewards to a person providing information or non-lethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. Armed Forces conducted outside the United States against terrorism, or providing such information or assistance that is beneficial to force protection associated with such an operation. The committee notes that this program has successfully contributed to U.S. counterterrorism objectives at the tactical, strategic, and national level. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to review and consider how this authority could also be used for transnational criminal organizations and activities that hold a terrorism nexus.

Section 1032—Congressional Notification of Sensitive Military Operations

This section would modify section 130f of title 10, United States Code, by striking the exception to the notification requirement for a sensitive military operation executed within the territory of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40).

Section 1033—Repeal of Semiannual Reports on Obligation and Expenditure of Funds for Combating Terrorism Program

This section would modify and streamline reporting requirements for budget information related to program for combating terrorism as required by section 229 of title 10, United States Code. This section would specifically eliminate subsection (d) of section 229, regarding semiannual reports on obligations and expenditures.

Section 1034—Reports to Congress on Contact between Terrorists and Individuals Formerly Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would amend section 319 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32), which requires the President to submit a report on individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to certain members and committees of Congress, to include in the reporting requirement a summary of all contact between individuals formerly detained at Guantanamo Bay and individuals known or suspected to be associated with a foreign terrorist group, and whether any of those contacts included information or discussion about hostilities against the United States or its allies or partners. This section would require that the summary of contact between individuals contain any means of communication, including but not limited to telecommunications, electronic or technical means, in person, or written communications. Additionally, the summary of contact between individuals shall include all contact, regardless of content.

The committee notes that the report should account for all former Guantanamo detainees who have been in contact with individuals known or suspected to be associated with foreign terrorist groups regarding hostilities against the United States or its allies or partners regardless of whether the former detainee has been determined to be suspected or confirmed of reengagement using definitions established by the U.S. Intelligence Community.

The requirements of this report are in addition to those already required by section 319 of Public Law 111–32, and should not be construed to terminate, alter, modify, override, or otherwise affect any reporting of information previously required by such section.

Section 1035—Inclusion in Reports to Congress Information about Recidivism of Individuals Formerly Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would amend section 319 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111–32), which requires the President to submit a report on individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to include in future quarterly reports the period of time between the date on which an individual was released or transferred from Guantanamo Bay, and the date on which the individual is suspected or confirmed of re-engaging in terrorist activities. This section would also require a summary of the average amount of time for all individuals from the date they were released or transferred from Guantanamo Bay until the date on which they are suspected or confirmed of re-engaging in terrorist activities.

Section 1036—Prohibition on the Use of Funds for the Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer or release detainees at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions.

Section 1037—Prohibition on Use of Funds to Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States to House Detainees Transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds available to the Department of Defense during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to modify or construct any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any detainee transferred from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

Section 1038—Prohibition on Use of Funds to Transfer or Release Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Combat Zones

This section would prohibit the use of funds by the Department of Defense to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to a combat zone, as defined in this section.

Section 1039—Requirements for Certifications Relating to the Transfer of Detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Foreign Countries and Other Foreign Entities

This section would prohibit the use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to transfer or release any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity. This prohibition would apply unless the Secretary of Defense provides a written certification to Congress addressing several requirements at least 30 days prior to the transfer of any such individual.

This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any funds for the transfer of any such individual to the custody or effective control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the same country or entity who engaged in terrorist activity subsequent to their transfer.

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive certain certification requirements if the Secretary determines that alternative actions will be taken, that actions taken will substantially mitigate risks posed by the individual to be transferred, and that the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States. Whenever the Secretary uses the waiver, the Secretary must provide a report that includes a copy of the waiver and determination, a statement of the basis for the determination, and a summary of the alternative actions to be taken.

Finally, this section would repeal current law, as contained in section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

The committee notes that the Department of Defense failed to comply with section 1035 of Public Law 113–66 by failing to notify the appropriate committees of Congress not later than 30 days before the transfer of five individuals detained at Guantanamo Bay to the State of Qatar on May 31, 2014. Additionally, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) concluded that the Department violated section 8111 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76) which prohibits the Department from using appropriated funds to transfer any individuals detained at Guantanamo unless the Secretary of Defense notifies certain congressional committees consistent with section 1035 of Public Law 113–66. According to GAO, as a consequence of using its appropriations in a manner specifically prohibited by law, the

Department also violated the Antideficiency Act (Public Law 97–258).

The committee also has concerns regarding the Department's recent actions related to the transfer of other detainees from Guantanamo Bay and the implications for U.S. national security.

Section 1040—Submission to Congress of Certain Documents Relating to Transfer of Individuals Detained at Guantanamo to Qatar

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General of the United States to submit to the congressional defense committees and the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives certain correspondence between the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice, or any other agency or entity of the U.S. Government, relating to the May 31, 2014, transfer of five individuals from United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the State of Qatar. Since the Department of Defense has failed to comply with the committee's requests, this section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 2016 until the submission of all required correspondence.

Section 1041—Submission of Unredacted Copies of Documents Relating to the Transfer of Certain Individuals Detained at Guantanamo to Qatar

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the House Committee on Armed Services unredacted copies of all documents produced in response to the committee's June 9, 2014, request for information regarding the transfer of five individuals from United States Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the State of Qatar. This requirement would apply to submissions both prior to and subsequent to the date of the enactment of this Act.

This section would also prohibit the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Office of the Secretary of Defense for fiscal year 2016 until the Secretary submits to the committee unredacted copies of documents that the Department has failed to unredact despite the committee's requests.

SUBTITLE E—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 1051—Enhancement of Authority of Secretary of Navy to Use National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund

This section would amend section 1022 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) by expanding the transfer authority provided to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund from the Department of the Navy to the Department of Defense; providing authority to enter into economic order quantity contracts for ballistic missile submarines and other nuclear powered vessels; and providing incremental funding and facilities funding authority. This section further requires the Secretary of the Navy to submit

a report on the Fund to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, and annually through the year 2025.

Section 1052—Department of Defense Excess Property Program

This section would make changes to excess defense article donations authorized under section 2576a of title 10, United States Code. Specifically, the provision would require the establishment of a public website containing information on certain transfers made under the program, establish specific criteria for State program managers to be met before the Defense Logistics Agency may transfer certain types of equipment, and mandate several reviews of program objectives and efficacy, to include training recommendations, by a federally funded research and development center, the Comptroller General of the United States, and the Department of Defense.

Section 1053—Limitation of Transfer of Certain AH–64 Apache Helicopters from Army National Guard to Regular Army and Related Personnel Levels

This section would amend section 1712(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to preserve the 60-day congressional review of the report from the National Commission on the Future of the Army.

Section 1054—Space Available Travel for Environmental Morale Leave by Certain Spouses and Children of Deployed Members of the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to amend the Air Transportation Eligibility Regulation, DOD 4515.13–R (1994) (as modified by the December 6, 2007, memorandum of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness) to authorize space-available travel for environmental morale leave by unaccompanied spouses and dependent children of service members deployed for at least 30 consecutive days under priority category IV. This section also requires the Secretary to update any other instructions, directives, or internal policies necessary to facilitate this expansion.

The committee notes that the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, in its final report, found that the average service member deploys 2.6 times during their time of Active Duty service, with many military occupational specialties deploying even more frequently. The Commission also noted that an analysis conducted in 2012 showed that, of the 678,382 Active Duty personnel deployed from 2001 to 2006 as part of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, a significant portion were deployed for fewer than 120 days.

The committee recognizes that the current policy governing the use of space-available travel under section 2641b of title 10, United States Code, allowing unaccompanied space-available travel for environmental morale leave for military dependents of service members deployed for 120 days or more, leaves a significant portion of recently deployed service member dependents ineligible for this important privilege. The committee concurs with the Commission's

recommendation that the Department of Defense expand space-available travel to a larger population of dependents by shortening the deployment length needed to qualify for unaccompanied travel on environmental morale leave under priority category IV to 30 days.

Section 1055—Information-Related and Strategic Communications Capabilities Engagement Pilot Program

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program to assess information-related and strategic communications capabilities to support the tactical, operational, and strategic requirements of the various combatant commanders, including urgent and emergent operational needs, and the operational and theater security cooperation plans of the Geographic and Functional Combatant Commanders.

The committee is concerned that the U.S. Government is losing the battle to operationalize information, which can shape the information environment and support its operational goals. The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and Al Qaeda are using radical jihadist narratives to shape the battlefield, drive recruitment and support, and inspire imitators outside their main area of control. In the case of ISIL, it is able to use the narratives in ways that reinforce its battlefield successes.

In addition, the Russian Federation has reinvigorated its uses of narratives to create uncertainty, providing cover for its activities and helping to shape the battlefield. It deploys similar narratives to mobilize support in society at home and, where possible, in the local population of other countries.

The committee does not believe that the U.S. Government, including the Department of Defense, is effectively coordinating its efforts in ways that can fundamentally root out and eliminate the narratives that drive these movements. The committee believes that the lack of an overall strategy to support unity of effort is a major deficit to the U.S. Government's actions. The inability to be proactive in our information engagement, or to be responsive enough from a defensive perspective to operate on the timescales of our adversaries, are also flaws in how the Department of Defense and the U.S. Government approach this problem.

The committee believes that providing the authority for the Department to carry out the pilot program established in this section would provide the flexibility needed to try out different approaches, tailored to the operating environment and circumstances, to see more broadly which approaches work and which do not. The committee also believes that there is an important technology component that has not been well-utilized in the past, which will help the military sense, respond and plan for operations in the information environment in ways that traditional approaches do not provide.

Section 1056—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Retirement of Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 84 and 85 Aircraft

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 or otherwise made available for such fiscal year for the Navy may be obligated or expended to: (1) retire, prepare to retire, transfer, or place in storage any Helicopter

Sea Combat Squadron 84 (HSC 84) or Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron 85 (HSC–85) aircraft; or (2) make any changes to manning levels with respect to any HSC–84 or HSC–85 aircraft squadron.

The section includes an exception that would allow the Secretary of the Navy to waive this restriction provided that the Secretary certifies that he has conducted a cost-benefit analysis identifying saving to the Department of Defense and has identified a replacement capability to meet all operational requirements.

Section 1057—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Destruction of Certain Landmines

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 or otherwise made available for such fiscal year for the Department of Defense may be obligated or expended for the destruction of anti-personnel landmines (APL) of the United States until: the Secretary of Defense publishes a study on the effects of a ban of such landmines; alternatives to such landmines are specifically authorized by law and provided appropriations; such alternatives are fully deployed and members of the U.S. armed forces and allies of the U.S. are fully trained in their use; and, the Secretary has certified that the replacement of current APL with such alternatives will not endanger members of the U.S. Armed Forces or of the armed forces of allies of the U.S.

This section includes an exception that would allow the demilitarization or destruction of APL that the Secretary certifies have become unsafe or pose a safety risk.

Section 1058—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Modifying Command and Control of United States Pacific Fleet

This section would limit the availability of fiscal year 2016 funds to modify command and control relationships to give Fleet Forces Command operational and administrative control of Navy forces assigned to the Pacific Fleet.

Section 1059—Prohibition on the Closure of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the closure of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and require the President to ensure that the obligations of the United States under Article III of the Treaty between the United States and Cuba signed at Washington, D.C., on May 29, 1934, are met. This section would also express the sense of Congress on the strategic importance of Naval Station Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and require a report from the Commander of U.S. Southern Command on a military assessment of the Naval Station.

SUBTITLE F—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 1061—Provision of Defense Planning Guidance and Contingency Planning Guidance Information to Congress

This section would amend section 113(g) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees, not later than 120 days after the

date of the enactment of this Act, a report containing summaries of the defense planning guidance and contingency planning guidance developed in accordance with the requirements of such section, and to include those summaries in the annual budget documents submitted to Congress. Additionally, this section would provide a limitation on the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds, authorized to be appropriated by this Act for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, until 15 days after the date on which the Secretary of Defense submits the first report required by this section.

Section 1062—Modification of Certain Reports Submitted by Comptroller General of the United States

This section would amend section 3255(a)(2) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2455) to provide the Comptroller General of the United States, in any odd-numbered year, 150 days to submit the report required by such section. The committee believes the Comptroller General's analysis under this section would benefit from information contained in the Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan and, therefore, provides the Comptroller General additional time. However, the committee expects the Comptroller General will still provide the committee an interim briefing on these matters in odd-numbered years to support the committee's legislative calendar.

This section would also amend section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to eliminate a requirement for the Comptroller General to conduct a final review of all projects carried out by the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management using American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–5) funds. The committee understands that as of last year, only one project within the scope of this review remained incomplete and the Comptroller General believes no significant issues have come to light that merit additional review and reporting. The committee recommends repeal of this final reporting mandate so that the Comptroller General can focus oversight resources on higher-priority committee requirements.

Section 1063—Report on Implementation of the Geographically Distributed Force Laydown in the Area of Responsibility of United States Pacific Command

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM), to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2016, on the Department of Defense's plans for implementing the geographically distributed force laydown in the area of responsibility of U.S. Pacific Command.

The committee notes that PACOM has made several posture changes within its area of responsibility in recent years, and several more are planned. These include the realignment of U.S. Marine Corps forces across Japan, Guam, and Hawaii; the rotation of U.S. forces to Darwin in the Commonwealth of Australia; and the planned enhancement of a rotational presence of U.S. forces in the Republic of the Philippines. While the committee understands

PACOM's desire for greater operational resiliency and survivability, particularly given the complex and lethal environment that PACOM expects to operate in, it is concerned about the demands such posture changes place on supporting commands and the military services. For example, the Commandant of the Marine Corps testified before the Senate Committee on Armed Services on March 10, 2015, on the additional lift capabilities that would be required to support PACOM's distributed force laydown. Therefore, the committee seeks to understand the requirements for support assets and infrastructure, and how the Department of Defense plans to address them.

Section 1064—Independent Study of National Security Strategy Formulation Process

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to contract with an independent research entity to carry out a comprehensive study of the Department of Defense role in, and process for, the formulation of national security strategy. The study would include the following:

(1) A review of case studies of previous national security strategy formulation processes;

(2) An examination of issues such as the frequency of strategy updates, the synchronization of timelines and content among different strategies, and the links between strategy and resourcing; and

(3) A review of the current national security strategy formulation process as it relates to the Department of Defense, to include an analysis of current defense-related national security strategy documents, such as the 2015 National Security Strategy, the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review, and the 2011 National Military Strategy.

The committee believes such a study will enhance its oversight of the national defense and national military strategy development and execution process, and complement its efforts to reform such strategies, such as its reform of the Quadrennial Defense Review contained in section 1072 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

The committee further expects that the annual budget request of the Department of Defense will contain clear linkages to the relevant current national security strategies.

Section 1065—Study and Report on Role of Department of Defense in Formulation of Long-term Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to direct the Office of Net Assessment to conduct a study on the role of the Department of Defense in the formulation of long-term strategy, and to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the results of the study not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 1066—Report on Potential Threats to Members of the Armed Forces of United States Naval Forces Central Command and United States Fifth Fleet in Bahrain

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the threat posed to members of the Armed Forces of the U.S. Naval Forces Central Command and the U.S. Fifth Fleet from Naval Support Activity Bahrain, and their families, should there be an increase in violent clashes in the Kingdom of Bahrain.

SUBTITLE G—REPEAL OR REVISION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 1071—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Military Personnel Issues

This section would repeal or revise certain reporting requirements related to acquisition that are overly burdensome on the Department of Defense, duplicative, or outdated, to include:

(a) Repealing section 1073b of title 10, United States Code, related to health protection and health assessment data.

(b) Amending section 1566(c) of title 10, United States Code, by striking subsections (2) and (3) related to voting assistance programs.

(c) Amending section 301b(i) of title 37, United States Code, by striking subsection (2) related to aviation officer retention bonuses.

(d) Amending section 316a of title 37, United States Code, by striking subsection (f) related to foreign language proficiency incentive pay.

(e) Amending section 553 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by striking subsection (e) related to waiver authority for military service academy appointments.

(f) Repealing subsection (e) of section 548 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), related to Junior Reserve Officers' Training Units.

(g) Amending section 582(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) by striking paragraph (4) related to a report on the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program.

(h) Amending section 1648 of the Wounded Warrior Act (10 U.S.C. 1071) by striking subsection (f) related to facility standards.

(i) Amending section 1662 of the Wounded Warrior Act (10 U.S.C. 1071) by striking subsection (b) related to inspection of facilities.

(j) Amending section 3307 of the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (10 U.S.C. 1073) by striking subsection (d) related to inspections of facilities.

(k) Amending section 574 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) by striking subsection (c) related to assistance to local education agencies.

Section 1072—Repeal or Revision of Certain Reports Relating to Readiness

This section would repeal or revise certain reporting requirements to include:

(a) Amending chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, by striking section 228, which requires a biannual report on the allocation of funds within operation and maintenance budget sub-activities.

(b) Amending section 7431 of title 10, United States Code, by striking subsection (c), which requires an annual report on Naval Petroleum Reserve.

(c) Amending chapter 1013 of title 10, United States Code, by striking section 10542, which requires an annual report on Army National Guard combat readiness.

(d) Amending section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by striking subsection (f), which requires a report on the insider threat detection budget submission.

(e) Repealing section 892 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), which requires a report on price trend analysis.

(f) Amending section 351 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) by striking subsection (b), which requires a report on the use of the authority for airlift transportation at Department of Defense rates for non-Department of Defense Federal cargoes.

(g) Amending section 358 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) by striking subsection (c), which requires a report on the procurement of military working dogs, and by making other technical conforming changes.

(h) Repealing section 958 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which requires a report on foreign language proficiency.

(i) Amending section 343 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) by striking subsection (g), which requires a report on the arsenal support program initiative.

(j) Amending section 345 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–26) by striking subsection (d), which mandates an ongoing Comptroller General review of the contractor-operated Civil Engineering Supply Stores Program, and by making other technical conforming changes.

(k) Repealing section 8104 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2014 (division C of Public Law 113–76), which requires a quarterly report on end strength.

(l) Repealing section 8105 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (division C of Public Law 113–6), which requires a quarterly report on end strength.

(m) Repealing section 806 of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (title VIII of Public Law 102–183), which requires a report on the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991.

Section 1073—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Naval Vessels and Merchant Marine

This section would repeal or revise certain reporting requirements that are overly burdensome, duplicative, or outdated, to include:

(a) Amending section 7292 of title 10, United States Code, to strike subsection (d) that required a 30 day congressional notice before the Secretary of the Navy names a naval vessel;

(b) Amending section 7306 of title 10, United States Code, to strike subsection (d) that required a 30 day congressional notice before Secretary of the Navy can transfer any vessel from the Naval Vessel Register to any State or not-for-profit entity;

(c) Amending section 126 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to delete a requirement for a quarterly report on Mission Modules of the Littoral Combat Ship;

(d) Deleting section 124 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) that required an assessment prior to the start of construction on the first ship of a shipbuilding program;

(e) Amending section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to delete a quarterly reporting requirement associated with the *Ford* class carrier;

(f) Amending section 50111 of title 46, United States Code, to request the Secretary of Transportation to submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate the Maritime Administration authorization request for that fiscal year; and

(g) Deleting a monthly reporting mandate that is provided by the Secretary of the Navy to the congressional defense committees on open architecture, and a monthly report on the USS *Ford*-class carrier.

Section 1074—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Nuclear, Proliferation, and Related Matters

This section would repeal or revise certain reporting requirements that are overly burdensome, duplicative, or outdated to include:

(a) Amending section 179 of title 10, United States Code, and strike subsection (g) related to an annual report by the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council.

(b) Amending section 1821(b) of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (50 U.S.C. 2911) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) related to a biannual reporting requirement on the Proliferation Security Initiative.

(c) Amending section 1282 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (22 U.S.C. 5951) by striking subsection (a) related to briefings on dialogue between the United States and the Russian Federation on nuclear arms.

(d) Amending section 1072 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (50 U.S.C. 3043) by striking subsection (b)

requiring an annual update to an implementation plan for the whole-of-government vision prescribed in the National Security Strategy.

Section 1075—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Missile Defense

This section would repeal or revise certain reporting requirements that are overly burdensome, duplicative, or outdated. This section would amend section 232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by striking subsection (b) requiring Annual Reports on Missile Defense Executive Board. This section would also amend section 234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by striking subsections (a) and (b) requiring a report on the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system.

Section 1076—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Acquisition

This section would repeal or revise certain reporting requirements related to acquisition that are overly burdensome on the Department of Defense, duplicative, or outdated, to include:

(a) Repealing section 8305 of title 41, United States Code, which requires that, not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense submit to Congress a report on the amount of purchases by the Department of Defense from foreign entities in that fiscal year.

(b) Striking subsection (f) of section 2334 of title 10, United States Code, which requires an annual report on cost assessment activities.

(c) Striking subsection (f) of section 2438 of title 10, United States Code, which requires an annual report on performance assessments and root cause analyses activities.

Section 1077—Repeal or Revision of Reporting Requirements Related to Civilian Personnel

This section would repeal or revise certain reporting requirements to include:

(a) Amending section 1110(i) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), by striking a report on the pilot program for the temporary exchange of information technology personnel.

(b) Amending section 1101(g) of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261) by striking the annual report on extension and modification of experimental personnel management program for scientific and technical personnel.

Section 1078—Repeal or Revision of Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements

This section would repeal or revise certain reporting requirements that are overly burdensome, duplicative, or outdated. Reports to be repealed or revised include:

(a) Amending section 127b of title 10, United States Code, by striking the annual report on rewards for assistance in combating terrorism;

(b) Amending section 138b of title 10, United States Code, by striking paragraph (2) that required a report by Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering assessing the technological maturity of critical technologies of major defense acquisition programs;

(c) Amending section 139b(d) of title 10, United States Code, by striking the annual report required for the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering:

(d) Amending section 2249c of title 10, United States Code, by striking the annual report on Regional Defense Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program;

(e) Repealing section 2352 of title 10, United States Code, which required the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency submit a biennial strategic plan;

(f) Repealing section 112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) which required annual reports on Army airlift requirements;

(g) Repealing the annual Comptroller General report on In-Kind Payments required by section 2805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239);

(h) Amending section 112(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) by striking paragraph (3) which requires an annual report on airborne signals intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities by the Department of Defense; and

(i) Repealing section 1034 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), which required a semi-annual report on the Next Generation Enterprise Network.

SUBTITLE H—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1081—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments of a non-substantive nature to existing law.

Section 1082—Executive Agent for the Oversight and Management of Alternative Compensatory Control Measures

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an executive agent for the oversight and management of alternative compensatory control measures. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after the close of each of the fiscal years 2016 through 2020, on the oversight and management of alternative compensatory control measures.

Section 1083—Navy Support of Ocean Research Advisory Panel

This section would modify the statutory requirement for the Secretary of the Navy to make funds available on an annual basis to support the activities of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel (ORAP).

The committee believes that this realignment of agency responsibility for supporting the ORAP from the Department of the Navy to another agency is consistent with the function of this advisory board and that the support responsibilities of ORAP are more appropriately aligned outside of the Department of the Navy. The committee notes that this change would not affect or diminish the statutory authorities of the National Ocean Research Leadership Council or the National Oceanographic Partnership Program, or their respective relationships with the ORAP.

Section 1084—Level of Readiness of Civil Reserve Air Fleet Carriers

This section would make a series of findings about the National Airlift Policy and the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). This section would also amend Chapter 931 of title 10, United States Code, by creating a new subsection addressing the readiness of the CRAF. Specifically, this new section would codify the importance of the CRAF and the need to provide appropriate levels of commercial airlift augmentation to maintain networks and infrastructure, exercise the system, and interface effectively within the military airlift system. This section also would require the Secretary of Defense to provide, concurrent with the submission of the President's request:

1) An assessment of the number of block hours necessary to achieve sufficient levels of commercial airlift augmentation;

2) A strategic plan for achieving necessary levels of commercial airlift augmentation; and

3) An explanation of any deviation from the previous fiscal year's assessment.

Section 1085—Authorization of Transfer of Surplus Firearms to Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer surplus firearms, spare parts, and related accessories under the control of the Secretary of the Army to the Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety, also known as the Civilian Marksmanship Program.

Section 1086—Modification of Requirements for Transferring Aircraft within the Air Force Inventory

This section would amend section 345 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to ease administrative burdens and facilitate routine transfers of aircraft from the Reserve Components to the Active Component of the Air Force.

Section 1087—Reestablishment of Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attacks

This section would reestablish the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, including providing updated guidance on the membership and duties of that commission.

Section 1088—Department of Defense Strategy for Countering Unconventional Warfare

This section would required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the President and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop a strategy for the Department of Defense to counter unconventional warfare threats posed by adversarial state and non-state actors. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit the strategy to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The committee is concerned about the growing unconventional warfare capabilities and threats being posed most notably and recently by the Russian Federation and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee notes that unconventional warfare is defined most accurately as those activities conducted to enable a resistance movement or insurgency to coerce, disrupt, or overthrow a government or occupying power by operating through or with an underground, auxiliary, or guerrilla force in a denied area. The committee also notes that most state-sponsors of unconventional warfare, such as Russia and Iran, have doctrinally linked conventional warfare, economic warfare, cyber warfare, information operations, intelligence operations, and other activities seamlessly in an effort to undermine U.S. national security objectives and the objectives of U.S. allies alike.

Section 1089—Mine Countermeasures Master Plan

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a mine countermeasures master plan to the congressional defense committees along with the annual budget request of each fiscal year from 2018 through 2023. The master plan shall include an assessment of the current and future capabilities, capacities, requirements, and readiness levels associated with mine countermeasure assets required to meet operational plans and contingency requirements. This section would also require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a one-time report to the congressional defense committees within 1 year of enactment of this Act as to current and future mine countermeasure force structure based on current mine countermeasure capabilities, including an assessment as to whether certain decommissioned ships should be retained in reserve operating status.

Section 1090—Congressional Notification and Briefing Requirement on Ordered Evacuations of United States Embassies and Consulates Involving the Use of United States Armed Forces

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to provide joint notification to the appropriate congressional committees as soon as practicable after the initiation of an evacuation operation of a U.S. embassy or consulate involving the use of U.S. Armed Forces. It would also require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to provide a joint briefing to the appropriate congressional committees within 15 days of an evacuation operation of a U.S. embassy or consulate involving the use of the Armed Forces.

Section 1091—Determination and Disclosure of Transportation Costs Incurred by Secretary of Defense for Congressional Trips Outside the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to determine and disclose the transportation costs incurred by the Department of Defense for certain congressional trips outside the United States.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Assessment of Hiring Authorities for Personnel at the Major Range and Test Facility Base

The committee is aware of the special civilian personnel needs of the Department of Defense for its scientific and engineering community, especially within the laboratories and engineering centers. The committee has traditionally been supportive of these unique authorities to be able to attract, hire and retain high quality, skilled technical expertise within the civilian workforce, and recognizes that many of those technical skills will be needed in other parts of the Department, such as the test and evaluation community. The Laboratory Demonstration program was established to provide personnel flexibility for that specialized community, and because of the related needs of test community in the Major Range and Test Facility Base (MRTFB), the committee recognizes that it would be valuable to understand whether those flexibilities might be useful for that community, and if so, how those authorities might be extended. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 30, 2015 which assesses the feasibility of extending the Laboratory Demonstration program to the entities of the MRTFB. This briefing should include a cost-benefit assessment that includes the advantages and disadvantages of such a decision, as well as specification of the facilities that would most benefit from inclusion in the Laboratory Demonstration program.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—One-Year Extension of Temporary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Civilian Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone

This section would modify section 1603(a)(2) of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234) to extend by 1 year the temporary discretionary authority to Federal agencies to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities comparable to those provided to members of the foreign service to an agency's civilian employees on official duty in a combat zone.

Section 1102—Authority to Provide Additional Allowances and Benefits for Defense Clandestine Service Employees

This section would enable the Secretary of Defense to include certain civilians who are assigned to the Defense Clandestine Serv-

ice among the population of the Department of Defense workforce eligible to receive special pay, allowances, and benefits, in addition to basic pay, similar to that provided to employees performing comparable, specialized work. The committee intends that this section provide the authority for the Secretary of Defense to establish a special allowance to help create and maintain a workforce that is more mobile in support of the Defense Intelligence Agency's worldwide mission.

Section 1103—Extension of Rate of Overtime Pay for Department of the Navy Employees Performing Work Aboard or Dockside in Support of the Nuclear-Powered Aircraft Carrier Forward Deployed in Japan

This section would amend section 5542(a)(6)(B) of title 5, United States Code, to extend for 2 years the authority for a civilian employee of the Department of the Navy who is assigned to temporary duty to perform work aboard or dockside in direct support of the nuclear aircraft carrier that is forward deployed in Japan, to receive overtime pay.

Section 1104—Modification to Temporary Authorities for Certain Positions at Department of Defense Research and Engineering Facilities

This section would modify section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) to allow for the noncompetitive conversion of students that have graduated from an applicable institution of higher learner to a permanent appointment. Additionally, this section would change the percentages of the work force that would be eligible for direct hiring authorities.

Section 1105—Preference Eligibility for Members of Reserve Components of the Armed Forces Appointed to Competitive Service; Clarification of Appeal Rights

The section would grant hiring preferences for Federal employment to members of a Reserve Component of the Armed Forces who have successfully completed Officer Candidate Training or entry level skill training, and performing a 6-year commitment, completed 10 years of service, or retired.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

OVERVIEW

Framing the committee's oversight of national security matters relating to foreign nations is the observation that the Nation is in the midst of a complex and challenging security environment. As senior U.S. statesman Dr. Henry Kissinger testified to the Senate Committee on Armed Services in January 2015, "The United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of the Second World War." The Nation also faces unprecedented technological challenges, with enemies and potential competitors focusing on the development of technologies to offset areas

of American military strength. The committee believes that the magnitude, scope, and simultaneity of the threats currently facing the Nation are truly unprecedented.

The committee concurs with the observation by the National Defense Panel in its July 2014 report to Congress that, "Since World War II, no matter which party has controlled the White House or Congress, America's global military capability and commitment has been the strategic foundation undergirding our global leadership." Therefore, the provisions contained in this title reinforce the committee's belief that American military strength, commitment, and presence will continue to be necessary to deter aggression, reassure U.S. allies and partners, and exercise global influence to shape a world order aligned with U.S. national interests.

The committee continues its focus on U.S. military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, with the bill providing extensions to key authorities, the authorization of necessary funding, and expressing the committee's view that the withdrawal of U.S. troops should occur only on a pace consistent with the ability of the Afghan National Security Forces to sustain itself and secure Afghanistan.

The committee has also focused its oversight on the efforts of the Department of Defense to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and address the growing instability and terrorism threats across the Middle East and Africa. The committee is concerned by many aspects of the Administration's larger efforts in Iraq and Syria, in particular, as part of Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR). It remains concerned by the lack of a comprehensive strategy for the Middle East and to counter Islamic extremism and would thus direct the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to develop such a strategy. The bill would also require the Department to provide greater detail on OIR command and control arrangements, the numbers and types of armed forces deployed as part of OIR, and provide increased support to allies and partners in the region, such as the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, to enhance their capability to fight ISIL. Furthermore, the bill would provide greater assistance to the Kurdish Peshmerga, the Sunni tribal security forces with a national security mission, and the Iraqi Sunni National Guard to increase their capability to fight ISIL, while also conditioning security assistance funds on progress towards on political inclusiveness by the Government of the Republic of Iraq.

The committee also remains concerned about the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear program and its malign military activities, and H.R. 1735 would express the committee's view that these destabilizing activities constitute a grave threat to regional stability and U.S. national security interests, that Congress should review and assess any agreement regarding Iran's nuclear program, and that the United States must continue to strengthen the defense of allies and partners in the region.

The committee has also focused on the Department's efforts to deter aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and other allies and partners in Europe. The committee recognizes that Russia has employed unconventional warfare methods in areas such as cyber warfare, economic warfare, information operations, and intelligence operations, and believes that the Department's Eu-

ropean Reassurance Initiative efforts should focus on countering such methods, as well as continuing conventional reassurance and deterrence activities. The bill would also authorize appropriations to provide sustainment and assistance to the military and national security forces of Ukraine, including the explicit authorization of lethal weapons of a defensive nature to enhance the defense of Ukraine and deter further Russian aggression.

The year 2015 marks the 70th anniversary of the end of the Allied military engagement in the Pacific theater and the end of the Second World War. In recognition of this milestone, H.R. 1735 would express a sense of Congress the tremendous sacrifice, bravery, and loss of U.S. and Allied Forces during the war. The bill would also highlight the close relationship forged between the United States and Japan since the end of the war, including expressing the committee's support for the recent finalization of the Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation, and require the President to develop a strategy to promote U.S. interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

Lastly, the committee notes that the Department has placed greater emphasis on security cooperation in general, and building partner capacity specifically, and the committee believes increased oversight of these activities is necessary. Therefore, the bill would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to develop a strategic framework for Department of Defense security cooperation to guide prioritization of resources and activities, and require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an inventory of Department of Defense security cooperation programs.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Central American Police Forces

The committee notes the continued, collective work of the nations of Central America to address regional stability and security. The committee acknowledges that there is a lack of confidence by the citizens of many of these countries in their domestic police forces. This lack of confidence in domestic police forces, coupled with weak judicial institutions, results in many of these countries utilizing their military forces to provide internal security. However, these countries also recognize that they must improve the public's confidence in their police forces, which includes creating greater accountability within these forces. As noted in the November 2014 agreement between the Republic of Honduras, the Republic of Guatemala, and the Republic of El Salvador, the "Alliance for Prosperity in the Northern Triangle: A Road Map," these nations will "bring the police closer to the community, including through solid accountability mechanisms that improve the image of the policy and people's trust in them." The Alliance for Prosperity has also articulated its commitment to provide greater transparency and access to information on government functions, actions, and plans to its nations' citizens.

The committee commends the Alliance for Prosperity for addressing this challenge. The committee urges the President of the United States to encourage the Governments of Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador to implement the public security strategy

contained in the Alliance for Prosperity road map and to make those nation-specific implementation plans publicly available. The committee further encourages these Central American nations to transition responsibility for public security from the military to domestic police forces as stability and security in these nations strengthen and as their police forces and judicial institutions improve.

Combatant Commander Requirements for Directed Energy Weapons

The committee remains committed to the development and deployment of directed energy weapons, including both lasers and high-powered microwave systems. While the committee sees much progress amongst the services and the defense agencies in investing in key programs, there are still concerns regarding the planning for how to transition these developmental systems into programs of record. The committee believes that refinement of the technology is important in the long-run, but that without strong warfighter support and buy-in, transition will be a low priority for both the acquisition and operational communities.

Elsewhere in this bill, the committee has directed the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to develop a plan for integrating advanced weapon systems such as directed energy weapons, into exercises already being conducted by the armed forces. The committee believes this is necessary to do the concept development and experimentation needed to get operational warfighters comfortable with the technology and integrated into the way they conduct operations. The committee also believes that the Department of Defense should gain a better understanding of the perspectives of the various combatant commanders in how they might employ such systems. Such an assessment will help the technology community better refine what applications they should be developing, as well as provide a more comprehensive understanding by the combatant commands on how it might leverage advances in directed energy technology.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the relevant geographic and functional combatant commanders, to review the integrated priority lists of these commands for the potential requirements they might have articulated that might be satisfied by leveraging directed energy technology, and brief the results of this review to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 15, 2015. The briefing should also include any recommendations on how to improve the coordination between the combatant commands and the acquisition community on developing these integrated priority lists, as well as any recommendations on actions to improve the transition to developmental efforts to support the affected commands.

Command and Control within Operation Inherent Resolve

The committee notes the complexity of Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR). It comprises multiple lines of effort to include: training and equipping of various security forces in the Republic of Iraq and of vetted groups and individuals opposing the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, conducting air strikes in Iraq and Syria,

combating the flow of foreign fighters to and from Iraq and Syria, conducting liaison activities across many elements in multiple countries, maintaining the international coalition and coordinating their activities, and improving the military capabilities of allies and partners in the region.

The committee further notes the geographic dispersion of OIR, which includes the operational planning and execution of this mission across at least four different countries. The committee believes that all of the lines of effort within OIR must be carefully coordinated across the full spectrum and area of operations. The committee is concerned that the current command and control relationships and arrangements within OIR are not achieving the coordination and synchronization required to be effective in meeting the OIR endstates.

As currently structured, training and equipping efforts in Syria, training and equipping efforts in Iraq, and the conduct of airstrikes in both Iraq and Syria appear to be synchronized at the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) level. Further, many of the associated activities required to effectively combat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, such as ending the flow of foreign fighters and coordinating with the Government of the Republic of Turkey, are, in large part, being conducted by other combatant commands, including U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command. The committee is concerned that the ineffective approach to coordinating all of these lines of effort could contribute to undermining the OIR mission.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than August 1, 2015, on the current command and control arrangements within OIR. The briefing should include a discussion of the command and control relationships of each command element within OIR, as well as the processes for coordinating and synchronizing efforts within CENTCOM, across combatant commands, and between allies and partners. The briefing should also include a description of how the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq integrates into the command and control structure for Operation Inherent Resolve in Iraq and any changes and recommendations under consideration to modify the current command and control arrangements in order to further enhance the effectiveness of the OIR mission.

Comptroller General Inventory of Department of Defense Security Cooperation Programs

The committee supports Department of Defense security cooperation efforts to develop and sustain partner nation security capabilities. Improving the security capabilities of partner nations may mitigate risks to U.S. national security and reduce the likelihood of U.S. intervention. The committee is concerned, however, that Department of Defense security cooperation programs lack strategic direction, may not act in concert with other programs, and are not resourced for long-term sustainability. In this regard, the committee intends to work with the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on a broad review of U.S. security cooperation and security assistance programs. To initiate this process, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees,

the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than January 28, 2016, on an inventory of Department of Defense security cooperation programs intended to build partner security capabilities. The inventory should include, but is not limited to, the following:

(1) The name of the program;

(2) The program's goals, objectives, and activities;

(3) The executive branch organizations with responsibility for implementing the program;

(4) The legislative authority for the program; and

(5) The amount of funds expended for the program in each of the past 3 fiscal years.

Department of Defense Training Programs on Military Justice and Accountability

As the Department of Defense's military operations increasingly focus on training and developing other nation's security forces across the globe, it is critical that these efforts include establishing the capacity within these forces to prevent the commission of unlawful acts and to pursue military justice and accountability in cases when members of the partner forces violate local or international law. The committee is concerned that a lack of emphasis on these core values could materialize and erode all that the U.S. has accomplished through its training programs.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to evaluate the Department's efforts to promote the capacity and will of partner security forces to carry out internal military justice and accountability functions. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, on preliminary results with a followup report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of briefing. The assessment should address the following:

(1) An identification of the statutory authorities, applicable doctrine (including field manuals), strategic guidance and programs the Department of Defense currently utilizes to implement military justice and accountability training efforts;

(2) The preparedness of U.S. forces to conduct military justice and accountability training, including the necessary training, skills and resources;

(3) A list of the countries receiving U.S. security assistance to develop internal military justice and accountability functions and the total dollar amount, by statutory authority or program, for the three preceding fiscal years.

(4) An assessment of the ways in which the efforts of the Department of Defense to build military justice and accountability capacity and will of foreign security forces are part of overarching U.S. security assistance to those countries, including the integrated country strategies formulated by the Department of State.

(5) The extent to which there are any statutory or other prohibitions on the provision of such assistance;

(6) How the Department of Defense assesses the effectiveness of activities that are designed to promote military justice and accountability capacity in foreign security forces, including the extent to which enhanced capacity leads to greater accountability.

(7) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to training foreign security forces on military justice and accountability.

Foreign Military Financing in U.S. European Command

The committee recognizes the significant contributions of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies and non-NATO partners to the International Security Assistance Force mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee notes that the United States provided these allies and partners with military equipment over the course of the mission in Afghanistan that they are now bringing home, but is concerned about their ability to sustain this equipment to ensure it is available to meet urgent and emerging security challenges. As noted by the Commander of U.S. European Command (EUCOM) in written testimony provided to the committee in February 2015, "the U.S. needs to be prepared to assist these countries, as appropriate, with sustainment of U.S.-provided systems. The only U.S. government program with this ability is Foreign Military Financing (FMF), which has been reduced for the EUCOM AOR [area of responsibility] (not including Israel), by more than 50 percent since fiscal year 2010. Congressional support for an increase in FMF for the European and Eurasian region would greatly assist in helping to address this sustainment challenge." The committee shares the commander's assessment and encourages the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, to prioritize FMF funding for the EUCOM AOR to support the sustainment of U.S.-provided systems.

Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation

The committee is aware that the Governments of the United States and Japan are currently working towards finalizing a revision to the Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation, which were last updated in 1997. In October 2014, the United States and Japan issued a joint interim report on the revised guidelines that summarized the intent of both governments to modernize their bilateral security relationship to reflect current and emerging security challenges, a greater contribution by Japan to the U.S.-Japan security alliance, and expanded cooperation in areas such as space, cyber, maritime security, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

The committee supports efforts by both governments to update these defense cooperation guidelines. It recognizes that, since 1997, the security environment in East Asia has changed substantially. Similarly, the committee also recognizes that Japan has enhanced its self-defense capabilities and capacities since 1997, and appreciates the contributions Japan continues to make to promote security in the region and globally, particularly in areas such as peacekeeping operations, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, and maritime security. The committee further commends the Government of Japan for its July 2014 policy decision regarding collective self-defense, which will enable Japanese Self-Defense Forces to engage in a wider range of defense operations and complement ongoing efforts to update bilateral guidelines for defense cooperation.

The committee seeks to ensure that the updated guidelines will endure and that the Department of Defense takes necessary actions to implement the guidelines relevant to the Department once they are finalized. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing not later than September 11, 2015, to the House Committee on Armed Services on the Department's plans for implementing the guidelines. The briefing should include a discussion of the specific implementation measures the Department plans to take; any changes in the Department's roles, responsibilities, and missions with respect to the bilateral security alliance; and any changes to U.S. military posture, capabilities, and investments that would be required to support the revised guidelines.

Multilateral Sales to Allies

The committee is aware that the Department of State and the Department of Defense, acting through the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), recently initiated a Lead-Nation Procurement Initiative. This initiative would allow North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) member countries and NATO organizations, acting as a lead-nation, to procure defense capabilities on behalf of others through foreign military sales. The committee understands that this initiative may help maximize NATO allies' defense budgets by enabling them to pool resources to acquire, develop, operate, and maintain shared defense capabilities. The committee notes that proposals for such procurements will be considered on a case-by-case basis for a 2-year trial period, and that lessons learned from this trial period will inform the potential development of more permanent policies to govern such transactions.

The committee is dedicated to ensuring the security of NATO allies and other U.S. partners in Europe. This security is often contingent on the ability of NATO allies and other European partners to acquire, maintain, and operate significant military equipment and other defensive military articles. The committee notes that the Lead-Nation Procurement Initiative is a potential mechanism which allows the United States to increase desired foreign military support in Europe.

The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to monitor the Lead-Nation Procurement Initiative and to keep the committee informed on the results of the initiative's 2-year trial period.

National Guard State Partnership Program

The budget request contained $5.6 million for the National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP).

The committee supports the role of SPP in Department of Defense security cooperation efforts. Section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) authorized SPP until September 30, 2016. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would extend the authority of the program by 2 years.

In its fiscal year 2016 unfunded priority list, the National Guard identified unfunded requirements totaling $7.0 million in SPP activities. Therefore, the committee recommends $12.6 million, an increase of $7.0 million, for the National Guard State Partnership

Program. The committee notes, however, that section 1205(e)(2) of Public Law 113–66 required the Department to submit an annual report to Congress that included, among other matters, a summary of expenditures. The committee urges the Department to ensure Congress receives information in a timely manner on the costs to plan, execute, and administer SPP.

Nonlethal Military Support for Ukraine

The committee notes that Congress has provided the President with the authority to provide increased military assistance for the Government of Ukraine, most recently in section 6 of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–272) and in section 1535 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), which authorized $75.0 million in assistance to Ukraine as part of the Department of Defense's European Reassurance Initiative (ERI). The committee further notes that, to date, the security assistance provided by the United States to the Government of Ukraine has been nonlethal assistance, including the March 2015 announcement that $75.0 million in ERI funds would be allocated to provide additional nonlethal equipment to Ukraine, including communications equipment, medical supplies, and force protection enablers.

The committee believes that defensive weapons and training are also necessary to enhance the defense of Ukraine, and elsewhere in this Act, it includes a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, in concurrence with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine, including the provision of lethal weapons of a defensive nature. However, the committee also recognizes that the United States must continue to provide nonlethal assistance as well to improve other aspects of the performance and professionalization of the Ukrainian Armed Forces.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake a review of other, non-weapons-related activities that could enhance the performance and professionalization of the Ukrainian Armed Forces. In conducting such a review, the committee believes that the Secretary should consider the following areas: (1) logistics and transportation; (2) maintenance; (3) medical evacuation and treatment; (4) intelligence collection and analysis; (5) battlefield command and control; (6) counterintelligence; (7) institutional capacity building at the ministerial level; and (8) any other areas the Secretary considers important. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2015, on the results of the review.

Operation United Assistance

The committee is pleased with the effectiveness and responsiveness of the Department of Defense in its support to Operation United Assistance to combat the Ebola Virus Disease (EVD) in West Africa. The committee recognizes that the Department provides unique capabilities, including command and control, air- and sea-lift, construction, and training, that other U.S. Government

agencies and international organizations are less able to provide. In a matter of weeks, the Department, under the leadership of the United States Agency for International Development, was able to assist in curbing the EVD outbreak in the Republic of Liberia. The Department built 10 Ebola Treatment Units in the Republic of Liberia; performed command and control out of Monrovia, Liberia; trained over 1,500 Liberian health care workers in precautionary safety measures for treating EVD patients; supplied mobile laboratories and personnel to diagnose EVD; and built the Monrovia Medical Unit to treat health care workers diagnosed with EVD. All of these tasks contributed to the international effort to quickly and efficiently bring the EVD epidemic under control.

While the committee believes pandemics are a national security concern, it recognizes that the Department is not, and should not be, the lead agency for monitoring and detecting them, or for building the capacity of other nations to combat them. However, the committee also recognizes that the U.S. Government will likely call on the Department of Defense in future outbreaks of EVD and other diseases to provide assistance similar to that provided as part of Operation United Assistance. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to remain engaged with other relevant U.S. Government and international agencies as they capture lessons learned from Operation United Assistance, and to support building capacity and monitoring systems in Africa to allow for faster and more effective responses in the future.

Lastly, the committee commends the leadership and fortitude of the over 3,000 men and women in uniform who exhibited professionalism and courage as they performed their tasks in a challenging environment.

Oversight of Assistance to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan

The committee applauds the positive agenda that President Ashraf Ghani initiated upon his recent election as president of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, including a commitment to fight corruption, support women's rights, ensure that Afghan government institutions are effective, and initiate political reform. However, the committee continues to be concerned about the current state of these issues in Afghanistan.

Additionally, the committee notes that not less than $25.0 million in Afghanistan Security Forces Fund were made available in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) for the programs and activities to support the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces.

The committee also notes that the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) was recently appointed by the Council of Inspectors General to be the lead IG for oversight of U.S. assistance in Afghanistan. The DOD IG should serve as the focal point for all IG inspections and oversight in Afghanistan. Further, the committee believes that the United States should continually review the progress that is being made within the Government of Afghanistan against corruption and should evaluate the steps that the Government of Afghanistan is taking to diminish corruption as part of any assessment of continued U.S. assistance.

Report on Government Police Training and Equipping Programs

In 2012, the committee received a one-time Presidential report on U.S. Government police training and equipping programs outside the United States, consistent with the requirements in section 1235(c) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383).

The committee acknowledges the value of this report in providing the relevant congressional committees with a comprehensive, whole-of-government survey and assessment of programs that the United States utilizes in training and equipping foreign police forces. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Attorney General of the United States, to submit an update to this report to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the House Committee on Homeland Security, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs, the House Committee on the Judiciary, and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by March 1, 2016, on U.S. Government police training and equipping programs outside the United States. The report shall include the following:

(1) A list of all U.S. Government departments and agencies involved in implementing police training and equipping programs;

(2) A description of the scope, size, and components of all police training and equipping programs for fiscal years 2015 and 2016, to include: (a) the name of each country that received assistance under the program; (b) for each training activity, the number of foreign personnel provided training, their units of operation, location of the training, cost of the activity, the U.S. unit involved, and the nationality and unit of non-U.S. training personnel (if any) involved in each activity; (c) the purpose and objectives of the program; (d) the funding and personnel levels for the program in each such fiscal year; (e) the authority under which the program is conducted; (f) the name of the U.S. Government department or agency with lead responsibility for the program and the mechanisms for oversight of the program; and (g) the metrics for measuring the results of the program;

(3) An assessment of the requirements for police training and equipping programs, and what changes, if any, are required to improve the capacity of the U.S. Government to meet such requirements;

(4) An evaluation of the appropriate role of U.S. Government departments and agencies in coordinating on and carrying out police training and equipping programs;

(5) An evaluation of the appropriate role of contractors in carrying out police training and equipping programs, and what modifications, if any, are needed to improve oversight of such contractors; and

(6) Recommendations for legislative modifications, if any, to existing authorities relating to police training and equipping programs.

The report shall be delivered in unclassified form, that is made available to the public, and may include a classified annex, if necessary.

Lastly, the committee commends the work of the U.S. Government to train, equip, and build partnership capacities with its allies and partners across the globe.

Russian Unconventional Warfare

Tactics employed by the Russian Federation in its aggression against Ukraine are not unique. However, Russia has combined them in new, effective, and troubling ways. It has fomented and taken advantage of ethnic disputes to train, build, and equip a separatist army in Ukraine under Russian direction. It has combined this line of effort with propaganda, diplomatic, and economic measures to try to reduce the effectiveness of Ukraine's response, as well as the response of the United States and Europe, and to preserve and extend its perceived sphere of influence.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is the most successful military alliance in history, defending the security interests of its members against external threats for over 60 years. The committee supports the NATO alliance and believes that it can successfully continue to serve as a bedrock for U.S. and European security. However, the committee notes that the methods currently being used by Russia in Ukraine pose a challenge to the NATO system.

The core of the NATO alliance is provided by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which enshrines the principle of collective self-defense: "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all . . ." In the wake of Russian actions in Ukraine, both the United States, in a series of bilateral actions referred to as the European Reassurance Initiative, and NATO collectively, in the Readiness Action Plan, have taken steps to ensure that all parties are postured to respond to any new aggression. The committee is concerned, however, that these steps may not sufficiently address the challenges posed by Russian tactics.

At its core, collective self-defense requires that the parties to the treaty agree that one of the members is under attack. This implies that such aggression can be correctly attributed to some actor outside the alliance. Russia's actions have been designed to be deniable and difficult to attribute directly to Russian government activity. Should similar tactics, or even more covert methods, be applied to NATO member states that border Russia, it may be difficult to attribute them to Russian activity and therefore difficult to trigger a collective NATO response. It is likely that some NATO members will have different views on the degree of Russian involvement. In addition, it is possible that Russia would perceive NATO may have difficulty in coming to an agreement about a collective response, which could undermine NATO's ability to deter Russia from engaging in attempts to intervene in sovereign issues of NATO members.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense, and NATO, should fully explore how the United States, NATO, and member states can, as necessary, establish deterrence mechanisms against activities such as those undertaken by the Russian government in Ukraine. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Office of Net Assessment or other such organization as the Secretary considers appropriate, to undertake a study exploring various strategies for deterring external efforts to interfere with the internal workings of NATO member states by Russia,

or any other actor utilizing tactics such as propaganda in media, economic warfare, cyber warfare, criminal acts, and intelligence operations, similar to those being used by Russia in Ukraine. The committee expects the Secretary to deliver a report to the congressional defense committees containing the findings of such study not later than March 31, 2016.

This study would complement a provision contained elsewhere in this Act requiring the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy for the Department of Defense to counter unconventional warfare threats posed by adversarial state and non-state actors.

Support to Coalition Partners Conducting Military Operations within Operation Inherent Resolve

Coalition countries, conducting military operations as part of Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR), have requested specific U.S. military assets and assistance to support their efforts to counter the threat presented by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in the Middle East and elsewhere. The committee values the contributions of these countries and urges the Department of Defense to continue consideration of their requests. The committee also recognizes that some of these coalition countries, including the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the United Arab Emirates, have requested unmanned aerial systems (UAS) capability.

The committee notes that on February 17, 2015, the United States announced a new export policy for military unmanned aerial systems. The new policy permits the export of Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) Category I intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) UAS and Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles, subject to case-by-case interagency reviews and consistent with all applicable U.S. law and policy, including those related to the State of Israel's Qualitative Military Edge and MTCR international commitments.

Consistent with UAS policy guidelines, the committee supports the sale, lease, or transfer of U.S.-origin UAS, including Category I systems, to those friends and allies in the Middle East whose military requirements demand persistent ISR assets. The committee notes that appropriate sale, lease, or transfer of UAS technology can help build the capacity of partner nation military forces, foster interoperability with the United States, support critical counterterrorism objectives, and sustain the U.S. defense industrial base. In this context, the committee urges the interagency to review all such outstanding letters of request or license applications for the export of such systems.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs not later than September 15, 2015, on all pending requests from Jordan, and other Middle Eastern countries that are contributing to OIR, for the sale, lease, or transfer of UAS systems. The briefing should include the dates that requests were received, specific issues under consideration, and time horizon for completing a review of each request.

The Transition or Termination of the Mission to Counter the Lord's Resistance Army

The committee continues to closely monitor the mission to apprehend or remove Joseph Kony, the leader of the Lord's Resistance Army (LRA), from the battlefield, which is otherwise known as the Counter-LRA mission.

Section 1208 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) authorized the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of Secretary of State, to provide logistic support, supplies, and services, and intelligence support, to foreign forces participating in operations to mitigate and eliminate the threat posed by the LRA, through September 30, 2017. However, the committee remains concerned that the Secretary of Defense has not provided to the committee details on its plan to transition or terminate the Counter-LRA mission should Joseph Kony be apprehended or removed from the battlefield or when the authority expires.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2015, on the transition plan for the Counter-LRA mission, to include addressing the transition or termination plan for the Counter-LRA mission; the authorities that would be required in any transition; and how the authorized resources would be utilized following any transition or termination of the Counter-LRA mission.

The Utilization of General Purpose Forces to Meet U.S. Africa Command Requirements

The committee notes the importance and value of engagements with militaries of friendly foreign nations on the continent of Africa. These engagements can provide critical training for such militaries, as well as host nation familiarity with U.S. forces that could be useful in the event that the U.S. military finds itself conducting operations in Africa.

To that end, section 1203 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) authorized the General Purpose Forces (GPF) of the United States military to conduct training with military and other security forces of friendly foreign countries. This authority was requested by the Secretary of Defense and, at the time, was presented as a way to meet the requirements of the commander of U.S. Africa Command.

However, to date, this authority has been utilized only once on the continent of Africa. On February 6, 2015, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy provided a letter to the committee that stated this authority would be utilized for a training event in the Republic of Zambia and that the incremental expenses would not exceed $4,000. The committee believes this authority has not been employed to meet the requirements of the commander of the U.S. Africa Command. Additionally, the committee believes that because this authority has only been used once, the Department of Defense has not established a record that would support a request for extension or re-authorization.

This authority does not terminate until September 30, 2017. Additionally, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–

291) authorized the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF), which could provide funding for this authority. The committee believes that through this authority and the CTPF, the Secretary of Defense could further achieve the training and military engagement requirements of the commander of U.S. Africa Command.

U.S.-Philippines Defense Cooperation

The committee notes that in April 2014, the Governments of the United States and the Republic of the Philippines announced a bilateral Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement. This 10-year agreement, building upon the 1951 Mutual Defense Treaty, would facilitate the enhanced rotational presence of U.S. forces, expand opportunities for joint military training and exercises, and support the long-term modernization of the Philippine military. It would also provide for greater U.S. presence in the region to reassure allies and partners and to monitor U.S. interests, particularly freedom of navigation in the South China Sea.

The committee welcomes the enhancement of defense cooperation with the Philippines and the expansion of bilateral military training opportunities. The committee also recognizes the willingness of the Philippines to host U.S. forces on a rotational basis as a strong signal of its commitment to the bilateral strategic partnership. It further supports efforts to modernize the Armed Forces of the Philippines and to strengthen their maritime security, maritime domain awareness, and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief capabilities, so that they can enhance their defensive capabilities and provide a greater contribution to regional security and stability.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Section 1201—One-Year Extension of Logistical Support for Coalition Forces Supporting Certain United States Military Operations

This section would amend section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1223 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to provide supplies, services, transportation, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting U.S. operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan during fiscal year 2016.

Section 1202—Strategic Framework for Department of Defense Security Cooperation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to develop a strategic framework for Department of Defense security cooperation to guide prioritization of resources and activities. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report on the strategic framework for security

cooperation to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act.

The committee notes that key guiding documents for the Department of Defense emphasize security cooperation in general, and building partner capacity specifically, as a priority for the Department. For example, the Department of Defense 2012 strategic guidance, "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," states that, "Building partnership capacity elsewhere in the world also remains important for sharing the costs and responsibilities of global leadership." Moreover, the Department's 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review states that, as a pillar of defense strategy, the Department will "Build security globally, in order to preserve regional stability, deter adversaries, support allies and partners, and cooperate with others to address common security challenges." The committee recognizes the Department's efforts to conduct a comprehensive review of its security assistance authorities. The committee supports the role of the U.S. Armed Forces in developing and maintaining the security capabilities of partner nations across a broad range of programs, but questions the extent to which the Department has established goals and a comprehensive strategy for its security cooperation efforts. Thus, the committee believes that a strategic framework for security cooperation is necessary. The committee recognizes these efforts should ideally be coordinated with the Department of State and other departments and agencies to achieve whole-of-government success in enhancing the security sectors of partner nations.

Section 1203—Modification and Two-Year Extension of National Guard State Partnership Program

This section would amend section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) by modifying and extending the authorization for the National Guard State Partnership Program (SPP).

This section would specify that SPP should support the national interests and security cooperation goals and objectives of the United States. This section would also revise the congressional notification requirements for SPP activities to make a technical adjustment to the underlying language.

This section would require the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to establish, maintain, and update a list of core competencies, consistent with the roles and missions of the Armed Forces as established by the Secretary of Defense, to support SPP activities, and to submit the list of core competencies to the Secretary of Defense for approval.

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a Fund to administer and execute the funds authorized and appropriated for SPP, and to consider certain matters in the establishment of the Fund. It would further require the Secretary to include this Fund in future year budget requests.

This section would revise the matters included in the SPP annual report and definitions of certain terms. Finally, this section would extend the authority of the program by two years, to September 30, 2018.

The committee encourages the Department to keep it informed on progress toward establishing the Fund required in this section, including, at a minimum, an assessment of the extent to which the matters required for consideration will be included in the Fund, and whether new legislation will be required to establish the Fund.

Section 1204—Extension of Authority for Non-Reciprocal Exchanges of Defense Personnel Between the United States and Foreign Countries

This section would amend section 1207(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) by extending the authorization for non-reciprocal exchanges of defense personnel between the United States and foreign countries for an additional 15 months, to December 31, 2017.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

Section 1211—Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan

This section would amend section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as most recently amended by section 1221 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), by extending for 1 year the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and authorizing $5.0 million for fiscal year 2016.

Section 1212—Extension and Modification of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would amend section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1222 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), by extending the authority for reimbursement of coalition nations for support provided to the United States for military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan through fiscal year 2016.

Additionally, this section would extend, through September 30, 2016, the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees, prior to making any reimbursement to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, of any logistical, military, or other support that Pakistan provides to the United States.

Further, this section would extend the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to certify, prior to providing reimbursement to Pakistan, that Pakistan is: maintaining security along the Ground Lines of Communications through Pakistan; taking demonstrable steps to support counterterrorism operations; disrupting cross-border attacks; and countering the threat of improvised explosive devices.

Finally, this section would specify that, of the total amount of reimbursements and support authorized for Pakistan during fiscal year 2016 pursuant to section 1233(d)(1) of Public Law 110–181, as

amended, $400.0 million would not be eligible for a national security waiver unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that Pakistan is conducting military operations against the Haqqani Network in North Waziristan, has prevented the Haqqani Network from using North Waziristan as a safe haven, and is actively coordinating with the Government of Afghanistan to restrict the movement of militants, such as the Haqqani Network, along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border.

Section 1213—Sense of Congress on United States Policy and Strategy in Afghanistan

This section would express a sense of Congress on U.S. policy and strategy in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, including that: the United States continues to have vital national security interests in ensuring that Afghanistan remains stable and sovereign; the Afghan President should be applauded for his leadership; the U.S. President's decision to maintain 9,800 U.S. troops through all of 2015 is appropriate and should be supported by Congress; the U.S. President should withdraw U.S. troops only on a pace that is consistent with the ability of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) to sustain itself and secure Afghanistan; the U.S. President should review maintaining the U.S. advisory mission beyond 2016; the United States should provide monetary and advisory support to the ANSF through 2018; the ANSF should have the independent capability to prevent Al Qaeda, the Haqqani Network, and the Taliban from being able to conduct destabilizing attacks in Afghanistan or against the United States; and the United States should continue to vigorously conduct counterterrorism operations, including against the Haqqani Network, in Afghanistan beyond 2016.

Section 1214—Extension of Authority to Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan

This section would extend section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as most recently amended by section 832 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), through December 31, 2016. The underlying authority provides for limiting competition for products or services that are from one or more countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan or providing a preference for such a product or service, under certain circumstances.

Section 1215—Extension of Authority to Transfer Defense Articles and Provide Defense Services to the Military and Security Forces of Afghanistan

This section would extend section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), as amended by section 1231 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), for 1 year through December 31, 2016.

This section also would extend the quarterly reporting requirement for this authority through March 31, 2017. Additionally, this section would authorize that, during fiscal years 2015–16, the ex-

cess defense articles transferred from the stocks of the Department of Defense to the military and security forces of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan will not be subject to the authorities and limitations set forth in section 561 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87–195).

Section 1216—Sense of Congress Regarding Assistance for Afghan Translators, Interpreters, and Administrative Aids

This section would express the sense of Congress that it is in the interest of the United States to continue to assist Afghan partners, and their immediate families, who have served as translators or interpreters and those who have performed sensitive and trusted activities for U.S. Armed Forces.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO SYRIA AND IRAQ

Section 1221—Extension of Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq

This section would amend and extend section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as most recently amended by section 1237 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), by extending the authority for the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC–I) for 1 year through fiscal year 2016. This authority would allow the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to authorize OSC–I to conduct training activities in support of the Iraqi Ministry of Defense and Counter Terrorism Service personnel at a base or facility of the Government of the Republic of Iraq in order to address capability gaps; integrate processes relating to intelligence, air power, combined arms, logistics, and maintenance; and manage and integrate defense-related institutions.

This section would limit the total authorized funding for operations and activities for OSC–I to $143.0 million in fiscal year 2016. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the activities of OSC–I, including how OSC–I integrates into Operation Inherent Resolve in Iraq.

Section 1222—Comprehensive Strategy for the Middle East and to Counter Islamic Extremism

This section would express findings and a sense of Congress on United States strategy in the Middle East and the state of Islamic extremism, including that Islamic extremism is growing in the Greater Middle East; the Islamic Republic of Iran continues to be a leading state sponsor of terrorism in the Greater Middle East and across the globe; the Building Partnership Capacity approach and limited counterterrorism operations have had some positive effects in some locations but have not prevented the proliferation and violence of terrorist groups or instability in the Middle East; the

United States should take a greater leadership role in fighting Islamic extremism; the United States remains an indispensable actor in the greater Middle East; and the President should ensure that U.S. Armed Forces remain forward postured in the region.

Additionally, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than February 15, 2016, a comprehensive strategy for the Middle East and to counter Islamic extremism, including a detailed description of the following: U.S. objectives; the roles and responsibilities of the Department of Defense in such strategy; actions to prevent the weakening and failing of states; actions to counter Islamic extremism globally; and a detailed definition of states and non-state actors the United States will address in order to counter Islamic extremism.

Section 1223—Modification of Authority to Provide Assistance to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide $715.0 million in fiscal year 2016 for assistance to the military and other security forces of, or associated with, the Government of the Republic of Iraq, including the Kurdish and tribal security forces or other local security forces with a national security mission. In addition, this section would require that not less than 25 percent of the fiscal year 2016 funds be expended for direct assistance to the Kurdish Peshmerga, the Sunni tribal security forces with a national security mission, and the Iraqi Sunni National Guard. It would further require that not less than half of such funds be obligated and expended for the Kurdish Peshmerga.

This section also would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, an assessment of the extent to which the Government of Iraq is meeting certain conditions relating to political inclusion of ethnic and sectarian minorities within the security forces of Iraq. If the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State do not assess that the Government of Iraq has substantially achieved such conditions, the Secretary of Defense would be required to withhold fiscal year 2016 assistance directly to the Government of Iraq. If the Secretary of Defense withholds such fiscal year 2016 assistance to the Government of Iraq, then the Secretary would be required to provide not less than 60 percent of all fiscal year 2016 unobligated funds to the Kurdish Peshmerga, the Sunni tribal security forces with a national security mission, and the Iraqi Sunni National Guard.

Finally, this section would require that the Kurdish Peshmerga, the Sunni tribal security forces with a national security mission, and the Iraqi Sunni National Guard be deemed a country, which would allow these security forces to directly receive assistance from the United States under this section, should the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State not submit the assessment required by this section or submit an assessment that the Government of Iraq has not substantially met the conditions related to the requirements for assistance, as outlined in this section.

Section 1224—Report on United States Armed Forces Deployed in Support of Operation Inherent Resolve

This section would express the sense of Congress that: (1) it should be a top priority to provide U.S. Armed Forces, deployed as part of Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR), with the necessary force protection and combat search and rescue (CSAR) support; (2) U.S. military CSAR, casualty evacuation, and medical support personnel should not be counted as part of any limitation on the number of ground forces for OIR; (3) military assets for OIR should be staged as far forward as possible and should not be subject to any limitation on the number of ground forces for OIR; and (4) the President, Secretary of Defense, and commanders on the ground in support of OIR should continuously evaluate the force protection and CSAR requirements to ensure that such requirements are sufficient and are optimally postured.

This section also would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report, 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and every 90 days thereafter, on the U.S. Armed Forces deployed in support of OIR, including: the total number of U.S. Armed Forces personnel deployed; the total number of U.S. Armed Forces personnel expected to be deployed; the total number of U.S. Armed Forces conducting force protection and CSAR; the authorities and limitations on such personnel; and any changes to the limitations, authorities, or U.S. policy. This section would terminate on the date that OIR terminates or 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, whichever occurs earlier.

Section 1225—Modification of Authority to Provide Assistance to the Vetted Syrian Opposition

This section would amend section 1209 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) by striking subsection (f) and inserting a new subsection (f) that would authorize $531.5 million to be appropriated from Overseas Contingency Operations in title XV for fiscal year 2016 for the Syria Train and Equip Fund for assistance to the vetted opposition in the Syrian Arab Republic.

The committee would authorize $600.0 million for the overall Syria Train and Equip program, which includes $531.5 million for the Syria Train and Equip Fund, $25.8 million for costs that would be incurred by the Army for such program, and $42.8 million for costs that would be incurred by the Air Force for such program.

The committee notes that the challenges associated with initiating the Syria train and equip program have been great. The committee remains concerned about the elongated nature of the timeline to start the training and equipping of the vetted Syrian opposition. The committee will continue to conduct rigorous oversight of how this program fits into the overall strategy for Operation Inherent Resolve to determine whether it will be able to effectively contribute to the fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

Section 1226—Assistance to the Government of Jordan for Border Security Operations

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide assistance on a reimbursement basis to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to support and enhance the efforts of its Armed Forces to sustain security along its border with the Syrian Arab Republic and the Republic of Iraq.

This section would also authorize $300.0 million in support of this authority. Additionally, not later than 15 days before providing assistance, the Secretary of Defense would be required to provide to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that describes the type, amount, and timeline for assistance that would be provided.

Lastly, under this section, the Secretary of Defense would not be authorized to enter into any contractual obligation to provide such assistance, and would not be able to provide assistance after December 31, 2016.

Section 1227—Report on efforts of Turkey to fight terrorism

This section would 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, on the Republic of Turkey's bilateral and multilateral efforts to combat the flow of foreign fighters through its country to the Syrian Arab Republic; Turkey's relationship with Hamas, including its harboring of leaders of Hamas; and the efforts of Turkey to fight terrorism, including Turkey's military and humanitarian role in the coalition to combat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO IRAN

Section 1231—Extension of Annual Report on Military Power of Iran

This section would amend section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as most recently amended by section 1277 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), by extending the annual report on the military power of the Islamic Republic of Iran to December 31, 2025, and adding a reporting requirement that provides an assessment of transfers of military equipment, technology, and training to Iran from non-Iranian sources.

Section 1232—Sense of Congress on the Government of Iran's Nuclear Program and its Malign Military Activities

This section would set forth certain findings and express the sense of Congress on the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran's nuclear program and its malign military activities. The sense of Congress includes that: Iran's illicit pursuit, development, or acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability and its malign military activities constitute a grave threat to regional stability and the na-

tional security interests of the United States and its allies and partners; Iran continues to expand its malign military activities in the Middle East and globally, which may well increase under a Comprehensive Joint Plan of Action (CJPOA); sanctions relief under the CJPOA will provide Iran the ability to increase funding for its ballistic missile development programs, acquisition of destabilizing types and amounts of conventional weapons, support for terrorism, and other malign activities throughout the Middle East and globally; U.S. bilateral and multilateral sanctions against Iran, once relieved, will be extremely difficult to reconstitute in response to Iranian violations of its international obligations; Iran would be an internationally-approved nuclear threshold state under the framework of the CJPOA, which will likely lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons across the Middle East; and Congress should review and assess all elements of any agreement entered into between the countries of the P5+1 (the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the French Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Russian Federation, and the People's Republic of China) and Iran, and it should approve or disapprove of any sanctions relief that results from such an agreement.

Further, this section would set forth that the United States must continue to support the defense of allies and partners in the region, including Israel, by strengthening ballistic missile defense capabilities and increasing security assistance; and that Congress supports efforts to reach a peaceful, diplomatic solution to permanently and verifiably end Iran's pursuit, development, and acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability, and it reaffirms that it is U.S. policy that Iran will not be allowed to develop a nuclear weapons capability and that all instruments of U.S. power must be considered to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Finally, this section would state that Congress reaffirms the rights of U.S. allies to exercise their legitimate right to self-defense against the Government of Iran.

Section 1233—Report on Military Posture Required in the Middle East to Deter Iran from Developing a Nuclear Weapon

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress, not later than 90 days after this Act, regarding the military posture required in the Middle East to deter the Islamic Republic of Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. The report would include a discussion of the military forces, bases, and capability required to maintain a military option to prevent Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon, counter Iran's military activities, and protect the U.S. military and other interests in the region.

SUBTITLE E—MATTERS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Section 1241—Notifications and Updates Relating to Testing, Production, Deployment, and Sale or Transfer to Other States or Non-State Actors of the Club-K Cruise Missile System by the Russian Federation

This section would require quarterly notifications by the Secretary of Defense to the congressional defense committees on the

testing, production, deployment, sale, or transfer to other states or non-state actors of the Club-K cruise missile system by the Russian Federation.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees not later than 7 days after the Secretary determines that there is reasonable belief that Russia has deployed, sold, or transferred the Club-K cruise missile system to other states or non-state actors.

Additionally, this section would require the Secretary to submit quarterly updates to the specified congressional committees on the coordination of allied responses to the deployment, sale, or transfer of the Club-K cruise missile system to other states or non-state actors by Russia.

Lastly, this section would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to develop a strategy to detect, defend against, and defeat the Club-K cruise missile system, including opportunities for allied contributions to such efforts based on consultations with them. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be required to submit the strategy to the congressional defense committees not later than September 30, 2016. The committee encourages the Chairman to ensure such strategy includes an estimation of its costs, if implemented in whole or in part, as well as a military assessment of the risks of such system to the United States, its deployed Armed Forces, and its allies if deployed by Russia or by a non-state actor.

The notification requirements in this section would sunset 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 1242—Notifications of Deployment of Nuclear Weapons by Russian Federation to Territory of Ukrainian Republic

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the appropriate congressional committees quarterly notifications on the status of the Russian Federation conducting exercises with, planning or preparing to deploy, or deploying certain weapon systems, including its nuclear weapons, onto the territory of the Ukrainian Republic.

This section would also require prompt notification, not more than 7 days, after the Secretary determines that there exists reasonable grounds to believe that Russia has deployed certain weapon systems onto the territory of Ukraine.

This section would further require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to develop a strategy to respond to the military threat posed by Russia deploying certain weapon systems into the territory of Ukraine, including opportunities for allied cooperation in developing such responses based on consultation with such allies. The Chairman would be required to submit the strategy to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2016, along with the views of the Secretary of Defense.

The notification requirement in this section would sunset 5 years after the date of the enactment of the Act.

Section 1243—Non-Compliance by the Russian Federation with its Obligations under the INF Treaty

This section would express the sense of Congress concerning ongoing violations of arms control agreements and treaties with the United States by the Russian Federation. This section would also require notification to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act regarding Russia's continued violation of the Treaty on Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) or return to compliance with such treaty, and not later than 30 days after Russia takes any further actions related to the INF, including any steps to return to compliance with that treaty.

This section would also require submission of a report by the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 120 days thereafter, on the status of discussions with allies of the United States on Russia's violation of the INF Treaty, including efforts to develop collective responses to said violation. This reporting requirement would sunset 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Lastly, this section would require the President, if on the date of the enactment of this Act, Russia has not begun to return to full compliance with the INF treaty, to begin research and development of counter force and countervailing U.S. responses, based on recommendations of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to fill current military requirements and capability gaps, with a priority on capabilities that could be deployed in 2 years. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends funds be authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of research and development of these capabilities in fiscal year 2016.

With respect to the options to be considered using the funds that would be authorized by this provision, the committee notes the testimony of the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy on December 10, 2014, that "we are looking at a number of possible countermeasures in the military sphere, ranging from reactive defense to counterforce to countervailing defense measures. I don't want to get into the specifics because we are still working through various options, but we have a broad range of options, some of which would be compliant with the INF Treaty, some of which would not be, that we would be able to recommend to our leadership if a decision were taken to go down that path."

Section 1244—Modification of Notification and Assessment of Proposal to Modify or Introduce New Aircraft or Sensors for Flight by the Russian Federation under Open Skies Treaty

This section would amend section 1242 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) by extending the number of days before notification to the stated congressional committees of the intention to approve a proposal of the Russian Federation with respect to the Open Skies Treaty from 30 days to 90 days. This section would further amend section 1242 to require the views

of any relevant combatant commander to also be provided in the assessment required by the section.

Section 1245—Sense of Congress on Support for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

This section would express a sense of Congress on U.S. support for the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia, and the Republic of Lithuania, including support for their sovereignty, concern over aggressive military actions of the Russian Federation against these nations, and encouragement for further defense cooperation between the United States and these nations.

Section 1246—Sense of Congress on Support for Georgia

This section would express the sense of Congress on U.S. support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as support for continued cooperation between the United States and Georgia.

SUBTITLE F—MATTERS RELATING TO THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Section 1251—Sense of Congress Recognizing the 70th Anniversary of the End of Allied Military Engagement in the Pacific Theater

This section would express the sense of Congress recognizing the 70th anniversary of the end of the Allied military engagement in the Pacific theater, and the end of the Second World War. It would also express a series of findings highlighting key events related to the Second World War in the Pacific; recognize the tremendous sacrifice, bravery, and loss of U.S. and Allied Forces; and note the close alliance relationship that the United States and Japan have forged in the years since the war.

Section 1252—Sense of Congress Regarding Consolidation of United States Military Facilities in Okinawa, Japan

This section would provide the sense of Congress that the Henoko location for the Futenma Replacement Facility has been studied and analyzed for several decades, reaffirmed by both the United States and Japan on several occasions, including the 2010 Futenma Replacement Facility Bilateral Experts study and the independent assessment required by section 346 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), and remains the only option for the Futenma Replacement Facility.

Section 1253—Strategy to Promote United States Interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific Region

This section would require the President to develop an overall strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region that is informed by the U.S. National Security Strategy, the Department of Defense strategy on prioritizing defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region as required by section 1251 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), and the Department of State strategy for a rebalancing of U.S. policy in Asia as required by section 7043 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act,

2014 (Public Law 113–76). This section would further require the President to issue a Presidential Policy Directive to relevant Federal departments and agencies that implement the required strategy, and require that the annual budget request submission to Congress include a description of how the programs and projects funded in the request align with the required strategy.

The committee notes that the President has issued Presidential Policy Directives (PPD) containing strategies for other regions of the globe, to include a PPD on Political and Economic Reform in the Middle East and North Africa in 2011, and a PPD on U.S. Strategy for Sub-Saharan Africa in 2012. The committee believes that such a PPD containing a strategy for promoting U.S. interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region, which also includes specific implementing guidance to relevant Federal departments and agencies, will help bring focus and cohesiveness to, and establish priorities for, relevant interagency and organization-specific programs and projects.

Section 1254—Sense of Congress on the United States Alliance with Japan

This section would express a sense of Congress on the U.S. alliance with Japan, including that the United States highly values the alliance with the Government of Japan, supports recent changes in Japanese defense policy and the new bilateral guidelines for U.S.-Japan defense cooperation, and reaffirms the U.S. commitment to the alliance.

Subtitle G—Other Matters

Section 1261—Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

This section would authorize a 1-year extension to the Department of Defense to continue to develop, manage, and execute a Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery personnel recovery program for isolated Department of Defense, U.S. Government, and other designated personnel supporting U.S. national interests worldwide. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to use up to $25.0 million in funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance for such recovery program through fiscal year 2017.

Section 1262—Amendment to the Annual Report under Arms Control and Disarmament Act

This section would amend section 2539a of title 22, United States Code, regarding the requirement for the annual briefing on arms control compliance, also known as the "Report on Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments."

This section would modify the associated requirement for the President to brief certain congressional committees on the report, to require that in any year in which that report is not submitted by the statutorily required submission date of April 15, the Director of National Intelligence shall provide a report, not later than June 15, detailing each instance of inconsistent behavior by a state

party to an arms control treaty or related agreement to which the United States is a party.

Section 1263—Permanent Authority for NATO Special Operations Headquarters

This section would make permanent the authority for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Special Operations Headquarters, as first authorized in section 1244(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1264—Extension of Authorization to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction

This section would extend the authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction from section 1204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) from 2017 to 2020.

Section 1265—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, for Arms Control Implementation

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit to the specified committees of Congress a report on certain information related to the Open Skies Treaty prior to the obligation or expenditure of more than 50 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force (PE 35145F), for arms control implementation.

Section 1266—Modification of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would modify the reporting requirement within section 1208(f)(1) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as most recently amended by section 1202(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), from annual to biannual, and raise the authorized amount to $100.0 million. Given the increased focus on this authority and additional authorization amount of $100.0 million, the committee believes biannual reporting is required to ensure robust congressional oversight of this important authority.

Section 1267—United States-Israel Anti-Tunnel Defense Cooperation

This section would establish a cooperative program with the State of Israel to develop an anti-tunneling defense system to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels.

Section 1268—Efforts of the Department of Defense to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally

This section would express a series of findings and a statement of policy on preventing and responding to gender-based violence

globally, and require the Secretary of Defense to continue implementation of the U.S. Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, as appropriate. Furthermore, it would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide training on such matters, and require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to certain congressional committees on the Department of Defense's implementation efforts.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program contained $358.5 million for fiscal year 2016. The request included $20.6 million for the Global Nuclear Security (GNS) Program, $264.6 million for the Cooperative Biological Engagement Program (CBEP), and $438.9 million for the Proliferation Prevention Program (PPP).

The committee continues to support the goals of the CTR Program and believes that the program is important to United States national security.

The committee notes that the CTR Cooperative Biological Engagement Program now encompasses 70 percent of the CTR budget request. The committee reaffirms its view, stated in the committee report (H. Rept. 111–491) accompanying the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, and reaffirmed in the two most recent committee reports accompanying the House of Representatives-passed national defense authorization acts, that biological threat reduction and engagement "should be guided by a comprehensive long-term interagency engagement and coordination; rigorous Department management and oversight; coordination and integration with other Department programs and activities; and concrete metrics for measuring progress." The committee further reaffirms its view that the CTR Program as a whole should "maintain a strong focus'" on the full range of threat reduction challenges. The committee continues to believe that concrete metrics remain important for measuring the impact and effectiveness of CBEP activities.

Lastly, the committee welcomes efforts by the Department of Defense to actively consult with the committee and to keep it fully informed of efforts and developments in these areas.

The committee recommends $358.5 million, the amount of the budget request, for the CTR Program. The committee believes that no CTR funds for fiscal year 2016 should be authorized for activities with the Russian Federation based on ongoing Russian aggression towards Ukraine, as provided in the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Funds

This section would define Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in sec-

tion 301 of this Act and made available by section 4301 of this Act, and would specify that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program from within the overall $358.5 million that the committee would authorize for the CTR program. The allocation under this section reflects the amount of the budget request for fiscal year 2016.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Assessment of Current State of Global Tantalum Supply

The committee has repeatedly expressed concern regarding supply chains for items critical to national security, such as rare earth materials, titanium, beryllium, ammonium perchlorate, and other materials. The committee understands that the Department of Defense may seek to procure up to 46,750 pounds of tantalum for the National Defense Stockpile as stated in the Department's Annual Materials Plan for Fiscal Year 2016. The committee believes it is important to ensure a reliable supply of tantalum for the production of military electronics and capacitors, armor-piercing munitions, military turbine engines, and rocket motor nozzles.

The committee is concerned about the reliability and transparency of the tantalum supply chain. As part of its biennial report on requirements, the National Defense Stockpile relies upon production data generated by the U.S. Geological Survey. While recent data from the U.S. Geological Survey states that 786 tonnes of tantalum was produced in 2013, industry publications indicate that global tantalum production was in excess of 1,500 tonnes in that year. This significant discrepancy is a serious concern for the committee, as the National Defense Stockpile's report may markedly underestimate global tantalum production and consumption.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit an assessment to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2016, of the current state of the global tantalum supply chain, to include the following:

(1) An assessment of global tantalum production from primary raw materials, slag materials, synthetic concentrates, and secondary materials;

(2) A comparison and analysis of data available from industry and data generated during the preparation of the National Defense Stockpile's biennial requirements report for 2015;

(3) An assessment of the reliability of tantalum producers during national defense emergency scenarios analyzed in the National Defense Stockpile's biennial requirements report for 2015; and

(4) Any other elements the Comptroller General deems relevant to the assessment.

Insufficient Working-Capital Fund Rate Calculations

The committee has been concerned for a number of years that the determination of prices and rates for Defense Working-Capital Fund activities is driven by an arbitrary, outdated goal of maintaining 7 to 10 days of cash to sustain business operations. This metric cannot respond to changes related to external pressures such as fluctuations in commodity markets that are outside of the Department of Defense's control.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a report examining a range of alternative cash balance parameters by which the revolving funds could be managed to sustain a single rate or price to the customer throughout the fiscal year. Having found this report to be insufficient, the committee mandated a study in section 1402 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) requiring an independent review of each working capital fund within the Department to ascertain the appropriate cash corpus required to maintain good financial management of each fund. This study was thorough and informative but did not provide for change within management of the working capital funds. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2013, the committee responded by recommending that the Department modify its Financial Management Regulations to adjust the range of the cash corpus required for fuel-related working capital funds to mitigate the continued fluctuation of rates charged to the customer during the fiscal year.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee commended the Department for initiating processes to determine the correct cash corpus thresholds for each working-capital fund. In addition, the committee looked forward to future budget submissions with prices and rates set to maintain an adequate cash balance to absorb external pressures, thereby maintaining a steady, dependable rate for the customer throughout the fiscal year.

However, the committee is dismayed to find that the fuel rates set within the budget request for fiscal year 2016 take a step back from this thoughtful calculation. Rather than assessing the current marketplace for fuel costs in this time of lower crude oil prices, the request merely footnotes the fact that the composite fuel rate for fiscal year 2015 was reduced on February 1, 2015, by $18.48, or 11.9 percent. This reduction was not accounted for in any of the decisions made by Defense Working-Capital Fund managers in the determination of fiscal year 2016 rates. In addition, the calculation of fuel rates is no longer based on estimated market prices for the upcoming fiscal year; rather, the rate is set on a 2009 funding level, adjusted for inflation. This basic rate calculation does not take into account the current cash balance of the fund and absolves working-capital fund managers of their responsibility of managing the fund. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction in the O&M budget for fiscal year 2016 as shown in section 4301 of

this Act, and realigns those funds to support higher priority defense requirements throughout the Department.

Review of Electronic Waste Recycling

The committee is aware that modern electronics contain many valuable recyclable materials, including strategic and critical materials and precious metals. The committee notes that through the proper disposal of end-of-life electronics used by the Department of Defense, these recyclable materials could be reclaimed for use in U.S. military programs. It is unclear, however, how the Department plans for, and executes this disposal process, leading to the possibility that significant quantities of these materials are being lost or wasted.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than September 30, 2016, on the current state of electronic waste recycling by the Department of Defense. Such a report shall include:

(1) Information on the disposition of used Department of Defense electronics, including the volume of electronics that are recycled, reused, refurbished, and demanufactured;

(2) Information on the value of all strategic and critical materials, including precious metals, recovered from recycled electronics of the Department during fiscal years 2010–14;

(3) Information on the economic models used by the Department for the collection and capture of strategic or critical materials from used electronics, including any benefits and challenges associated with the models; and

(4) An identification and assessment of potential opportunities for improving the efficiency or effectiveness of the Department's efforts to recover strategic and critical materials from used Department of Defense electronics.

Review of Non-Navy Workload within Navy Working Capital Fund Activities

The committee is aware of guidance issued by the Chief of Naval Operations to Navy Working Capital Funded entities, including the science and technology laboratories and test and evaluation centers, to increase the scrutiny of and elevate the approval levels for reimbursable work for other Federal agencies. The committee is concerned that an unintended consequence of such guidance is a failure to recognize how working capital funded entities operate and the value that outside, reimbursable work can have on reducing the overall rate structure for entities such as the naval warfare centers. The committee also believes that such a move could be detrimental to the overall efficiency of the Federal research and test enterprise by forcing other Federal partners to rely on contractors to provide these services or to build additional, redundant scientific and test capabilities. For example, the Department of Homeland Security works closely with the naval warfare centers to provide science, technology, test, and evaluation capabilities for its programs, and without that support, the Department of Homeland Security would have to devote a larger percentage of its research, de-

velopment, test, and evaluation budget to providing those services itself.

The committee is concerned that the aforementioned guidance could be affecting decisions at naval facilities, including the Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division (NAWCAD) and the Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC). The committee has received information from the Department of the Navy that NAWCAD has not rejected any Department of Homeland Security work; however, NAWCAD had identified one instance where a fiscal year 2014 request by the Department of Homeland Security to extend the period of performance of an existing effort did not continue. Additionally, work valued at $3.7 million to procure and install runway lighting systems for the New York Port Authority was rejected in fiscal year 2014 because it was deemed not to be within the NAWCAD mission area.

To understand the nature of the impact this guidance might have on operations and budget requests of Navy Working Capital Fund entities, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Chief of Naval Operations, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2015, commenting on all discrepancies between the budgeted position and actual workload, as presented in the President's budget request for each fiscal year from 2012–15 for each subcategory under "Other Orders" as shown in the Sources of New Orders and Revenue budget display. The briefing shall include a discussion of the discrepancies, to include the rationale for refusing any workload from these entities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize appropriations for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1405—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1406—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1407—National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Extension of Date for Completion of Destruction of Existing Stockpile of Lethal Chemical Agents and Munitions

This section would modify section 1412(b)(3) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1986 (Public Law 99–45) by extending the stockpile elimination deadline from December 31, 2017, to December 31, 2023.

SUBTITLE C—WORKING–CAPITAL FUNDS

Section 1421—Limitation on Furlough of Department of Defense Employees Paid Through Working-Capital Funds

This section would prohibit the furlough of Department of Defense employees paid through working capital funds unless the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of a military department determines that the working capital fund is insolvent or there are insufficient funds to pay working capital fund labor costs of the employee. This section would also provide the authority for the Secretary concerned to waive the prohibition in the interest of national security.

Section 1422—Working-Capital Fund Reserve Account for Petroleum Market Price Fluctuations

This section would amend section 2208 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new subsection that establishes a reserve account within the Defense Working Capital Fund to provide fund managers a contingency account for sudden fluctuations in market rates for petroleum. With the volatility of the current fuel market, the committee believes setting fuel rates up to 18 months prior to execution is a difficult and imprecise action. This account would allow fund managers to maintain the standard price for fuel to customers when market prices suddenly increase, which the committee believes would keep operation and maintenance accounts unaffected during the year of execution.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1431—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds from the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund created by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1432—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $64.3 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2016.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

OVERVIEW

The committee notes that section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) requires the budget submission to Congress for each fiscal year to include:

(1) A request for the appropriation of funds for ongoing operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan;

(2) An estimate of all funds expected to be required in that fiscal year for operations; and

(3) A detailed justification of the funds requested.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations to be available upon enactment of this Act to support overseas contingency operations. These authorizations support, but are not limited to, current operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL); enhanced security and military capabilities for countries in the region to include Jordan, a key member of the coalition against ISIL; increased assistance and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine to deter Russian aggression; reassurance and support for our allies and partners; and continued support for the Afghanistan National Security Forces to support stability and security in Afghanistan.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund

The committee notes that the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) authorized the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to foreign security forces and to improve the capacity of the U.S. Armed Forces in the U.S. Central Command and

U.S. Africa Command areas of responsibility under the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF). Public Law 113–291 also authorized $1.30 billion for this fund.

The budget request contained $2.10 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations funding for the CTPF. However, the committee is concerned that the Secretary of Defense has not provided the plan for CTPF, as required by section 1534 of Public Law 113–291, and has not devised a strategy for this fund. Given the complexities of the CTPF, the nascent stage of the execution of the fiscal year 2015 CTPF authorization, and that no funds have been obligated or executed under the fiscal year 2015 CTPF authorization, the committee recommends not authorizing a fiscal year 2016 CTPF. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee realigns such CTPF funds to areas in which the requirements have been determined.

The committee intends to conduct close and thorough oversight of the fiscal year 2015 CTPF authorization in order to ensure that: (1) the CTPF serves the purpose that the Secretary of Defense envisions for this fund; (2) the CTPF is executed consistent with the fiscal year 2015 CTPF authorization; and (3) the Department of Defense is able to execute the fiscal year 2015 CTPF authorized funding effectively.

Funding and Support for the European Reassurance Initiative

The budget request included $789.3 million for the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI). The committee supports the policy and activities contained in the ERI, which was originally proposed as part of the budget request for fiscal year 2015. However, the committee observes that these initiatives are largely focused on conventional reassurance and deterrence activities. The committee also recognizes that the Russian Federation has employed unconventional warfare methods in areas such as cyber warfare, economic warfare, information operations, and intelligence operations, and believes the Department of Defense should increase its focus on countering such methods.

The committee believes that ERI funds for fiscal year 2016 should be allocated for continued conventional reassurance and deterrence activities, as outlined in section 1535 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), as well as countering unconventional threats. Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would: (1) lay out a statement of policy regarding ERI; (2) require a Department of Defense strategy to address unconventional warfare methods; and (3) authorize increased funding for U.S. intelligence and warning capabilities related to the European theater, technologies supporting U.S. information operations and strategic communications activities, the Javelin weapon system, and Stryker combat vehicle upgrades to meet U.S. Army Europe operational needs.

The committee further believes that, as part of the U.S. effort to increase security assistance to allies and partners in Europe, ERI funds should be allocated to provide both nonlethal equipment and lethal equipment of a defensive nature to Ukraine. Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize appropriations to provide sustainment and assistance to the military and national security forces of Ukraine.

The committee believes that all of these U.S. efforts taken in combination are vital to address regional security and to deter and counter continued Russian aggression. The committee further believes that these efforts should be enduring and must be sustained as core activities of the Department of Defense in Europe.

National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Account

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained no funding for National Guard and Reserve Component equipment account. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee notes that the base budget request contained $3.1 billion for procurement of National Guard and Reserve Component equipment.

Given the uncertainty of the current and projected fiscal environment, the availability of equipment needed to sustain and modernize the National Guard and Reserve Components as an operational reserve and for their domestic support missions remains a concern. The committee recognizes the National Guard and Reserve Components continue to report significant equipment shortages in modernized equipment. For example, the committee notes there are significant modernization and capability challenges associated with the current Air National Guard aircraft charged with the Aerospace Control Alert mission.

The committee believes additional funds would help eliminate identified shortfalls in the areas of critical dual-use equipment. The committee expects these funds to be used for the purposes of, but not limited to, the procurement of aircraft, avionic and radar upgrades for legacy strike fighter aircraft, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios to include single channel ground and airborne radio systems, non-system training devices, logistics automation systems, sense and avoid system upgrades for unmanned aerial systems, civil support communication systems, semipermanent humidity controlled aircraft shelters, chemical/biological protective shelters, internal and external fuel tanks for rotorcraft, F–16 center display units, mobile ad hoc network emergency communications equipment, and other critical dual-use, unfunded procurement items for the National Guard and Reserve Components.

The committee recommends additional funding for a National Guard and Reserve Component equipment account within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. The committee also recommends $3.1 billion, the full amount of the base budget request, for National Guard and Reserve equipment.

Support to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would increase support to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan for training, operations, and enhancement of their capability to fight the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

Specifically, this Act would provide: (1) $300.0 million for support to the border security of Jordan, (2) $16.5 million for support to the training and operations of the Jordanian military, and (3) $300.0 million for enhancements to the capabilities of the Jordanian military.

The committee continues to believe that the United States should take all steps to ensure that it is supporting Jordan in its fight against ISIL to include providing parts, equipment, training, and enhanced capability in a timely manner.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 1501—Purpose

This section would establish the purpose of 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 and other additional funding requirements.

Section 1502—Procurement

This section would authorize additional appropriations for procurement at the levels identified in section 4102 of division D of this Act.

Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize additional appropriations for research, development, test, and evaluation at the levels identified in section 4202 of division D of this Act.

Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize additional appropriations for operation and maintenance programs at the levels identified in sections 4302 and 4303 of division D of this Act.

The committee notes that funds authorized for the Syria Train & Equip Fund shall be executed pursuant to section 1209 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

Section 1505—Military Personnel

This section would authorize additional appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4402 of division D of this Act.

Section 1506—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1507—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the level identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1508—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1509—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations

This section would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the transfer of up to $3.5 billion of additional war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

SUBTITLE C—EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE AND RELATED MATTERS

Section 1531—Statement of Policy Regarding European Reassurance Initiative

This section would express a series of findings highlighting continued aggression and intimidation by the Russian Federation against U.S. allies and partners in Europe, in particular, and include a statement of policy on efforts by the United States to continue and expand initiatives to reassure U.S. allies and partners and to deter aggression and intimidation by the Russian Government, in order to enhance security and stability in the region.

Section 1532—Assistance and Sustainment to the Military and National Security Forces of Ukraine

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, in concurrence with the Secretary of State, to provide assistance and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine through September 30, 2016. This assistance would include the explicit authority for the Secretary of Defense to provide lethal weapons of a defensive nature to the security forces of Ukraine.

This section would also require a notification to specified congressional committees containing a description of the plan for providing assistance, and require a quarterly report on the status of the activities and assistance. Lastly, this section would authorize appropriations of $200.0 million to carry out this authority.

While the committee acknowledges the Administration's efforts to provide nonlethal security assistance to Ukraine, including its March 2015 announcement that $75.0 million in Department of Defense European Reassurance Initiative funds would be allocated to provide additional nonlethal equipment to Ukraine, the committee

believes that defensive weapons and training are also necessary to enhance the defense of Ukraine. The committee notes that a February 2015 Atlantic Council, Brookings Institute, and Chicago Council on Global Affairs Report, "Preserving Ukraine's Independence, Resisting Russian Aggression: What the United States and NATO [the North Atlantic Treaty Organization] Must Do," authored by former senior U.S. diplomatic and military officials, came to a similar conclusion in its recommendation that the United States and NATO "bolster Ukraine's defense and deter further Russian aggression by providing military assistance to Ukraine—including lethal defensive assistance."

The committee views this Ukraine assistance authority as part of a larger policy to reassure U.S. allies and partners in Europe and to deter further Russian aggression in both conventional and unconventional forms. Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize funds for the Department of Defense to continue its European Reassurance Initiative activities, including increasing training, exercises, and partnership capacity with European allies and partners. Additionally, elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake a study on how the Department should address unconventional warfare methods.

SUBTITLE D—LIMITATIONS, REPORTS, AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 1541—Continuation of Existing Limitation on Use of Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would continue the existing limitation on the use of funds in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) subject to conditions of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 1531 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), through fiscal year 2016.

Additionally, this section would require that $50.0 million from ASFF be used for the recruitment and retention of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces, including the modification of facilities of the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Defense to accommodate female service members and police.

Further, this section would require that, not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, submit to the congressional defense committees, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, an inventory of the facilities and services of the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of the Interior that are lacking in adequate resources for Afghan female service members and police.

In addition, this section would require that, not later than 60 days after the submission of such an inventory, the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, submit to the congressional defense committees, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, a plan to address the shortcomings of such facilities and services that the Secretaries consider

to be most significant and to identify the funding that would be required to fully address such shortcomings.

This section also would require the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to submit to the congressional defense committees, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, updates to the inventory and plan required at the same time that the President submits the budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2020.

Section 1542—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

This section would authorize various transfer authorities, reporting requirements, and other associated activities for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat Fund, as managed by the Joint IED Defeat Organization, or director of the successor defense agency to the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization, during fiscal year 2016. This section would also modify the implementation requirements associated with the plan for consolidation and alignment of rapid acquisition organizations required to be developed by section 1533(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). Finally, this section would repeal the prohibition in section 1533(d) of Public Law 113–291 on the use of fiscal year 2015 funds for the Joint IED Defeat Fund to assign personnel or contractors to combatant commands or associated military components under certain circumstances.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Army Space Programs

The committee is aware of various U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC) investments in space technologies to support the warfighter. One program that SMDC is developing, called Kestrel Eye, will launch two low-cost imaging satellites, which are controlled by and provide direct support to tactical forces. Additionally, there are other investments in low-cost communications satellites for beyond-line-of-sight mission command for tactical forces in forward-deployed operating areas. These communications satellites may also offer the ability to provide greater situational awareness and rapid targeting information to tactical operations, as well as provide a testbed for telemetry collection and technology demonstration of a space-based range. Lastly, the Enhanced Advanced Space Data Exploitation capability is designed to provide consumable, real-time information and intelligence to the warfighter. Further space data exploitation and integration may offer significant cost savings and operational advantage to military forces.

The committee fully supports these SMDC activities and encourages the Army to continue technology development for tactical forces to harness the unique advantages that space provides.

The committee also encourages the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency, which are both combat support agencies, as well as the National Reconnaissance Office, to partner with SMDC on opportunities to further leverage the advantages of space capabilities for tactical forces.

Calibration of Space Sensors

The committee supports the calibration of space sensors prior to launch. Without proper calibration, characterization, testing, and evaluation, there is risk of under-performance for the warfighter, and waste of investment of the taxpayer. In this regard, the committee notes that short-term decisions based on budget-driven solutions could have longer-term implications. Therefore, the committee recommends that space sensors being developed by the Department of Defense be properly calibrated, tested, and evaluated prior to launch.

Combatant Command Commercial Imagery Tasking

The committee is aware that the flexibility for a combatant command to directly task a space-based reconnaissance asset enhances the warfighter's ability to address intelligence and/or operational gaps. In this regard, the Operationally Responsive Space satellite (ORS–1) provided direct tasking ability for the commanders of the combatant commands, most directly to U.S. Central Command. However, the ORS–1 satellite is currently operating well beyond its design life, and there is no related follow-on program planned. The committee believes that allowing the combatant commands to directly task commercial imagery assets could be the logical next step in providing that flexibility and improving responsiveness to the warfighter.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, based on the feedback from each of the combatant commanders, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by November 1, 2015, on the utility and impacts of combatant commanders directly tasking commercial imagery satellites. Based on feedback from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the committee further directs the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA), in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and the Director of National Intelligence, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by January 1, 2016, on current and potential future activities, including costs, to address the ability of the combatant commands to directly task commercial imagery satellites. The Director of NGA should consider current and future complementary commercial imagery capabilities to support this activity.

Commercial Space-based Environmental Monitoring

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has various requirements for accurate and relevant characterization of the atmospheric, maritime, terrestrial, and space environments to support the full spectrum of military operations worldwide. The committee is also aware that multiple U.S. companies are planning to

develop and commercially sell space-based environmental monitoring capabilities. The committee is interested in the utility of these potential future commercial capabilities for Department of Defense requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2015, on the current and projected commercial space-based environmental monitoring capabilities, the utility of these capabilities to meet Department of Defense requirements, the cost and benefit analysis of opportunities in the future to leverage these potential commercial capabilities, and any other considerations the Under Secretary deems appropriate.

Comptroller General Review of Patriot System

The committee is aware of the increasing operational demands being made on the Patriot system to meet current and emerging threats, as well as the Army's rising investments to modernize the Patriot system, and the impact that modernization has on coordinating systems in the Army's Air and Missile Defense portfolio.

In the President's request, excluding costs for the development and acquisition of a new radar, the Army plans to invest a combined total of nearly $2.00 billion in modernization of the Patriot system over the next 5 years in research, development, test, and evaluation and missile procurement. Given the significant planned investment of funding and the large number of concurrent modernization activities, the committee is interested in increasing oversight of the Patriot system and its modernization, including testing and fielding, particularly in the next 5 years, both within the Patriot modernization program elements and other Army Air and Missile Defense coordinating programs.

In addition, the committee is aware that Patriot modernization efforts not only affect Army coordinating systems, but have greater implications since many of these modernization efforts are for increased interoperability with elements in the Missile Defense Agency's Ballistic Missile Defense System.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an interim report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2016, and a final report not later than June 1, 2016, that includes an assessment of the following: (1) the current status of the Army's Patriot System performance, including how well the system's current performance is meeting combatant commander requirements, and any gaps that may exist between how the system currently functions and functionality the combatant commanders need in order to meet the growing and changing threat; (2) the Army's strategy, including its cost, schedule, and testing plans to upgrade and modernize its Patriot system as well as other coordinating systems in the Army's Air and Missile Defense in order to meet combatant commander requirements and address the growing threat; (3) the effect that Patriot modernization requirements for integration and interoperability has on Ballistic Missile Defense Systems and coordinating allied systems for regional defense; (4) how well the Army has and is currently providing the training, size, capability, and availability

of Patriot operators necessary to meet combatant commander needs and to remain current with the latest modernizations being added to the Patriot system; and (5) any other findings and recommendations on other acquisition issues with Patriot or its interfaces with other coordinating systems that the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

The committee expects the Comptroller General to take into consideration the findings and analysis of the Department of Defense Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation office as it completes its ongoing Analysis of Opportunities on Patriot modernization, as well as other appropriate reviews and studies underway in the Joint Staff and Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy.

Continuing Oversight of Missile Defense Discussions with the Russian Federation

The committee continues to have an interest in maintaining and protecting U.S. missile defense capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to notify the House Committee on Armed Services not later than 1 week after the date on which the Department of Defense conducts any discussions with the Russian Federation pertaining to missile defense during fiscal year 2016. The committee notes that similar direction was provided to the Secretary for fiscal year 2015 in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

Cyber Defense Network Segmentation

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is looking at modifying the way it builds, maintains, and upgrades data center, including increased use of commercial cloud capabilities and public-private partnerships. The committee is aware that as the Department increasingly looks at software-defined networking, it could potentially reduce the mobility of cyber threats across data center and other networks by increasing the compartmentalization and segmentation between systems, and providing a mix of security techniques to enable access to those compartments. Such actions have the potential to lessen the chance of a widespread or catastrophic breach, including breaches caused by insider threats. The committee encourages the Department to explore ways to use compartmentalization or segmentation as part of a software-defined networking approach in order to increase the security of its networks.

Cyber Support to Civil Authorities

The committee recognizes that the danger of disruptive and destructive cyber attacks is growing and that the U.S. military and civilian cyber infrastructure is being targeted by malicious government, criminal, and individual actors who try to avoid attribution. Although the Department of Defense generally does not resource support to civil authorities in response to a domestic cyber incident, the Department possesses an array of capabilities that may be requested when civilian response capabilities are overwhelmed or exhausted, or in instances where the Department offers unique capa-

bilities not likely to be found elsewhere. For instance, the nexus with the authorities and responsibilities of the National Guard provides a valuable link between military capabilities and civilian State, local, tribal and Federal needs.

In 2012, the Government Accountability Office highlighted gaps in the Department of Defense's plans and guidance for assisting civil authorities in the event of a domestic cyber incident. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has worked in coordination with the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Justice to agree upon shared roles and responsibilities for Federal cyber security. The committee also notes that among the challenges the Department of Defense continues to face are determining the scope of the potential cyber support it may be requested to provide, and the appropriate mixture and involvement of Active and Reserve Component military cyber forces to meet anticipated defense cyber civil support needs. In testimony before the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities on March 4, 2015, the Commanding General of U.S. Army Cyber Command stated that "While title 10 authorities are clear, title 32 and State active duty require the application of varied State constitutional, legislative, and executive authorities and coordination with state Agencies and officials. While every State is different, there is merit in developing a common approach for authorities and capabilities to facilitate rapid and effective response in cyberspace."

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the Department of Defense's plans and actions for providing support to civil authorities in the event of a domestic cyber incident, and to provide a report on the findings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing on preliminary results to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, with the report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of briefing. The assessment should address the following:

(1) To what extent has the Department of Defense planned and identified its critical capabilities for responding to domestic cyber civil support incidents, including the use of Active and Reserve Component cyber capabilities and personnel for civil support?

(2) To what extent has the Department of Defense trained and exercised for domestic cyber civil support incidents and coordinated with the Department of Homeland Security and other relevant Federal agencies?

(3) To what extent has the Department of Defense or the Department of Homeland security developed a common approach for title 32 and State Active Duty forces that balances the differences in State approaches, authorities, and responsibilities?

Department of Defense Cyber Mission Forces

The committee recognizes the growing importance of the Cyber Mission Forces within the Department of Defense to address current and future cyber security requirements. The committee is aware that the evolving nature of cyber threats and missions will require the Department to reassess their force structure and operations on a continuous basis. Section 1631 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) requires the Secretary of Defense to provide to Congress an annual budget justification display that includes (1) a major force program category for the Future Years Defense Program of the Department of Defense for the training, manning, and equipping of the cyber mission forces; and (2) program elements for the cyber mission forces, beginning with the fiscal year 2017 budget request.

The committee believes that these annual budget justification displays will provide the transparency necessary to address challenges with efficiently using resources towards the evolving cyber threats and missions and maintain congressional oversight of cyber investments.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2015, on progress towards meeting the requirements of Section 1631 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

Deployment of a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Battery in the Republic of Korea

The committee is aware that bilateral discussions have taken place regarding the potential deployment of a U.S. Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) battery to the Republic of Korea. The committee sees mutual benefit in the deployment of such a capability that protects both Koreans and deployed U.S. forces from the nuclear and ballistic missile threat posed by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

As noted by the Commander of U.S. Forces Korea in testimony before the committee in March 2015, "[I]t is critical for the alliance to build a layered and interoperable BMD capability." The commander has further stated that, "[t]he THAAD system provides a greater sensor array, better awareness of the threats and adds to the interoperability of all our systems." The committee shares this assessment of THAAD and believes it would both enhance and complement the current air and missile defense capabilities maintained by both countries, including across the entire ballistic missile kill chain, on the peninsula.

The committee recognizes that any deployment decision regarding THAAD rests with the Government of the Republic of Korea. Should such a decision be made, the committee would welcome it as a further demonstration of the collective security commitments of both countries.

Development of Missile Defense Targets Related to the Hypersonic Threat

The committee is aware of the rapidly evolving threat from potential adversaries' development of hypersonic weapons; consequently, the committee discusses potential responses to these developments elsewhere in this report.

The committee is also aware of several recent tests by the People's Republic of China of hypersonic weapons, as well as other hypersonic weapon developments by the Russian Federation and the Republic of India. The committee believes this rapidly emerging

capability could be a threat to national security and our operational forces.

The committee recognizes U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command's Advanced Hypersonic Weapons (AHW) developments have resulted in significant work in design, technology development, hardware engineering, and understanding relevant to hypersonic threats. The committee is aware that Flight 1A of the AHW program successfully demonstrated a medium range flight of a hypersonic boost-glide system. AHW Flight 2 was intended to mature these technologies and demonstrate a longer range capability, but it failed shortly after ignition for reasons related to launch configuration control.

The committee believes that the residual hardware, designs, and technology from these earlier developments should be used to develop and provide a hypersonic threat target system to improve U.S. defenses, based on successfully flight-tested designs, to characterize emerging foreign threat developments, and understand potential threat capabilities.

The committee is concerned that without proper understanding of and testing against realistic threats, the United States will not be prepared for the emerging capabilities of our adversaries. The committee believes that increasing our understanding and testing is important given significant investments and capability developments by the United States and an emerging threat.

Distributed Common Ground System—Army GAO Report

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the General Accountability Office (GAO) to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, that reviews the schedule and cost estimates for all increments of the Distributed Common Ground System—Army (DCGS–A). This review should examine the program to determine the extent to which:

(1) The current schedule was prepared in accordance with standard government best practices for program management;

(2) The current cost estimates are consistent with GAO's cost estimation guidelines;

(3) The program has changed or modified their planned cost and schedule estimates over the course of the program; and

(4) The extent to which the program has met cost goals and performance targets.

Evaluation of Missile Defense Options to Confront Hypersonic Missile Systems

The committee is aware that the worldwide ballistic missile threat is growing in sophistication, capability, and numbers. The committee also notes the Future Years Defense Program for the Missile Defense Agency submitted along with the budget request for fiscal year 2016 included $291.0 million for the development of an extended range (ER) variant of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD). The committee supports an investment in such a capability, understanding that although a material solution decision has not yet been made, THAAD–ER could be a vital capability improvement for the Ballistic Missile Defense System to defeat

evolving and emerging threats, including hypersonic vehicles and anti-ship ballistic missiles.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Central Command, the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command, and the Commander, U.S. European Command, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2016, concerning the potential utility of THAAD–ER or similar capability to counter emerging and evolving threats in each of their respective geographic area of responsibility.

The committee further directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2016, on potential opportunities for co-development or co-financing of THAAD–ER or a similar capability with an allied nation, and any policies, technology release decisions, data sharing, or other related issues that would need to be resolved prior to entering into such an arrangement.

Lastly, the committee directs the Director, Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 1, 2015, on the results of the THAAD–ER concept development, and the Director's analysis of regional sensors and interceptors against emerging threats, including on the value and cost of developing such capability.

Evaluation of National Security Space and Missile Test Ranges and Infrastructure

The committee is aware that several Department of Defense offices and agencies, including the U.S. Navy, the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Army, and the Missile Defense Agency, conduct multiple test launches each year to collect data on system performance and reliability. The committee is also aware that while some of these tests have different standards for data fidelity collection and timeliness, they share the basic goal of collecting large amounts of telemetric and other data, and almost all of these users have similar range safety requirements. The committee understands that, combined, these Department of Defense users spend multiple billions of dollars per year on test activities, including hundreds-of-millions of dollars on test ranges and infrastructure. The committee believes the Department should conduct an intensive review to understand these costs and how it could realize savings across the defense test enterprise. For example, the committee understands that the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC)/Army Forces Strategic Command has conducted limited experimentation on potentially promising technologies to yield savings.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to collect data from all entities and offices involved in relevant test activities and to conduct a Business Case Analysis (BCA) on specific options, including the SMDC Space Based Range, for how to accomplish the goals of these Department of Defense users' test activities while achieving meaningful savings. The committee intends that the BCA focus on national security space and missile defense users, including the U.S. Air Force Intercontinental Ballistic Missile test program, the U.S. Navy Strategic Systems Program test launches, Missile Defense Agency test ef-

forts, and other similar test activities within the Department of Defense.

The committee further directs the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to provide the data and conclusions from this review to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics not later than December 1, 2015. Finally, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 15, 2016, consisting of the findings and recommendations of the BCA and the Under Secretary's views on the analysis, and recommendations for a roadmap for the Department to implement a way ahead on its test enterprise based on the BCA.

Funding for Pilot Program for Acquisition of Commercial Satellite Communication Services

The budget request contained $53.5 million in PE 33600F, but contained no funding for the pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite communication services, also known as pathfinder programs, as authorized in section 1605 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). Therefore, the committee recommends $79.5 million, an increase of $26.0 million, in PE 33600F for the pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite communication services.

Funding Mechanism for Department of Defense Priorities at the National Nuclear Security Administration

The committee is aware that, from fiscal year 2011 to fiscal year 2015, the Department of Defense has transferred billions of dollars in defense budget authority to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) during formulation of the President's annual budget request to support priorities set by the Nuclear Weapons Council. The committee notes the cooperation between NNSA and the Department of Defense, through the Nuclear Weapons Council, is to ensure the military's requirements related to nuclear weapons sustainment and modernization, including nuclear weapons life extension programs and plans for building a responsive infrastructure and capability, are met. The committee is also aware of the challenges related to management, accountability, and transparency resulting from this budget authority transfer.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2015, containing the Under Secretary's assessment of costs, benefits, and risks of various options for either continuing, discontinuing, or modifying the current budget authority transfer mechanism, including assessing the benefit and risk of using a Work-For-Others funding mechanism. Such assessment should discuss what additional authorities may be needed to carry out each option.

Global Positioning System

The committee notes that the Global Positioning System (GPS) is a critical national asset that provides a worldwide navigation

and timing source which supports military, civil, and commercial users. There are multiple segments of the Air Force GPS program, including space, user terminals, and the ground system. The committee supports the GPS program.

The committee recognizes the challenges during the initial development of GPS III space vehicles. The committee is also aware that some of the major technical hurdles associated with the initial technology development may have been overcome. The committee supports the GPS III program, and recommends the Air Force fully leverage the non-recurring investment in program planning for the future space vehicles. The committee continues to support evolutionary acquisition with technology insertion plans to meet warfighter requirements.

The committee continues to recommend that the Department take the necessary steps to accelerate the development and fielding of M-code capable user terminals. M-code capable receivers, when paired with the necessary space and ground capabilities, will provide significantly greater anti-jam capabilities for the warfighter. The committee addresses this matter elsewhere in this Act.

Regarding the ground segment, the committee is also aware of the challenges with the Next Generation Operational Control Segment (OCX). OCX is designed to deliver incremental capabilities in multiple blocks. The program has rigorous information assurance requirements to ensure the system is secure from adversary threats. The committee believes that an independent advisory team, compromised of experts from other Department of Defense agencies and federally funded research and development centers, may provide valuable support to ensure the Government meets its objectives on this critical program. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2015, on the potential value and feasibility of establishing a temporary independent advisory team for GPS OCX.

Ground Based Strategic Deterrent

The committee commends the Air Force for its proposal to structure the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) program, which will create a follow-on to the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), as an integrated system consisting of the missiles, launch facilities, launch control centers, communications, and related infrastructure and equipment. The committee believes the Air Force's structural approach to creating a GBSD "weapon system" will ease both acquisition and long-term sustainment of all the core components that comprise the ICBM capability.

As the Air Force continues the materiel solution analysis phase for the GBSD program, the committee believes that the Air Force should carefully consider the program's effects on the solid rocket motor industrial base. Due to the volume of rocket motors likely to be procured, the Air Force's acquisition strategy for GBSD will have lasting impacts on the health and vitality of this key element of the U.S. defense industrial base. As with all major defense acquisition programs, the committee believes competition generally provides the Air Force with the best combination of innovation, cost reduction, and performance. The committee encourages the Sec-

retary of the Air Force to develop an affordable acquisition strategy for GBSD that considers the value of competition to maximize benefit to the Government and maintains a strong solid rocket motor industrial base. To better understand the GBSD strategy, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2015, that provides an assessment of GBSD's potential impacts on the solid rocket motor industrial base, what acquisition strategy options are available to the Secretary, and an evaluation of the costs and benefits of options that may provide the Secretary the ability to leverage competition throughout the life cycle of the GBSD program.

Imagery Analysis and Acquisition

The committee commends the Director, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) for his leadership in assessing the merit of using potentially new approaches to intelligence collection and analysis that could inform, complement, and add to NGA's support of warfighter requirements. While recognizing the need to take the appropriate steps to protect national security, the committee notes the benefit of the expanding commercial imagery capabilities which could support defense requirements. The committee remains interested in the commercial capability developments, as well as the steps to protect national security, and encourages the Director and the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to keep the committee informed on these issues as they relate to the Department of Defense.

Improving Contract Cost Data Collection and Analysis at the Missile Defense Agency through Evaluation of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Multiyear Procurement

The committee is aware that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) briefly evaluated multiyear procurement of Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) interceptors in the process of developing the fiscal year 2016 budget request. Multiyear procurement of THAAD interceptors could have helped to arrest a significant decline in such interceptor production across the past several fiscal years by reducing per unit interceptor cost. However, such evaluation was hindered by the lack of high fidelity and detailed cost information of the parts and components of THAAD interceptors.

The committee believes that effective cost analysis depends on the availability and quality of historical program cost data. The committee is aware that the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) currently manages the Department of Defense's primary weapon system cost data collection system. The components of the system include defining cost data requirements, development of cost collection plans to meet these requirements, insuring these plans are included in acquisition contracts, performing quality control on the contractor data submissions, archiving and organizing the cost data to facilitate analysis, and protecting access to the data.

The committee believes CAPE could assist MDA in developing practices and policies, including contract requirements, to improve contract cost data collection at MDA. Therefore, the committee di-

rects the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, in coordination with the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, to evaluate the potential per unit cost savings of THAAD interceptors if acquired through multiyear procurement as compared to recent MDA procurement contracts. In conducting the evaluation, the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation should also assess and make recommendations for (1) reducing the barriers to collect adequate contract cost data for THAAD interceptors specifically; and (2) what contract cost data collection policies, practices, and requirements MDA should adopt to achieve identified Department of Defense best practices more broadly. The committee further directs the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to brief the results of the evaluation to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 15, 2016.

In addition, the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 31, 2016, on its plan to implement the assessment and recommendations for cost data collection improvements made by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation.

Integrated Air and Missile Defense Strategy

The committee has reviewed the "Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense: Vision 2020" strategy approved by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on January 27, 2014. The committee commends the Chairman for the thoughtful and forward-leaning approach he has brought to a critical challenge this nation will face in the near future when it comes to air and missile defense.

The committee is interested in understanding how the "Vision 2020" is being implemented by the Joint Staff and the relevant combatant commanders. Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 3, 2015, on the following:

(1) How the Global Employment for the Force has been or is being updated to reflect the six "Imperatives" stated by the Chairman in the "Vision 2020" strategy;

(2) Specific initiatives undertaken by the Commander, U.S. European Command, the Commander, U.S. Central Command, and the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command to implement "Vision 2020" or to otherwise ensure the true and complete integration of air and missile defense, including prioritization of operational and planning resources, and exercises; and

(3) The terms of reference, assumptions, analysis, and results of the Joint Capabilities Mix Study, IV.

Interagency Collaboration on Physical Security for Nuclear Weapons

As a key element of the "3+2" strategy for the future of the nuclear weapons stockpile, the Nuclear Weapons Council has identified collaboration and interoperability between the Navy and the Air Force as an integral measure for fulfilling the nuclear deterrence mission while minimizing costs. While at this early stage the success of the 3+2 in achieving this goal is uncertain, the com-

mittee is interested in exploring this principle within other areas of the council's jurisdiction.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, in coordination with the Administrator for Nuclear Security, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2015, on opportunities, challenges, and plans for enhanced collaboration and interoperability of technologies between the military departments, the Department of Defense, and the National Nuclear Security Administration on physical security for nuclear weapons. The briefing should describe opportunities for collaboration on: physical security efforts in general; joint development or use of analysis tools, methodologies, and technologies; integration and prioritization of technology needs; and development of common standards and processes for each organization to utilize physical security technology approved for general use in nuclear weapon security environments.

Joint Integrated Lifecycle Surety

The committee believes the Joint Integrated Lifecycle Surety (JILS) analysis tool developed through cooperation of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of Defense may provide operators, analysts, and senior leaders unique insights into the safety and security of U.S. nuclear weapons across the full spectrum of scenarios that they may encounter throughout their life cycle. The committee believes this tool could be utilized to inform future investments intended to reduce nuclear weapon safety and security risks across the entire Department of Defense and NNSA nuclear enterprise and each warhead's life cycle, from cradle to grave and from stockpile to target.

The committee directs the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on JILS by November 1, 2015. The briefing should include the methodology and current results of the JILS tool; the scenarios examined by the tool; any impacts the tool has had on previous decision-making; any plans for enhancing the tool in the future; and a description of how the Nuclear Weapons Council, the military services, and NNSA will leverage JILS to study cost-benefit and risk in future life extension programs, delivery system acquisition programs, and other efforts to enhance safety, security, or use control for U.S. nuclear weapons.

Joint Space Operations Center Mission System

The committee continues to support the Air Force development of the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System (JMS) program. JMS is a critical program designed to deliver an integrated, net-centric space situational awareness and command and control capability. Given the growing space threat environment, the committee encourages the Air Force to look for reasonable opportunities to accelerate the delivery of key capabilities, or increments, of the program. The committee also recognizes and supports the Air Force's efforts to leverage mature commercial software for JMS, in an effort to reduce costs, increase capability, and shorten schedule timelines. The committee expects the Air Force to perform thor-

ough market research and evaluation of mature commercial capabilities for the follow-on increment of the JMS program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2015, on the status and potential to reasonably accelerate the current increment of the JMS program and the plan for future increments, including the status of market research to leverage commercially available capabilities.

Mission System Cybersecurity

The committee is aware that the weapon and mission systems upon which warfighters rely are increasingly being networked together for greater effectiveness and interoperability. However, this has happened without a sufficient appreciation of the cybersecurity threat environments currently facing such systems. As noted in the final report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat from January 2013, the Department should be doing more to build a cyber-resilient force that should extend beyond traditional networks and information systems to include these weapon and mission systems. Included in this would be the introduction and incorporation of cyber resiliency requirements throughout the Department, for both new and emerging systems, and developing the means to red-team, test, model and provide feedback to the acquisition community and Intelligence Community.

Despite Department of Defense policies designed to address this threat, such as Department of Defense Instruction 5200.44, and the formation of task forces for the Navy and the Air Force, the committee is concerned that progress on the identification and remediation of cyber vulnerabilities on vital legacy platforms may be lagging. Moreover, the committee is concerned that without the direction and funding to immediately address these vulnerabilities, program leaders will continue to focus limited resources on other platform needs.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the military service chiefs, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, detailing the process for identifying and assessing vulnerabilities on legacy weapons and mission systems, as well as for designating funding to remedy these vulnerabilities. The briefing shall also include an accounting of the legacy weapon and mission systems that the military service chiefs have directed to be assessed through this process, the budget and acquisition processes designed to support assessment and remediation efforts, and a schedule and proposed budget for conducting the required assessments and completing any necessary remediation.

Mobile User Objective System

The committee supports the U.S. Navy Mobile User Objective System (MUOS) program to provide next-generation narrow-band tactical satellite communications to U.S. forces. The committee is aware of the progress being made on the program, and continues

to support efforts that accelerate the schedule to provide the full MUOS capability to the warfighter.

Modeling and Simulation for Nuclear Targeting and Planning

The committee is aware of efforts to improve both tactical and strategic targeting and planning processes to better incorporate modeling and simulation of nuclear strikes' potential effects and consequences across a range of factors including political, military, economic, social, infrastructure, and information. The committee believes such efforts could provide planners and senior decision-makers important information when considering strike options, particularly with regards to nuclear weapons employment. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command and the Director of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 31, 2015, on the Department's efforts to integrate modeling and simulation of a broad spectrum of a nuclear strike's potential effects and consequences into nuclear targeting analysis and planning.

Multi-source Cyber Intelligence Analysis Needs

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense is making significant strides in building out a cyber mission force to operate and defend critical Department information systems, and is on track to have full operational capability by 2017. However, the committee is concerned that those teams, while they have needed organic intelligence analysis capability, may not be adequate to meet the full multi-source cyber intelligence collection and analysis needs required to support and enable those cyber mission forces. As recommended in the final report of the Defense Science Board Task Force on the Resilient Military Systems and the Advanced Cyber Threat from January 2013, the Department should be working with the Intelligence Community to increase the priority of support for collection and analysis of high-end cyber threats, including the identification and understanding of adversarial cyber weapon development organizations, tools, leadership, and intentions, and the development of targeting information to support initiatives to counter cyber weaponization. While the National Security Agency provides significant support to those units, the need to provide multi-source intelligence support from the Defense Intelligence Agency and the service intelligence centers remains. It is unclear to the committee whether resourcing decisions related to personnel to support cyber has extended to the multi-source intelligence support centers within the Department.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to assess and validate the multi-source cyber intelligence collection and analysis needs of the Department of Defense, and to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by November 1, 2015, on the findings of the analysis. The assessment should cover both the number of personnel needed, as well as the types and priority for current missions and tasking.

Multiyear Procurement of Commercial Satellite Communications

The committee believes that the current statutory language, specifically section 2306c of title 10, United States Code, provides the necessary authority to the Department of Defense to enter into contracts for periods of not more than 5 years for commercial satellite communications (SATCOM) services which support the broadly covered services identified in section 2306c. When done appropriately, the committee supports multiyear leasing of commercial SATCOM as a way to lower costs for the Department, provide greater assurance to meet stable warfighter requirements, and partner with industry providers.

The committee recognizes that multiyear leasing is not the solution for all of the Department's commercial satellite communications requirements, but is one useful acquisition approach that Department officials should use. Analysis provided by the Department and industry has shown the potential for significant savings in longer term contracts. Specifically, one group of industry providers publicly stated that "studies have shown that buying capacity on the spot-market with IDIQ [indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity] contracts costs the DOD [Department of Defense] up to 25 percent more than it would pay with a long-term contract for the same capacity."

The committee looks forward to working with the Department on this important area to meet the requirements of the warfighter while reducing the costs to the taxpayers.

National Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Resilience

The committee recognizes that the Global Positioning System (GPS) is a critical national security capability, as well as a key element of critical infrastructure, and other civilian and commercial applications. The use and dependence on GPS signals in the United States continues to grow, despite the reality that GPS jammers are relatively inexpensive and widely available.

Regarding a backup system to GPS, the committee is aware of a related National Security Presidential Directive which assigns the Secretary of Transportation, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the responsibility to develop, acquire, operate, and maintain backup position, navigation, and timing capabilities that can support critical transportation, homeland security, and other critical civil and commercial infrastructure applications within the United States. This system could be of some benefit to the Department of Defense, but would not address all Department of Defense and warfighter requirements, as this system would be focused geographically within the United States.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2016, on the Department of Defense requirements for backup position, navigation, and timing capabilities, including the plan and estimated cost to address such requirements. The committee expects the briefing to also include an assessment of the potential benefit of a U.S.-based ground system and any current or planned funding for this activity.

National Security Space Acquisition

The committee is aware that acquiring and developing space programs, including satellites, ground segments, and user segments is a challenging task. The committee believes in the importance of well-developed acquisition strategies that are designed to manage risks, reduce costs, support the industrial base, and provide for technology insertion planning to meet warfighter and national security requirements.

As an example of the current challenges, the General Accountability Office (GAO) recently reported on the Space-based Infrared Systems Program and stated that "current efforts—such as individual science and technology projects, including those in the Space Modernization Initiative—are limited by lack of direction, focusing on isolated technologies, and therefore are not set up to identify specific insertion points for a desired future system." The committee is concerned with the GAO's finding.

The committee is aware of different acquisition planning, strategies, and approaches being taken throughout national security space programs. While there is not one answer for every program, there are best practices and lessons learned that could be applied across the national security space enterprise.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE), in coordination with the Assistant Director of National Intelligence for Systems and Resource Analyses (SRA) regarding intelligence programs, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by February 1, 2016, on a review of the acquisition practices for national security space programs of the Department of Defense, including with respect to the National Reconnaissance Office. The review should include the following:

(1) An analysis of the costs, schedules, and performances of selected, recent, and relevant major current and previous contracts entered into for the acquisition of national security space programs;

(2) An analysis of acquisition practices to determine differences in practices and which practices have proven effective in meeting requirements and appropriately managing cost and schedule;

(3) An analysis of the technology insertion planning, achievements, and challenges for various programs and agencies;

(4) Any recommendations to improve the acquisition and/or cost estimation practices for national security space programs by the Department of Defense; and

(5) Any other related matters the Director, CAPE and the Assistant Director, SRA deem appropriate.

Network Access Control Technologies for Secure Facilities

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense continues to pursue enhancements to the security of its networks and systems to deal with new and evolving cyber security threats. Further, the committee recognizes that the Department's Secure Compartmented Information Facilities need to be both highly secure and highly connected from an information management perspective, which poses unique challenges in that kind of cyber threat environment. The prevalence of mobile devices increases the com-

plexity of defending those facilities from the diverse array of cyber threats facing the Department. The committee encourages the Department to explore the use of network access control technologies to intelligently manage appropriate mobile device usage by cleared personnel, and to use such systems to determine the location of any unauthorized mobile devices within a secured facility.

Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications Budget Displays

The committee maintains an interest in ensuring the reliability and capability of a robust nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) system. The committee is aware that, in response to an October 2014 letter from the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) responded in a December 2014 letter that the Department would work with the committee to "improve visibility into the content and funding" for the NC3 system. The committee believes that an improved budget structure could ensure that the Department and Congress are in the best possible position to make available needed resources for the NC3 system.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), in coordination with any Department of Defense offices as the Under Secretary deems useful, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2015, that details the Under Secretary's views of the viability of options to improve the defense budget structure for such programs.

Nuclear Detection Capability

The committee recently received a joint Air Force-National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) briefing, as directed in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, on the requirements and plans for the nuclear detection capability. The committee notes that although the Secretary of State was also directed to be part of the briefing, there was no State Department representative at the briefing to the committee. The committee continues to be concerned about the long-term coordination between the Department of Energy, the Department of State, and the Department of Defense. The committee notes the March 2015 Department of Energy/National Nuclear Security Administration report, "Prevent, Counter and Respond—A Strategic Plan to Reduce Global Nuclear Threats (FY2016–FY2020)," that recognized program challenges remains with regard to "sustaining a nuclear detonation detection sensor production rate and capability that aligns with [the Department of Defense's] changing satellite launch schedule and long-term procurement plans and requirements," and, "identifying a long-term satellite host platform that addresses the requirement to maintain current nuclear detonation detection capabilities at geosynchronous altitude." The committee expects the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Department of Energy and the Department of State, to keep the committee informed on the way forward (including on the Space and Atmospheric Burst Reporting System), including identification of requirements and attribution of the requirements to a particular Department(s) or

agency mission, and the specific current and future funding being provided by each Department or agency to meet each such requirement.

Nuclear Enterprise Review

Following revelations about troubling lapses of integrity in the nation's nuclear forces, on February 10, 2014, the Secretary of Defense directed the initiation of comprehensive internal and external assessments of the health of all components of the Department of Defense's nuclear enterprise. According to recent testimony before the committee from a senior Department official, this "Nuclear Enterprise Review (NER) highlighted evidence of systemic problems in the strategic deterrent forces that threaten the future safety, security, and effectiveness of our nuclear forces," and "made clear the need to refocus attention and resources at all levels of the [Department of Defense] on this essential mission."

Upon conclusion of the Nuclear Enterprise Review in November 2014, the Secretary of Defense sent a "Message to the Force on our Nuclear Enterprise" saying, "[o]ur nuclear deterrent plays a critical role in assuring U.S. national security, and it is [the Department of Defense's] highest priority mission. No other capability we have is more important." The Secretary appointed the Deputy Secretary of Defense to lead a group of senior leaders from the Department and the military services to address problems identified by the NER. This group, called the Nuclear Deterrent Enterprise Review Group (NDERG), has met regularly to provide oversight and direction to efforts by the Air Force and Navy to implement corrective actions. As a result of the NER and NDERG, the fiscal year 2016 budget request contained approximately $1.00 billion in additional funding for the Department of Defense nuclear enterprise, with a total of $8.00 billion in additional funding planned over the next 5 years.

The committee recognizes and applauds the robust personal engagement of the Deputy Secretary and the former Secretary in beginning to address these difficult and longstanding problems. The committee believes sustained leadership, follow-through, and investment will be required to ensure the revitalization of our nuclear enterprise, including in certain instances improving or changing the culture and leadership standards. The committee believes the NDERG seems to be successful in this regard, but cautions that institutionalization of such a process may be required to ensure sustained attention after key leaders depart. The committee expects the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, and all leaders within the Department of Defense to ensure continued focus and resources for the Department's "highest priority mission."

Operationally Responsive Space

The budget request contained $6.5 million in PE 64857F for the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program. The committee is encouraged that this program was included in the budget request this year, although the funding is not enough to make substantial progress on addressing urgent warfighter space requirements. The committee recognizes and generally supports the concept that the Air Force Space and Missile System Center may leverage the ORS

program office to execute urgent activities that are identified within other relevant space budget lines.

Additionally, the committee is aware that leadership of the ORS program office will change over time due to normal rotations of assignments. Since the ORS is a jointly manned office, with a mission to meet joint military operational requirements, the committee recommends that the ORS Executive Committee consider an Army, Navy, or Marine Corps officer to serve as the military commander of ORS.

Lastly, the committee is aware of potential urgent requirements for space situational awareness and space-based weather collection, and supports ORS concepts and management to meet these requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends $20.5 million, an increase of $14.0 million, in PE 64857F for the Operationally Responsive Space program.

Organization of the Military Service and Technical Intelligence Centers

The committee is aware of disparities in the organization and command structure of the intelligence centers aligned to the military services and the Defense Intelligence Agency, namely the National Air and Space Intelligence Center, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Marine Corps Intelligence Activity, the National Ground Intelligence Center, and the Missiles and Space Intelligence Center. The committee believes that there would be benefits in applying a similar organizing model and command structure across the centers, including increased efficiencies, best practices, and improved overall long-term performance.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to review the current organization and command structure of the military service and technical intelligence centers and to provide a report to the congressional defense and the congressional intelligence committees by December 1, 2015, on the current structure of the centers and recommendations for improvements.

Patriot Product Improvement

The committee is aware of the ongoing evaluation by the Department of Defense, including the U.S. Army, to determine the future path for investment in the lower tier of the U.S. Army's air and missile defense capability. The committee supports retention of U.S. technical superiority in integrated air and missile defense capability to protect U.S. deployed forces and allied forces.

The committee therefore applauds the U.S. Army for thoroughly assessing future radar capabilities, beyond the currently deployed legacy system. The committee is aware of significant technological developments since the initial deployment of the Patriot radar capability, including active electronically scanned array and gallium nitride technology.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would direct the Army to provide the analysis and recommendations of the analysis of alternatives for the Army's Lower Tier Integrated Air and Missile Defense Capability. The committee expects this review would thoroughly evaluate multiple facets of the

sustainment and modernization of the Patriot air and missile defense system over the next 25 years, including modernization of the Patriot radar.

Programmable Embedded Information Security Product

The committee is aware that the Naval Research Laboratory has been working for a number of years on a new cryptographic system to more rapidly enable upgrading of encryption algorithms. This effort, known as PEIP, or the Programmable Embedded Information Security Product, is not tied to any hardware implementation, and thereby provides flexibility, adaptability, and the ability to be rapidly upgraded and modified over time. The committee recognizes that this approach is a vast improvement from the traditional method for upgrading and modifying cryptographic hardware and algorithms, which can be a time-consuming and lengthy process. The committee encourages the Navy and the Department of Defense to continue investing in ways to expand the functionality of the PEIP system and to use that as a model for future cryptographic modernization efforts.

Protected Tactical Satellite Communications

The committee recognizes the importance of protected satellite communications. In a statement for the record, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency informed the committee that "Chinese and Russian military leaders understand the unique information advantages afforded by space systems and are developing capabilities to deny U.S. use of space in the event of a conflict. Chinese military writings specifically highlight the need to interfere with, damage, and destroy reconnaissance, navigation, and communication satellites. China has satellite jamming capabilities and is pursuing other antisatellite systems."

In response to the increasing foreign threat, the committee supports efforts that leverage existing military and commercial satellites to provide greater protection for the warfighter. The committee is aware of multiple ongoing activities within the Air Force to increase capacity of protected satellite communications. One such activity is a capabilities insertion program which will provide increased capacity on the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellite through a software enhancement. Another activity is the development of a protected tactical waveform for commercial satellites and Wideband Global Satellite Communications (WGS). The committee is aware that these activities will provide different levels of protection but has not yet seen a strategic approach to address the warfighter requirements, including against a determined foreign adversary. Additionally, the committee believes that further evaluation of enterprise-level satellite communications ground architecture is necessary. This requires consideration of the ground command and control as well as user terminals. The warfighter will require situational awareness of the threat activity as well as options to rapidly respond to maintain the necessary warfighter capabilities. The committee recognizes that terminals, which represent a major driver for any architecture, will need to be considered in future concepts that are designed to permit flexible operations in threatened environments.

The committee is aware of the benefits the Air Force has seen by co-locating space operations squadrons with complementary missions. The committee also believes that there may be opportunities for doing space operations more jointly, within the Air Force and Army for instance, as well as appropriately integrating commercial capabilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chief Information Officer, to provide the House Committee on Armed Services a briefing by December 15, 2015 on the requirements and plan to provide protected tactical communications to the warfighter through existing satellite programs; the necessary funding for such plan, and opportunities for acceleration as needed, in accordance with the highest priority warfighter requirements; and a strategic approach and concept definition for enterprise level satellite communications ground architecture for threatened environments.

Quarterly Briefings on Strategic Forces

The committee is concerned that certain matters are not reported to the committee in a timely way. For example, the committee had to learn about a recent weather satellite break-up from press reporting rather than from the Department. The committee acknowledges the satellite in question was operated by another federal department; nonetheless, matters related to the break-up of satellites and the creation of debris are closely tracked by the Department and that information should be shared with the congressional defense committees as soon as practicable.

The committee is concerned with the current reporting structure, or lack thereof, to keep the committee abreast of national security space-related issues. In an effort to resolve this, the committee is aware that the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command plans to take certain specific steps to address this. The committee welcomes this commitment. The committee expects prompt notification of matters related to national security space. The committee notes the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office has set a benchmark standard that the Commander should look to as he seeks to improve notifications to the congressional defense committees.

The committee further notes that it is not just in the area of national security space where notification to the congressional defense committees needs improvement. The committee notes that several significant issues that prompted the Department's Nuclear Enterprise Review had not been disclosed to the committee and several specific problems in the Air Force component of the Department's nuclear enterprise were only made known to the committee through press reporting.

To improve notification, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide quarterly briefings to the committee, starting June 1, 2015 and continuing through September 30, 2016, detailing the following: readiness and disposition of ballistic missile defense assets, including interceptors (including Patriot, THAAD, Aegis BMD ships and ashore sites, A/N TPY–2 radars); and readiness and disposition of assets and personnel in the nuclear triad (including ballistic missile submarines, interconti-

nental ballistic missiles, and nuclear certified heavy bombers), as appropriate.

The committee notes that notifications concerning matters affecting national security space are being addressed through the aforementioned agreement with the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, and the committee expects to be briefed on any major issue affecting national security space.

Report on Current and Anticipated Global Demand for U.S. Missile Defense Systems

The committee understands the significant requirement for limited quantities of missile defense capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2016, that includes the following information:

(1) A quantitative assessment of the current demand and projected demand (in 5 and 10 years) for U.S. missile defense systems, including Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense cruisers, destroyers, and Aegis Ashore sites, Terminal High Altitude Area Defense batteries, Patriot batteries, and missile interceptors associated with such missile defense systems;

(2) The current availability, projected availability (in 5 and 10 years) of such systems and interceptors;

(3) An identification of the sources of demand for missile defense systems, including combatant commander requests, international commitments, and contingency plans;

(4) An explanation of how demand for missile defense systems is adjudicated within the Department of Defense;

(5) The current and projected costs (in 5 and 10 years) for missile defense capability across the Department of Defense, including as a percentage of the total defense budget; and

(6) Any other matters the Chairman deems appropriate.

Report on Improving Discrimination for Missile Defense

The committee supports and commends the efforts of the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to invest in discrimination improvements to counter ballistic missile threats from states, including the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea and the Islamic Republic of Iran. These ballistic missile threats include increasingly complex countermeasures, threatening the U.S. homeland, its deployed forces, and allies. The committee agrees that improving this capability is important to achieving a higher degree of reliability, effectiveness, and efficiency, including improving shot doctrine.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than October 15, 2015, on the cost, schedule, and options to accelerate and field discrimination improvements based on robust acquisition practices.

Report on Patriot Guidance Enhanced Missile Tactical Ballistic Missile Recertification for Allied Inventory

The committee is aware that allied nations continue to acquire and maintain the Patriot Guidance Enhanced Missile Tactical Ballistic Missile (GEM–T) interceptor missile as an effective and effi-

cient defense against lower-tier, air-breathing threats. The committee is also aware that the Army has chosen not to maintain its own inventory of GEM–T interceptors through recertification. The committee is concerned not only about the resulting impact on the Army's magazine depth in countering lower-tier, air-breathing threats to deployed forces, but also the impacts to the inventories of these interceptors held by allies.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2016, that assesses the impacts of the Army's decision with respect to re-certification of its inventory of GEM–T interceptors on the industrial base, including at Army depots involved in maintaining this system, to ensure that allies will continue to be able to maintain their inventories of these interceptors for as long as technically safe and reliable. The report should also recommend any steps (along with estimated costs) that might be necessary to guarantee that allies will not lose their ability to re-certify their inventories as a result of the Army's decision. In addition, the Under Secretary, in consultation with relevant regional combatant commanders, should assess the impacts of the decision not to re-certify GEM–T on their plans and requirements, and what the cost would be to re-certify the system if a decision was made to do so. The committee further directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide an interim briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the report not later than January 15, 2016.

Report on Strategic Missile Commonality

The committee strongly supports the nuclear triad and is aware of the urgent need for modernization of all three legs of the triad. The committee is also aware of the substantial cumulative cost to accomplish this modernization. The committee seeks to further understand opportunities to accomplish this effort at reduced cost and without reducing capability or delaying modernization plans.

Specifically, the committee is interested in assessing the potential to reduce or avoid certain costs by pursuing various types of commonality between the future ground- and sea-based strategic deterrent weapon systems. The committee notes that the Air Force plans to acquire a replacement weapon system for the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile through the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) program, while the Navy continues the D5 sea-launched ballistic missile life extension program and will similarly require a replacement in the longer-term future.

As these programs develop, the committee seeks to understand the opportunities for commonality and its impacts on program executability, technical and schedule risk, and potential cost savings or avoidances from pursuing commonality in components, subsystems, supply chain, logistics, or other elements affecting acquisition or lifecycle costs. While the committee believes the benefits of limited commonality may be substantial, the committee continues, as it stated in the committee's report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (House Report 113–102), to urge the Department of Defense "to use caution in implementing this approach to ensure that commonality does not lead to

unacceptable risk of widespread impacts to the deterrent force, should a technical risk cause a common component or subsystem to fail."

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, by November 30, 2015, on the benefits and risks of pursuing various types of commonality in these programs, including the range of possible options for commonality and any associated cost-reduction potential or technical risks.

Responsive Launch

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) directed the Department of Defense Executive Agent (EA) for Space to conduct a study on responsive, low-cost launch efforts. The study required a review of the existing and past efforts, an identification of the requirements that would provide the necessary military utility, viability for greater utilization of innovative methods, a consolidated plan for a way ahead, among other areas of review. While the committee has received an interim briefing on this study, the final report is overdue. The committee appreciated the briefing, but is disappointed in what appears to be an overall lack of attention, unity of effort, and strategic approach in this area.

In general, the committee supports responsive, low-cost launch efforts to rapidly reconstitute or replenish critical space capabilities, and believes that the Department needs to appropriately investigate and develop this area, including launch and the appropriate payloads. Therefore, the committee encourages the EA for Space to work with the necessary stakeholders in the Department and apply the resources to finish the study and provide a consolidated plan for development within the Department of Defense of an operationally responsive, low-cost launch capability in accordance with warfighter requirements.

Roadmap for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System

The committee believes that as adversaries of the United States develop or acquire ballistic missiles, the United States must maintain, improve, and expand our capability to protect the homeland from ballistic missile attack through the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) System. The committee also believes that by 2020, the GMD system requires a significant block upgrade of an ALL-Up-Round (AUR) Ground Based Interceptor that incorporates a redesigned Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle; incorporating increased capability and reliability at much lower production and maintenance costs, an upgrade of the booster to eliminate obsolescence, and incorporate nuclear hardening and lightening protection. The committee further believes that the ground system supporting the GMD system must be improved to incorporate system modernization and upgrades to mitigate obsolescence, improve operations and reliability through re-architecturing, and upgrade the associated software to currently supported language. The committee also notes that the GMD system of 2020 needs to incorporate improved discrimination to address advanced complex threats that the system

is most likely to encounter as the threat grows in numbers and complexity. The committee also notes the need to use robust acquisition practices as appropriate to avoid delays and cost increases.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to provide to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2016, a roadmap of recommended time-phased improvements that should be incorporated into the GMD program from 2016 to 2025 to ensure the viability of the GMD system paced ahead of the threat to the U.S. homeland from the growing threat of ballistic missiles.

Satellite Communications Interference

The committee believes in the importance of a robust ability for the warfighter to monitor, detect, characterize, geolocate and report sources of radio frequency interference on U.S. military and commercial satellites that are in direct support of combatant commanders. The committee is concerned that the Department has not developed a clear strategy to meet the related warfighter requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command and the Secretary of the Air Force, to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee by September 15, 2015 on the related JROC-validated requirements; identification of current SATCOM interference monitoring activities and funding within the Department; cost-benefit analysis of options to meet the requirements; and a recommended strategy including a description of future program, or programs, and funding to meet the requirements. The committee would be concerned if the Department of Defense made any substantial changes to the counter-electromagnetic interference programs of record, including EAGLE SENTRY and ARC STORM, before providing the required briefing.

Satellite Ground Systems and Overhead Persistent Infrared Data

The committee is aware that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics is developing a Department-wide long-term plan for satellite ground control systems in response to Section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). With military personnel reductions and more austere budgets, it has become an imperative that the Department identify the most efficient and effective method to meet associated military requirements. The committee is aware that satellite control functions are accomplished routinely by commercial industry for very large satellite constellations. As such, industry may be able to accomplish some of the military's ground control activities in a secure, reliable, and cost effective manner. This approach would allow military space operators to focus on operating satellite payloads that deliver military effects on the battlefield and to invest in areas that only the military can do, which includes protecting and defending space assets. Therefore, the committee encourages the Under Secretary to include the potential contribution of commercial industry in the long-term plan for satellite ground control systems.

Separately, regarding overhead persistent infrared (OPIR), the committee is aware that the data is classified and used for multiple purposes by the Department including missile warning, missile defense, battlespace awareness, and technical intelligence. OPIR data may also be very useful in civil applications, including firefighting, but the civil agencies and first responders may not currently have timely access to relevant data. Therefore, the committee encourages the Air Force to consider methods that would enable the declassification of certain appropriate OPIR data to support civil agencies.

Science and Technology Intelligence

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community to maintain the level of awareness needed to understand the impact of various advances in science and technology, and their impact on national security. The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics has written and spoken on the eroding technological superiority of the United States compared to the efforts of potential adversaries. Maintaining visibility into those technological developments will be a challenge for the Intelligence Community, both to inform the acquisition community, but also to provide some strategic warning for operational planners that will have to incorporate needed insights of technology trends into their plans. For that reason, the Under Secretary has also specifically called for a stronger relationship between the acquisition, requirements and intelligence communities as part of the Better Buying Power 3.0 initiative.

The committee also recognizes that the Intelligence Community is grappling with how to deal with the issue of maintaining global awareness of technological advances to prevent surprise and support the acquisition process. The unclassified "Report of the National Commission for the Review of the Research and Development Programs of the United States Intelligence Community" made several key findings and recommendations in this area. In particular, the commission called for comprehensive strategic scientific and technical intelligence to improve understanding of foreign strategies for science and technology development and to use such assessments for planning and resource allocation.

The committee applauds recent efforts by the Department of Defense science and technology (S&T) community to reinvigorate its relationship with the intelligence community, including the establishment of an Office of Technical Intelligence within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and development of an Intelligence Needs lan in order to formally convey the S&T communities' intelligence requirements to the Intelligence Community. The committee believes that such efforts are important in order to position science and technology for the development of capabilities for new and emerging threat areas. The committee encourages both the Department and the Intelligence Community to continue to make progress in strengthening the role of science and technology intelligence in both enterprises.

Smart Building Cyber Vulnerability Assessment

The committee recognizes that Department of Defense facilities are transitioning to smart buildings increasingly utilizing wireless controls for heating, ventilation and air conditioning, security systems, lighting, electrical power, fire alarms, elevators, visitor controls, cellular communications, Wi-Fi networks, and first responder communications and other systems are increasing interconnected and online. This higher connectivity has increased the threat and vulnerability to cyber-attacks. A recent Government Accountability Office study (GAO–15–6) highlighted the vulnerabilities and cyber risks to building and access control systems. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2016 on the cyber risks to smart buildings and access control systems from radio frequency systems and wireless communications, and identification of available technologies and practices available to potentially counter and mitigate the identified security risks.

Space Situational Awareness

The committee continues to support improvements to the space surveillance network (SSN) of the United States. Ground-based optical systems are a critical component of the SSN. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to incorporate emerging technologies in order to accelerate augmentation or replacement of the legacy ground-based optical systems in support of U.S. Strategic Command requirements.

Spaceports

The committee is aware of commercially licensed spaceports and range complexes, including ones which also receive funding from State and local governments. Regarding national security space launch, these spaceports may offer potential schedule flexibility for missions that fit within the spaceport's launch parameters. The spaceports may also provide backup capabilities for increased resilience.

Section 1617 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) directed the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing on range support for launches in support of national security. As part of the briefing, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to evaluate the broad national security space launch infrastructure requirements and priorities, including an assessment of the potential role of commercial and State-sponsored launch infrastructure in supporting such requirements.

Strategic Deterrence Research and Education

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee noted that "challenges remain in educating airmen on their role in safeguarding national security. Educating the warfighters who execute the daily mission of nuclear deterrence remains a critical element to ensuring the level of excellence required for the mission."

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee noted that "the [Secretary of Defense] should take appropriate steps to refocus the military member education to ensure it is adequately covering, across-the-board, the essentials of nuclear deterrence policy and operations (including such concepts as strategic stability and escalation control)".

In addition, the 2014 study by the National Research Council titled, "U.S. Air Force Strategic Deterrence Analytic Capabilities," identified a continued deficiency in the science and research of nuclear deterrence and assurance. The Council found that, "The Air Force, working with its Service partners and the Department of Defense more generally, should pursue research on deterrence and assurance with a coherent approach that involves content analysis, leadership profiling, abstract modeling, and gaming and simulations as a suite of methods. It should organize its investments in analytic and other activities accordingly."

The committee also notes that today's geopolitical environment presents various threats and opportunities related to nuclear deterrence. With several internal reviews and outside assessments suggesting an increased focus on strategic deterrence education and research programs, and the committee's multi-year emphasis on this subject, the committee seeks more clarity on the concrete actions taken by the Secretary of the Air Force, as well as future plans, for strengthening nuclear deterrence education and research within the Air Force.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, on the steps taken by various elements of the Air Force to improve service member education on nuclear deterrence and establish a sustainable, coherent, and robust strategic deterrence research program. Such education and research program should include examining the linkages among strategic deterrence and assurance, strategic stability, escalation control, missile defense, strategic conventional capabilities, nuclear terrorism, and nonproliferation efforts. This report should provide an overview of recent actions, as well a multi-year plan, to develop and sustain a research program that addresses the deficiencies identified by the National Research Council and other groups. The committee encourages the Secretary to leverage academia, industry, the other services, and other Government partners to meet the needs of this program.

Strengthening National Security Space

The committee is aware of the strategic challenges due to a growing foreign threat to national security space. At a recent Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing, a senior Department of Defense official stated in a statement for the record that, "today the U.S. is not adequately prepared for a conflict, which might extend to space." The committee is concerned by this inadequate posture.

However, the committee recognizes and commends the Department on the considerable analysis that has been done throughout the past year to develop an initial plan to assure space capabilities. As a result of the analysis, the Department has planned for sub-

stantial additional resources over the next 5 fiscal years for space security-related activities.

While investment in capabilities is essential, the committee also believes that in order to address the challenges posed by the increasingly contested space environment that the Department has described, the Department should review the organization and management of space activities within the Department of Defense to ensure that it is organized most effectively to address these challenges. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would direct the establishment of a major force program for space with a plan for more unified authorities. Consistent with previous independent commissions, however, the committee believes this is only the first step that the Department should take to strengthen national security space.

Therefore, in recognition of the changing space environment, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, to submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by December 1, 2015, a plan that strengthens national security space stewardship, leadership, management, and organization within the Department of Defense, including the National Reconnaissance Office, while streamlining decision-making and limiting unnecessary bureaucracy, and respecting the existing Director of National Intelligence authorities. Such plan shall identify and assess actions that achieve:

(1) Greater unity of funding and authorities within the Department of Defense to prioritize national security space activities in accordance with defense and national security requirements;

(2) Improved focus on Department of Defense space strategy and architectures that align to budgets and specific programs to provide coherence across the space domain, including space, ground, and user terminals;

(3) Improved management of the Department of Defense space portfolio, to ensure that the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Director of National Intelligence, facilitates strategic trades, identifies under-resourced areas and redundant functions, and more effectively manages the critical space industrial base;

(4) Further appropriate integration of the space acquisition and operations of the Department of Defense military and intelligence activities; and

(5) Any other matters the Secretary deems appropriate.

Study on Left-of-Launch

The committee notes the November 5, 2014, memo to the Secretary of Defense from the Chief of Naval Operations and Chief of Staff of the Army about the U.S. ballistic missile defense strategy and developing a long-term holistic approach that addresses homeland missile defense and regional missile defense priorities. The committee is aware that the memo stated that, "the recent Army-Navy Warfighter Talks highlighted the growing challenges associated with ballistic missile threats that are increasingly capable, continue to outpace our active defense systems, and exceed our Services' capacity to meet Combatant Commanders' demand." The memo concluded that, "[o]ur present acquisition-based strategy is

unsustainable in the current fiscal environment and favors forward deployment of assets in lieu of deterrence-based options to meet contingency demands," and that, "[n]ow is the opportunity to develop a longterm approach . . . that is more sustainable and cost effective . . . to balance priorities, inform resourcing decisions and restore our strategic flexibility."

The committee is aware that then-Secretary of Defense Hagel responded on February 4, 2015, that, "[d]uring last fall's Strategic Portfolio Review (SPR), the Deputy's Management Action Group (DMAG) reviewed the question of how to address the growing GCC demand for regional BMD forces. The DMAG concluded that our current national BMD policy is sound, but an update to the 2011 Joint Capability Mix (JCM) sufficiency study was needed to inform force requirements and related issues for the FY 2017 Program and Budget Review."

The committee also notes that the "Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense: Vision 2020" was released by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on December 5, 2013, and stated, "the approach for [Integrated Air and Missile Defense] IAMD in 2020 will be balanced, taking into account a full range of opportunities including diplomacy, a robust approach to passive defense both left and right of enemy launch, electronic warfare, active defense, and increased cooperation with our friends and allies."

The committee is also aware of several other ongoing reviews looking at regional ballistic missile defense and left-of-launch (including an additional review proposed in another section of this Act), but believes there is good reason to specifically focus on a number of the elements referenced in the memo by the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than December 1, 2015, a report outlining how the concepts outlined in the "Vision 2020" plan authored by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the memo authored by the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations in November 2014, are being implemented, including left-of-launch opportunities and non-kinetic means of defense. The report should include the Secretary and the Chairman's evaluation of the feasibility and value of a missile defense strategy that increasingly relies on left-of-launch and non-kinetic means of defense against ballistic missiles; an analysis of the cost-benefit for such an approach to complement current missile defense capabilities and strategy; a description of the programs involved in achieving such capability and the technology readiness levels of such programs if applicable, including projected costs to develop and deploy such capabilities; projected cost-savings; the acquisition strategy to develop and deploy such capabilities and an optimal timeline for their development and deployment; any impacts on force structure of the military departments; any impacts on the current ballistic missile defense strategy; and any related Department of Defense policy decisions in place or needed concerning the use of U.S. military options left-of-launch.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Section 1601—Major Force Program and Budget for National Security Space Programs

This section would amend chapter 9 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a unified major force program for national security space programs to prioritize national security space activities in accordance with the requirements of the Department of Defense and national security. This section would also include an assessment of the budget for national security space programs for fiscal years 2017–20. This assessment, in report form from the Secretary of Defense, would provide an overview of the budget including a comparison between the current budget and the previous year's budget, as well as the current Future Years Defense Program and the previous one with specific budget line identification. This assessment would include any significant changes, priorities, challenges and risks related to the budget. The Secretary would also include any additional matters that the Secretary deems appropriate.

In addition, this section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to provide to the congressional defense committees a report on the plan to carry out the unified major force program, including any recommendations for legislative action the Secretary considers necessary to fully implement the plan.

Section 1602—Modification to Development of Space Science and Technology Strategy

This section would modify and streamline section 2272 of title 10, United States Code, by removing specific direction on elements of the strategy, coordination, and reporting requirements to Congress.

Section 1603—Rocket Propulsion System Development Program

This section would amend section 1604 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) by inserting a section on streamlined acquisition which would require the Secretary of Defense to use a streamlined acquisition approach, including tailored documentation and review processes.

In addition, this section would clarify that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the rocket propulsion system required by section 1604 of Public Law 113–291, the Secretary of Defense would be permitted to obligate or expend such funds only for the development of such rocket propulsion system, and the necessary interfaces to the launch vehicle, to replace non-allied space launch engines by 2019 as required by such section.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and make a briefing available to any other congressional defense committee, not later than 60

days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the streamlined acquisition approach, requirements, and acquisition strategy.

Section 1604—Modification to Prohibition on Contracting with Russian Suppliers of Rocket Engines for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program

This section would amend section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). As amended, this section would prohibit, with certain exceptions and a waiver, the Secretary of Defense from awarding or renewing a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities under the evolved expendable launch vehicle program if such contract carries out such space launch activities using rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation. This section would also prohibit the Secretary from modifying contract number FA8811–13–C–0003 awarded on December 18, 2013, if such modification increases the number of cores procured under such contract to a total of more than 35.

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive one or both of the prohibitions if the Secretary determines, and certifies to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days before the waiver takes effect, that the waiver is necessary for the national security interests of the United States, and the space launch services and capabilities covered by the contract could not be obtained at a fair and reasonable price without the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation.

The prohibition on the award or renewal of a contract would not apply to either the placement of orders or the exercise of options under the contract numbered FA8811–13–C–0003 and awarded on December 18, 2013; or, subject to certification from the Secretary, a contract awarded for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities that includes the use of rocket engines designed or manufactured in Russia if, prior to February 1, 2014, the contractor had fully paid for such rocket engines or had entered into a contract to procure such rocket engines.

The Secretary would not be authorized to award or renew a contract for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities described in the prohibition unless the Secretary, upon the advice of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, certifies to the congressional defense committees that the offeror has provided to the Secretary sufficient documentation to conclusively demonstrate that the offeror meets the requirements of the exception.

Section 1605—Delegation of Authority Regarding Purchase of Global Positioning System User Equipment

This section would modify section 913 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) by limiting the delegation of waiver authority to a level no lower than the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics.

Section 1606—Acquisition Strategy for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Air Force needs to develop an updated, phased acquisition strategy and contracting plan for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program; that the acquisition strategy and contracting plan should eliminate the currently structured EELV launch capability (ELC) arrangement after the current contractual obligations; the Secretary should acquire launch services in a manner consistent with full and open competition; that the Secretary should be consistent and fair with EELV providers regarding the requirement for certified cost and pricing data, selection of contract types, and the appropriate audits to protect the taxpayer; and that the Secretary should consider various contracting approaches, including launch capability arrangements with multiple certified providers which continue to provide the necessary stability in budgeting and contracting, and flexibility to the Government.

This section would require the Secretary to discontinue the ELC arrangement by the latter of either the date on which the Secretary determines that the obligations of the contracts relating to such arrangement have been met, or by December 31, 2020. This section would provide a waiver to the discontinuation of the ELC arrangement if the Secretary determines that such waiver is necessary for the national security interests of the United States, the Secretary notifies the congressional defense committees of such waiver, and a period of 90 days has elapsed following the date of such notification.

This section would also require the Secretary to apply consistent and appropriate standards to certified EELV providers with respect to certified cost and pricing data, and audits, in accordance with section 2306a of title 10, United States Code.

Additionally, this section would require the Secretary to develop and carry out a 10-year acquisition strategy for the EELV program, in accordance with section 2273 of title 10, United States Code, and other elements of this provision. This acquisition strategy would establish a contracting plan that uses competitive procedures and provides the necessary stability in budgeting and acquisition of capabilities, and flexibility to the Federal Government. The strategy would ensure that a contract awarded for launch services, capabilities, or infrastructure specifically takes into account the effect of all Federal contracts entered into and any assistance provided to certified EELV providers, including the ELC; the requirements of the Department of Defense that are met by such providers including launch capabilities and pricing data; the cost of integrating a satellite onto a launch vehicle; and any other matters the Secretary considers appropriate.

Also, in awarding any contract for launch services in a national security space mission pursuant to a competitive acquisition, the evaluation shall account for the value of the ELC per contract line item numbers in the bid price of the offer as appropriate per launch.

This section would require the Secretary to provide to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees, by not later than 180 days after the date of the enact-

ment of this Act, a report on the acquisition strategy detailed within this section.

Section 1607—Procurement of Wideband Satellite Communications

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a senior Department of Defense official to procure wideband satellite communications, both military and commercial, to meet the requirements of the Department.

This section would provide for an exception to the preceding requirement if an appropriate official (Secretary of a military department; Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics; the Chief Information Officer of the Department; or a combatant commander) determines that such procurement is required to meet an urgent need. This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2017, and each year thereafter through 2021, with a brief description of the urgent need, the date, the length of the contract, and the value of such contract.

Finally, this section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a plan for the Secretary to meet the requirements of the Department for satellite communications, including identification of roles and responsibilities.

Section 1608—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Weather Satellite Follow-On System

This section would limit any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the weather satellite follow-on system until: (1) the Secretary of Defense provides a briefing to the congressional defense committees on a plan to address the requirements of the Department of Defense for cloud characterization and theater weather imagery; and (2) the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff certifies to the congressional defense committees that such plan will not negatively affect the commanders of the combatant commands and will meet the requirements of the Department for cloud characterization and theater weather imagery.

Section 1609—Modification of Pilot Program for Acquisition of Commercial Satellite Communication Services

This section would modify the pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite communications services that was established pursuant to section 1605 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct the pilot program, while removing the requirement to use the working capital fund.

The committee is aware of the Secretary's commercial satellite communications "pathfinder" efforts, the term currently used by the Department, to more effectively and efficiently acquire commercial satellite communications services. The committee believes these pathfinder efforts meet the intent and direction of the pilot program. Therefore, the committee would authorize multiple meth-

ods or pathfinder efforts to be used within the pilot program. Additionally, the Secretary would have to establish metrics to track the progress of meeting the objectives of the program. Lastly, the Secretary would be required to provide annual briefings on the progress of the pilot program, concurrent with the submission of the budget request in each year from fiscal year 2017 through fiscal year 2020.

The committee recognizes that a great deal of work remains to be done, but the committee commends the efforts to date that the Secretary is putting forth in this area.

Section 1610—Prohibition on Reliance on China and Russia for Space-Based Weather Data

This section would prohibit reliance on space-based weather data from the Government of the People's Republic of China or the Government of the Russian Federation, and would require the Secretary of Defense to certify that the Department of Defense does not rely on, or in the future does not plan to rely on, space-based weather data for national security purposes, that is provided by the Government of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the Russian Federation, or an entity owned or controlled by the Government of China or the Government of Russia.

Section 1611—Evaluation of Exploitation of Space-based Infrared System Against Additional Threats

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Director of National Intelligence, to conduct an evaluation of the Space-based Infrared System to detect, track, and target, or develop the capability to do the detect, track and target, against the full-range of threats to the United States, deployed members of the Armed Forces, and the allies of the United States, and provide the results of such evaluation to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 2016. Further discussion related to this section is contained in the classified annex to this report.

Section 1612—Plan on Full Integration and Exploitation of Overhead Persistent Infrared Capability

This section would require that the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command and the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a plan for the integration of overhead persistent infrared (OPIR) capabilities to support specified mission capabilities of the Department of Defense. These mission areas include strategic missile warning, missile defense, and tactical intelligence (for example, the capability to detect illicit weapons of mass destruction-related shipments).

The section would also require the Secretary of Defense, in the budget justification materials to accompany the annual budget submission, to certify that the plan on integration of OPIR capabilities is implemented under the budget submission.

The committee recognizes that requirements for OPIR capability are not driven exclusively by the Department of Defense. The com-

mittee expects the Department's plan will focus on defense exploitation of OPIR, and it should not impose costs on other customers who will need to use this data.

Section 1613—Options for Rapid Space Reconstitution

This section would state the sense of Congress regarding rapid reconstitution of critical space capabilities. It would also direct the Secretary of Defense to evaluate options for the use of current assets of the Department of Defense for the purpose of rapid reconstitution of critical space-based warfighter enabling capabilities and provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees not later than March 31, 2016.

Section 1614—Sense of Congress on Space Defense

This section would state a sense of Congress regarding space defense, as outlined in the National Space Policy of 2010.

Section 1615—Sense of Congress on Missile Defense Sensors in Space

This section would state the sense of Congress that a robust multi-mission space sensor network will be vital to ensuring a strong missile defense system.

SUBTITLE B—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Section 1621—Executive Agent for Open-Source Intelligence Tools

This section would amend chapter 21 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section that would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a senior official of the Department of Defense to act as an executive agent for open source intelligence tools.

Section 1622—Waiver and Congressional Notification Requirements Related to Facilities for Intelligence Collection or for Special Operations Abroad

This section would modify section 2682 of title 10, United States Code, regarding the requirement to accomplish maintenance and repair of a real property facility for an activity or agency of the Department of Defense (other than a military department) by or through a military department designated by the Secretary of Defense. Section 2682(c) provides the Secretary of Defense with the authority to waive this requirement if necessary to provide security for authorized intelligence collection or special operations activities abroad undertaken by the Department of Defense. This section would modify the waiver requirement to include a notification requirement for the Secretary of Defense to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees when waiver authority is used and to sunset the waiver authority on December 31, 2017.

Section 1623—Prohibition on National Intelligence Program Consolidation

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2016, to execute: the separation of the portion of the Department of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program from the rest of the Department of Defense budget; the consolidation of the portion of the Department of Defense budget designated as part of the National Intelligence Program within the Department of Defense budget; or the establishment of a new appropriations account or appropriations account structure for such funds.

Section 1624—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Distributed Common Ground System of the Army

This section would limit the availability of funds for the Army's Distributed Common Ground System to 75 percent of the funds authorized to be obligated by the program until the Secretary of the Army conducts a review of the program planning and submits the findings of such review to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees.

Section 1625—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Distributed Common Ground System of the United States Special Operations Command

This section would limit the availability of funds for the Special Operations Command's Distributed Common Ground System to 75 percent of the funds authorized to be obligated by the program until the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command conducts a review of the program planning and submits the findings of such review to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees.

Section 1626—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (OUSD(I)) until the Secretary of Defense establishes the policy required by section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). Section 922 required the Secretary to develop a written policy by June 24, 2014, governing the internal coordination and prioritization of intelligence priorities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the military departments to improve identification of the intelligence needs of the Department of Defense.

The committee understands that OUSD(I) is responsible for creating the required policy and is troubled that OUSD(I) has missed the statutory deadline.

Section 1627—Clarification of Annual Briefing on the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Requirements of the Combatant Commands

This section would modify section 1626 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to include U.S. Special Operations Command within the annual briefing requirement by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

Section 1628—Department of Defense Intelligence Needs

This section would require the Director of National Intelligence to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees on how the Director ensures that the National Intelligence Program budgets for the elements of the Intelligence Community that are within the Department of Defense are adequate to satisfy the national intelligence needs of the Department, as required by section 102A(p) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3024(p)). The report would specifically include a description of how the Director incorporates the needs of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commanders of the unified and specified commands into the metrics used to evaluate the performance of the elements of the Intelligence Community that are within the Department of Defense in conducting intelligence activities funded under the National Intelligence Program.

While the committee applauds the continued efforts to integrate the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community, it is critical to ensure that unique warfighter needs remain a priority at the national level and are incorporated into the metrics used to assess performance under the National Intelligence Program.

Section 1629—Report on Management of Certain Programs of Defense Intelligence Elements

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to review the Science and Technology Research and Foreign Material Exploitation work being conducted by the intelligence elements of the Department of Defense and recommend any changes and realignment of organizations that should take place.

The committee believes that there are significant synergies and potential savings to be gained through consolidation of these activities within the intelligence elements of the Department of Defense.

Section 1630—Government Accountability Office Review of Intelligence Input to the Defense Acquisition Process

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to carry out a comprehensive review of the processes and procedures for the integration of intelligence into the Department of Defense acquisition process. The review would include the integration of intelligence on foreign capabilities into the acquisition process from initial requirement through deployment, including

staffing and training of intelligence personnel assigned to the program offices, as well as the procedures for identifying opportunities for weapon systems to collect intelligence, and accounting for the support requirements the weapon systems will place on the Defense Intelligence Enterprise once fielded.

The committee believes it is important to ensure that the Department is taking into consideration both intelligence assessments of potential adversaries, as well as the exquisite intelligence required to make new weapon systems work to their fullest potential.

SUBTITLE C—CYBERSPACE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 1641—Codification and Addition of Liability Protections Relating to Reporting on Cyber Incidents or Penetrations of Networks and Information Systems of Certain Contractors

This section would codify and amend section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) as a new section 393 of title 10, United States Code, and also amend section 391 of such title, to provide for liability protection for covered contractors reporting cyber incidents to the Department of Defense through these two statutorily required mechanisms.

SUBTITLE D—NUCLEAR FORCES

Section 1651—Organization of Nuclear Deterrence Functions of the Air Force

This section would require that, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Air Force, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force shall be responsible for overseeing the safety, security, effectiveness, and credibility of the nuclear deterrence mission of the Air Force.

This section would also require that, by March 1, 2016, the Chief of Staff designate a Deputy Chief of Staff to carry out the following duties: (1) provide direction, guidance, integration, and advocacy regarding the nuclear deterrence mission; (2) conduct monitoring and oversight activities regarding the safety, security, reliability, effectiveness, and credibility of the nuclear deterrence mission; and (3) conduct periodic comprehensive assessments of all aspects of the nuclear deterrence mission and provide such assessments to the Secretary and the Chief of Staff.

This section would also require that, by March 30, 2016, the Secretary shall consolidate, to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate, under a major command commanded by a single general officer, the responsibility, authority, accountability, and resources for carrying out the nuclear deterrence mission. The major command would be made responsible, to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate, for carrying out all elements and activities related to nuclear deterrence, including nuclear weapons, nuclear weapon delivery systems, and the nuclear command, control, and communication system. The activities would include planning and execution of modernization programs; procurement and acquisition; research, development, test, and evaluation; sustainment; operations; training; safety and security; research, education, and applied science relating to nuclear deterrence and assurance; and

such other functions of the nuclear deterrence mission as the Secretary determines appropriate.

Finally, the Secretary would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 1, 2016, on the plans of the Secretary and the resources required to implement this section.

Section 1652—Assessment of Threats to National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System

This section would require the Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System, established by section 1052 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), to collect and assess (consistent with the provision of classified information, and intelligence sources and methods) all reports and assessments conducted by the Intelligence Community regarding foreign threats, including cyber threats, to the command, control, and communications system for the national leadership of the United States and the vulnerabilities of such system to the threats.

This section would also require that, in its annual report to the Congress, the Council include its assessment of such intelligence reports and assessments along with any plans to address such threats and vulnerabilities.

Section 1653—Procurement Authority for Certain Parts of Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Fuzes

This section would authorize $13.7 million of the funds made available by this Act for Missile Procurement, Air Force, for the procurement of certain commercially available parts for intercontinental ballistic missile fuzes, notwithstanding section 1502(a) of title 31, United States Code, under contracts entered into under section 1645(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

Section 1654—Annual Briefing on the Costs of Forward-Deploying Nuclear Weapons in Europe

This section would require that, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the budget for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the congressional defense committees a briefing on specific costs related to forward-deploying nuclear weapons in Europe.

Section 1655—Sense of Congress on Importance of Cooperation and Collaboration between United States and United Kingdom on Nuclear Issues

This section would express the sense of Congress that: (1) cooperation and collaboration under the 1958 Mutual Defense Agreement and the 1963 Polaris Sales Agreement are fundamental elements of the security of the United States and the United Kingdom, as well as international stability; (2) the recent renewal of the Mutual Defense Agreement and the continued work under the Po-

laris Sales Agreement underscore the enduring and long-term value of the agreements to both countries; and (3) the vital efforts performed under the purview of both the Mutual Defense Agreement and the Polaris Sales Agreement are critical to sustaining and enhancing the capabilities and knowledge base of both countries regarding nuclear deterrence, nuclear nonproliferation and counterproliferation, and naval nuclear propulsion.

Section 1656—Sense of Congress on Organization of Navy for Nuclear Deterrence Mission

This section would state that Congress finds that: (1) the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the nuclear deterrent of the United States is a vital national security priority; (2) nuclear weapons require special consideration because of the political and military importance of the weapons, the destructive power of the weapons, and the potential consequences of an accident or unauthorized act involving the weapons; and (3) the assured safety, security, and control of nuclear weapons and related systems are of paramount importance.

This section would also express the sense of Congress that: (1) the Navy has repeatedly demonstrated the commitment and prioritization of the Navy to the nuclear deterrence mission of the Navy; (2) the emphasis of the Navy on ensuring a safe, secure, reliable, and credible sea-based nuclear deterrent force has been matched by an equal emphasis on ensuring the assured safety, security, and control of nuclear weapons and related systems ashore; and (3) the Navy is commended for the actions it has taken subsequent to the 2014 Nuclear Enterprise Review to ensure continued focus on the nuclear deterrent mission by all ranks within the Navy, including the clarification and assignment of specific responsibilities and authorities within the Navy contained in OPNAV Instruction 8120.1 and SECNAV Instruction 8120.1B.

SUBTITLE E—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Section 1661—Prohibitions on Providing Certain Missile Defense Information to Russian Federation

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense to provide the Russian Federation with "hit-to-kill" technology and telemetry data for missile defense interceptors or target vehicles.

This section would also prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense to provide Russia with information relating to the velocity at burnout of missile defense interceptors or targets of the United States, or classified or otherwise controlled missile defense information.

This section would provide the President with a single use waiver to provide Russia with information regarding ballistic missile early warning in the event the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, and the Commander, U.S. European Command, jointly certify to the President and the congressional defense committees that the provision of such information is required because of a failure of the early warning system of Russia.

The prohibitions established by this section would expire on January 1, 2031.

Section 1662—Prohibition on Integration of Missile Defense Systems of China into Missile Defense Systems of United States

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2016 for the integration of a missile defense system of the People's Republic of China into any missile defense system of the United States.

Section 1663—Prohibition on Integration of Missile Defense Systems of Russian Federation into Missile Defense Systems of United States and NATO

This section would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense or for contributions of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to integrate a missile defense system of the Russian Federation into any missile defense system of the United States or NATO.

The prohibition in this section would expire at the end of fiscal year 2031.

Section 1664—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Long-Range Discriminating Radar

This section would state the sense of the Congress concerning the priority of the Long-Range Discriminating Radar (LRDR) for improving the ballistic missile defense system and achieving operational status of the LRDR in 2020.

This section would provide that no funds authorized to be appropriated may be obligated or expended for military construction for the LRDR (other than for planning and design) until (1) the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) submits an assessment to the congressional defense committees concerning the cost of the MDA sensor architecture required if such radar is based at certain potential sites; (2) the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command and the Commander, U.S. Northern Command jointly certify the proposed site for the LRDR best supports missile defense and space situational awareness and is the most cost-effective option, as informed by the CAPE assessment; and (3) such certification has been submitted to the congressional defense committees for at least 60 days.

Finally, this section would require the Director of CAPE, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to submit the CAPE assessment to the congressional defense committees, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, and the Commander of the United States Northern Command.

Section 1665—Limitations on Availability of Funds for Patriot Lower Tier Air and Missile Defense Capability of the Army

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated for programs related to the Patriot lower tier air

and missile defense capability that depend specifically on the results of the analysis of alternatives (AOA) regarding the Patriot lower tier air and missile defense capability of the Army, may be obligated or expended until the results of the AOA are submitted to the congressional defense committees.

This section would also provide that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics could waive the application of the limitation in this section if the Under Secretary determines that it is necessary to prevent an unacceptable risk to mission performance of the Patriot system and notifies the congressional defense committees of the decision to use such waiver authority.

The committee understands that the AOA will be completed by September 2015, prior to the beginning of fiscal year 2016. The committee does not intend to limit funding for programs or technology that could support Patriot modernization regardless of the options chosen based on the AOA. The committee believes a modernized Patriot capability is vital to a robust air and missile defense capability of the Army, and that such capability is further required for the protection of deployed U.S. Armed Forces and allied forces. The committee is committed to the modernization of Patriot and, elsewhere in this Act, recommends full funding of the budget request for these activities.

Section 1666—Integration and Interoperability of Air and Missile Defense Capabilities of the United States

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to ensure the interoperability and integration of U.S. certain covered air and missile defense systems, including by directing operational testing that they determine is necessary to ensure militarily useful interoperability and integration of such systems.

This section would further require that the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Secretary of the Army conduct a minimum of at least one intercept or flight test per year that demonstrates interoperable and integrated air and missile defense capability. The Director and the Secretary of the Army would be authorized to waive this subsection if the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics determines such waiver is necessary and submits to the congressional defense committees an explanation for how such waiver will not negatively affect demonstrating the interoperability and integration of the air and missile defense capability of the United States.

For the purposes of this section, covered air and missile defense systems are Patriot air and missile defense batteries and associated interceptors and systems, Aegis ships and associated ballistic missile interceptors (including Aegis Ashore capability), AN/TPY–2 radars, and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system batteries and interceptors.

Section 1667—Integration of Allied Missile Defense Capabilities

This section would require that, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commander, U.S. European

Command, the Commander, U.S. Central Command, and the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command shall submit to the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff an assessment of the opportunities for integration and interoperability of air and missile defenses of the United States with those capabilities of allies of the United States. This section would require the Secretary and the Chairman to submit such assessments to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after receipt from the combatant commander concerned.

This section would further require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Staff of the Navy, to carry out the planning, risk assessments, policy development and concept of operations development necessary to assure the integration and interoperability of U.S. and allied air and missile defenses by December 31, 2016. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be required to provide quarterly updates on the progress of such planning and related activities by not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each 90 period thereafter, until such integration and interoperability has been achieved.

For the purposes of this section, covered air and missile defense systems are Patriot air and missile defense batteries and associated interceptors and systems, Aegis ships and associated ballistic missile interceptors (including Aegis Ashore capability), AN/TPY–2 radars, and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system batteries and interceptors.

Section 1668—Missile Defense Capability in Europe

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure the Aegis Ashore site to be deployed in the Republic of Poland has anti-air warfare (AAW) capability upon the site achieving full operating capability. This section would also require that the Aegis Ashore site in Romania be retrofitted with AAW capability not later than December 31, 2018. This section would further require the Secretary to evaluate the feasibility, benefit, and cost of using the evolved sea sparrow missile or the Standard Missile 2 in providing the anti-air warfare capability that would be required by this Act.

This section would also require that the Secretary of Defense ensure a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) battery is available for rotational deployment to the U.S. European Command (EUCOM) area of responsibility not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, as appropriate to respond to military requirements, unless required in another combatant command's area of responsibility. The Secretary would also be required to examine sites to pre-position such THAAD battery if such pre-position is necessary for military requirements.

This section would also require that the Secretary study not fewer than three sites in the EUCOM area of responsibility for the deployment of a THAAD battery, in the event one is determined to be necessary and not fewer than three sites for the deployment of a Patriot air and missile defense battery, in the event one is determined to be necessary.

The Secretary of Defense would be required to work with the Secretary of State to enter into any necessary agreements with prospective host nations and to coordinate with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Section 1669—Availability of Funds for Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense System

This section would make available $41.4 million of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 101 of this Act, and as specified in the funding table in section 4101, for the Government of Israel for components for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

This section would condition those funds such that they are available subject to the terms, conditions, and co-production targets specified for fiscal year 2015 the "Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement."

This section would also require that not less than 30 days prior to the initial obligation of these funds, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that the Agreement is being implemented as provided in the Agreement and an assessment detailing any risks relating to the implementation of such Agreement.

Section 1670—Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense Program Co-Development and Potential Co-Production

This section would authorize $165.0 million out of such funds as are authorized to be appropriated in section 101 of this Act, and as specified in the funding table in section 4101, for procurement and coproduction of the David's Sling Weapons System and the Arrow 3 Upper Tier missile defense system. This section would further specify the terms and conditions that shall be achieved by the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics prior to the disbursement of the authorized funds. These terms and conditions would include, achievement of the knowledge points and production readiness agreements within the current bilateral research, development, test, and evaluation agreements; matched funding by the Government of the State of Israel; the successful negotiation of a bilateral agreement between the United States and the Government of Israel; agreed co-production targets based on the teaming agreements for the co-development programs; and, certain other matters.

The committee notes it recommends the authorization of these funds for procurement of missile defense system batteries and interceptors for the Government of Israel based on the availability of these funds as opposed to specific production goals (e.g., numbers of batteries or numbers of interceptors). The committee is mindful of the hundreds of millions of dollars already invested in the David's Sling and Arrow 3 programs during co-development of these systems. The committee remains committed, even during a con-

strained budget environment, to support the missile defense requirements of the Government of Israel.

Section 1671—Development and Deployment of Multiple-Object Kill Vehicle for Missile Defense of the United States Homeland

This section would state the sense of the Congress that the ballistic missile defense of the U.S. homeland is the highest priority of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA); that the Missile Defense Agency is appropriately prioritizing the design, development, and deployment of the redesigned kill vehicle; and, the multiple-object kill vehicle (MOKV) is critical to the future of the ballistic missile defense of the U.S. homeland.

This section would require that the Director of the Missile Defense Agency develop a highly reliable multiple-object kill vehicle for the ground-based midcourse defense system using best acquisition practices, with rigorous flight testing to occur by not later than 2020, and deployment of such vehicle as soon as practicable thereafter. This section would also require that the management of the MOKV program be undertaken by the Deputy Director of the Missile Defense Agency. This section would also require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to provide the funding profile required for the MOKV program to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

While the committee supports the development of the MOKV by MDA, it expects, and will conduct close oversight to ensure that such development does not interfere with the development, flight test and deployment of the Redesigned Kill Vehicle, also known as the CE–III kill vehicle.

Section 1672—Boost Phase Defense System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to prioritize technology investments to develop and field a boost phase missile defense system by fiscal year 2022; ensure that development and fielding of a boost phase missile defense system can benefit multiple warfighter requirements; continue development of high-energy lasers and high-power microwave systems as part of a layered architecture to defend ships and theater bases against air and cruise missile strikes; and encourage collaboration among the military departments and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency with respect to high energy laser efforts carried out in support of the Missile Defense Agency.

This section would also require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to establish a senior level advisory group to recommend to the Director promising technologies that the Director can evaluate for use as a boost phase missile defense layer.

Finally, this section would require the Director to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees not later than May 1, 2016, on the recommendations of the senior-level advisory group; a plan for developing one or more programs of record for boost phase missile defense systems; and the views of the Director regarding the recommendations and plan.

Section 1673—East Coast Homeport of Sea-Based X–Band Radar

This section would require that the sea-based X-band radar (SBX) shall be relocated to a new homeport on the East Coast of the United States not later than December 31, 2020, and shall have an at-sea capability of not less than 120 days per year. Prior to executing the relocation, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency would be required to certify that the relocation will not impact the missile defense of Hawaii.

This section would also require that not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall begin siting studies, environmental impact studies (as necessary), and any other appropriate studies and evaluations to base SBX at a site on the East Coast.

Section 1674—Plan for Medium Range Ballistic Missile Defense Sensor Alternatives for Enhanced Defense of Hawaii

This section would state the sense of Congress regarding ballistic missile defense sensor and sensor discrimination capability.

This section would further require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to conduct an evaluation of potential options for fielding a medium range ballistic missile defense sensor for the defense of Hawaii. Such evaluation would have to be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Section 1675—Research and Development of Non-terrestrial Missile Defense Layer

This section would require that, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency shall commence a concept definition, design, research, development, and engineering evaluation of a space-based ballistic missile intercept and defeat layer to the ballistic missile defense system.

This section would further require that, not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the findings of such concept development, a plan for developing one or more programs of record for a non-terrestrial missile defense layer, and the views of the director regarding such findings and plan. The Director would be required to brief the congressional defense committees on an interim basis not later than March 31, 2016.

Section 1676—Aegis Ashore Capability Development

This section would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army, to evaluate the role, feasibility, cost, and cost benefit of additional Aegis Ashore sites and upgrades to current ballistic missile defense system sensors to offset capacity demands on current Aegis ships, Aegis Ashore sites, and Patriot and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense capability and to meet the requirements of the combatant commanders. Such evaluation should be submitted by the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman

of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, after their review, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of the Act.

This section would further require that the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Secretary of State shall jointly identify any obstacles to foreign military sales of Aegis Ashore or co-financing of additional Aegis Ashore sites. Such review would have to include the feasibility of host nation manning or dual manning with the United States and such host nations. The results of such review would have to be briefed to the specified congressional committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and a final report provided not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Finally, this section would require the President to seek to enter into host nation agreements for Aegis Ashore sites and co-financing and co-development opportunities as appropriate if the sites meet the requirements of the combatant commanders.

Section 1677—Briefings on Procurement and Planning of Left-of-Launch Capability

This section would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide the specified congressional committees a briefing on the military requirement for left-of-launch capability and any current capability gaps in meeting such requirement.

This section would further require that not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Director National Intelligence jointly provide a briefing to the specified congressional committees on the plan of the Secretary and the Director to develop and procure the left-of-launch capabilities described in the briefing to be provided by the Chairman.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction, family housing, and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2016. As recommended by the committee, division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $7,683,000,000 for construction in support of the Active Forces, Reserve Components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2016.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $6,641,995,000 for military construction, $251,334,000 for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities, and $1,413,181,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2016. The committee recommends authorization of $5,873,003,000 for military construction, $251,334,000 for BRAC activities, and $1,413,181,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2016. The committee also recommends $532,000,000 for military

construction for Overseas Contingency Operations military construction within title XXIX.

Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016."

Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required to be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVII and title XXIX of this Act shall expire on October 1, 2018, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.

Section 2003—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, and XXIX of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2015, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $743,245,000 for Army military construction and $493,206,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2016. The committee recommends authorization of $663,245,000 for military construction and $493,206,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2016.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Generator and Rail Equipment Center

The Defense Generator and Rail Equipment Center (DGRC) is currently located at Hill Air Force Base (AFB), Utah. This is the Department of Defense's sole organic capability for depot-level repair and maintenance of rail stock and rail equipment, as well as certain types of large-scale power generation equipment. DGRC currently services not only the Army's nationwide rail fleet, but also rail equipment for the Air Force and the Navy.

The committee notes that the DGRC's present location may interfere with the long-term viability of an Air Force Enhanced Use Lease project at Hill AFB. The committee also notes that the Army has conducted two cost studies for relocation of the DGRC from its present location to the Anniston Army Depot (ANAD), Alabama. The most recent cost validation, dated September 30, 2014, estimated the costs to relocate DGRC to ANAD to be $17.1 million. This included costs associated with military construction and the relocation of personnel and equipment. However, the committee also notes that the estimate examined only one-time costs for the relocation and did not account for the potential life-cycle savings gained from relocating the function to an Army installation. In addition, the estimate did not address the feasibility of a public-private partnership with the State and local community that may as-

sist in financing the costs of relocating the center. The committee also notes that if the DGRC were to stay in its present location at Hill AFB, the Army's tenant agreement with the Air Force would need to be renegotiated to account for increased operating costs to secure an isolated land parcel, plus the cost to construct new fencing and gates in accordance with Department of Defense Force Protection standards.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by December 15, 2015, that revalidates the personnel, equipment, and military construction costs associated with a relocating the DGRC from Hill AFB to ANAD. The report should also address the life-cycle costs associated with the functions of DGRC remaining in place compared to relocating to ANAD, including the feasibility of a private-public partnership arrangement.

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction of funding for projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $43.0 million for a Homeland Defense Operations Center at Joint Base San Antonio, Texas. The budget request included $43.0 million to provide a command and control facility in support of Army North, the Army Service Component Command of U.S. Northern Command. The committee believes that the requirements for this facility are undefined and the facility is early-to-need. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $43.0 million, for this project.

(2) $37.0 million for an Instruction Building at Joint Base Myer-Henderson, Virgina. The budget request included $37.0 million to construct a training facility for the U.S. Army Band at Joint Base Myer-Henderson. The committee is sympathetic to the constraints of the existing facility, but does not support this requirement at this time. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $37.0 million, for this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2016.

Section 2103—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to make improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2016.

Section 2104—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize appropriations for Army military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2105—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects

This section would extend the authorization of a certain projects originally authorized in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2107—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects

This section would extend the authorization of certain projects originally authorized by section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2108—Additional Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2016 Projects

This section would authorize a military construction project in the amount of $6,000,000 to construct a multi-sport athletic field and track and perimeter road and fencing and acquire approximately 5 acres of land adjacent to the existing Sterrebeek Dependent School site in Brussels, Belgium, to allow relocation of Army functions to the site in support of the European Infrastructure Consolidation effort. In addition, this section would authorize a payment-in-kind project in the amount of $12,400,000 to construct a vehicle bridge and traffic circle to facilitate traffic flow to and from the Medical Center at Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,605,929,000 for Navy military construction and $369,577,000 for family housing for fiscal year

2016. The committee recommends authorization of $1,361,925,000 for military construction and $369,577,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2016.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustment

The committee recommends reduction of funding for several projects contained in the base budget request for military construction and family housing and recommends a transfer of these projects to the Overseas Contingency Operations title of this Act. These reductions include:

(1) $37.7 million for the Mina Salman Pier Replacement at Bahrain. The budget request included $37.7 million to support berth requirements for homeported, forward deployed, and visiting ships in Bahrain. The committee supports this requirement. However, the committee recommends no funds in the base budget, a reduction of $37.7 million, for this project in order to transfer this project to Title XXIX, Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction.

(2) $52.1 million for the Ship Maintenance Support Facility at Bahrain. The budget request included $52.1 million to support forward deployed Littoral Combat Ships in Bahrain. The committees supports this requirement. However, the committee recommends no funds in the base budget, a reduction of $52.1 million, for this project in order to transfer this project to Title XXIX, Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction.

(3) $62.3 million for the P–8 Hangar and Fleet Support Facility at Naval Air Station Sigonella, Italy. The budget request included $62.3 million to support squadron maintenance for P–8A aircraft operating at Naval Air Station Sigonella. The committee supports this requirement. However, the committee recommends no funds in the base budget, a reduction of $62.3 million, for this project in order to transfer this project to Title XXIX, Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction.

(4) $40.6 million for the Triton Hangar and Operation Facility at Naval Air Station Sigonella, Italy. The budget request included $40.6 million to support operations and maintenance for the MQ–4C Broad Area Maritime Surveillance platforms operating from Naval Air Station Sigonella. The committee supports this requirement. However, the committee recommends no funds in the base budget, a reduction of $40.6 million, for this project in order to transfer this project to Title XXIX, Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction.

(5) $51.3 million for the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense Complex at Redzikowo Base, Poland. The budget request included $51.3 million to support personnel operating the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System in Redzikowo, Poland. The committee supports this requirement. However, the committee recommends no funds in the base budget, a reduction of $51.3 million, for this project in order to transfer this project to Title XXIX, Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2016.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2016.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize appropriations for Navy military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2205—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, and originally included in section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 11281), until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2207—Townsend Bombing Range Expansion, Phase 2

This section would provide special conveyance authority to the Secretary of the Navy for two fire and emergency response stations as part of the land acquisition agreement to support emergency services for Townsend Bombing Range Expansion, Phase 2, Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, Townsend, Georgia.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,354,785,000 for Air Force military construction and $491,730,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2016. The committee recommends authorization of $1,279,785,000 for military construction and $491,730,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2016.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustment

The committee recommends reduction of funding for several projects contained in the base budget request for military construction and family housing and recommends a transfer of these projects to the Overseas Contingency Operations title of this Act. These reductions include:

(1) $50.0 million for Construct Airfield and Base Camp at Agadez, Niger. The budget request included $50.0 million for airfield infrastructure at Agadez, Niger, to support operations in western Africa. The committee supports this requirement. However, the committee recommends no funds in the base budget, a reduction of $50.0 million, for this project in order to transfer this project to Title XXIX, Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction.

(2) $25.0 million for an Airlift Apron at Al Musanah Air Base, Oman. The budget request included $25.0 million to construct an airlift apron in support of strategic and tactical aircraft at Al Musanah Air Base, Oman. The committee supports this requirement. However, the committee recommends no funds in the base budget, a reduction of $25.0 million, for this project in order to transfer this project to Title XXIX, Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction.

Former Norton Air Force Base, California

The committee notes that Norton Air Force Base, California, was closed on March 31, 1994, as part of the 1988 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. The committee is aware that the Department of the Air Force conveyed portions of the Former Norton Air Force Base, to include land, improvements thereon, and easements, to the San Bernardino International Airport Authority by quitclaim deed on December 17, 1999. In addition to the 1999 quitclaim deed, the committee is aware that section 2851 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) directed the Administrator of General Services to convey two avigation easements to the Inland Valley Development Agency. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Administrator of the General Services Administration, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2016, regarding the conveyance directed by section 2851 of Public Law 107–107. The report should discuss the ownership status of the land and easements associated with

the Former Norton Air Force Base, the ability to complete the conveyance as directed by section 2851 of Public Law 107–107, and the impact of the enacting legislation that results in the repeal or amendment of section 2851 of Public Law 107–107.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2016.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2016.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize appropriations for Air Force military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2305—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2010 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (division B of Public Law 111–84) and authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2306—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) and authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section would also require a notification and 14-day wait period, or 7-day wait period if submitted via electronic medium, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the selected project location before commencing construction. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2307—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2015 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2308—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed, originally provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81), until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2309—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed, originally provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239), until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2310—Limitation on Project Authorization to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2016 Project

This section would limit the Secretary of the Air Force from expending any funds authorized by this title that are associated with the construction of Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex Consolidation, Phase 2, at Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom, until the Secretary submits a report on the continuity of operations considerations for the critical communications and intelligence capabilities located at or being located to Royal Air Force Croughton, United Kingdom. This section would also limit action to realign forces at Lajes Air Force Base, Azores, until the Secretary of Defense certifies that Lajes Air Force Base is not an optimal location for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex, or any of the critical communications or intelligence capabilities considered in the continuity of operations planning.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $2,300,767,000 for defense agency military construction and $58,668,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2016. The committee recommends authorization of $1,939,879,000 for military construction and $58,668,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2016.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction of funding for several projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $10.4 million for the Special Operations Force (SOF) Performance Resiliency Center-West at Camp Pendleton, California. The budget request included $10.4 million to support the U.S. Special Operations Command's Human Performance Initiative at Camp Pendleton. The committee continues to have concerns regarding the Human Performance Initiative. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $10.4 million, for this project.

(2) $47.2 million for the SOF Logistics Support Unit One Ops Fac. #2 at Naval Base Coronado, California. The budget request included $47.2 million in support of air operations, operational gear storage and distribution, and combat services support at Naval Base Coronado. The committee notes that the utilities needed to support this facility are not available and are not programmed until fiscal year 2017. Without these utilities, the committee notes that the facility would not be complete and usable and believes that this project is early-to-need based on the sequencing of the supporting utilities. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $47.2 million, for this project.

(3) $20.0 million for the Operations Support Facility at a classified location. The committee has concerns regarding this project, and believes that the requested construction project may be early-to-need. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $20.0 million, for this project.

(4) $31.8 million for the Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement at Marine Corps Base Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii. The budget request included $122.1 million to construct a replacement clinic to provide primary medical care at Marine Corps Base Kaneohe Bay. The committee supports the requirement for this project and provides the full project authorization included in the budget request. However, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2016. As such, the committee recommends $90.3 million, a reduction of $31.8 million, for this project.

(5) $36.0 million for the Behavioral Health/Dental Clinic Addition at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii. The budget request included $123.8 million for a health clinic and dental clinic addition, as well as a new parking structure to support the beneficiary population at Schofield Barracks. The committee supports the requirement for this project, but believes that it would be more efficient to construct the parking structure in coordination with a future planned medical clinic project that also contains a parking structure. Therefore, the committee reduced the authorization for the project by $16.3 million. In addition, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the

Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2016. As such, the committee recommends $87.8 million, a reduction of $36.0 million, for this project.

(6) $0 million for the NSAW Recapitalization Building #2, Increment 1 at Fort Meade, Maryland. The budget request included a request for an authorization of $782.3 million, with a request for an authorization of appropriations of $34.9 million in fiscal year 2016 for a new operations facility to support mission operations. The committee supports the requirements for this project but does not believe it is cost-effective to spend $93.2 million on a parking garage when compared to the cost per parking space of a paved surface parking area. As such, the committee recommends an authorization of $692.0 million, a decrease of $93.2 million, for this project. In addition, the committee recommends full funding for the authorization of appropriations, as requested in the budget request, in the amount of $34.9 million in fiscal year 2016. In future budget requests, the committee expects the Department of Defense to seek additional authorizations of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations.

(7) $2.5 million for the SOF 21 STS Operations Facility at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. The budget request included $16.9 million to support training, planning, and equipping combat controllers at Fort Bragg and includes a project element in support of the U.S. Special Operations Command's Human Performance Initiative. The committee continues to have concerns regarding the Human Performance Initiative. As such, the committee recommends $14.4 million, a reduction of $2.5 million, for this project.

(8) $50.0 million for the Hospital Replacement, Increment 7 at Fort Bliss, Texas. The budget request included $239.9 million to support the replacement of a hospital that provides inpatient and outpatient care to the beneficiary population at Fort Bliss. The committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2016. As such, the committee recommends $189.9 million, a reduction of $50.0 million, for this project.

(9) $212.9 million for the Construct Fuel Storage and Distribution Facilities at Camp Lemonier, Djibouti, and the Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex at Redzikowo Base, Poland, that was transferred to Title XXIX, Overseas Contingency Operations Military Construction.

(10) $10.0 million for contingency construction at various worldwide locations. The budget request included $10.0 million to support contingency construction requirements not previously authorized by law. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has not requested a military construction project using funds from this account since 2008. In addition, the committee notes that unobligated balances remain available in the military construction account and other authorities exist to construct projects that are in keeping with a national security interest. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $10.0 million, for this program.

In addition, the committee recommends an increase of funding for projects contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) $30.0 million for Arlington Cemetery Defense Access Roads at Arlington, Virginia. This project would realign roadways and supporting infrastructure to make the land previously known as the Navy Annex site contiguous to Arlington National Cemetery and increase burial space. The budget request did not include funding for this project, but it was included in the Army Chief of Staff's Unfunded Requirements List. As such, the committee recommends $30.0 million, an increase of $30.0 million, for this project.

(2) $30.0 million for the Missile Defense Agency Military Construction Planning and Design activities for an East Coast site for homeland missile defense. The budget request did not include funding for this project. The committee recommends $30.0 million, an increase of $30.0 million, for this project.

Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility

The committee is aware that the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command has stated that the Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility "serves as a critical asset supporting United States Pacific Command operations in peacetime and contingency" and will "remain vitally important to our security interests for the next thirty years." The committee is also aware that U.S. Pacific Command, the Department of the Navy, and the Defense Logistics Agency have determined the storage requirement to remain between 13 and 15 operational storage tanks at the facility, with the ability to bring additional tanks online at the end of the repair and modernization cycle should future requirements warrant.

The committee is further aware that the Naval Facilities Engineering Command is currently conducting an engineering assessment to determine the best available practicable technological (BAPT) solutions for the recapitalization of the storage tanks to ensure long-term integrity and environmental compliance in a cost-effective manner. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of the Defense Logistics Agency Energy, not later than 30 days after the date of approval of the BAPT by the regulatory agencies, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the BAPT solutions and the proposed recapitalization plan for the Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility. Once the BAPT solution is determined, the committee encourages the Defense Logistics Agency to proceed with efforts to recapitalize the Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility as quickly as possible, subject to available resources.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized defense agencies' construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects valued at a cost greater than $3.0 million at the amounts authorized for each project at a specific location. This section would also authorize the sum total of projects across various locations, each project of which is less than $3.0 million. This section would also preclude the ability to set-aside operation and maintenance facilities restoration and modernization funds for the exclusive purpose of funding energy projects. It would require installation energy projects to compete in the normal process of determining installation requirements.

Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize appropriations for defense agencies' military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2404—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81), as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2405—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, originally authorized by section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81), until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2406—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, originally authorized by section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239), until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2407—Modification and Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66), to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously au-

thorized construction project. This section would also extend the authorization authority of the project through October 1, 2018, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $120,000,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2016. The committee recommends authorization of $150,000,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2016.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this Act and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $517,269,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year 2016. The committee recommends authorization of $478,169,000 for military construction for fiscal year 2016.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends the decrease of funding for several projects requested by the Department that were previously authorizations in the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). These decreases include:

(1) $10.8 million for Nation Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop at Dagsboro, Delaware. The committee continues to support this valid authorization from fiscal year 2015, however, the committee encourages the Department of the Army to use available unobligated

balances for this requirement. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $10.8 million, for this project.

(2) $19.0 million for Enlisted Barracks and Transit Training at the Yakima Training Center, Washington. The committee continues to support this valid authorization from fiscal year 2015, however, the committee encourages the Department of the Army to use available unobligated balances for this requirement. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $19.0 million, for this project.

(3) $9.3 million for an Army Reserve Center and Land at Starkville, Mississippi. The committee continues to support this valid authorization from fiscal year 2015, however, the committee encourages the Department of the Army to use available unobligated balances for this requirement. As such, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $9.3 million, for this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2611—Modification and Extension of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section would also extend the authorization listed until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2612—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2012 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, originally provided by section 2602 the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2613—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, originally provided by sections 2601, 2602, and 2603 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $251,334,000 for activities related to Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities. The committee recommends authorization of $251,334,000 for BRAC activities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account

This section would authorize appropriations for ongoing activities that are required to implement the Base Realignment and Closure activities authorized by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510), at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2702—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round

This section would state that nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round, affirming congressional intent to reject the budget request to authorize another BRAC round in 2017.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Collaboration on Electromagnetic Pulse Threats to the Electrical Grid

The committee remains concerned with the Nation's preparedness to withstand, mitigate, and respond to the effects of naturally occurring or manmade electromagnetic pulse (EMP) events. The committee notes that the Department of Defense maintains military standards for the protection of critical military infrastructure to enhance EMP preparedness and survivability of key national security systems and capabilities. However, the Department of Defense relies heavily on civilian utility providers to meet installation energy requirements. The committee notes that Department of Defense missions and systems may be adversely impacted by civilian power grid failures due to natural or manmade threats, including cyber threats and EMP events. Given the Department of Defense expertise on EMP issues and reliance on civilian electrical utilities, the committee encourages the Department to collaborate with and, as appropriate, share information with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, and civilian utility commissions and utility providers, with the intent of enhancing protection of the electrical grid from natural or manmade EMP events.

Conveyance of Water and Wastewater Systems on Guam

The committee notes that section 2822 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) authorized the Secretary of Defense to convey the Navy's water and wastewater treatment utility systems on Guam, including the Fena Reservoir, to the Guam Waterworks Authority. The committee is aware that the Navy, through Navy-owned and operated water and wastewater infrastructure, continues to provide water and wastewater services to several villages in southern Guam. Further, it is noted that Navy water rates increased from $5.41 to $7.59 per 1,000 gallons in October 2014. The committee is aware of significant concerns that have been raised about these price increases by local leaders, stakeholders, and rate payers. Further, the committee notes that recent press reports indicate that the Naval Facilities Engineering Command may increase water rates again in fiscal year 2016.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense, working through the Secretary of the Navy, has not utilized the authority provided to them to convey the water and wastewater system to the Guam Waterworks Authority. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2015, on the feasibility, cost effectiveness, and impact of integrating the Navy and Guam Waterworks Authority utility systems. The report should also indicate whether the Navy intends to utilize its authority to convey the water and wastewater utility systems, provide a timeline for the conveyance if the Navy intends to utilize its authority, and cover the steps being taken to provide the Guam Waterworks Authority with third party assistance to bring its operations of the system to mutually agreed upon standards.

Defense Laboratory Enterprise Infrastructure

The committee recognizes the important role that the Defense Laboratory Enterprise plays, ensuring the United States maintains technological superiority, responding to the needs of the Department of Defense, and accelerating delivery of technical capabilities to the warfighter. To ensure the Defense Laboratory Enterprise is able to continue its mission, the committee believes it is important that the military departments make appropriate investments to sustain and recapitalize the infrastructure supporting the Defense Laboratory Enterprise. The committee notes that several critical technologies, including hypersonic weapons, directed energy, unmanned aerial systems and electromagnetic railgun, will potentially transition from development into production in the coming years. However, the budget request for fiscal year 2016 and the current Future Years Defense Program do not include military construction projects in support of the Defense Laboratory Enterprise.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 15, 2016, on the infrastructure supporting the Defense Laboratory Enterprise. At minimum, the briefing should address the current condition and capacity of existing infrastructure supporting defense laboratories, infrastructure-related investments made to

defense laboratory infrastructure since fiscal year 2011, and the required infrastructure investments in laboratories, offices, and support facilities necessary in the coming years to synchronize Defense Laboratory capacity with the capability to transition emerging technologies into programs of record.

F–35 Stationing, Basing, and Laydown Selection Process

The committee believes that the military departments' selection process for stationing, basing, and laydown decisions for units and missions should remain transparent, repeatable, and defendable in nature. While the committee recognizes that the military departments each have their own unique requirements that may require variations in their stationing, basing, and laydown decisions, the committee believes that engagement with the congressional defense committees at multiple points throughout each of the military services' stationing, basing, and laydown processes is critical. The committee notes that congressional engagements prior to initial screening criteria, upon determining candidate locations, upon determining specific site survey criteria, upon determining preferred and reasonable alternatives, and upon making a final decision have been the most effective in keeping the process transparent, repeatable, and defendable. With respect to the criteria used, the committee believes that the military departments should assess the ability of a military installation and its associated or adjacent training areas to support the unit or mission, the capacity of a military installation to accommodate the unit or mission, the costs associated with the stationing, basing, or laydown action, and encroachment and environmental considerations.

Specifically, for future F–35 basing decisions, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services before the Secretary concerned announces the initial screening and site survey criteria for the next aviation basing or stationing action, or by December 1, 2015, whichever date is earlier. The briefing should address each military services' existing process for station, basing, and laydown decisions for F–35s, outlining existing criteria with an explanation of the calculus involved for each criteria. In addition, the briefing should detail when and how existing military service criteria consider actual routings and altitudes traveled to reach the training areas, the types or spectrum of training activities the range or ranges concerned can support, annual operating costs of transiting to and from the training areas, and how weather at both the basing location and the training areas are considered in support of mission requirements. The briefing should also address how each military service currently factors in installations that control training areas versus installations that share training areas controlled by other users, whether Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace is factored into available airspace calculations, and if proximity to joint partners for training requirements is evaluated.

Facilities Sustainment and Recapitalization Policy and Funding

The committee notes that the Department of Defense manages and operates more than 562,000 facilities, which the Department

needs to sustain and recapitalize to keep them in the condition and configuration to support the Department's missions. The committee also notes that the Department has not fully funded sustainment to meet its estimated needs, which can lead to deterioration of the facility, limited use and performance of the facility, and can impact mission and readiness of the installation. Further, the committee notes that deferred maintenance and repair of facilities leads to a need for more recapitalization funding in the future to restore and replace facilities that become deteriorated and outdated faster than expected.

On March 3, 2015, the Acting Assistant Secretary Of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment testified before the Subcommittee on Readiness that the military departments are accepting risk in not sustaining, restoring, and modernizing facilities. In an effort to better track and limit risk, in fiscal years 2013–14, the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment issued two memoranda establishing a sustainment and recapitalization policy, directing the military components to complete certain actions, such as funding sustainment to at least 90 percent of the Facility Sustainment Model estimate, standardizing gathering of facility condition data, and developing mitigation plans for facilities that are in failing condition to help improve the condition of the facilities in coming years.

As such, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department of Defense's plans and actions and to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 14, 2016, that addresses the state of the Department's facility sustainment and recapitalization programs. At a minimum, the report should address the following:

(1) To what extent has the Department of Defense made progress in meeting its policy goals for sustainment and recapitalization of its facilities as outlined in the two Department memoranda?

(2) What is known about the condition of facilities and the trend in conditions since fiscal year 2011?

(3) To what extent have the military departments addressed deferred facility sustainment needs and what is known about the impact of deferred sustainment on facility condition and mission readiness?

(4) What is known about the effect of facilities sustainment and recapitalization policy and funding since fiscal year 2011 on the quality of life of personnel and readiness of the installation?

Impact of Wind Energy Developments on Military Installations

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has negotiated mitigation efforts with proposed wind energy developments in proximity to military installations, training ranges, and low-level training routes. The committee is aware that some of these mitigations were negotiated prior to the completion of scientific studies to determine the effects of the wind energy structures and rotating blades on military aircraft's main and terrain-following radars. Without the results of these studies, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense may not have the information necessary to determine the actual impact of mitigation efforts or the extent of risk to military missions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than October 1, 2015, on the science, standards, assumptions, and criteria by which the Department assesses the risks to military missions posed by wind energy developments in proximity to military installations or training ranges. The report shall also include the proposed parameters and distances from military training routes and ranges that are considered an acceptable risk, and a review of the success of mitigation measures included in past agreements with wind energy developments, including the cost of mitigation measures. Finally, the report shall include an analysis of feedback from local military installation commanders of the impact or effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.

Improvement of Design-Build Selection Process

The committee continues to remain interested in the Department of Defense's use and implementation of the two-phase design-build selection procedures. The committee notes that Section 2305a, title 10, United States Code, was modified in the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, limiting the number of offerors specified in a solicitation to five for contract values that exceed $4,000,000, but not requiring the use of a two-phase selection procedures for these procurements. The committee continues to be concerned about how these changes have affected the industry and the Department's ability to award construction projects.

As such, the committee requests the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2016, that addresses how the Department has implemented the modifications to the law enacted last year, any feedback the Department has received from industry, and any challenges to the implementation of the statue. Further, the briefing should include the list of instances in which the agency awarded a design-build contract pursuant to this section that had more than five finalists for phase-two request for proposals during fiscal year 2015, and the list of design-build requests for proposals that used a one-step process.

Intergovernmental Support Agreements

The committee notes that section 331 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) authorized the Department of Defense to enter into intergovernmental support agreements with State or local governments for the procurement of installation support services. Section 351 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) provided additional clarification to the authorities for military installations to enter into intergovernmental support agreements with State or local governments. The committee supports the use of intergovernmental support agreements between the Department of Defense and State and local governments, and believes that such agreements provide an opportunity to streamline costs, realize efficiencies, and enhance the quality of services to the Department of Defense. The committee notes that the authority to enter into

intergovernmental support agreements is broad and encourages the Department of Defense to leverage this authority in a manner that provides cost savings and improved services in support of Department of Defense installations, military personnel, and their families.

Joint Basing

The committee notes that in 2005, the Department of Defense recommended to the Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission that 26 installations be combined into 12 joint bases to generate efficiencies and savings. This recommendation was implemented, and the committee commends the Department and military departments on their implementation of joint basing. The BRAC Commission estimated that joint basing would result in $183.0 million in annual recurring savings. The committee notes that, according to the Department's Report to Congress on the Joint Basing Initiative, joint bases saved $255.0 million in fiscal year 2012 and $830.0 million in fiscal year 2013, surpassing both the one-time implementation cost of $155.0 million and the estimated savings predicted by the BRAC Commission. The committee believes there is a strong fiscal and operational incentive to joint basing, evident in the efficiencies that have occurred to date. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to continue looking for opportunities to streamline operations at joint bases and continue its efforts to achieve additional efficiencies through joint basing.

Lincoln Laboratory Recapitalization

The committee recognizes the role that Lincoln Laboratory plays in conducting research and developing technologies that address critical national security challenges. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee noted its concern about the need to recapitalize the infrastructure supporting Lincoln Laboratory's facilities at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is conducting an analysis of alternatives to determine the most appropriate and fiscally responsible approach to recapitalize the infrastructure supporting Lincoln Laboratory. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 1, 2015, to review the results of the analysis of alternatives and the Department's plan for ensuring that Lincoln Laboratory's facilities are able to appropriately support research and development that is vital to the security of the United States.

Major Range and Test Facility Base Military Construction Assessment

The Major Range and Test Facility Base (MRTFB) is a set of test installations, facilities, and ranges which are regarded as "national assets." This designated core set of Department of Defense Test and Evaluation (T&E) infrastructure and associated workforce is a critical capability to be preserved in order to conduct necessary T&E analyses to support the Department's acquisition process. The

MRTFB exists primarily to provide T&E information for Department of Defense decision makers and to support T&E needs of Department of Defense research and weapon system development programs. The committee recognizes that the MRTFB must remain sized, operated, and maintained to preserve core, governmental T&E capabilities.

The committee is aware that the Test Resource Management Center (TRMC), a field activity within the Department of Defense, has the lead responsibility for oversight of the Department's facilities, ranges, and all other physical assets that are used to support Department of Defense T&E. TRMC exercises that responsibility in a number of ways, including the biennial strategic plan for Department T&E Resources, as well as annual budget certification to ensure each military department and Department of Defense agency with responsibility for T&E is proposing adequate funding within its annual budget submission. In the Strategic Plan for Department of Defense T&E Resources from March 2013, the report noted, "Due to age and outmoded technology, many test facilities are increasingly difficult to sustain and/or maintain. Obsolescence and deterioration contribute significantly to increased levels of maintenance, reductions in reliability, and an overall increase in operating costs. Services are under pressure to keep existing ground test facilities viable and relevant to meet immediate and forecasted needs. Across all services, there has been a downward trend in T&E Military Construction (MILCON) appropriations to address ongoing maintenance, sustainment, and modernization needs of our T&E facilities. Further analysis is required (e.g., recapitalization rate) to provide a comprehensive assessment of MRTFB-only MILCON needs and investments."

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, on the results of the comprehensive assessment of MRTFB-only military construction needs and investments called for by the March 2013 strategic plan. The assessment should include an estimated cost to replace or bring to code deficient structures, as well as a plan for ensuring sufficient capacity for all Department of Defense MRTFB facilities to support current and projected future operations. Additionally, the committee encourages TRMC to use the results from this assessment to inform future budget certifications from the military departments and Department of Defense agencies.

The committee further directs the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2016, on the Director's preliminary findings.

Non-Federally Connected Civilian Children Residing in Military Privatized Housing

The committee notes its continued support for the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI), which has worked to improve military family housing by allowing private developers to improve, maintain and operate housing communities. In the two decades since it was enacted, private ventures created under the program have improved quality of life for those who serve. Recent testimony to the committee notes that the department completed its MHPI

award phase in fiscal year 2013 with award of the final three Air Force MHPI projects, bringing the total privatized inventory to about 205,000 housing units.

The committee is aware that under the program, priority for housing goes first to military personnel, federal employees, and retirees. However, if occupancy rates drop below certain levels for a period of time, housing can be made available to the general public. While the committee believes that this is an important part of ensuring the financial viability of these public-private ventures, it is concerned that this approach could also pose unanticipated challenges to the communities that support them.

To this end, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016 with an analysis that includes:

(1) Site-by-site census of non-federally connected civilian children living in housing under the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI) annually between FY2011 and FY2015;

(2) An evaluation of projected force structure trends over the next decade that may influence the levels of non-federally connected civilian children; and

(3) A discussion of any impacts to civilian communities as a result of any changes in the levels of non-federally connected civilian children residing in such housing, and recommendations to mitigate such impacts.

Public Schools on Department of Defense Installations

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense, acting through the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), has provided grants to local educational agencies to construct, renovate, repair, or expand elementary and secondary public schools on military installations. In awarding grants to local educational agencies, OEA has given priority consideration to those military installations with schools having the most serious capacity and facility condition deficiencies, as determined by the Department of Defense in a July 2011 priority list.

The committee recognizes the efforts of the Department of Defense to improve the condition and capacity deficiencies of elementary and secondary public schools on military installations in support of military dependents. Therefore, the committee encourages the the Department of Defense to continue to take appropriate steps to address condition and capacity deficiencies at elementary and secondary public schools on military installations. Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide an updated report to the congressional defense committees by March 14, 2016, on the condition and capacity of schools in bands 7, 8, and 9 of the July 2011 Priority List.

Utility Privatization

The committee notes that the military departments have leveraged existing authorities to privatize the utility systems providing electricity, water, wastewater, and natural gas to military installations. Through utilities privatization, military installations have been able to achieve greater efficiencies and reduce operating costs while recapitalizing aging utilities infrastructure with modern, reli-

able systems. In addition, the committee notes that utilities privatization can also enhance support to military missions. Therefore, the committee encourages the military departments to continue to pursue utility privatization initiatives when they are supported by a business case analysis and are in the best interest of the government in terms of efficiency, operating costs, and mission assurance.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING CHANGES

Section 2801—Revision of Congressional Notification Thresholds for Reserve Facility Expenditures and Contributions to Reflect Congressional Notification Thresholds for Minor Construction and Repair Projects

This section would align Reserve Component minor construction and repair thresholds with the threshold specified in chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2802—Authority for Acceptance and Use of Contributions from Kuwait for Construction, Maintenance, and Repair Projects Mutually Beneficial to the Department of Defense and Kuwait Military Forces

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, to accept contributions from the Government of the State of Kuwait in support of construction, maintenance, and repair projects within Kuwait that are mutually beneficial to the Department of Defense and the Kuwait military forces. The section would also limit the maximum amount the Secretary of Defense may obligate to $50.0 million annually, require a congressional notification with 21-day wait period, 14-day period if notification is provided in electronic medium, for projects exceeding the thresholds prescribed by section 2805, title 10, United States Code, and expire on September 30, 2020.

Section 2803—Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program

The section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program, using amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, such military construction projects for any Department of Defense Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratory or Department of Defense federally funded research and development center as are authorized in the Military Construction Authorization Act. This section would also limit the maximum amount that may be obligated in any fiscal year under this authority at $150.0 million and would expire on October 1, 2020.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Enhancement of Authority to Accept Conditional Gifts of Real Property on Behalf of Military Service Academies

This section would provide consistency across the military service academies on the acceptance of a gift of real property, if the gift

of such real property is conditioned upon the property bearing a specified name. This section would authorize the military service academies to accept such a gift if the acceptance and naming would not reflect unfavorably on the United States, and the real property has not otherwise been named by an act of Congress. This section would also require the Secretaries of the military departments to issue uniform regulations governing circumstances under which gifts conditioned on naming rights may be accepted.

Section 2812—Consultation Requirement in Connection with Department of Defense Major Land Acquisitions

This section would modify section 2664(a) of title 10, United States Code, to require consultation by the Secretary concerned with the chief executive officer of the State, district, or territory as to options for completing the real property acquisition.

The committee notes that the Secretary concerned is already required to obtain a specific military construction authorization in accordance with section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, and comply with National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321) before any major land acquisition can be implemented.

Section 2813—Additional Master Plan Reporting Requirements Related to Main Operating Bases, Forward Operating Sites, and Cooperative Security Locations of Central Command and Africa Command Areas of Responsibility

This section would amend section 2687a(a) of title 10, United States Code, by adding a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to include with the existing overseas basing report a strategic summary for each main operating base, forward operating site, or cooperative security location within the U.S. Central Command and U.S. Africa Command area of responsibility. This section would sunset in fiscal year 2020.

Section 2814—Force-Structure Plan and Infrastructure Inventory and Assessment of Infrastructure Necessary to Support the Force Structure

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, as part of the budget justification documents accompanying the President's budget request for fiscal year 2017, that details a 20-year force structure plan for each of the military services and a comprehensive inventory of worldwide infrastructure. The report would also compare these two items to determine the infrastructure necessary to support the force structure, discuss the categories of excess infrastructure and infrastructure capacity, and assess the value of retaining certain excess infrastructure to accommodate contingency, mobilization, or surge requirements. In addition, this section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to prepare an evaluation of such force-structure plans and infrastructure inventory not later than 60 days after the date on which the plans and inventory are submitted to Congress. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General to also take into consideration, as appropriate, the recommendations regarding force structure and force sizing provided by the

July 31, 2014, assessment of the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review by the National Defense Panel.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATED TO ASIA-PACIFIC MILITARY REALIGNMENT

Section 2821—Restriction on Development of Public Infrastructure in Connection with Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region

This section would amend restrictions placed on the development of civilian infrastructure on Guam to support the realignment of Marine Corps Forces in the Asia-Pacific region to allow the use of funds for infrastructure projects that are identified in the report of the Economic Adjustment Committee required by section 2831(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). This section would also permit the use of funding for the planning and design of such projects.

Section 2822—Annual Report on Government of Japan Contributions toward Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report to the congressional defense committees for each of fiscal years 2017–26 that addresses the total amount contributed from the Government of Japan to the Support for United States Relocation to Guam Account during the most recent year, as well as the anticipated contributions to be made during the current and next Japanese fiscal years. The report would also cover the infrastructure projects carried out on Guam or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in the previous fiscal year using funds from the Support for United States Relocation to Guam Account, as well as the projects anticipated to be carried out during the next fiscal year. This section would also repeal a reporting requirement from the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417).

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2831—Land Exchange Authority, Mare Island Army Reserve Center, Vallejo, California

This section would authorize a land exchange involving a parcel of real property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army on the site of the former Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, California, in the event that a current real property exchange process is unsuccessful.

Section 2832—Land Exchange, Navy Outlying Landing Field, Naval Air Station, Whiting Field, Florida

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, containing Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8 in Escambia County, Florida, to Escambia County. In exchange, this section would require Escambia County to convey to the Secretary of the Navy a

parcel of property that is suitable for use as a Navy outlying landing field to replace Navy Outlying Landing Field Site 8.

Section 2833—Release of Property Interests Retained in Connection with Land Conveyance, Fort Bliss Military Reservation, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to release the rights and the reversionary interests reserved by the United States for a parcel of land in El Paso, Texas, to authorize the State of Texas to sell a portion of the property and use all proceeds from the sale to fund improvements or repairs for the National Guard facilities on the remainder of the property.

SUBTITLE E—MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWALS

Section 2841—Withdrawal and Reservation of Public Land, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California

This section would provide for the withdrawal and reservation of additional public land in San Bernardino County, California, to support operations at Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California.

Section 2842—Bureau of Land Management Withdrawn Military Lands Efficiency and Savings

This section would extend the public lands withdrawn for military purposes listed in the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title 30 of Public Law 106–65) until the Secretary of the military department determines a military purpose does not exist, or the Secretary of Interior permanently transfers the administrative jurisdiction to the Secretary of the military department concerned.

SUBTITLE F—MILITARY MEMORIALS, MONUMENTS, AND MUSEUMS

Section 2851—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio

This section would modify the name of the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers Aviation Center, Dayton, Ohio, to the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers National Museum, Dayton, Ohio.

Section 2852—Extension of Authority for Establishment of Commemorative Work in Honor of Brigadier General Francis Marion

This section would extend the authority to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor Brigadier General Francis Marion and his service, originally provided by section 331 of the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–229), through May 8, 2018.

Section 2853—Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act

This section would prohibit the designation of Federal property as a National Historic Landmark or for nomination to the World Heritage List if the head of the agency managing the Federal property objects to such inclusion or designation for reasons of national

security. This section would also authorize the expedited removal of Federal property listed on the National Register of Historic Places if the managing agency of that Federal property submits a request to the Secretary of Interior for such removal for reasons of national security.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2861—Modification of Department of Defense Guidance on Use of Airfield Pavement Markings

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to modify the Unified Facilities Guide Specifications for pavement markings, an Air Force engineering technical letter, and any other Department of Defense guidance on airfield pavement markings as necessary to permit the use of Type III category of retro-reflective beads. In addition, the Secretary shall develop appropriate policy to ensure that determination of the category of retro-reflective beads used on airfields is determined on an installation-by-installation basis based on local conditions and the life-cycle maintenance costs of the pavement markings.

Section 2862—Protection and Recovery of Greater Sage Grouse

This section would delay any finding by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Greater Sage Grouse under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)) through September 30, 2025. In an effort to foster greater coordination between the States and the Federal Government regarding management plans for the Greater Sage Grouse, this section would prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from amending any Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in a State in which the Governor of the State has notified the Secretaries concerned that the State has a State management plan in place. Lastly, this section would also require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly submit an annual report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives on the effectiveness of the systems to monitor the status of Greater Sage Grouse on Federal lands under their jurisdiction through 2021.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request did not contain a request for Overseas Contingency Operations military construction for fiscal year 2016. The committee recommends authorization of $532,000,000 for military construction for fiscal year 2016.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2901—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Project

This section would contain the list of a certain authorized Army construction project for fiscal year 2016. This project represents a binding list of the specific projects authorized at this location.

Section 2902—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of certain authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2016. These projects represent a binding list of the specific projects authorized at these locations.

Section 2903—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of certain authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2016. These projects represent a binding list of the specific projects authorized at these locations.

Section 2904—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of certain authorized Defense-Wide construction projects for fiscal year 2016. These projects represent a binding list of the specific projects authorized at these locations.

Section 2905—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for overseas contingency operations military construction at the levels identified in section 4602 of division D of this Act.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $18.87 billion for atomic energy defense activities. The committee recommends $18.69 billion, a decrease of $175.3 million to the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $12.57 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The committee recommends $12.77 billion, an increase of $204.7 million to the budget request.

Weapons Activities

Advanced radiography

The committee notes the fiscal year 2016 budget request justification materials for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) described a technology gap identified by the directors of the national security laboratories and the director of the Nevada National Security Site regarding NNSA's ability to assess the final stages of a nuclear weapon's primary implosion without nuclear explosive testing. The committee supports NNSA's initiative to fill this gap through the development of enhanced radiography for integrated subcritical plutonium experiments at NNSS and therefore reduce risks in scientific understanding necessary to design and certify future stockpile life extension programs.

However, the committee notes that NNSA has requested initial funding for this project but has not yet submitted a project data sheet for it, which would provide increased transparency on the project's multi-year cost and schedule. The committee understands that certain aspects of this project may require significant cutting-edge science and substantial research and development before implementation, but other, largely separate, portions of the project are focused on more standardized equipment and infrastructure improvements. The committee believes these latter aspects of this project, at least, should be accelerated and managed under a full or streamlined capital asset acquisition process under Department of Energy (DOE) Order 413.3B, "Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets." The committee believes that portions of the project requiring significant further technology maturation and research and development may, if the Administrator determines it appropriate, continue to be developed under other authorities.

The committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide the congressional defense committees, by September 1, 2015, a project data sheet in compliance with DOE Order 413.3B for part or all of the enhanced radiography project to enable transparency and accountability for this program. As always, the committee expects NNSA to follow a best practices acquisition approach for this project.

B61–12 and W76–1 Life Extension Programs

The budget request contained $643.3 million for the B61–12 Life Extension Program (LEP) and $244.0 million for the W76–1 LEP. The committee continues to believe that the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) primary focus must be its nuclear weapon stockpile stewardship program. Within that broader pro-

gram the deliverables directly supporting Department of Defense requirements must be paramount. Successfully delivering LEPs efficiently and on schedule must be NNSA's central focus.

The committee highlights the value of the B61–12 LEP in producing a nuclear gravity bomb that will be both a tangible and credible extended deterrent to U.S. allies, as well as a critical component of the United States' own strategic deterrent. The committee also notes the importance of the W76–1 to the strategic triad. With the sea-based leg of the triad expected to soon carry approximately 70 percent of the nation's operationally deployed strategic warheads, the W76–1 will be the cornerstone of the U.S. nuclear deterrent for decades to come.

The committee notes the significant progress made on both of these LEPs in the past year. Information from NNSA and its laboratories indicates that the B61–12 LEP continues to meet all major milestones on-schedule and on-budget. The B61–12 LEP is scheduled to enter Phase 6.4, Production Engineering, in 2016 and the committee looks forward to this progress. Meanwhile, the W76–1 LEP recently completed over 50 percent of the planned warhead production. The committee commends the progress in both programs and believes sustained success in these crucial national security programs will continue to help NNSA rebuild trust with the Department of Defense and Congress.

The committee recommends $643.3 million for the B61–12 LEP and $244.0 million for the W76–1 LEP, the full amount of the budget request.

Defense nuclear security

As the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) continue to implement corrective actions resulting from the intrusion at the Y–12 National Security Complex in 2012, the committee notes modest improvements in certain aspects of the defense nuclear security program. For instance, a degree of clarification of roles, responsibilities, authority, and accountability for security has been undertaken, though the committee believes more should be done to formalize and institutionalize these efforts. The committee is also encouraged by ongoing efforts to review and update certain security policies, including the Department's design basis threat.

As its oversight of these matters continues, the committee is concerned about the long list of deferred physical security expenditures across the nuclear security enterprise. Recent estimates by NNSA show a list of deferred security expenditures of over $1.4 billion, which appears to be in addition to the $3.6 billion backlog of general deferred maintenance across the enterprise. Modernization and recapitalization of the Perimeter Intrusion Detection and Assessment Systems (PIDAS) at the Y–12 National Security Complex and the Pantex Plant account for more than half of the $1.4 billion. The committee believes NNSA must undertake a comprehensive program to prioritize and manage its physical security recapitalization efforts over the next 10 years. To enable this recapitalization to be both cost effective and appropriately designed, NNSA must conduct rigorous analysis of policies, technologies, and options to ensure it is postured to address current and future threats while striving for standardization and cost efficiencies wherever possible.

Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2016, containing a 10-year plan to recapitalize the nuclear security enterprise's physical security systems. Such risk-based plan should include the following: a condition assessment for physical security equipment; a prioritized list with costs and schedules for recapitalization of individual systems and equipment; an analysis of security policies, technologies, and gaps related to current and evolving threats; and how standardization and cost efficiencies will be sought across the enterprise. The committee encourages NNSA to conduct rigorous and comprehensive analyses of alternatives for all major components of this recapitalization program, particularly the PIDAS modernization programs. The committee further directs the Administrator to provide an interim briefing to the congressional defense committees on the development of this plan by February 15, 2016.

To begin this planning and initial recapitalization of the NNSA physical security infrastructure, the committee recommends $631.9 million, an increase of $12.0 million to the budget request, for Defense Nuclear Security, Operations and Maintenance.

Deferred maintenance

Within a proposed Infrastructure and Safety budget category, the budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) contained $227.0 million for Maintenance and $257.7 million for Recapitalization. Respectively, these programs fund day-to-day preventative or corrective maintenance activities and efforts to reduce the large backlog of deferred maintenance across the nuclear security enterprise. Combined, these programs are critical to arresting the declining state of NNSA's infrastructure.

Budget request justification materials submitted by NNSA note that NNSA's deferred maintenance backlog is over $3.6 billion and growing. The materials highlight that, of NNSA's approximately 3,800 facilities, almost 30 percent were built during the Manhattan Project era and over 50 percent are more than 40 years old. Moreover, 12 percent of NNSA's buildings are no longer in use, but must be maintained in a safe state until funds can be allocated for demolition and disposition.

The committee agrees with NNSA that infrastructure risk, if left unaddressed, becomes safety risk and mission risk. This fact was made vivid in March 2014 and July 2014 when large blocks of concrete fell from ceilings in two separate facilities at the Y–12 National Security Complex in Tennessee. Multiple fire suppression system leaks last year at the Pantex Plant and the Device Assembly Facility resulted in shutdowns, and broken basic infrastructure resulted in program delays at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Y–12, and other sites. The committee reiterates its position that the decrepit state of the nation's nuclear infrastructure is unacceptable and must be expeditiously corrected. The nation cannot expect to attract and retain first-class scientists, engineers, and technicians to the nuclear security enterprise if several of its facilities present safety hazards.

The committee believes the Administrator for Nuclear Security has taken a major and important step in finding creative solutions to this problem by pursuing a lease option to acquire administra-

tive support capabilities at Pantex. The committee encourages the Administrator and the Secretary to continue to seek such solutions (when they are fiscally sound) and to refine and improve their methodology for understanding, calculating, and prioritizing infrastructure projects.

The committee is encouraged that the Administrator and the Secretary have taken steps to stop the growth in the backlog of deferred maintenance, but believes more must be done to actually decrease the total amount of the backlog. Therefore, the committee recommends $407.7 million, an increase of $150.0 million, for Recapitalization, and $251.0 million, an increase of $24.0 million, for Maintenance.

Funding prioritization within Weapons Activities

The budget request contained $8.85 billion for the Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). These programs support NNSA's central mission of ensuring and sustaining the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the U.S. nuclear weapon stockpile.

Within Weapons Activities, the committee continues to believe NNSA must emphasize programs and capabilities that directly support NNSA's deliverables to the Department of Defense. The committee believes NNSA has taken significant steps in this regard within its budget request and recommends no adjustment from the budget request level for life extension programs.

As NNSA focuses on its concrete deliverables to the military, the committee seeks to ensure NNSA does not neglect longer-term requirements and needs. Therefore, the committee recommends $203.8 million, an increase of $11.2 million, for R&D Certification and Safety, to support an increased rate of underground subcritical experiments. The committee also recommends $26.9 million, an increase of $2.4 million, for Nuclear Survivability, to support an increased level of effort, and $51.9 million, an increase of $1.1 million, for Enhanced Surety, to support continued development and maturation of safety, security, and use-control technologies. Finally, the committee recommends $67.3 million, a decrease of $6.0 million, for Ignition, and $322.8 million, a decrease of $11.0 million, for Facility Operations and Target Production, to redirect funds from fusion ignition efforts towards higher priority needs.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee explains other recommendations regarding funding priorities within NNSA's Weapons Activities. Overall, the committee recommends $9.08 billion, an increase of $237.7 million, for Weapons Activities.

Funding related to execution of life extension programs

The committee understands that certain funding within the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) budget request for Weapons Activities, but not within the life extension program (LEP) budget lines themselves, directly affect NNSA's ability to successfully execute LEPs. For instance, if cut, certain funding within Advanced Simulation and Computing or Stockpile Services would have a direct and negative impact on the B61–12 LEP. The committee acknowledges the difficulty, transparency issues, and possible inefficiency in ensuring all such funding resides in the LEP budget lines, but encourages the Administrator for Nuclear

Security make clear in future budget requests what funding within the broader Weapons Activities account supports and is considered critical to successful execution of LEPs.

Governance and management of the nuclear security enterprise

The committee thanks the co-chairs and members of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise that was established by section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). The work of this advisory panel is a valuable contribution to the ongoing effort to address longstanding governance and management problems at the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The advisory panel's final report, "A New Foundation for the Nuclear Enterprise," makes a series of recommendations for action, many of them aligning with suggestions from previous studies and many of them new.

The committee notes that the advisory panel's final report makes several recommendations for legislative action, stating that, "inadequate implementation of the legislation establishing NNSA as a separately organized sub-element of DOE has resulted in overlapping DOE and NNSA headquarters staffs and blurred ownership and accountability for the nuclear enterprise missions." The committee agrees that the executive branch's implementation of the NNSA Act (50 U.S.C. 2401 et seq.) has been inadequate, but does not believe this is sufficient reason, or that there is sufficient trust at this time, for Congress to change key elements of this statute and return to an organizational structure within DOE that proved deficient in the past. The proposed remedy of fully reintegrating NNSA's defense functions back into DOE may merely compound the difficult problem of fixing NNSA by requiring a fix to larger problems across the much broader Department as a whole. Therefore, the committee has decided not to make any statutory changes at this time to the NNSA Act or related legislation to address the advisory panel's recommendations, and believes DOE and NNSA should not take any steps inconsistent with current law. However, the committee looks forward to rebuilding trust and seeking cooperative solutions with the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Secretary of Energy.

Based on its oversight, the committee believes the Administrator and the Secretary have begun taking significant initial steps in this regard. More, however, must be done, and the effort must be sustained for the long-term and across administrations. The advisory panel's final report points to cultural, management, and leadership problems as root causes. The committee recognizes that leadership from both the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator will be essential and believes it will take sustained, personal engagement by the Administrator and the Secretary to remedy these problems. For instance, actions to reduce detailed, transactional oversight without reducing oversight of health, safety, and security will require major long-term cultural shifts driven by senior leaders. Similarly, moving to rebuild trust and partnership among Federal officials and the NNSA laboratories and plants will require clear direction, requirements, and vision as well as strong accountability for implementing concrete and measurable changes. Successfully

taking action on many other recommendations, including adopting proven management and best business practices, making fundamental changes to contracting approaches and award fees, and establishing very clear roles, responsibilities, authorities, and accountability, will require the Administrator and the Secretary to guide major shifts away from NNSA's and DOE's traditional practices and address NNSA's and DOE's challenges.

In the end, the advisory panel concluded that "demonstrated performance is the ultimate measure of success and the foundation for credibility and trust." The committee agrees. The committee expects continued action and focused attention from Congress and the administration can provide the nation a nuclear security enterprise that is focused on achieving its mission effectively and efficiently as well as safely and securely.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would provide NNSA and DOE an implementation framework for taking actions to address the recommendations of the advisory panel (and other studies) that do not require legislative action. The committee looks forward to continued engagement with the Administrator and the Secretary on this issue and to significant progress in the years ahead.

Plutonium strategy

The budget request contained $174.7 million for Plutonium Sustainment and $155.6 million for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Project. Combined, these two budget lines provide funding for achieving the nation's plutonium strategy to revitalize plutonium pit production capabilities.

The committee supports the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) plutonium strategy, which aligns with the statutory pit production requirements established by section 3112 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The committee believes the three-step approach proposed by NNSA, coupled with line item budgeting, will ensure transparency while providing NNSA the flexibility to execute this important strategy. The committee will continue to closely monitor the plutonium strategy, as well as efforts to address the concerns that resulted in the plutonium operations safety stand-down at Los Alamos National Laboratory, and particularly emphasizes the imperative to cease operations in the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research building, which is over 60 years old, by 2019.

To support NNSA's plutonium strategy, and ensure NNSA meets safety and statutory pit production requirements, the committee recommends $183.1 million, an increase of $8.4 million, for Plutonium Sustainment, and $155.6 million, the full amount requested, for the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement Project.

Primary Assessment Technologies

The budget request contained $98.5 million for Primary Assessment Technologies within the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Research, Development, Testing, and Evaluation Science program.

Among other activities, Primary Assessment Technologies supports capabilities needed for Intelligence Community assessments

of foreign nuclear weapon activities. The committee also understands that NNSA proposes to fund fiscal year 2016 efforts to carry out section 4509 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2660) related to design and use of prototypes of nuclear weapons for intelligence purposes within Primary Assessment Technologies. The committee expects that these efforts will be intelligence-driven and tightly linked to designs based on intelligence assessments.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision to create a nuclear weapon design responsiveness program to sustain, enhance, and continually exercise all capabilities required to conceptualize, study, design, develop, engineer, certify, produce, and deploy nuclear weapons.

To facilitate all of these efforts, the committee recommends $120.1 million, an increase of $21.6 million, for Primary Assessment Technologies. Due to the tightly coupled nature of these programs, the committee believes this is an appropriate location for funding these efforts in fiscal year 2016. However, as these efforts gain further clarity and grow more distinct, the committee urges the Administrator for Nuclear Security to consider whether other funding mechanisms may be more appropriate.

Stockpile Surveillance and Assessment

The budget request contained $52.2 million for B61 Stockpile Systems and $42.2 million for B83 Stockpile Systems. This funding provides for, among other things, weapon maintenance, surveillance, and assessment activities.

The budget request proposes significant reductions in funding for these activities, amounting to an over 50 percent reduction for B61 Stockpile Systems and a 33 percent reduction for B83 Stockpile Systems as compared to fiscal year 2015. These reductions are based on the administration's proposals to retire these weapons in the mid- or late-2020s, when the B61–12 has been fully produced and is operational. The proposed funding reductions allow the National Nuclear Security Administration to increase funding for the W88 Alt 370 program to support an expanded scope for this effort. While the committee supports the expansion of the W88 Alt 370 to include a refresh of the weapon's conventional high explosives, the committee is concerned about the increased risk that is being accepted in surveillance and assessments of the safety and reliability of the B61 and B83. The budget justification materials provided to the committee highlight that the "reduction in surveillance activities increases risk in ability to detect and investigate anomalies and increases the uncertainty in reliability assessments."

To decrease this risk, the committee recommends $73.2 million, an increase of $21.0 million, for B61 Stockpile Systems, and $51.2 million, an increase of $9.0 million, for B83 Stockpile Systems.

Uranium for national security purposes

The committee understands that the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator for Nuclear Security, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense are reviewing the available stockpile of unencumbered uranium and considering potential options for ensuring a long-term supply of enriched uranium is available for national security purposes. Within the nuclear enterprise, enriched

uranium is required for nuclear weapons, production of tritium for use in nuclear weapons, and for naval nuclear propulsion.

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Administrator for Nuclear Security, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Defense, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 15, 2016, assessing the options for ensuring a supply of enriched uranium for national security purposes for the long-term. For the options considered, the briefing should provide a description and cost-benefit analysis, as well as timelines and costs. The briefing should also identify available and potentially available stocks of uranium, policy changes or international agreements that could be considered, and include any other matters that the Secretaries concerned and the Administrator determine appropriate.

The committee also expects the Administrator to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the results of the related cost study that the Office of Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation plans to prepare.

W78/88–1 Life Extension Program

As noted in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee does not object, in principle, to the deferral of a first production unit from the W78/88–1 Life Extension Program (LEP) to fiscal year 2030. The committee notes the potential cost of this program and believes this deferral has allowed resources to be focused on higher priority programs, such as the W80–4 LEP. The committee is also aware of the recent JASON advisory panel report examining the viability and requirements of the "3+2" concept.

The committee also notes the potential impact this deferral could have upon critical design and development skills within the nuclear security enterprise, if not mitigated in another manner. For instance, deferral of all funding for this program until fiscal year 2020, coupled with constrained funding in programs such as Enhanced Surety and R&D Certification and Safety, could place significant limits on efforts to develop and mature technical options and certification tools for this LEP. The committee notes ongoing technical, reliability, and cost challenges and uncertainties expected with this LEP. The committee encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Nuclear Weapons Council to review and consider what small investments, if any, may be warranted between now and fiscal year 2020 that could enhance critical design skills, develop technology options, improve understanding of certification challenges, and consider creative or novel design and manufacturing paradigms that could reduce costs and reliability challenges for the W78/88–1 LEP and other future Directed Stockpile Work.

W88 Alt 370 and W80–4 Life Extension Program

The budget request contained $220.2 million for the W88 Alt 370 program and $195.0 million for the W80–4 Life Extension Program (LEP).

With the fiscal year 2016 budget request, the Administration has proposed significant changes for each of these programs. First, in

November 2014 the Nuclear Weapons Council approved the addition of a "refresh" of the conventional high explosives within the W88 warhead as part of the ongoing W88 Alt 370 program. Based on review of stockpile assessment data, cost estimates, and proposed timelines for life extension programs, the committee supports this decision. As the W88 Alt 370 moves into Phase 6.4, Production Engineering, in fiscal year 2016, the committee expects the National Nuclear Security Administration to rigorously manage this additional work scope and provide additional transparency on its plans, and the related costs, benefits, and risks, through the Weapon Design Cost Report.

Second, last year the Nuclear Weapons Council took action to align the production schedule of the cruise missile warhead LEP with the requirements of section 3119 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), which required the Secretary of Energy to deliver a first production unit for the long-range standoff weapon by September 30, 2025. The committee believes this schedule will mitigate risks in the nation's standoff capabilities and ensure a consistent and manageable LEP workload within the nuclear security enterprise. The committee notes the Nuclear Weapons Council's decision to downselect to the W80 warhead for this LEP and looks forward to continued refinement of design options, requirements, and cost estimates as the LEP moves into Phase 6.2, Feasibility Study.

The committee recommends $220.2 million for the W88 Alt 370 program and $195.0 million for the W80–4 LEP, the full amount of the budget request.

Weapons dismantlement and disposition

The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) plans to dismantle, by the end of fiscal year 2022, all U.S. nuclear weapons retired prior to fiscal year 2009. In an April 2014 report, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommended that NNSA clarify its dismantlement performance goal and how NNSA measures progress towards this goal. The report stated that "having clear goals and measures is a key element of program management," but, "[b]ecause the dismantlement performance goal does not make these practices clear, NNSA risks providing misleading information about progress related to its goal." It noted that "NNSA does not track the actual date that dismantled weapons were retired and may be counting some dismantled weapons retired after fiscal year 2009 as equivalent to weapons retired prior to fiscal year 2009," and, "NNSA will not dismantle some weapons retired prior to fiscal year 2009 but will reinstate them to the stockpile to save on rebuilding other weapons and count the reinstated weapons as equivalent dismantlements." The GAO also recommends NNSA consider extending the goal because it is unclear whether NNSA will meet the fiscal year 2022 date and, if the goal is successfully met, there will be a "significant dismantlement workload gap during the mid-2020s." The GAO also found that "NNSA's ability to significantly accelerate dismantlement and complete planned workload earlier than fiscal year 2022 could be costly, and it is unclear whether Pantex would have sufficient capacity to do so."

To provide clarity on these matters, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2015, detailing the plan for dismantlement, including the timeline and the funding and capacity required to meet the NNSA's goal to dismantle nuclear weapons retired before 2009 by 2022. The committee expects this briefing to address dismantlement performance goals, including how dismantled weapons are counted, whether that goal should be extended, the risk of a significant dismantlement workload gap during the mid-2020s that could result in the loss of certified dismantlement personnel at Pantex, requirements at the Pantex site for effectively managing its component inventory management system, and any impacts of delaying any planned dismantlement of weapons retired prior to 2009 past 2022. The briefing should also include the Administrator's estimate of the capacity and costs for accelerating this goal, including any costs associated with increasing Pantex's capacity to address such an increased workload to accelerate this goal. In addition, the briefing should include any plans and assess the capacity for dismantlement of nuclear weapons retired since 2009.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

Comptroller General assessment of Nonproliferation Research and Development Program

The National Nuclear Security Administration's Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) program manages several efforts to research and develop technologies to prevent or combat the proliferation of nuclear materials. While the committee is supportive of efforts to explore and develop such technologies, the committee desires an independent assessment regarding how DNN manages and prioritizes these programs to create technologies that are actively deployed, as compared to longer-term research and development efforts.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2016, containing the Comptroller General's assessment of DNN's nonproliferation technology research and development efforts. In particular, the briefing should provide the Comptroller General's assessment of: (1) how much of the research and development conducted thus far under DNN's programs has translated into technologies that are actively deployed; (2) how the DNN program prioritizes technology research and development funding in support of near-term and long-term goals, including technology to improve monitoring, detection, and in-field inspection and analysis capabilities; (3) how the DNN program measures success in technology development efforts, the role deployment of technology plays in such measures, and to what extent DNN has met its performance measures; and (4) how the technology research and development program is managed and the roles of and funding for participating national laboratories.

Funding prioritization within Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

The budget request contained $1.94 billion for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN). Of this amount, $426.8 million was re-

quested for Global Material Security, $311.6 for Material Management and Minimization, and $419.3 million for DNN Research and Development (R&D).

As in past years, within Global Material Security's Nuclear Smuggling Detection and Deterrence (NSDD) subprogram, the committee continues to question the value of fixed site detection units at major international border crossings and ports in deterring and intercepting nuclear weapons-usable special nuclear material. The committee believes NSDD funds would be better focused on mobile detection capabilities to reduce the risk of nuclear smuggling. Therefore, the committee recommends $336.8, a decrease of $90.0 million, for Global Material Security. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would deauthorize the subprogram related to fixed site radiological monitors.

The committee recommends an increase in funding for higher priority efforts within DNN. The committee recommends $331.6 million, an increase of $20.0 million, for Material Management and Minimization, to allow acceleration of clean-out efforts and security upgrades at the highest-risk sites in countries other than the Russian Federation. The committee recommends $439.3 million, an increase of $20.0 million, for DNN R&D, to support early research and development of next-generation verification and remote sensing technologies.

Overall, the committee recommends $1.90 billion, a decrease of $39.0 million, for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation.

Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response Program

The budget request contained $234.4 million for the Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response Program of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). This program, which the budget request proposes to move from Weapons Activities into Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, is responsible for countering nuclear terror threats, responding to nuclear incidents worldwide, and providing the Department of Energy's emergency management capability.

As one of the most direct contributions NNSA makes to the nation's warfighters, the committee highlights the importance and value of NNSA's programs that help counter and respond to nuclear terrorism threats. These programs leverage unique technical knowledge and tools enabled by NNSA's nuclear weapons program to detect, evaluate, disable, and respond to any potential nuclear threat. The committee notes that the ability to provide the nation's responders with detailed technical information on nuclear threats is dependent upon robust and timely communication between those responders and NNSA experts. The committee believes the Administrator for Nuclear Security must ensure that the knowledge, tools, and communications systems that are the foundation of this program remain strong.

The committee notes the serious deficiencies within the Department of Energy's emergency management program that were identified by the February 2014 incidents at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant and further highlighted by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board and various other entities. As the emergency management lead for the entire Department of Energy, the NNSA Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations shoulders a unique

responsibility for preparing for and responding to a broad spectrum of emergencies. The range of emergencies the Department must be prepared for range from those faced by any organization to nuclear weapon accidents. The committee believes the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator, acting through the Associate Administrator for Emergency Operations, should undertake a comprehensive assessment of the Department's emergency management program, develop actions and a risk-based investment plan to address any deficiencies, and carry out swift remedies.

The committee recommends $245.4 million for the Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response Program, an increase of $11.0 million, to support emergency management enhancements across the nuclear security enterprise, as well as upgrades to the communications systems utilized by nuclear incident response teams.

Verification and detection technology

The committee continues to support the need for improved interagency coordination and focus on verification and detection technology research and development (R&D) to address current and future proliferation threats, and notes the potential challenges associated with the spread of nuclear energy and new technologies, such as additive manufacturing, that could impact nuclear proliferation. The committee agrees with the 2014 Defense Science Board report, "Assessment of Nuclear Monitoring and Verification Technologies," which concluded that "monitoring for proliferation should be a top national security objective, but one for which the nation is not yet organized or fully equipped to address."

The committee notes that section 3133 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) requires the President to submit, not later than September 1, 2015, a comprehensive national plan for verification and monitoring to address the potential proliferation of nuclear weapons, components of such weapons, and fissile material, including policy, operations, and research, development, testing, and evaluation efforts. The committee understands that this plan is being developed and expects that it will be delivered to Congress on time. The committee also reiterates its expectation that the Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration keep the committee informed on the development of this plan and on improving focus and investments in these areas.

The committee also notes the March 2015 Secretary of Energy Advisory Board (SEAB) "Report of the Task Force on Nuclear Nonproliferation," that recommended improving research and development on new verification and nonproliferation technologies. The report stated that DOE's "approach of spreading nonproliferation R&D investment to large numbers of laboratories in small increments is inhibiting nonproliferation technology innovation within the labs," and that "it may still be difficult for high-risk, 'out of the box' ideas to get funded."

Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for nonproliferation and verification R&D. The committee intends this increase in funding to support R&D of next-generation verification and remote sensing technology, as well

as R&D on high-risk, high-reward ideas as recommended by the SEAB report.

Naval Reactors

Naval Reactors and Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project

The budget request contained $1.38 billion for the Naval Reactors program. Naval Reactors is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion efforts, including reactor plant technology design and development, reactor plant operation and maintenance, and reactor retirement and disposal. The program ensures the safe and reliable operation of reactor plants in nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers that comprise over 40 percent of the Navy's major combatants.

The committee is concerned that, due to funding challenges, Naval Reactors has only recently been able to begin a project to replace its Expended Core Facility (ECF) in Idaho. This facility, which handles and processes spent naval nuclear fuel, is over 60 years old and the water pool that is central to the operation of the facility is deteriorating. The current ECF is also physically unable to handle and process the larger spent fuel assemblies being offloaded from modern aircraft carriers. Because of delays in construction of the Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project, which will replace the ECF with a modern facility, the U.S. Navy has bought several otherwise unnecessary and expensive temporary storage and transportation containers to hold the spent aircraft carrier fuel while awaiting construction of the new facility.

The committee recommends $1.39 billion, an increase of $12.0 million, for the Naval Reactors program to support acceleration of the Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project.

Federal Salaries and Expenses

Classification guidance

The committee notes the Department of Energy Inspector General's February 2015 report (DOE/IG–0935) that reviewed Los Alamos National Laboratory's (LANL) classification program found that LANL's, "Classification Officer had not always adequately protected and controlled classified information resulting in the misclassification and improper disclosure of sensitive, national security information." The Inspector General's investigation revealed six incidents in which LANL documents were misclassified. The report concluded that the classification officer had not always ensured that derivative classifiers had appropriate and updated classification bulletins, including detailed interpretive guidance; had not classified information properly; and had not always reported security incidents as required.

The committee notes the importance, across the nuclear security enterprise and particularly at a national security laboratory, of consistent and rigorous application of classification standards. The committee is concerned about the inadequate response by LANL leadership on this problem and the lack of awareness of National Nuclear Security Administration officials. The committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than July 31, 2015,

on the measures taken to improve the effectiveness of the classification process and related oversight.

Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation

The committee notes that section 3112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) established a Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation (CEPE) to improve the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) cost estimating and program management. The committee is encouraged that NNSA has stood up this position but notes that progress hiring experienced staff to support the Director is taking time. The committee recognizes the challenges of standing up a new office staffed by personnel with the requisite and unique expertise required may be difficult, but believes this is a crucial capability needed to continue rebuilding NNSA's trust and credibility with Congress.

The committee is aware of the plan to have CEPE staff train alongside the staff of the Department of Defense's Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE). The committee encourages the Director to ensure CEPE staff receive effective training and meaningful experience in this manner, and restates the importance of the joint NNSA and Department of Defense implementation plan to standing up this new office. The committee reiterates the statement contained in the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, which states, "we expect the DOD CAPE to play an active role in not only training personnel of the new NNSA office, but helping shape and ensure quality cost estimates and program evaluations during the early years of the new NNSA office." The committee is hopeful that CEPE, coupled with this initial interagency collaboration, will prove effective in improving NNSA's track record on program management and cost estimation, particularly for major projects.

Improvements to National Nuclear Security Administration budget structure

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee noted that it was encouraged by an effort by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the White House Office of Management and Budget to propose an updated and streamlined NNSA budget structure that would provide better transparency, increased efficiency and flexibility, and greater focus on NNSA's mission and priorities. The committee is concerned that this effort has been slow and has lacked transparency. The committee believes the Administrator for Nuclear Security should make every effort to revive this effort and improve dialogue with Congress on the matter. The committee continues to believe that, if carefully considered with input from all stakeholders, an improved budget structure can increase efficiency and agility for NNSA programs while also ensuring robust transparency and accountability. The committee expects the Administrator to consult closely with the committee as budget structure changes are considered.

Labor cost review

As part of previous efforts to improve the Department of Defense's visibility into National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) programs, the Department of Defense Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) conducted reviews of labor costs at the facilities comprising NNSA's nuclear security enterprise. The committee believes these reviews should be updated and may provide significant insight into improvement of NNSA's cost accounting systems, financial reporting standardization efforts, and overall efficiency.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, supported by the Director of the NNSA Office of Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation, to provide to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 15, 2015, a briefing on the labor costs at each facility of NNSA's nuclear security enterprise and the laboratories of the Naval Reactors program. The briefing shall include an assessment of the various components that comprise total labor costs at each NNSA facility and the laboratories of the Naval Reactors program as compared to similar, comparable high-technology facilities and defense entities in the United States (including other facilities of the Department of Energy); accounting practices with regards to direct and indirect costs as compared to typical defense contractors or federally funded research and development centers; effects of labor costs on spending for materials, equipment, and other non-labor resources; and, such other matters as the Director of CAPE determines appropriate. The briefing shall also discuss both base labor costs and labor cost-rate growth at the comparable entities reviewed. In addition, the briefing should include the recommendations of the Director of CAPE for modifying NNSA's cost accounting and financial reporting structure to accurately reflect direct and indirect costs, improve financial reporting standardization, and improve efficiency while continuing to attract and retain highly-qualified personnel. To facilitate this briefing, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide the Director of CAPE full access to all information, including information from the management and operating contractors of the NNSA, as well as the resources the Director of CAPE determines are required to carry out this review.

Provision of information to Congress by management and operating contractors

The committee reaffirms and restates its statutory prerogative to both receive and seek information, advice, and professional views related to their mission from the laboratories and plants of the nuclear security enterprise. These exchanges are critical to enabling the committee's understanding and oversight of the complex issues related to the National Nuclear Security Administration's mission and must not be restricted or hindered in any way. However, the committee cautions that unsolicited requests from management and operating contractors of the nuclear security enterprise for funding increases or legislative changes may be construed as lobbying. The committee urges the directors of the laboratories and plants of the nuclear security enterprise to be mindful of restrictions on lobbying and clear on distinctions between providing pro-

gram updates or other information which help inform the committee's work, as compared to advocacy on behalf of certain programs.

Reforming and streamlining access authorizations for Restricted Data

The committee continues to emphasize efforts to streamline Government operations, seek efficiencies, and apply cost savings directly to defense missions. The committee is aware of a proposal within the Department of Energy to reform and streamline processes regarding access authorizations for Restricted Data. Such an effort may allow elimination of the separate "Q" and "L" access authorization process administered by the Secretary of Energy and instead institute Restricted Data as a compartment of sensitive information administered by the Secretary of Energy within the broader Government's access authorization program. If properly planned and executed, this effort could significantly streamline work among the agencies that deal with Restricted Data, reduce the number of personnel with access to Restricted Data that do not have a direct requirement for such access to carry out their work activities, and provide substantial cost savings. However, the committee cautions that any such effort must maintain commensurate and rigorous security measures for Restricted Data.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence, to provide the House Committee on Armed Services a briefing by November 1, 2015, on the risks and benefits of making such a change, as well as on the potential costs and cost-savings, and whether they recommend pursuing a plan for reforming and streamlining processes regarding access authorizations for Restricted Data.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 contained $6.30 billion for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $5.92 billion, a decrease of $380.0 million to the budget request.

Defense Environmental Cleanup

Hanford and Savannah River

The budget request for Defense Environmental Cleanup contained $843.8 million for cleanup activities at the Hanford Site (excluding the Office of River Protection, which is authorized at $1.41 billion, the amount of the budget request) and $1.21 billion for cleanup activities at the Savannah River Site. As the two primary production sites for plutonium during the Cold War, long-term cleanup efforts at these sites are top priorities of the program.

The committee supports increased levels of effort at both sites to reduce risk and accelerate the most critical cleanup efforts. Therefore, the committee recommends $915.8 million, an increase of $72.0 million, for cleanup activities at the Hanford Site, and $1.22 billion, an increase of $11.6 million, for cleanup activities at the Savannah River Site.

Report on pension adjustments

The committee is aware that retired employees from various facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration's nuclear security enterprise and the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management defense environmental cleanup program have been under financial strain due to fixed pension payments. For instance, retirees from the Savannah River Site have not received a cost-of-living adjustment in their pension payments for over fifteen years. With an increase in inflation of 30 percent since that time, the committee is concerned that the lack of pension adjustments may not be commensurate with other government and public sector pension plans over that period of time.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Energy to provide a briefing on pension cost-of-living adjustments to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2016. This briefing shall include the following elements:

(1) An assessment and comparison of pension plan cost-of-living adjustments since 2000 for retirees from Department of Energy facilities, including those of the nuclear security enterprise and defense environmental cleanup sites as compared to other facilities of the Department;

(2) An assessment and comparison of how such cost-of-living adjustments since 2000 compare to those in other U.S. Government pension plans and comparable public sector pension plans; and

(3) An assessment of the impacts on site operations, the current workforce, and the costs associated with providing a cost-of-living adjustment to any pension plan that has not received one for more than ten years.

Technology development

The budget request contained $14.5 million for the technology development program of the Office of Environmental Management. This program provides key investments in mid- to long-term research and development efforts that seek to develop new technologies to reduce cleanup costs and accelerate cleanup schedules.

The committee has long been supportive of this program because it believes that, since the defense environmental cleanup program is expected to last until 2070 and cost hundreds of billions of dollars, even small amounts of funding invested in technology development efforts have the potential to provide large cost savings to taxpayers through new or more efficient cleanup methods. Therefore, the committee recommends $18.5 million, an increase of $4.0 million, for the technology development program.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

The committee continues to monitor the investigations and corrective actions resulting from the February 2014 incidents at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in Carlsbad, New Mexico. The committee has reviewed a series of reports on the incidents, including the most recent Phase 2 Report of the Department of Energy's Accident Investigation Board (AIB) examining the root cause of the February 14, 2014, release of radioactive material from a transuranic waste drum underground at WIPP. The AIB found that the release was caused by a reaction involving incompatible materials in a drum that was processed at Los Alamos National Laboratory

(LANL) in December 2013 and sent to WIPP. The AIB concluded that, "if LANL had adequately developed and implemented repackaging and treatment procedures that incorporated suitable hazard controls and included a rigorous review and approval process, the release would have been preventable." Separate investigations have found serious deficiencies in the emergency management and response actions taken at WIPP during and after the event.

The committee expects the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security to seriously consider all of the recommendations resulting from the various investigations into the events at WIPP. Efforts to improve operations, oversight, and emergency response at WIPP are well underway, but the committee expects these important lessons learned to be transferred across the Department. Furthermore, the committee expects the Secretary and the Administrator to continue to take robust action to hold accountable the officials and contractors responsible for these failures.

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

Defense nuclear waste repository

The committee notes the Secretary of Energy's recent proposal to seek a separate geological repository for high-level defense nuclear waste. While the committee believes a pathway for final disposition of high-level defense waste from facilities such as the Hanford Site and the Savannah River Site is necessary, the committee is concerned that construction and operation of a defense-only repository would require significant funding from the already-oversubscribed national defense budget function. With the many defense priorities facing the Department of Energy in the next decade, the committee expresses caution that construction of a high-level defense waste repository must not come at the expense of currently planned priorities in atomic energy defense activities. The committee will continue to conduct oversight of this matter as the plans develop.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2016, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and Federal Salaries and Expenses (formerly known as the Office of the Administrator), at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act. This section would also authorize a new plant project for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize appropriations for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2016, at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize appropriations for other defense activities for the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016 at the levels identified in section 4701 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Authorized Personnel Levels of National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would amend section 3241A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a) to require that, by October 1, 2016, the total number of employees within the Office of the Administrator may not exceed 1,350.

This section would also amend section 3241 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441) by striking "600" and inserting "450" as the number of employees allowed to be appointed under the authority provided by such section. This section would also clarify that any employees appointed pursuant to the authority provided by such section 3241 would not be counted for the purposes of the cap of 1,350 employees. To facilitate transparency, this section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to include certain information regarding the number of various types of employees within the Office of the Administrator in each annual budget request submission.

Section 3112—Full-time Equivalent Contractor Personnel Levels

This section would amend section 3241A of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a) to specify that the total number of full-time equivalent employees working under a service support contract of the NNSA may not exceed the number that is 30 percent of the number of employees of the Office of the Administrator authorized under subsection (a)(1) of such section 3241A. The Administrator for Nuclear Security would be required to not exceed this total number of full-time equivalent contractor employees unless, during each fiscal year in which the Administrator exceeds such authorized number, the Administrator submits a report to the congressional defense committees justifying such excess.

This section would also require the Administrator to submit, with each fiscal year budget request, information on: (1) the number of full-time equivalent employees of the Office of the Administrator; (2) the number of service support contracts of the NNSA; (3) the number of full-time equivalent contractor employees working under each service support contract; and (4) the number of full-time equivalent contractor employees that have been employed under a service support contract for a period greater than two years.

Section 3113—Improvement to Accountability of Department of Energy Employees and Projects

This section would amend subtitle C of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Act (50 U.S.C. 2441) to add a new section requiring the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security to jointly notify, at the time of the annual budget

request, the appropriate congressional committees of the number of covered employees whose security clearance was revoked during the previous year and the length of time such employees were employed by the Department of Energy or NNSA since such revocation. In addition, whenever the Secretary or the Administrator terminates the employment of a covered employee or removes and reassigns a covered employee for cause, the Secretary or the Administrator shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of such termination or reassignment by not later than 30 days after the date of such termination or reassignment.

This section would also require that not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary and the Administrator shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate written certification that the Secretary and the Administrator possess the authorities needed to terminate the employment of an employee for cause relating to improper program management.

This section would require that the Secretary or the Administrator may not pay to a covered employee a bonus during the one-year period beginning on the date on which the Secretary or the Administrator determines that the covered employee committed improper program management. This section includes a waiver on a case-by-case basis if the Secretary or the Administrator notifies the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver and a period of 60 days elapses following such notification.

This section would modify subtitle A of title 47 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2741) to add the sense of Congress that the Administrator should use all contractual remedies available to the Administrator, including through the withholding of all award fees, in case in which the Administrator determines that a contractor of a covered project is responsible for delaying the project; reducing the scope of the project; increasing the cost of the project; or undermines health, safety, and security. At or about the time that the President's budget request is submitted to Congress, this section would require the Administrator to certify to the appropriate congressional committees that each covered project is being carried out on time, on budget, and within the planned scope of the project, while protecting health, safety, and security. Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Administrator makes each certification, the Administrator shall notify the appropriate congressional committees of any covered project for which the Administrator could not make such a certification; except as provided in the section, an explanation as to whether termination of contract for the project is an appropriate remedy, a description of the terms of the contract regarding award fees and performance, and a description of how the Administrator plans to exercise contractual options; and, in the case in which the Administrator could not make such certification or provide such information by reason of a contract enforcement action, a notification of such contract enforcement action and the date on which the Administrator plans to submit the information described.

Section 3114—Cost-Benefit Analyses for Competition of Management and Operating Contracts

This section would amend section 3121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to require that the report submitted by the Administrator for Nuclear Security pursuant to section 3121 must include a description of the factors considered and processes used by the Administrator to determine: (1) whether to compete or extend a contract to manage and operate a facility of the nuclear security enterprise; and (2) whether and which activities at the facility should be covered under the management and operating contract rather than under a different contract. The report would also be required to include a detailed description of the analyses conducted by the Administrator to reach the conclusions presented in the report, including any assumptions, limitations, and uncertainties relating to such conclusions.

This section would also extend the requirement for the Administrator to submit a report under section 3121 of Public Law 112–239 by 2 years, through fiscal year 2019. Finally, this section also would express the sense of Congress regarding competition of management and operating contracts of the nuclear security enterprise.

Section 3115—Nuclear Weapon Design Responsiveness Program

This section would express the sense of Congress that: (1) a modern and responsive nuclear weapons infrastructure is only one component of a nuclear posture that is agile, flexible, and responsive to change; and (2) to ensure the nuclear deterrent of the United States remains safe, secure, reliable, credible, and responsive, the United States must continually exercise all capabilities required to conceptualize, study, design, develop, engineer, certify, produce, and deploy nuclear weapons.

This section would also amend the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2521) to establish that it is the policy of the United States to sustain, enhance, and continually exercise all capabilities required to conceptualize, study, design, develop, engineer, certify, produce, and deploy nuclear weapons to ensure the nuclear deterrent of the United States remains safe, secure, reliable, credible, and responsive. The Secretary of Energy, acting through the Administrator for Nuclear Security and in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, would be required to carry out a program in parallel with the stockpile stewardship program and stockpile management program to fulfill this policy. This section would also stipulate a series of objectives for this program. Finally, this section would amend certain existing annual reporting requirements to ensure robust attention on the program by senior leaders and enable congressional oversight of the status and effectiveness of the program.

The committee notes that this section does not authorize the development and production of new or modified nuclear weapons, and does not modify the statutory requirement contained in section 4209 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2529) for the Secretary of Energy to seek congressional authorization by making specific requests for funding if the Secretary seeks to carry out activities that are intended to lead to production of new or modified nuclear weapons.

Section 3116—Disposition of Weapons-Usable Plutonium

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to carry out construction and program support activities for the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility with any funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for such purposes for fiscal year 2016 and any prior fiscal years.

This section would also require the Secretary to include in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress for fiscal year 2017 an updated performance baseline for construction and project support activities relating to the MOX facility.

Section 3117—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Fixed Site Radiological Portal Monitors in Foreign Countries

This section would prohibit any funds authorized by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 or any fiscal year thereafter for the National Nuclear Security Administration from being obligated or expended for the research and development, installation, or sustainment of fixed site radiological portal monitors or equipment for use in foreign countries. This section would clarify that this prohibition does not apply to such activities for mobile radiological inspection equipment.

Section 3118—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Provision of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Assistance to Russian Federation

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities may be obligated or expended to enter into a contract with, or otherwise provide assistance to, the Russian Federation. The Secretary of Energy, without delegation, would be provided the authority to waive this prohibition if the Secretary submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing notification that such a waiver is in the national security interest of the United States, a justification for such waiver, and a period of 15 days elapses.

Section 3119—Limitation on Authorization of Production of Special Nuclear Material Outside the United States by Foreign Country with Nuclear Naval Propulsion Program

This section would require that, prior to the approval by the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) of any part 810 authorization (regarding the transfer of certain civil nuclear technology) for a foreign state with a nuclear naval propulsion program, the Director of National Intelligence and the Chief of Naval Operations shall submit an assessment to the specified congressional committees on the risks of diversion, and the likely consequences of such diversion, of technology authorized by such part 810 authorization to such foreign state's nuclear naval propulsion program.

This section would also require that, not less than 90 days prior to the approval of any part 810 authorization for a foreign state with a nuclear naval propulsion program, the Administrator of the NNSA shall certify to the specified congressional committees that there is sufficient diversion control and such transfer presents a

minimal risk of diversion of such technology to a military program that would degrade the technical advantage of the United States.

Section 3120—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Development of Certain Nuclear Nonproliferation Technologies

This section would prohibit any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the National Nuclear Security Administration's Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program from being obligated or expended to develop nonproliferation or arms control verification or monitoring technologies beyond Technology Readiness Level 5 (TRL 5) unless the Secretary of Energy certifies that such technologies are being developed to fulfill the rights or obligations of the United States under either: (1) a current arms control or nonproliferation treaty or agreement; or (2) a treaty or agreement that the Secretary expects will enter into force within 2 years. The Secretary would be required to submit this written certification to the appropriate congressional committees and include, for each technology the Secretary certifies for development beyond TRL 5, an identification of the amount of fiscal year 2016 funds that will used and how such development helps to fulfill the rights or obligations of the United States under the treaty or agreement.

This section would also provide the Secretary the authority to waive this prohibition if the Secretary determines the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States and submits a certification of such determination to the appropriate congressional committees 15 days prior to carrying out the waiver.

Section 3121—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Unilateral Disarmament

This section would provide that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), not more than $50.0 million may be obligated or expended in each such fiscal year to carry out nuclear weapons dismantlement and disposition activities.

This section would also prohibit any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, to be obligated or expended to dismantle a nuclear weapon of the United States unless: (1) the nuclear weapon was retired on or before September 30, 2008; (2) the Administrator for Nuclear Security certifies that the components of the nuclear weapon are directly required for the purposes of a current life extension program; or (3) the President certifies that the nuclear weapon is being dismantled pursuant to a nuclear arms reduction treaty or similar international agreement that has entered into force after the date of enactment of this Act and was approved with the advice and consent of the Senate or by an Act of Congress.

This section would also prohibit any funding authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 from being used to dismantle or dispose of a W84 nuclear weapon.

Finally, this section would include an exception to these prohibitions for any activities necessary to conduct maintenance or sur-

veillance of the nuclear weapons stockpile or activities to ensure the safety or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

Section 3122—Use of Best Practices for Capital Asset Projects and Nuclear Weapon Life Extension Programs

This section would require that, within 30 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Administrator for Nuclear Security, shall ensure that analyses of alternatives are conducted (including through contractors, as appropriate) in accordance with best practices for capital asset projects and life extension programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) as well as capital asset projects relating to defense environmental management.

This section would also require that, within 30 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator, shall develop cost estimates in accordance with cost estimating best practices for capital asset projects and life extension programs of NNSA as well as capital asset projects relating to defense environmental management.

Finally, this section would require that, as soon as practicable, but not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall revise:

(1) The capital asset project management order of the Department of Energy to require the use of best practices for preparing cost estimates and for conducting analyses of alternatives for NNSA and defense environmental management capital asset projects; and

(2) The nuclear weapon life extension program procedures of the Department to require the use of best practices for preparing cost estimates and conducting analyses of alternatives for NNSA life extension programs.

SUBTITLE C—PLANS AND REPORTS

Section 3131—Root Cause Analyses for Certain Cost Overruns

This section would amend section 4713(c) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2753) to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct and submit to the congressional defense committees a root cause assessment when certain programs experience a significant cost overrun. The assessment would be required to include the contribution of any shortcomings in cost, schedule, or performance of the program, including the role, if any, of the following: (1) unrealistic performance expectations; (2) unrealistic baseline estimates for cost or schedule; (3) immature technologies or excessive manufacturing or integration risk; (4) unanticipated design, engineering, manufacturing, or technology integration issues arising during program performance; (5) changes in procurement quantities; (6) inadequate program funding or funding instability; (7) poor performance by personnel of the Federal Government or contractor personnel responsible for program management; or (8) any other matters.

Section 3132—Extension and Modification of Certain Annual Reports on Nuclear Nonproliferation

This section would amend section 3122(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by striking the date of 2016 and inserting 2020. This section would also amend such subsection to clarify that, in the Secretary of Energy's annual assessment, the Secretary must (1) identify any highly-enriched uranium around the world that is obligated by the United States and (2) provide a list, by country and by site, of the separated plutonium around the world, identify such plutonium that is obligated by the United States, and provide an assessment of the vulnerability of such plutonium to theft or diversion.

Section 3133—Governance and Management of Nuclear Security Enterprise

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding governance and management problems with respect to the nuclear security enterprise, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), and the Department of Energy.

This section would also require the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security to jointly establish a team of senior officials from the Department of Energy and NNSA to develop and carry out an implementation plan to reform governance and management to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the nuclear security enterprise. The plan would be required to be developed and implemented in accordance with the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2401), the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501), and any other provision of law. This section would require the team to be co-chaired by the Deputy Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security. The plan developed by the team would be required to address all recommendations contained in certain studies (including the final report of the advisory panel established by section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239)), except those requiring legislative action to carry out. The Secretary and the Administrator would be required to submit the plan to the appropriate congressional committees by January 30, 2016.

This section would also require the Administrator to seek to enter into a joint agreement with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Public Administration to establish a panel of external, independent experts to evaluate the plan developed by the Department of Energy and NNSA and to evaluate the implementation of such plan. The panel's duties would include providing advice to the Secretary and the Administrator on the plan, tracking its implementation, and assessing its effectiveness. The panel would also be required to submit several reports to the appropriate congressional committees and the Secretary and the Administrator. In addition, the Secretary and the Administrator would be required to provide full and timely access to all information, personnel, and systems that the panel determines necessary.

Finally, this section includes rules of construction that nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize any action: (1) in contravention of section 3220 of the National Nuclear Security Admin-

istration Act (50 U.S.C. 2410); or (2) that would undermine or weaken health, safety, or security.

Section 3134—Assessments on Nuclear Proliferation Risks and Nuclear Nonproliferation Opportunities

This section would require the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, by March 1 of each year from 2016–20, containing: (1) an assessment and prioritization of international nuclear proliferation risks and nuclear nonproliferation opportunities; and (2) an assessment of the effectiveness of various means and programs for addressing such risks and opportunities.

Section 3135—Independent Review of Laboratory-Directed Research and Development Programs

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to seek to enter into a contract with the JASON Defense Advisory Panel to conduct a review of the laboratory-directed research and development (LDRD) program authorized under section 4811 of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2791). The review would be required to include assessments of whether and how the projects within the LDRD program support the mission of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), whether the science conducted under LDRD underpin the advancement of scientific understanding necessary for NNSA's core programs, the scientific and programmatic opportunities and challenges in the LDRD program, recent significant accomplishments and failures within the LDRD program, and how LDRD projects are selected for funding. This section would require the Administrator to submit to the congressional defense committees, by November 1, 2016, a report containing the review carried out by the JASON Defense Advisory Panel.

This section would also require a briefing to the congressional defense committees by the Comptroller General of the United States by November 1, 2016. The Comptroller General would be required to assess: how NNSA LDRD funding limits compare to other Department of Energy and Department of Defense laboratories and federally funded research and development centers; how many NNSA personnel are supported by LDRD funding, including how many receive a majority of their compensation from LDRD; and how many devote the majority of their time to LDRD programs for more than three years.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 3141—Transfer, Decontamination, and Decommissioning of Nonoperational Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to establish and carry out a plan under which the Administrator for Nuclear Security transfers to the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management the responsibility for decontaminating and decommissioning facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration that the Secretary of Energy determines are not operational

as of the date of the enactment of this Act and meet the requirements for such transfer. The plan would be required to include:

(1) A schedule for transferring the facilities within 3 years;

(2) A prioritized list and schedule, including how such priorities and schedules integrate with other facility disposition priorities and schedules of the Office of Environmental Management; and,

(3) A description of the estimated life-cycle costs for the facilities.

The Secretary of Energy would be required to submit the plan to the appropriate congressional committees, along with any additional views of the Secretary, by February 15, 2016.

Section 3142—Research and Development of Advanced Naval Nuclear Fuel System Based on Low-Enriched Uranium

This section would require that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for defense nuclear nonproliferation for material management and minimization, not more than $5.0 million shall be made available to the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors for initial planning and early research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium.

In addition, this section would require that, at the same time the President submits the fiscal year 2017 budget to Congress, the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Navy shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees their determination as to whether the United States should continue to pursue research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium. If the Secretaries determine to continue the research and development, the Secretaries would be required to ensure the budget request for fiscal year 2017 includes funding to carry out the program within the defense nuclear nonproliferation, material management and minimization budget line.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the submission of such determination, the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors would be required to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for such research and development, as well as ensuring that the budget includes amounts for defense nuclear nonproliferation for material management and minimization necessary to carry out the plan. This plan would be required to include timelines; costs, including an analysis of the cost of such research and development as compared to the cost of maintaining current navel nuclear reactor technology; milestones; identification of any benefits or risks for nuclear nonproliferation; identification of any military benefits or risks; a discussion of potential security cost savings, including for transportation and the relation of cost savings to the cost of fuel fabrication; distinguishment between requirements for aircraft carriers from submarines; and any other matters the Deputy Administrator determines appropriate.

Finally, this section would require that, if the Secretaries determine such research and development should continue, not later than 60 days after the date on which the Deputy Administrator submits the plan, the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors would be required to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation regarding the research and development of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium, including with

respect to how funding for such research and development will be requested for the "Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation" account for material management and minimization and provided to Naval Reactors to carry out the program.

Section 3143—Plutonium Pit Production Capacity

This section would express the sense of Congress that: (1) the requirement to create a modern, responsive nuclear infrastructure that includes the capability and capacity to produce, at minimum, 50 to 80 pits per year, is a national security priority; (2) delaying creation of a modern, responsive nuclear infrastructure until the 2030's is an unacceptable risk to the nuclear deterrent and the national security of the United States; and (3) timelines for creating certain capacities for production of plutonium pits and other nuclear weapons components must be driven by the requirement to hedge against technical and geopolitical risk and not solely by the needs of life extension programs.

This section would also require the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, in consultation with the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, to provide a briefing to congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, on the annual plutonium pit production capacity requirement of the nuclear security enterprise. The briefing would be required to include a description of the number of pits produced that are needed for life extension programs and the number of pits produced that are required to support a responsive nuclear weapons infrastructure and hedge against technical and geopolitical risk.

Section 3144—Analysis of Alternatives for Mobile Guardian Transporter Program

This section would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit to the congressional defense committees the analysis of alternatives conducted by the Administrator for the Mobile Guardian Transporter (MGT) program within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Administrator would also be required to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct an independent assessment of the analysis of alternatives for the MGT program. The Administrator would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016, containing the independent assessment, without change, and any views of the Administrator on the assessment or the MGT program. Finally, this section would also require the Secretary of Energy to include in the annual budget request submission, a separate, dedicated program element for the MGT program.

Materials provided to the committee by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) state that, "Not only must the [MGT] design take into account current technology and production costs, it must also have the engineering flexibility to serve the nuclear security enterprise for up to 20 years." The committee believes that, due to the 20 year service life of the MGT and the importance of its cargo, the NNSA must conduct a rigorous and comprehensive analysis of alternatives to inform acquisition decisions. This analysis must consider all safety and security scenarios the

MGT may encounter as well as the costs, benefits, and risks of various engineering and policy changes that could affect the program.

Section 3145—Development of Strategy on Risks to Nonproliferation Caused by Additive Manufacturing

This section would require the President to develop and pursue a strategy to address the risks to the goals and policies of the United States regarding nuclear nonproliferation caused by the increased use of additive manufacture technology (including 3D Printing). This section would require the President to brief the appropriate congressional committees on the development and execution of such strategy not later than March 31, 2016, and every 120 days thereafter until January 1, 2019. Finally, this section would highlight the importance of pursuing such strategy at the Nuclear Security Summit in Chicago in 2016.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $29.2 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2016. The committee recommends $29.2 million, the amount of the budget request.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize funds for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2016.

Section 3202—Administration of Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

This section would amend section 311(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2886(c)) to clarify that, in carrying out certain duties, the Chairman of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Board may not withhold from any member of the Board any information that is made available to the Chairman regarding the Board's functions, powers, and mission (including with respect to the management and evaluation of employees of the Board). This section would further amend section 311(c) to clarify that the Chairman of the Board, subject to the approval of the Board, may appoint and remove particular senior employees of the Board: (1) the senior employee responsible for budgetary and general administration matters; (2) the general counsel; and (3) the senior employee responsible for technical matters.

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $17.5 million for fiscal year 2016 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Merchant Mariner Workforce

The committee notes that the number of United States merchant mariners has declined in recent years. This is in large part due to the decline in the number of United States flagged merchant vessels. The committee is concerned that there may not be enough qualified merchant mariners to meet the demands of the Department of Defense should it ever need to activate the Ready Reserve fleet of the United States Navy. Therefore, the committee directs the Maritime Administrator, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, to provide a comprehensive report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2015 on the status of the merchant mariner workforce and whether there are sufficient merchant mariners to meet the Navy's surge fleet requirements in the event of a national emergency. If they conclude there are insufficient mariners, it should analyze options for correcting the problem and take into account U.S. national security interests, U.S. commercial shipping interests, and budgetary implications.

National Security Multi-Mission Vessel

The committee understands that the existing six State Maritime Academies are vital maritime training and education assets that provide unique maritime learning opportunities. The State Maritime Academies produce annually two-thirds of the total of trained, Coast Guard-credentialed officers for service in the United States Merchant Marine, thus ensuring a cadre of well-educated and trained merchant mariners in the event of a national emergency or contingency. Because United States Merchant Marine credentialed officers remain vital to ensure the economic and national security of the United States, State Maritime Academies remain valuable partners with the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, and other Federal agencies. However, the quality of maritime training available at State Maritime Academies is limited by the advanced age of State Maritime Academy training ships, which reduce available days at sea, increase annual maintenance costs, and create other obstacles to ensuring such vessels fully comply with international and domestic maritime statutes, rules, and regulations. Recapitalizing the State Maritime Academy training fleet would improve mariner education, reduce operational risks and annual operation and maintenance costs, and ensure that State Maritime Academies have modern and reliable training platforms for the future. A national security multi-mission ship would

maximize mariner training opportunities for cadets and midshipmen while providing a flexible platform suitable and available for national security, emergency, or humanitarian response or meeting other contingencies.

The committee supports the planning and design investment for the development of a new class of National Security Multi-Mission Training Vessels for use by State Maritime Academies and for deployment in support of Federal agency security or emergency missions. The ships designed under this process will provide a modern, functional, environmentally compliant maritime training platform and will be capable of deployments in support of homeland and national security missions, natural disasters, emergencies, and humanitarian missions.

The committee encourages the Department of Transportation to continue budgeting for the design and construction of a National Security Multi-Mission Vessel in order to recapitalize the aging fleet of State Maritime Academy training vessels.

Small Shipyard Grants

The committee notes the need for continued investment in small shipyards, taking advantage of existing grant programs, to sustain the ship repair and shipbuilding industries. The committee also notes that many of these shipyards are in need of repair and upgrade after being used extensively in operating environments of the past decade. Furthermore, the committee notes that many small businesses ancillary to public shipyards have invested in maritime research and development and have multiyear track records conducting ship repair operations. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the Maritime Administration to use existing programs, like the Assistance to Small Shipyards Grant program, to fund infrastructure upgrades in small shipyards.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of Appropriations for National Security Aspects of the Merchant Marine for Fiscal Year 2016

This section would authorize appropriations for the national security aspects of the merchant marine for fiscal year 2016.

Section 3502—Sense of Congress Regarding Maritime Security Fleet Program

This section would express the sense of Congress that dedicated and enhanced support is necessary to stabilize and preserve the Maritime Security Fleet program.

The committee notes that declines in the U.S.-flag international fleet have diminished the pool of U.S. civilian mariners critical to crewing not only commercial U.S.-flag vessels but also national defense surge sealift. The drop in the number of U.S.-flag vessels in the international trades is in part a result of reductions in government-impelled cargoes, both Department of Defense cargoes and food aid cargoes. The committee is concerned that future reductions in U.S.-flag commercial vessels, especially militarily useful vessels in the Maritime Security Program, could put at risk the Nation's

ability to fully activate, deploy, and sustain Armed Forces around the globe.

Section 3503—Update of References to the Secretary of Transportation Regarding Unemployment Insurance and Vessel Operators

This section would update sections 3305 and 3306(n) of title 26, United States Code, to reflect the Maritime Administration's transfer from the Department of Commerce to the Department of Transportation that occurred in 1981.

Section 3504—Reliance on Classification Society Certification for Purposes of Eligibility for Certificate of Inspection

This section would modify section 53102 of title 46, United States Code, and require the U.S. Coast Guard to implement certain class society certification standards.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables

This section would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming guidance in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, this section would also require that a decision by an Agency Head to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and section 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
National Defense Funding, Base			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Title I—Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,689,357	179,800	5,869,157
Missile Procurement, Army	1,419,957	76,000	1,495,957
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,887,073	148,617	2,035,690
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,233,378	–11,000	1,222,378
Other Procurement, Army	5,899,028	–91,000	5,808,028
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	16,126,405	2,214,100	18,340,505
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,154,154	77,800	3,231,954
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	723,741		723,741

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	16,597,457	–327,190	16,270,267
Other Procurement, Navy	6,614,715	111,500	6,726,215
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,131,418	37,500	1,168,918
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	15,657,769	290,500	15,948,269
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,987,045		2,987,045
Space Procurement, Air Force	2,584,061	26,000	2,610,061
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	1,758,843	–20,000	1,738,843
Other Procurement, Air Force	18,272,438	22,900	18,295,338
Procurement, Defense-Wide	5,130,853	132,480	5,263,333
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	99,701	–99,701	0
Subtotal, Title I—Procurement	**106,967,393**	**2,768,306**	**109,735,699**
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	6,919,178	105,500	7,024,678
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	17,885,916	–1,233,693	16,652,223
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	26,473,669	–515,700	25,957,969
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	18,329,861	217,220	18,547,081
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	170,558		170,558
Subtotal, Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**69,779,182**	**–1,426,673**	**68,352,509**
Title III—Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	23,822,655	–58,310	23,764,345
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,035,017	6,000	1,041,017
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	3,576,169	513,990	4,090,159
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	32,430,364	–828,900	31,601,464
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	4,595,074	–325,200	4,269,874
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	819,847	4,500	824,347
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	276,112	400	276,512
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	31,317,486	–426,530	30,890,956
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	2,817,743	–98,200	2,719,543
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,956,210	–60,600	6,895,610
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	30,480,285	–391,600	30,088,685
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid	100,266		100,266
Subtotal, Title III—Operation and Maintenance	**138,227,228**	**–1,664,450**	**136,562,778**
Title IV—Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	130,491,227	–291,492	130,199,735
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	6,243,449		6,243,449
Subtotal, Title IV—Military Personnel	**136,734,676**	**–291,492**	**136,443,184**
Title XIV—Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	50,432	5,000	55,432
Working Capital Fund, Navy	0	5,000	5,000
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	62,898	5,000	67,898
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	45,084		45,084
Working Capital Fund, DECA	1,154,154	322,000	1,476,154
National Defense Sealift Fund	474,164	674,190	1,148,354
National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund	0	1,390,693	1,390,693
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction	720,721		720,721

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	850,598	50,000	900,598
Office of the Inspector General	316,159	–1,000	315,159
Defense Health Program	32,243,328	–508,000	31,735,328
Subtotal, Title XIV—Other Authorizations	**35,917,538**	**1,942,883**	**37,860,421**
Total, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations	**487,626,017**	**1,328,574**	**488,954,591**
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Military Construction			
Army	743,245	–80,000	663,245
Navy	1,605,929	–244,004	1,361,925
Air Force	1,354,785	–75,000	1,279,785
Defense-Wide	2,300,767	–360,888	1,939,879
NATO Security Investment Program	120,000	30,000	150,000
Army National Guard	197,237	–29,800	167,437
Army Reserve	113,595	–9,300	104,295
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	36,078		36,078
Air National Guard	123,538		123,538
Air Force Reserve	46,821		46,821
Subtotal, Military Construction	**6,641,995**	**–768,992**	**5,873,003**
Family Housing			
Construction, Army	99,695		99,695
Operation & Maintenance, Army	393,511		393,511
Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	16,541		16,541
Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps	353,036		353,036
Construction, Air Force	160,498		160,498
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	331,232		331,232
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	58,668		58,668
Subtotal, Family Housing	**1,413,181**	**0**	**1,413,181**
Base Realignment and Closure			
Base Realignment and Closure—Army	29,691		29,691
Base Realignment and Closure—Navy	157,088		157,088
Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force	64,555		64,555
Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure	**251,334**	**0**	**251,334**
Undistributed Adjustments			
Prior Year Savings	0	–386,518	–386,518
Subtotal, Undistributed Adjustments	**0**	**–386,518**	**–386,518**
Total, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations	**8,306,510**	**–1,155,510**	**7,151,000**
Total, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**495,932,527**	**173,064**	**496,105,591**

Function 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities

Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Nuclear Energy	135,161		135,161
Weapons Activities	8,846,948	237,700	9,084,648
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,940,302	–39,000	1,901,302
Naval Reactors	1,375,496	12,000	1,387,496
Federal salaries and expenses	402,654	–6,000	396,654
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,527,347	–384,197	5,143,150
Other Defense Activities	774,425	4,200	778,625
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**19,002,333**	**–175,297**	**18,827,036**
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	29,150		29,150
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	**29,150**	**0**	**29,150**
Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations	**19,031,483**	**–175,297**	**18,856,186**
Subtotal, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**19,031,483**	**–175,297**	**18,856,186**
Total, National Defense Funding, Base	**514,964,010**	**–2,233**	**514,961,777**

National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations and Additional Authorizations

National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations

Function 051, Department of Defense-Military

Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	164,987		164,987
Missile Procurement, Army	37,260		37,260
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	26,030		26,030
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	192,040		192,040
Other Procurement, Army	1,205,596		1,205,596
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	493,271	–50,700	442,571
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	217,394		217,394
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,344		3,344
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	136,930		136,930
Other Procurement, Navy	12,186		12,186
Procurement, Marine Corps	48,934		48,934
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	128,900		128,900
Missile Procurement, Air Force	289,142		289,142
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	228,874		228,874
Other Procurement, Air Force	3,859,964		3,859,964
Procurement, Defense-Wide	212,418		212,418
National Guard & Reserve Equipment	0	250,000	250,000
Subtotal, Procurement	**7,257,270**	**199,300**	**7,456,570**
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	1,500		1,500

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	35,747		35,747
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	17,100		17,100
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	137,087	25,000	162,087
Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**191,434**	**25,000**	**216,434**
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	11,382,750	120,800	11,503,550
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	24,559		24,559
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	60,845		60,845
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	3,762,257	337,743	4,100,000
Iraq Train & Equip Fund	715,000		715,000
Syria Train & Equip Fund	600,000	–68,550	531,450
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	5,131,588		5,131,588
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	952,534		952,534
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	31,643		31,643
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	3,455		3,455
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	9,090,013	659,250	9,749,263
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	58,106		58,106
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	19,900		19,900
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	5,805,633	294,000	6,099,633
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund	2,100,000	–2,100,000	0
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**39,738,283**	**–756,757**	**38,981,526**
Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	3,204,758		3,204,758
Subtotal, Military Personnel	**3,204,758**	**0**	**3,204,758**
Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	2,500		2,500
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	86,350		86,350
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	186,000		186,000
Office of the Inspector General	10,262		10,262
Defense Health Program	272,704		272,704
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	**557,816**	**0**	**557,816**
Military Construction			
Army	0	76,000	76,000
Navy	0	244,004	244,004
Air Force	0	75,000	75,000
Defense-Wide	0	136,996	136,996
Subtotal, Military Construction	**0**	**532,000**	**532,000**
Subtotal, Overseas Contingency Operations	**50,949,561**	**–457**	**50,949,104**
Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**50,949,561**	**–457**	**50,949,104**
Total, National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations	**50,949,561**	**–457**	**50,949,104**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
National Defense Funding, Additional Authorizations			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	11,284,891		11,284,891
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	1,630,775		1,630,775
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	3,141,808		3,141,808
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	9,770,392		9,770,392
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	1,633,708		1,633,708
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	181,911		181,911
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	924		924
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	6,874,443		6,874,443
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	246,514		246,514
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	1,960,558		1,960,558
US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense	14,078		14,078
Cooperative Threat Reduction	358,496		358,496
Defense Acquisition Development Workforce Fund	84,140		84,140
Environmental Restoration, Army	234,829		234,829
Environmental Restoration, Navy	292,453		292,453
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	368,131		368,131
Environmental Restoration, Defense	8,232		8,232
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Sites	203,717		203,717
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**38,290,000**	**0**	**38,290,000**
Subtotal, Additional Authorizations	**38,290,000**	**0**	**38,290,000**
Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**38,290,000**	**0**	**38,290,000**
Total, National Defense Funding, Additional Authorizations	**38,290,000**	**0**	**38,290,000**
Total, National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations and Additional Authorizations	**89,239,561**	**–457**	**89,239,104**
Total, National Defense	**604,203,571**	**–2,690**	**604,200,881**
MEMORANDUM: BASE BUDGET REQUIREMENTS			
Base Funding	514,964,010	–2,233	514,961,777
Additional Authorizations	38,290,000	0	38,290,000
Total, Base Budget Requirements	**553,254,010**	**–2,233**	**553,251,777**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV—Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	64,300		64,300
Title XIV—Cemeterial Expenses, Army (Function 700)	70,800		70,800
Title XXXIV—Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (Function 270)	17,500		17,500
Title XXXV—Maritime Administration (Function 400)	184,637		184,637
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADD)			
Title X—General Transfer Authority	[5,000,000]		[5,000,000]

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Title XV—Special Transfer Authority	[3,500,000]		[3,500,000]
MEMORANDUM: DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS NOT UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE (NON-ADD)			
Defense Production Act	[46,680]		[46,680]

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	**495,932,527**	**173,064**	**496,105,591**
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	**19,031,483**	**–175,297**	**18,856,186**
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)—BASE BILL	**514,964,010**	**–2,233**	**514,961,777**
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	**89,239,561**	**–457**	**89,239,104**
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	**604,203,571**	**–2,690**	**604,200,881**
Base National Defense Discretionary Programs that are Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Do Not Require Additional Authorization			
Defense Production Act Purchases	25,000		25,000
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	8,000		8,000
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	33,000		33,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**66,000**		**66,000**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	104,000		104,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**104,000**		**104,000**
Other Discretionary Programs	7,566,000		7,566,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**7,566,000**		**7,566,000**
Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)	**7,736,000**		**7,736,000**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	585,238,088	172,607	585,410,695
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,135,483	–175,297	18,960,186
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,566,000		7,566,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary	**611,939,571**	**–2,690**	**611,936,881**
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Baseline)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	6,932,000		6,932,000
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,135,000		1,135,000
Offsetting receipts	–1,593,000		–1,593,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**6,474,000**		**6,474,000**
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,168,000		1,168,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**1,168,000**		**1,168,000**

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	59,000		59,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	514,000		514,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**573,000**		**573,000**
Total National Defense Mandatory (050)	**8,215,000**		**8,215,000**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	591,712,088	172,607	591,884,695
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	20,303,483	–175,297	20,128,186
Defense-Related Activities (054)	8,139,000		8,139,000
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory	**620,154,571**	**–2,690**	**620,151,881**

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
002	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT		879				879
004	MQ–1 UAV	15	260,436		17,000	15	277,436
	Extended Range Modifications				[17,000]		
	ROTARY						
006	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	28	187,177			28	187,177
007	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	64	1,168,461			64	1,168,461
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		209,930				209,930
011	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	94	1,435,945	8	128,000	102	1,563,945
	Additional 8 rotorcraft for Army National Guard			[8]	[128,000]		
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		127,079				127,079
013	UH–60 BLACK HAWK A AND L MODELS	40	46,641	8	8,800	48	55,441
	Additional 8 rotorcraft for Army National Guard			[8]	[8,800]		
014	CH–47 HELICOPTER	39	1,024,587			39	1,024,587
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		99,344				99,344
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
016	MQ–1 PAYLOAD (MIP)		97,543				97,543
019	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		95,725				95,725
020	AH–64 MODS		116,153				116,153

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
021	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		86,330				86,330
022	GRCS SEMA MODS (MIP)		4,019				4,019
023	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP)		16,302				16,302
024	EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP)		13,669				13,669
025	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		16,166				16,166
026	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		13,793				13,793
028	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN		112,807				112,807
029	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE		82,904				82,904
030	GATM ROLLUP		33,890				33,890
031	RQ–7 UAV MODS		81,444				81,444
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
032	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		56,215				56,215
033	SURVIVABILITY CM		8,917				8,917
034	CMWS		78,348		26,000		104,348
	Apache Survivability Enhancements—Army Unfunded Requirement				[26,000]		
	OTHER SUPPORT						
035	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		6,937				6,937
036	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		64,867				64,867
037	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		44,085				44,085
038	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		94,545				94,545
039	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,207				1,207
040	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		3,012				3,012
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**280**	**5,689,357**	**16**	**179,800**	**296**	**5,869,157**

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY
SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM

001	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD)		115,075				115,075
002	MSE MISSILE	80	414,946			80	414,946
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
003	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	113	27,975			113	27,975
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		27,738				27,738
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
005	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	331	77,163	519	91,000	850	168,163
	Program increase to support Unfunded Requirements			[519]	[91,000]		
006	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1,704	87,525			1,704	87,525
008	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,668	251,060			1,668	251,060
009	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	3,121	17,428			3,121	17,428
	MODIFICATIONS						
011	PATRIOT MODS		241,883				241,883
012	ATACMS MODS		30,119		–15,000		15,119
	Early to need				[–15,000]		
013	GMLRS MOD		18,221				18,221
014	STINGER MODS		2,216				2,216
015	AVENGER MODS		6,171				6,171
016	ITAS/TOW MODS		19,576				19,576
017	MLRS MODS		35,970				35,970
018	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		3,148				3,148
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
019	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		33,778				33,778
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
020	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		3,717				3,717
021	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)		1,544				1,544
022	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		4,704				4,704
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**7,017**	**1,419,957**	**519**	**76,000**	**7,536**	**1,495,957**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	STRYKER VEHICLE		181,245				181,245

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
002	STRYKER (MOD)		74,085		44,500		118,585
	Lethality Upgrades				[44,500]		
003	STRYKER UPGRADE	62	305,743			62	305,743
005	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		225,042				225,042
006	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		60,079				60,079
007	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	30	273,850			30	273,850
008	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	31	123,629		72,000	31	195,629
	Additional Vehicles – Army Unfunded Requirement				[72,000]		
009	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)		2,461				2,461
010	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE		2,975				2,975
011	M88 FOV MODS		14,878				14,878
012	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	4	33,455			4	33,455
013	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		367,939		40,000		407,939
	Program Increase				[40,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
015	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)		6,479				6,479
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
016	MORTAR SYSTEMS		4,991				4,991
017	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)		26,294				26,294
018	PRECISION SNIPER RIFLE		1,984		–1,984		0
	Army request – schedule delay				[–1,984]		
019	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM		1,488		–1,488		0
	Army request – schedule delay				[–1,488]		
020	CARBINE		34,460				34,460
021	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION		8,367				8,367

022	HANDGUN		5,417	–5,417		0
	Army request – early to need and schedule delay			[–5,417]		
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH					
023	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS		2,777			2,777
024	M777 MODS		10,070			10,070
025	M4 CARBINE MODS		27,566			27,566
026	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		44,004			44,004
027	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		1,190			1,190
028	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		1,424			1,424
029	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		2,431	–1,451		980
	Army request – schedule delay			[–1,451]		
030	M119 MODIFICATIONS		20,599			20,599
032	MORTAR MODIFICATION		6,300			6,300
033	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		3,737			3,737
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES					
034	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		391			391
035	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)		9,027	2,457		11,484
	Army requested realignment			[2,457]		
036	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS		304			304
037	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		2,392			2,392
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**127**	**1,887,073**	**148,617**	**127**	**2,035,690**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY					
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION					
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		43,489			43,489
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		40,715			40,715
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		7,753	–1,000		6,753
	Army request – program reduction			[–1,000]		
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		24,728			24,728
005	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		8,305			8,305
006	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		34,330			34,330
007	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		79,972	–10,000		69,972

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Program reduction				[–10,000]		
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
008	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		42,898				42,898
009	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		43,500				43,500
010	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		64,372				64,372
	TANK AMMUNITION						
011	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES		105,541				105,541
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
012	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES		57,756				57,756
013	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		77,995				77,995
014	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982		45,518				45,518
015	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL		78,024				78,024
	ROCKETS						
016	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		7,500				7,500
017	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		33,653				33,653
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
018	CAD/PAD, ALL TYPES		5,639				5,639
019	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		9,751				9,751
020	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		19,993				19,993
021	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		9,761				9,761
022	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		9,749				9,749
	MISCELLANEOUS						
023	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		3,521				3,521
024	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		1,700				1,700
025	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (AMMO)		6,181				6,181
026	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		17,811				17,811

027	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		14,695			14,695
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT					
029	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		221,703			221,703
030	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION		113,250			113,250
031	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,575			3,575
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**1,233,378**	**–11,000**		**1,222,378**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	TACTICAL VEHICLES					
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		12,855			12,855
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:		53			53
004	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	450	308,336		450	308,336
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	166	90,040		166	90,040
006	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		8,444			8,444
007	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	273	27,549		273	27,549
008	PLS ESP		127,102			127,102
010	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS		48,292			48,292
011	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		130,993			130,993
012	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		19,146			19,146
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES					
014	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		1,248			1,248
015	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		9,614			9,614
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS					
016	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK		783,116	–40,000		743,116
	Unobligated balances			[–40,000]		
017	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		49,898			49,898
018	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY		4,062			4,062
019	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		5,008			5,008
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS					
020	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS		196,306			196,306
021	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS		44,998	–10,000		34,998
	Program Reduction			[–10,000]		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
022	SHF TERM		7,629				7,629
023	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)		14,027				14,027
024	SMART-T (SPACE)		13,453				13,453
025	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS		6,265				6,265
026	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)		1,042				1,042
027	ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC)		7,116				7,116
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM						
028	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		10,137				10,137
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
029	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM		64,640		–10,000		54,640
	Unobligated balances				[–10,000]		
030	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)		27,762		–5,000		22,762
	Excess Program Management Costs				[–5,000]		
031	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		9,422				9,422
032	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2		26,020				26,020
033	TRACTOR DESK		4,073				4,073
034	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		1,403				1,403
035	SPIDER FAMILY OF NETWORKED MUNITIONS INCR		9,199				9,199
036	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS		349				349
037	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM		25,597				25,597
038	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE		21,854				21,854
040	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE		24,388				24,388
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM						
042	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,349				1,349
043	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT		3,695				3,695
	INFORMATION SECURITY						

045	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	19,920		19,920
046	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	72,257		72,257
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS			
047	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	16,082		16,082
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS			
048	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	86,037		86,037
050	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	8,550		8,550
051	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	73,496		73,496
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)			
054	JTT/CIBS-M	881		881
055	PROPHET GROUND	63,650	–15,000	48,650
	Program reduction		[–15,000]	
057	DCGS-A (MIP)	260,268	–10,000	250,268
	Program reduction		[–10,000]	
058	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	3,906		3,906
059	TROJAN (MIP)	13,929		13,929
060	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	3,978		3,978
061	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	7,542		7,542
062	CLOSE ACCESS TARGET RECONNAISSANCE (CATR)	8,010		8,010
063	MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM-M	8,125		8,125
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)			
064	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	63,472		63,472
065	EW PLANNING & MANAGEMENT TOOLS (EWPMT)	2,556		2,556
066	AIR VIGILANCE (AV)	8,224		8,224
067	CREW	2,960		2,960
068	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE	1,722		1,722
069	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	447		447
070	CI MODERNIZATION	228		228
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)			
071	SENTINEL MODS	43,285		43,285
072	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	124,216		124,216
074	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	23,216		23,216

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
076	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS		60,679				60,679
077	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS)		53,453				53,453
078	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP		3,338				3,338
079	PROFILER		4,057				4,057
081	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)		133,339				133,339
082	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS)		47,212				47,212
083	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)		22,314				22,314
084	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32		12,131				12,131
085	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		10,075				10,075
086	COUNTERFIRE RADARS		217,379		–30,000		187,379
	Unobligated balances				[–30,000]		
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
087	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		1,190				1,190
090	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS		28,176				28,176
091	IAMD BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM		20,917		–5,000		15,917
	Program Reduction				[–5,000]		
092	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		5,850				5,850
093	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		12,738				12,738
094	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		145,405				145,405
095	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)		162,654				162,654
096	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP		4,446				4,446
098	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET		16,218				16,218
099	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (ENFIRE)		1,138				1,138
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION						
100	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		12,089				12,089
101	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		105,775				105,775

102	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM	18,995		18,995
103	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)	62,319		62,319
104	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	17,894		17,894
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)			
106	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	4,242		4,242
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT			
107	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	425		425
108	BCT EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES	7,438		7,438
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
108A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,467		6,467
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT			
109	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	248		248
110	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	1,487		1,487
112	CBRN DEFENSE	26,302		26,302
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT			
113	TACTICAL BRIDGING	9,822		9,822
114	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	21,516		21,516
115	BRIDGE SUPPLEMENTAL SET	4,959		4,959
116	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP	52,546	–10,000	42,546
	Program decrease		[–10,000]	
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT			
117	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)	58,682		58,682
118	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS)	13,565		13,565
119	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)	2,136		2,136
120	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION	6,960		6,960
121	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	17,424		17,424
122	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	8,284		8,284
123	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	5,459		5,459
124	FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS	8,429		8,429
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
125	HEATERS AND ECU'S	18,876		18,876
127	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	2,287		2,287

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
128	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)		7,733				7,733
129	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM		49,798				49,798
130	MOBILE SOLDIER POWER		43,639				43,639
132	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		13,118				13,118
133	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM		28,278				28,278
135	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS		34,544				34,544
136	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)		595				595
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
137	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		5,368				5,368
138	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		35,381				35,381
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
139	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		73,828				73,828
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
140	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		25,270				25,270
141	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)		2,760				2,760
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
142	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		5,903				5,903
143	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING		26,125				26,125
146	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		27,156				27,156
147	ALL TERRAIN CRANES		16,750				16,750
148	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING		984				984
149	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)		2,656				2,656
150	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP		2,531				2,531
151	FAMILY OF DIVER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		446				446
152	CONST EQUIP ESP		19,640				19,640
153	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		5,087				5,087

	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT					
154	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP		39,772			39,772
155	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)		5,835	89,000		94,835
	Strategic mobility shortfall mitigation – railcar acquisition			[89,000]		
	GENERATORS					
156	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		166,356	–20,000		146,356
	Program decrease			[–20,000]		
157	TACTICAL ELECTRIC POWER RECAPITALIZATION		11,505			11,505
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT					
159	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS		17,496			17,496
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					
160	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT		74,916			74,916
161	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM		303,236	–25,000		278,236
	Program reduction			[–25,000]		
162	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER		45,210			45,210
163	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER		30,068			30,068
164	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING		9,793			9,793
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)					
165	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		4,650			4,650
166	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		34,487			34,487
167	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)		11,083			11,083
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
169	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		17,937			17,937
170	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		52,040			52,040
171	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		1,568			1,568
172	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)		64,219			64,219
173	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		1,525			1,525
174	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		3,268			3,268
176	TRACTOR YARD		7,191			7,191
	OPA2					
177	INITIAL SPARES—C&E		48,511			48,511
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**889**	**5,899,028**	**–91,000**	**889**	**5,808,028**

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
002	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET			12	1,150,000	12	1,150,000
	Additional 12 Aircraft—Navy Unfunded Requirement			[12]	[1,150,000]		
003	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	4	897,542		–24,500	4	873,042
	Anticipated contract savings				[–7,700]		
	Cost growth for support equipment				[–16,800]		
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		48,630				48,630
005	JSF STOVL	9	1,483,414	6	974,900	15	2,458,314
	Additional 6 Aircraft—Marine Corps Unfunded Requirement			[6]	[1,000,000]		
	Anticipated contract savings				[–17,600]		
	Cost growth for support equipment				[–7,500]		
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		203,060				203,060
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		41,300				41,300
008	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	19	1,436,355			19	1,436,355
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		43,853				43,853
010	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	28	800,057			28	800,057
011	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		56,168				56,168
012	MH–60S (MYP)		28,232				28,232
014	MH–60R (MYP)	29	969,991			29	969,991
016	P–8A POSEIDON	16	3,008,928			16	3,008,928
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		269,568				269,568
018	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	5	857,654			5	857,654
019	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		195,336				195,336
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						

020	JPATS		8,914				8,914
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
021	KC–130J	2	192,214			2	192,214
022	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		24,451				24,451
023	MQ–4 TRITON	3	494,259	1	65,000	4	559,259
	Additional Air Vehicle			[1]	[65,000]		
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		54,577		18,000		72,577
	Additional Advance Procurement				[18,000]		
025	MQ–8 UAV	2	120,020		36,000	2	156,020
	MQ–8 UAV-Additional three air vehicles				[36,000]		
026	STUASLO UAV		3,450				3,450
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
028	EA–6 SERIES		9,799				9,799
029	AEA SYSTEMS		23,151		15,000		38,151
	Additional Low Band Transmitter Modifications				[15,000]		
030	AV–8 SERIES		41,890				41,890
031	ADVERSARY		5,816				5,816
032	F–18 SERIES		978,756		–10,300		968,456
	Unjustified request				[–10,300]		
034	H–53 SERIES		46,887				46,887
035	SH–60 SERIES		107,728				107,728
036	H–1 SERIES		42,315				42,315
037	EP–3 SERIES		41,784				41,784
038	P–3 SERIES		3,067				3,067
039	E–2 SERIES		20,741				20,741
040	TRAINER A/C SERIES		27,980				27,980
041	C–2A		8,157				8,157
042	C–130 SERIES		70,335				70,335
043	FEWSG		633				633
044	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		8,916				8,916
045	E–6 SERIES		185,253				185,253
046	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		76,138				76,138

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
047	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		23,702				23,702
048	T–45 SERIES		105,439				105,439
049	POWER PLANT CHANGES		9,917				9,917
050	JPATS SERIES		13,537				13,537
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		131,732				131,732
052	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		202,745				202,745
053	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		3,062				3,062
054	ID SYSTEMS		48,206				48,206
055	P–8 SERIES		28,492				28,492
056	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		7,680				7,680
057	MQ–8 SERIES		22,464				22,464
058	RQ–7 SERIES		3,773				3,773
059	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		121,208				121,208
060	F–35 STOVL SERIES		256,106				256,106
061	F–35 CV SERIES		68,527				68,527
062	QRC		6,885				6,885
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,563,515		–10,000		1,553,515
	Program decrease				[–10,000]		
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
064	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		450,959				450,959
065	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		24,010				24,010
066	WAR CONSUMABLES		42,012				42,012
067	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		2,455				2,455
068	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		50,859				50,859
069	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,801				1,801

	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**117**	**16,126,405**	**19**	**2,214,100**	**136**	**18,340,505**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
001	TRIDENT II MODS		1,099,064				1,099,064
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		7,748				7,748
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
003	TOMAHAWK	100	184,814	49	30,000	149	214,814
	Minimum Sustaining Rate Increase			[49]	[30,000]		
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
004	AMRAAM	167	192,873			167	192,873
005	SIDEWINDER	227	96,427			227	96,427
006	JSOW		21,419	85	47,800	85	69,219
	Industrial Base Sustainment			[85]	[47,800]		
007	STANDARD MISSILE	113	435,352			113	435,352
008	RAM	90	80,826			90	80,826
011	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	27	4,265			27	4,265
012	AERIAL TARGETS		40,792				40,792
013	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,335				3,335
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
014	ESSM	30	44,440			30	44,440
015	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		54,462				54,462
016	HARM MODS		122,298				122,298
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
017	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		2,397				2,397
018	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		39,932				39,932
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
019	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		57,641				57,641
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
020	SSTD		7,380				7,380
021	MK–48 TORPEDO	8	65,611			8	65,611

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
022	ASW TARGETS		6,912				6,912
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
023	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS		113,219				113,219
024	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		63,317				63,317
025	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		13,254				13,254
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
026	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		67,701				67,701
027	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		3,699				3,699
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
028	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,342				3,342
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
029	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		11,937				11,937
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
030	CIWS MODS		53,147				53,147
031	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		19,022				19,022
032	GUN MOUNT MODS		67,980				67,980
033	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		19,823				19,823
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
035	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		149,725				149,725
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**762**	**3,154,154**	**134**	**77,800**	**896**	**3,231,954**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		101,238				101,238
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		67,289				67,289
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION		20,340				20,340

004	PRACTICE BOMBS		40,365		40,365
005	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES		49,377		49,377
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		59,651		59,651
007	JATOS		2,806		2,806
008	LRLAP 6″ LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE		11,596		11,596
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION		35,994		35,994
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION		36,715		36,715
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION		45,483		45,483
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO		52,080		52,080
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		10,809		10,809
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,469		4,469
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION				
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		46,848		46,848
016	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES		350		350
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES		500		500
018	60MM, ALL TYPES		1,849		1,849
019	81MM, ALL TYPES		1,000		1,000
020	120MM, ALL TYPES		13,867		13,867
022	GRENADES, ALL TYPES		1,390		1,390
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		14,967		14,967
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		45,219		45,219
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES		29,335		29,335
027	NON LETHALS		3,868		3,868
028	AMMO MODERNIZATION		15,117		15,117
029	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		11,219		11,219
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**723,741**		**723,741**
	SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY				
	OTHER WARSHIPS				
001	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,634,701		1,634,701
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		874,658		874,658
003	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,346,370	2	3,346,370

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,993,740				1,993,740
005	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS	1	678,274			1	678,274
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		14,951				14,951
007	DDG 1000		433,404				433,404
008	DDG–51	2	3,149,703			2	3,149,703
010	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	3	1,356,991			3	1,356,991
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
012	LPD–17	1	550,000			1	550,000
013A	AFLOAT FORWARD STAGING BASE ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)				97,000		97,000
	Procurement				[97,000]		
014A	LX(R) ADVANCE PROCURMENT (CY)				250,000		250,000
	LX(R) Acceleration				[250,000]		
015	LHA REPLACEMENT ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		277,543				277,543
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
017	TAO FLEET OILER	1	674,190	–1	–674,190		0
	Transfer to NDSF—Title XIV			[–1]	[–674,190]		
019	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		138,200				138,200
020	OUTFITTING		697,207				697,207
021	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR	5	255,630			5	255,630
022	SERVICE CRAFT		30,014				30,014
023	LCAC SLEP	4	80,738			4	80,738
024	YP CRAFT MAINTENANCE/ROH/SLEP		21,838				21,838
025	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		389,305				389,305
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING & CONVERSION, NAVY	**19**	**16,597,457**	**–1**	**–327,190**	**18**	**16,270,267**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						

	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT					
001	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE	4,881				4,881
002	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	5,814				5,814
003	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)	32,906				32,906
	GENERATORS					
004	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E	36,860				36,860
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT					
005	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	87,481				87,481
	PERISCOPES					
006	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	63,109				63,109
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT					
007	DDG MOD	364,157	1	60,000	1	424,157
	Additional DDG Modification-Unfunded Requirement		[1]	[60,000]		
008	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	16,089				16,089
009	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	2,255				2,255
010	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE	28,571				28,571
011	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM	12,313				12,313
012	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	16,609				16,609
013	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,498				10,498
014	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	35,747				35,747
015	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	48,399				48,399
016	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	23,072				23,072
017	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	55,283				55,283
018	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	18,563				18,563
019	DSSP EQUIPMENT	7,376				7,376
021	LCAC	20,965				20,965
022	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	51,652				51,652
023	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	102,498				102,498
024	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	3,027				3,027
025	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	7,399				7,399
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT					
027	REACTOR COMPONENTS	296,095				296,095

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OCEAN ENGINEERING						
028	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT		15,982				15,982
	SMALL BOATS						
029	STANDARD BOATS		29,982				29,982
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT						
030	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT		66,538				66,538
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT						
031	OPERATING FORCES IPE		71,138				71,138
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
032	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		132,625				132,625
033	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT		23,500				23,500
034	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES		85,151				85,151
035	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES		35,228				35,228
036	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)		87,627				87,627
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT						
037	LSD MIDLIFE		2,774				2,774
	SHIP SONARS						
038	SPQ–9B RADAR		20,551				20,551
039	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		103,241				103,241
040	SSN ACOUSTICS		214,835	4	20,000	4	234,835
	Submarine Towed Array-Unfunded Requirement			[4]	[20,000]		
041	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,331				7,331
042	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS		11,781				11,781
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
044	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		21,119				21,119
045	SSTD		8,396				8,396

046	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	146,968				146,968
047	SURTASS	12,953				12,953
048	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNSAISANCE FORCE	13,725				13,725
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT					
049	AN/SLQ–32	324,726	2	28,000	2	352,726
	SEWIP Block II-Unfunded Requirement		[2]	[28,000]		
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT					
050	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	148,221				148,221
051	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	152				152
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT					
052	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	79,954				79,954
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT					
053	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	25,695				25,695
054	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	284				284
055	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	14,416				14,416
056	ATDLS	23,069				23,069
057	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	4,054				4,054
058	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	21,014				21,014
059	SHALLOW WATER MCM	18,077				18,077
060	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	12,359				12,359
061	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	4,240				4,240
062	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	17,440				17,440
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					
063	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	41,314				41,314
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT					
064	MATCALS	10,011				10,011
065	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	9,346				9,346
066	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	21,281				21,281
067	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	25,621				25,621
068	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	8,249				8,249
069	LANDING SYSTEMS	14,715				14,715
070	ID SYSTEMS	29,676				29,676

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
071	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		13,737				13,737
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
072	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL		1,314				1,314
074	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS		13,600				13,600
075	DCGS-N		31,809				31,809
076	CANES		278,991				278,991
077	RADIAC		8,294				8,294
078	CANES-INTELL		28,695				28,695
079	GPETE		6,962				6,962
080	MASF		290				290
081	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY		14,419				14,419
082	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION		4,175				4,175
083	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		44,176				44,176
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS						
084	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS		8,722				8,722
085	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION		108,477				108,477
086	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M		16,613				16,613
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS						
087	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT		20,691				20,691
088	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		60,945				60,945
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
089	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		30,892				30,892
090	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)		118,113				118,113
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
091	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		4,591				4,591
092	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS		1,403				1,403

	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT					
093	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	135,687				135,687
094	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM	970				970
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT					
095	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	11,433				11,433
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT					
096	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	2,529				2,529
	SONOBUOYS					
097	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES	168,763				168,763
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
098	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	46,979				46,979
100	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	123,884	2	3,500	2	127,384
	F–35 Visual/Optical Landing System Training Equipment Unfunded Requirement.		[2]	[3,500]		
103	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	15,090				15,090
104	DCRS/DPL	638				638
106	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	14,098				14,098
111	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	49,773				49,773
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT					
112	SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT	5,300				5,300
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT					
115	SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	298,738				298,738
120	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	71,245				71,245
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
123	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	240,694				240,694
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
124	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	96,040				96,040
125	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	30,189				30,189
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
129	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	22,623				22,623
130	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	9,906				9,906
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
134	TRAINING DEVICE MODS		99,707				99,707
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
135	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,252				2,252
136	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS		2,191				2,191
137	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP		2,164				2,164
138	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		14,705				14,705
139	TACTICAL VEHICLES		2,497				2,497
140	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT		12,517				12,517
141	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT		3,018				3,018
142	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION		14,403				14,403
143	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES		1,186				1,186
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
144	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT		18,805				18,805
145	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		10,469				10,469
146	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		5,720				5,720
147	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS		211,714				211,714
	TRAINING DEVICES						
148	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,468				7,468
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
149	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		36,433				36,433
150	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,180				3,180
151	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,790				4,790
153	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,608				4,608
154	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		5,655				5,655
155	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		9,929				9,929
156	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		26,795				26,795

157	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	88,453				88,453
159	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	99,094				99,094
	OTHER					
160	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE	99,014				99,014
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
160A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	21,439				21,439
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
161	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	328,043				328,043
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**6,614,715**	**9**	**111,500**	**9**	**6,726,215**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS					
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES					
001	AAV7A1 PIP	26,744				26,744
002	LAV PIP	54,879				54,879
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS					
003	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	2,652				2,652
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	7,482				7,482
005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	17,181				17,181
006	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	8,224				8,224
	OTHER SUPPORT					
007	MODIFICATION KITS	14,467				14,467
008	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	488				488
	GUIDED MISSILES					
009	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE	7,565				7,565
010	JAVELIN	1,091	441	77,500	441	78,591
	Program increase to support Unfunded Requirements		[441]	[77,500]		
011	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW	4,872				4,872
012	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)	668				668
	OTHER SUPPORT					
013	MODIFICATION KITS	12,495				12,495
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS					
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	13,109				13,109

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
015	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C		35,147				35,147
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT						
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		21,210				21,210
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
017	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM		792				792
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
019	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		3,642				3,642
020	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		3,520				3,520
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
021	RADAR SYSTEMS		35,118				35,118
022	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	3	130,661		–40,000	3	90,661
	Delay in IOTE				[–40,000]		
023	RQ–21 UAS	4	84,916			4	84,916
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
024	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		9,136				9,136
025	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		29,936				29,936
028	DCGS-MC		1,947				1,947
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
031	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT		2,018				2,018
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
032	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN)		67,295				67,295
033	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		43,101				43,101
034	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		29,255				29,255
035	RADIO SYSTEMS		80,584				80,584
036	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		66,123				66,123
037	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		79,486				79,486

	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
037A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,803				2,803
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
038	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES		3,538				3,538
039	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		22,806				22,806
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
041	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		7,743				7,743
043	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	109	79,429			109	79,429
044	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		3,157				3,157
	OTHER SUPPORT						
045	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,938				6,938
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
046	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		94				94
047	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT		896				896
048	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		136				136
049	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		10,792				10,792
050	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		3,235				3,235
051	EOD SYSTEMS		7,666				7,666
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
052	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		33,145				33,145
053	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)		1,419				1,419
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
057	TRAINING DEVICES		24,163				24,163
058	CONTAINER FAMILY		962				962
059	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		6,545				6,545
060	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		7,533				7,533
	OTHER SUPPORT						
062	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,322				4,322
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		8,292				8,292
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**116**	**1,131,418**	**441**	**37,500**	**557**	**1,168,918**

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
001	F–35	44	5,260,212		–99,100	44	5,161,112
	Anticipated contract savings				[–75,500]		
	Cost growth for support equipment				[–23,600]		
002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		460,260				460,260
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT						
003	KC–46A TANKER	12	2,350,601		–24,000	12	2,326,601
	Program Decrease				[–24,000]		
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
004	C–130J	14	889,154	1	73,000	15	962,154
	Unfunded Requirements			[1]	[73,000]		
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		50,000				50,000
006	HC–130J	5	463,934			5	463,934
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		30,000				30,000
008	MC–130J	8	828,472			8	828,472
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		60,000				60,000
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
011	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	6	2,617			6	2,617
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
012	TARGET DRONES	75	132,028			75	132,028
014	RQ–4		37,800				37,800
015	MQ–9	29	552,528			29	552,528
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
017	B–2A		32,458				32,458
018	B–1B		114,119				114,119

019	B–52	148,987		148,987
020	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES	84,335		84,335
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT			
021	A–10		240,000	240,000
	A–10 restoration— wing replacement program		[240,000]	
022	F–15	464,367		464,367
023	F–16	17,134		17,134
024	F–22A	126,152		126,152
025	F–35 MODIFICATIONS	70,167		70,167
026	INCREMENT 3.2B	69,325		69,325
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT			
028	C–5	5,604		5,604
030	C–17A	46,997		46,997
031	C–21	10,162		10,162
032	C–32A	44,464		44,464
033	C–37A	10,861	–10,000	861
	Program decrease		[–10,000]	
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT			
034	GLIDER MODS	134		134
035	T–6	17,968		17,968
036	T–1	23,706		23,706
037	T–38	30,604		30,604
	OTHER AIRCRAFT			
038	U–2 MODS	22,095		22,095
039	KC–10A (ATCA)	5,611		5,611
040	C–12	1,980		1,980
042	VC–25A MOD	98,231		98,231
043	C–40	13,171		13,171
044	C–130	7,048	73,200	80,248
	C–130 AMP increase		[10,000]	
	Eight-Bladed Propeller		[30,000]	
	T–56 3.5 Engine Mod		[33,200]	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
045	C–130J MODS		29,713				29,713
046	C–135		49,043				49,043
047	COMPASS CALL MODS		68,415		28,700		97,115
	EC–130H Force Structure Restoration				[28,700]		
048	RC–135		156,165				156,165
049	E–3		13,178				13,178
050	E–4		23,937				23,937
051	E–8		18,001				18,001
052	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM		183,308				183,308
053	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS		44,163		–10,000		34,163
	Program decrease				[–10,000]		
054	H–1		6,291				6,291
055	UH–1N REPLACEMENT		2,456				2,456
056	H–60		45,731				45,731
057	RQ–4 MODS		50,022				50,022
058	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		21,660				21,660
059	OTHER AIRCRAFT		117,767				117,767
060	MQ–1 MODS		3,173				3,173
061	MQ–9 MODS		115,226				115,226
063	CV–22 MODS		58,828				58,828
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
064	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		656,242				656,242
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
065	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		33,716				33,716
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
067	B–2A		38,837				38,837

068	B–52		5,911				5,911
069	C–17A		30,108				30,108
070	CV–22 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT		3,353				3,353
071	C–135		4,490				4,490
072	F–15		3,225				3,225
073	F–16		14,969		18,700		33,669
	Additional Mission Trainers				[24,700]		
	Unobligated balances				[–6,000]		
074	F–22A		971				971
076	MQ–9		5,000				5,000
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
077	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		18,802				18,802
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
078	WAR CONSUMABLES		156,465				156,465
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
079	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		1,052,814				1,052,814
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
079A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		42,503				42,503
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**193**	**15,657,769**	**1**	**290,500**	**194**	**15,948,269**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC						
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		94,040				94,040
	TACTICAL						
003	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE	360	440,578			360	440,578
004	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	506	200,777			506	200,777
005	AMRAAM	262	390,112			262	390,112
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	3,756	423,016			3,756	423,016
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	1,942	133,697			1,942	133,697
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
008	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		397				397
	CLASS IV						

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
009	MM III MODIFICATIONS		50,517				50,517
010	AGM–65D MAVERICK		9,639				9,639
011	AGM–88A HARM		197				197
012	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		25,019				25,019
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
014	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		48,523				48,523
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
028	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		276,562				276,562
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
028A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		893,971				893,971
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**6,826**	**2,987,045**			**6,826**	**2,987,045**
	SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
001	ADVANCED EHF		333,366				333,366
002	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		53,476		26,000		79,476
	SATCOM Pathfinder				[26,000]		
003	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	1	199,218			1	199,218
004	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		18,362				18,362
005	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		66,135				66,135
006	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)		89,351				89,351
007	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH CAPABILITY		571,276				571,276
008	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	5	800,201			5	800,201
009	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)		452,676				452,676
	TOTAL SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**6**	**2,584,061**		**26,000**	**6**	**2,610,061**

	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE					
	ROCKETS					
001	ROCKETS		23,788			23,788
	CARTRIDGES					
002	CARTRIDGES		131,102			131,102
	BOMBS					
003	PRACTICE BOMBS		89,759			89,759
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		637,181			637,181
005	MASSIVE ORDNANCE PENETRATOR (MOP)		39,690			39,690
006	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	6,341	374,688	–20,000	6,341	354,688
	Program reduction			[–20,000]		
	OTHER ITEMS					
007	CAD/PAD		58,266			58,266
008	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		5,612			5,612
009	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		103			103
010	MODIFICATIONS		1,102			1,102
011	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,044			3,044
	FLARES					
012	FLARES		120,935			120,935
	FUZES					
013	FUZES		213,476			213,476
	SMALL ARMS					
014	SMALL ARMS		60,097			60,097
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**6,341**	**1,758,843**	**–20,000**	**6,341**	**1,738,843**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES					
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		8,834			8,834
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES					
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		58,160			58,160
003	CAP VEHICLES		977			977
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		12,483			12,483

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES		4,728				4,728
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		4,662				4,662
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		10,419				10,419
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
008	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		23,320				23,320
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP		6,215				6,215
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		87,781				87,781
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)						
011	COMSEC EQUIPMENT		136,998				136,998
012	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)		677				677
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS						
013	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT		4,041				4,041
014	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT		22,573				22,573
015	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS		14,456				14,456
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
016	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		31,823				31,823
017	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM		5,833				5,833
018	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED		1,687				1,687
019	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS		22,710				22,710
020	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST		21,561				21,561
021	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL		286,980				286,980
022	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX		36,186				36,186
024	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN)		9,597				9,597

	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS			
025	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	27,403		27,403
026	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	7,212		7,212
027	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	11,062		11,062
028	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	131,269		131,269
029	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	33,606		33,606
030	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N	5,232		5,232
031	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	7,453		7,453
032	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM	3,976		3,976
033	GCSS-AF FOS	25,515		25,515
034	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM	9,255		9,255
035	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	7,523		7,523
036	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	12,043		12,043
037	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) 10.2	24,246		24,246
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS			
038	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	74,621		74,621
039	AFNET	103,748		103,748
041	JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE)	5,199		5,199
042	USCENTCOM	15,780		15,780
	SPACE PROGRAMS			
043	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	79,592	–15,000	64,592
	Program decrease		[–15,000]	
044	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	90,190		90,190
045	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	2,029		2,029
046	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	5,095		5,095
047	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	76,673		76,673
048	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	113,275		113,275
049	MILSATCOM SPACE	35,495		35,495
050	SPACE MODS SPACE	23,435		23,435
051	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	43,065		43,065
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE			
052	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	77,538	33,900	111,438

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Battlefield Airmen Kits Unfunded Requirement				[19,900]		
	Joint Terminal Control Training Simulation Unfunded Requirement				[14,000]		
054	RADIO EQUIPMENT		8,400				8,400
055	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		6,144				6,144
056	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		77,010				77,010
	MODIFICATIONS						
057	COMM ELECT MODS		71,800				71,800
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP						
058	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		2,370				2,370
059	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		79,623				79,623
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ						
060	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		7,249				7,249
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
061	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		9,095		4,000		13,095
	Additional Equipment				[4,000]		
062	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT		17,866				17,866
064	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		61,850				61,850
065	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		30,477				30,477
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS						
067	DARP RC135		25,072				25,072
068	DCGS-AF		183,021				183,021
070	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		629,371				629,371
071	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		100,663				100,663
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
071A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		15,038,333				15,038,333
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						

073	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		59,863			59,863
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**18,272,438**	**22,900**		**18,295,338**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE					
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA					
001	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		1,488			1,488
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA					
002	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,494			2,494
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA					
003	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		9,341			9,341
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA					
007	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		8,080	15,000		23,080
	SHARKSEER			[15,000]		
008	TELEPORT PROGRAM		62,789			62,789
009	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,399			9,399
010	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		1,819			1,819
011	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		141,298			141,298
012	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		12,732			12,732
013	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY		64,098			64,098
014	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE		617,910			617,910
015	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT		84,400			84,400
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA					
016	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		5,644			5,644
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT					
017	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	4	11,208		4	11,208
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA					
018	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		1,298			1,298
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY					
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS					
020	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		1,048			1,048
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY					
021	VEHICLES		100			100

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
022	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		5,474				5,474
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY						
023	THAAD	30	464,067			30	464,067
024	AEGIS BMD	40	558,916	18	120,445	58	679,361
	SM–3 Block IB			[9]	[117,880]		
	SM–3 Block IB (Canisters)			[9]	[2,565]		
025	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		147,765		–147,765		0
	SM–3 Block IB				[–147,765]		
026	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS		78,634				78,634
027	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III		30,587				30,587
028	IRON DOME	1	55,000			1	55,000
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
035	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		37,177				37,177
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD						
036	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	17	46,939			17	46,939
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
038	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		13,027				13,027
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
040	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		27,859				27,859
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY						
028A	DAVID SLING			1	150,000	1	150,000
	David's Sling Weapon System Procurement—Subject to Title XVI			[1]	[150,000]		
028B	ARROW 3			1	15,000	1	15,000
	Arrow 3 Upper Tier Procurement—Subject to Title XVI			[1]	[15,000]		
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
040A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		617,757				617,757

	AVIATION PROGRAMS			
041	MC–12	63,170		63,170
042	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	135,985		135,985
044	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	61,275		61,275
047	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	20,087		20,087
048	CV–22 MODIFICATION	18,832		18,832
049	MQ–1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	1,934		1,934
050	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	11,726	15,200	26,926
	Medium Altitude Long Endurance Tactical (MALET) MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle.		[15,200]	
051	STUASL0	1,514		1,514
052	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE	204,105		204,105
053	AC/MC–130J	61,368	–35,400	25,968
	MC–130 Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar Program		[–35,400]	
054	C–130 MODIFICATIONS	66,861		66,861
	SHIPBUILDING			
055	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	32,521		32,521
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS			
056	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M	174,734		174,734
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS			
057	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	93,009		93,009
058	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	14,964		14,964
059	OTHER ITEMS <$5M	79,149		79,149
060	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	33,362		33,362
061	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	143,533		143,533
062	TACTICAL VEHICLES	73,520		73,520
063	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <$5M	186,009		186,009
064	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	19,693		19,693
065	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,967		3,967
066	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	19,225		19,225
068	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	213,252		213,252
	CBDP			

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
074	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS		141,223				141,223
075	CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION		137,487				137,487
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**92**	**5,130,853**	**20**	**132,480**	**112**	**5,263,333**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		99,701		–99,701		0
	Program reduction				[–99,701]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**99,701**		**–99,701**		**0**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**22,785**	**106,967,393**	**1,158**	**2,768,306**	**23,943**	**109,735,699**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
003	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	5	99,500			5	99,500
004	MQ–1 UAV	2	16,537			2	16,537
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
016	MQ–1 PAYLOAD (MIP)		8,700				8,700
023	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP)		32,000				32,000
031	RQ–7 UAV MODS		8,250				8,250
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**7**	**164,987**			**7**	**164,987**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
003	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	270	37,260			270	37,260
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**270**	**37,260**			**270**	**37,260**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
016	MORTAR SYSTEMS		7,030				7,030
021	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION		19,000				19,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY		**26,030**				**26,030**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		4,000				4,000

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
008	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		11,700				11,700
009	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		4,000				4,000
010	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES		7,000				7,000
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
012	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES		5,000				5,000
013	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES		10,000				10,000
015	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL		2,000				2,000
	ROCKETS						
017	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES		136,340				136,340
	OTHER AMMUNITION						
019	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		4,000				4,000
021	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		8,000				8,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**192,040**				**192,040**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
005	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	1,191	243,998			1,191	243,998
009	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV		223,276				223,276
011	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		130,000				130,000
012	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		393,100				393,100
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
021	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS		5,724				5,724
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
051	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		29,500				29,500
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)						

057	DCGS-A (MIP)		54,140		54,140
059	TROJAN (MIP)		6,542		6,542
061	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		3,860		3,860
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)				
068	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE		14,847		14,847
069	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		19,535		19,535
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)				
084	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32		2,601		2,601
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS				
087	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		48		48
094	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		252		252
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION				
101	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		652		652
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT				
111	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)		4,035		4,035
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
131	FORCE PROVIDER	12	53,800	12	53,800
133	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM		700		700
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
159	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS		10,486		10,486
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
169	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,500		8,500
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,203**	**1,205,596**	**1,203**	**1,205,596**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND				
	NETWORK ATTACK				
001	ATTACK THE NETWORK		219,550		219,550
	JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT				
002	DEFEAT THE DEVICE		77,600		77,600
	FORCE TRAINING				
003	TRAIN THE FORCE		7,850		7,850
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE				

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
004	OPERATIONS		188,271		–50,700		137,571
	Program Reduction				[–50,700]		
	TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND		**493,271**		**–50,700**		**442,571**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
026	STUASLO UAV	3	55,000			3	55,000
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
030	AV–8 SERIES		41,365				41,365
032	F–18 SERIES		8,000				8,000
037	EP–3 SERIES		6,300				6,300
047	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		14,198				14,198
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		72,700				72,700
052	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		13,988				13,988
059	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		4,900				4,900
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
065	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		943				943
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**3**	**217,394**			**3**	**217,394**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
010	LASER MAVERICK		3,344				3,344
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**3,344**				**3,344**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						

001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	9,715	9,715
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	11,108	11,108
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	3,603	3,603
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	11,982	11,982
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	4,674	4,674
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	3,456	3,456
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	1,989	1,989
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,674	4,674
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION		
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	10,719	10,719
023	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	3,993	3,993
024	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	67,200	67,200
025	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	518	518
026	FUZE, ALL TYPES	3,299	3,299
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**136,930**	**136,930**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		
135	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	186	186
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		
160A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,000	12,000
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**12,186**	**12,186**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		
	GUIDED MISSILES		
010	JAVELIN	7,679	7,679
	OTHER SUPPORT		
013	MODIFICATION KITS	10,311	10,311
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS		
014	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	8,221	8,221
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)		
018	MODIFICATION KITS	3,600	3,600

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
019	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		8,693				8,693
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
027	RQ–11 UAV		3,430				3,430
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
052	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		7,000				7,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS		**48,934**				**48,934**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
015	MQ–9		13,500				13,500
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
044	C–130		1,410				1,410
056	H–60		39,300				39,300
058	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		5,690				5,690
061	MQ–9 MODS		69,000				69,000
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**128,900**				**128,900**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL						
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	1,811	280,902			1,811	280,902
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	63	2,520			63	2,520
	CLASS IV						
010	AGM–65D MAVERICK		5,720				5,720
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**1,874**	**289,142**			**1,874**	**289,142**

	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE				
	CARTRIDGES				
002	CARTRIDGES		8,371		8,371
	BOMBS				
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		17,031		17,031
006	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	5,953	184,412	5,953	184,412
	FLARES				
012	FLARES		11,064		11,064
	FUZES				
013	FUZES		7,996		7,996
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**5,953**	**228,874**	**5,953**	**228,874**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE				
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS				
025	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		3,953		3,953
027	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL		2,000		2,000
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS				
042	USCENTCOM		10,000		10,000
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE				
052	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		4,065		4,065
056	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		15,400		15,400
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP				
058	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES		3,580		3,580
059	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,407		3,407
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
062	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT		46,790		46,790
064	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		400		400
065	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,800		9,800
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS				
071	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.		28,070		28,070
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
071A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,732,499		3,732,499

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**3,859,964**				**3,859,964**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
008	TELEPORT PROGRAM		1,940				1,940
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
040A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		35,482				35,482
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
041	MC–12		5,000				5,000
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
056	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M	746,066	35,299			746,066	35,299
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
061	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	1	15,160			1	15,160
063	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <$5M	50	15,000			50	15,000
068	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	3	104,537			3	104,537
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**746,120**	**212,418**			**746,120**	**212,418**
	NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
007	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT				250,000		250,000
	NGREA Program Increase				[250,000]		
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT				**250,000**		**250,000**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**755,430**	**7,257,270**		**199,300**	**755,430**	**7,456,570**

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 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	13,018		13,018
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	239,118		239,118
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	72,603		72,603
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	100,340		100,340
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**425,079**		**425,079**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	28,314		28,314
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	38,374		38,374
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	6,879		6,879
008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	56,884		56,884
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	19,243		19,243
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	45,053	8,000	53,053
		A2/AD Anti-Ship Missile Study		[8,000]	
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	29,428		29,428
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	27,862		27,862
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	68,839		68,839

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	92,801		92,801
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,866		3,866
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,487		5,487
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	48,340		48,340
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	55,301		55,301
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	33,807		33,807
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	25,068		25,068
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	23,681		23,681
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	20,850		20,850
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	36,160		36,160
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	12,656		12,656
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	63,409		63,409
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	24,735	–5,000	19,735
		Program decrease		[–5,000]	
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	35,795		35,795
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	76,853		76,853
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**879,685**	**3,000**	**882,685**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	46,973		46,973
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	69,584		69,584
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	89,736		89,736
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,663		57,663
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	113,071		113,071
034	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	5,554		5,554
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	12,636		12,636
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	7,502		7,502

038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	17,425	17,425
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	11,912	11,912
040	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	27,520	27,520
041	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	2,381	2,381
042	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,431	2,431
043	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,874	26,874
044	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	49,449	49,449
045	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	10,999	10,999
046	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	177,159	177,159
047	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,993	13,993
048	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,105	5,105
049	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	40,929	40,929
050	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	10,727	10,727
051	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,145	20,145
052	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	38,163	38,163
053	0603794A	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,816	37,816
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**895,747**	**895,747**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		
054	0603305A	ARMY MISSLE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	10,347	10,347
055	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	25,061	25,061
056	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	49,636	49,636
057	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	13,426	13,426
058	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	46,749	46,749
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	6,258	6,258
061	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	13,472	13,472
062	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	7,292	7,292
063	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	8,813	8,813
065	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	294	294
067	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	21,233	21,233
068	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	31,962	31,962
069	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	22,194	22,194

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
071	0604100A	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	9,805		9,805
072	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	40,917		40,917
073	0604120A	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT)	30,058		30,058
074	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2–INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	155,361		155,361
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**492,878**		**492,878**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
076	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	12,939		12,939
078	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	18,843		18,843
079	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	9,861		9,861
080	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	8,763		8,763
081	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	4,309		4,309
082	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	15,138		15,138
083	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	74,128	6,500	80,628
		Army requested realignment		[1,500]	
		Soldier Enhancement Program		[5,000]	
085	0604611A	JAVELIN	3,945		3,945
087	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	10,076		10,076
088	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	40,374		40,374
089	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	67,582		67,582
090	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	1,763		1,763
091	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	27,155		27,155
092	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	24,569		24,569
093	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	23,364		23,364
094	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	8,960		8,960
095	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	9,138		9,138
096	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	21,622		21,622

097	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	99,242		99,242
098	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	21,379		21,379
099	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	48,339		48,339
100	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	2,726		2,726
101	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	45,412		45,412
102	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	55,215		55,215
104	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	163,643		163,643
105	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	12,309		12,309
106	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	15,700		15,700
107	0604823A	FIREFINDER	6,243		6,243
108	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	18,776		18,776
109	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	1,953		1,953
110	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	67,358		67,358
111	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	136,011		136,011
112	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	230,210		230,210
113	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	13,357		13,357
114	0605031A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN)	18,055		18,055
115	0605032A	TRACTOR TIRE	5,677		5,677
116	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM)	77,570	24,000	101,570
		Apache Survivability Enhancements—Army Unfunded Requirement		[24,000]	
117	0605051A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT	18,112	75,000	93,112
		Apache Survivability Enhancements—Army Unfunded Requirement		[60,000]	
		Concept development by the Army of a CPGS option		[15,000]	
118	0605350A	WIN-T INCREMENT 3—FULL NETWORKING	39,700		39,700
119	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	12,987		12,987
120	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	88,866	–20,000	68,866
		EMD contract delays		[–20,000]	
121	0605456A	PAC–3/MSE MISSILE	2,272		2,272
122	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	214,099		214,099
123	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	49,247	–10,000	39,247
		Funding ahead of need		[–10,000]	
124	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	2		2

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
125	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	10,599		10,599
126	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	32,486		32,486
127	0605830A	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,880		8,880
128	0210609A	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	152,288		152,288
129	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	5,022		5,022
130	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	12,686		12,686
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**2,068,950**	**75,500**	**2,144,450**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
131	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	20,035		20,035
132	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,684		16,684
133	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	62,580		62,580
134	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,853		20,853
135	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	205,145		205,145
136	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	19,430		19,430
138	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	277,646		277,646
139	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	51,550		51,550
140	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	33,246		33,246
141	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,760		4,760
142	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	8,303		8,303
143	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	20,403		20,403
144	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	10,396		10,396
145	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	49,337		49,337
146	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	52,694		52,694
147	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	938		938
148	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	60,319		60,319
149	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	28,478		28,478

150	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	32,604	–8,000	24,604
		Program reduction		[–8,000]	
151	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	3,186		3,186
152	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	48,955		48,955
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,027,542**	**–8,000**	**1,019,542**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
154	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	18,397		18,397
155	0603813A	TRACTOR PULL	9,461		9,461
156	0607131A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	4,945		4,945
157	0607133A	TRACTOR SMOKE	7,569		7,569
158	0607135A	APACHE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	69,862		69,862
159	0607136A	BLACKHAWK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	66,653		66,653
160	0607137A	CHINOOK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	37,407		37,407
161	0607138A	FIXED WING PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	1,151		1,151
162	0607139A	IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM	51,164		51,164
163	0607140A	EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FROM NIE	2,481		2,481
164	0607141A	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION	1,673		1,673
166	0607665A	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS	13,237		13,237
167	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	105,816		105,816
169	0202429A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT—COCOM EXERCISE	40,565		40,565
171	0203728A	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOCS)	35,719		35,719
172	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	257,167	35,000	292,167
		Stryker Lethality Upgrades		[35,000]	
173	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	15,445		15,445
175	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	364		364
176	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	4,361		4,361
177	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	3,154		3,154
178	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	35,951		35,951
179	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	34,686		34,686
180	0205402A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	10,750		10,750
181	0205410A	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	402		402

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
183	0205456A	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM	64,159		64,159
184	0205778A	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS)	17,527		17,527
185	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	20,515		20,515
187	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	12,368		12,368
188	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	31,154		31,154
189	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	12,274		12,274
190	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	9,355		9,355
191	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	7,053		7,053
193	0305179A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	750		750
194	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	13,225		13,225
195	0305206A	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	22,870		22,870
196	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	25,592		25,592
199	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	7,297		7,297
201	0310349A	WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING	3,800		3,800
202	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	48,442		48,442
202A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,536		4,536
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,129,297**	**35,000**	**1,164,297**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**6,919,178**	**105,500**	**7,024,678**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	116,196	18,000	134,196
		Defense University Research Instumentation Program increase		[18,000]	
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	19,126		19,126
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	451,606		451,606
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**586,928**	**18,000**	**604,928**

		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	68,723		68,723
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	154,963		154,963
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	49,001		49,001
007	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	42,551		42,551
008	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,056		45,056
009	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	115,051		115,051
010	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	42,252	20,000	62,252
		Service Life Extension for the AGOR Ship		[20,000]	
011	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,119		6,119
012	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	123,750		123,750
013	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	179,686		179,686
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	37,418		37,418
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**864,570**	**20,000**	**884,570**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
015	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,093		37,093
016	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	38,044		38,044
017	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	34,899		34,899
018	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	137,562		137,562
019	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,745		12,745
020	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	258,860	–10,000	248,860
		Program decrease		[–10,000]	
021	0603680N	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	57,074		57,074
022	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,807		4,807
023	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,748		13,748
024	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	66,041		66,041
025	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	1,991		1,991
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**662,864**	**–10,000**	**652,864**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
026	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	41,832		41,832
027	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	5,404		5,404
028	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	3,086		3,086
029	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	11,643		11,643
030	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,555		5,555
031	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	3,087		3,087
032	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,636		1,636
033	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	118,588		118,588
034	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	77,385		77,385
035	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	8,348		8,348
036	0603525N	PILOT FISH	123,246		123,246
037	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	28,819		28,819
038	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	112,678		112,678
039	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	710		710
040	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	1,096		1,096
041	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	87,160	48,000	135,160
		Program increase		[48,000]	
042	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	10,371		10,371
043	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	11,888		11,888
044	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	4,332		4,332
045	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	482,040	–419,300	62,740
		Transfer to National Sea-Based Deterrance Fund		[–419,300]	
046	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	25,904		25,904
047	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	511,802		511,802
048	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	118,416		118,416
049	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	35,901		35,901
050	0603595N	OHIO REPLACEMENT	971,393	–971,393	0

		Transfer to National Sea-Based Deterrance Fund-OR Development		[–971,393]	
051	0603596N	LCS MISSION MODULES	206,149		206,149
052	0603597N	AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST (ATRT)	8,000		8,000
053	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	7,678		7,678
054	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	219,082		219,082
055	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	623		623
056	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	18,260		18,260
057	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	76,247		76,247
058	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,520		4,520
059	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	20,711		20,711
060	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	47,761		47,761
061	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	5,226		5,226
062	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	182,771		182,771
063	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,866		3,866
064	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	360,065		360,065
065	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	237,416		237,416
066	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	37,944		37,944
067	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	47,312		47,312
068	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	17,408		17,408
069	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,359		9,359
070	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	887	10,000	10,887
		5–Inch Guided Projectile Technology		[10,000]	
071	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	29,448		29,448
072	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	91,479		91,479
073	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	67,360		67,360
074	0604112N	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80)	48,105		48,105
075	0604122N	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	20,089		20,089
076	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	18,969		18,969
077	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	7,874		7,874
078	0604292N	MH-XX	5,298		5,298
079	0604454N	LX (R)	46,486	29,000	75,486
		LX(R) Acceleration		[29,000]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
080	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	3,817		3,817
081	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	9,595		9,595
082	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	29,581		29,581
083	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	285,849		285,849
084	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	36,656		36,656
085	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	9,835		9,835
086	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	580		580
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**5,024,626**	**–1,303,693**	**3,720,933**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
087	0603208N	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	21,708		21,708
088	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	11,101		11,101
089	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	39,878		39,878
090	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	53,059		53,059
091	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	21,358		21,358
092	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	4,515		4,515
093	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,514		1,514
094	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	5,875		5,875
095	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	81,553		81,553
096	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	272,149		272,149
097	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	27,235	25,000	52,235
		UH–1Y/AH–1Z Readiness Improvement Unfunded Requirement		[25,000]	
098	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	35,763		35,763
099	0604262N	V–22A	87,918		87,918
100	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	12,679		12,679
101	0604269N	EA–18	56,921		56,921
102	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	23,685		23,685

103	0604273N	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	507,093		507,093
104	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	411,767		411,767
105	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	25,071		25,071
106	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	443,433		443,433
107	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	747		747
108	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	97,002		97,002
109	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	129,649		129,649
110	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	11,647		11,647
111	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION	2,778		2,778
112	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	23,695		23,695
113	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM	134,708		134,708
114	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	43,914		43,914
115	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	109,908		109,908
116	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	57,928		57,928
117	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	120,217	15,000	135,217
		Concept development		[15,000]	
118	0604522N	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM	241,754		241,754
119	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	122,556		122,556
120	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	48,213	12,000	60,213
		Program increase		[12,000]	
121	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	49,712		49,712
122	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	4,096		4,096
123	0604580N	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM)	167,719		167,719
124	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	15,122		15,122
125	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	33,738		33,738
126	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,123		8,123
127	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	7,686		7,686
128	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	405		405
129	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	153,836		153,836
130	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	99,619		99,619
131	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	116,798		116,798
132	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	4,353		4,353

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
133	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	9,443		9,443
134	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	32,469		32,469
135	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	537,901		537,901
136	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	504,736		504,736
137	0604810M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—MARINE CORPS	59,265	–12,500	46,765
		Program delay		[–12,500]	
138	0604810N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—NAVY	47,579	–12,500	35,079
		Program delay		[–12,500]	
139	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	5,914		5,914
140	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	89,711		89,711
141	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	632,092		632,092
142	0605220N	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC)	7,778		7,778
143	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	25,898		25,898
144	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	247,929		247,929
145	0204202N	DDG–1000	103,199		103,199
146	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	998		998
147	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	17,785		17,785
148	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	35,905		35,905
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**6,308,800**	**27,000**	**6,335,800**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
149	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	30,769		30,769
150	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	112,606		112,606
151	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	61,234		61,234
152	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	6,995		6,995
153	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	4,011		4,011
154	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	48,563		48,563

155	0605285N	NEXT GENERATION FIGHTER	5,000		5,000
157	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	925		925
158	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	78,143		78,143
159	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,258		3,258
160	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	76,948		76,948
161	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	132,122		132,122
162	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	351,912		351,912
163	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	17,985		17,985
164	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	5,316		5,316
165	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	6,519		6,519
166	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	13,649		13,649
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**955,955**		**955,955**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
174	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	107,039		107,039
175	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	46,506		46,506
176	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	3,900		3,900
177	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	16,569		16,569
178	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	18,632		18,632
179	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	133,265		133,265
181	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	62,867		62,867
182	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	36,045		36,045
183	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	25,228		25,228
184	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	54,218		54,218
185	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	11,335		11,335
186	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	80,129		80,129
187	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	39,087	15,000	54,087
		Anti-Submarine Warfare Underwater Range Instrumentation Upgrade		[15,000]	
188	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,915		1,915
189	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	46,609		46,609
190	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	52,708		52,708
191	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	149,997		149,997

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
192	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	24,460		24,460
193	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	42,206		42,206
194	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	117,759		117,759
195	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	101,323		101,323
196	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	67,763		67,763
197	0206335M	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S)	13,431		13,431
198	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	56,769		56,769
199	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	20,729		20,729
200	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	13,152		13,152
201	0206629M	AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT VEHICLE	48,535		48,535
202	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	76,016		76,016
203	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	32,172		32,172
208	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	53,239		53,239
209	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	21,677		21,677
210	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	28,102		28,102
211	0303150M	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	294		294
213	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	599		599
214	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	6,207		6,207
215	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,550		8,550
216	0305205N	UAS INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	41,831		41,831
217	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	1,105		1,105
218	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	33,149		33,149
219	0305220N	RQ–4 UAV	227,188		227,188
220	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	52,770		52,770
221	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	635		635
222	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	688		688
223	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	4,647		4,647

224	0305239M	RQ–21A	6,435		6,435
225	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	49,145		49,145
226	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)	9,246		9,246
227	0305421N	RQ–4 MODERNIZATION	150,854		150,854
228	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	4,757		4,757
229	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	24,185		24,185
231	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	4,321		4,321
231A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,252,185		1,252,185
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,482,173**	**15,000**	**3,497,173**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**17,885,916**	**–1,233,693**	**16,652,223**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	329,721		329,721
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	141,754		141,754
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,778		13,778
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**485,253**		**485,253**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	125,234		125,234
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	123,438		123,438
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	100,530	–10,000	90,530
		Program decrease		[–10,000]	
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	182,326	–5,000	177,326
		Program decrease		[–5,000]	
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	147,291		147,291
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	116,122		116,122
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	99,851		99,851
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	115,604		115,604
012	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	164,909		164,909
013	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	42,037		42,037

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,217,342**	**–15,000**	**1,202,342**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
014	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	37,665	10,000	47,665
		Metals Affordability Initiative		[10,000]	
015	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	18,378		18,378
016	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	42,183		42,183
017	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	100,733		100,733
018	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	168,821		168,821
019	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	47,032		47,032
020	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	54,897		54,897
021	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	12,853		12,853
022	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	25,448		25,448
023	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	48,536		48,536
024	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	30,195		30,195
025	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	42,630	10,000	52,630
		Maturation of advanced manufacturing for low-cost sustainment		[10,000]	
026	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	46,414		46,414
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**675,785**	**20,000**	**695,785**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
027	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,032		5,032
029	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	4,070		4,070
030	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	21,790		21,790
031	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,736		4,736
033	0603830F	SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM	30,771		30,771
034	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	39,765		39,765

036	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	1,246,228	–460,000	786,228
		Program decrease		[–460,000]	
037	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	3,512	10,000	13,512
		Technology transfer program increase		[10,000]	
038	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	54,637		54,637
040	0604422F	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON	76,108	–20,000	56,108
		Unjustified increase and analysis of alternatives		[–20,000]	
044	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	6,457	14,000	20,457
		SSA, Weather, or Launch Activities		[14,000]	
045	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	246,514		246,514
046	0605230F	GROUND BASED STRATEGIC DETERRENT	75,166		75,166
049	0207110F	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE	8,830	–4,900	3,930
		Program reduction		[–4,900]	
050	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	14,939		14,939
051	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	142,288		142,288
052	0306250F	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	81,732		81,732
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**2,062,575**	**–460,900**	**1,601,675**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
055	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	929		929
056	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	60,256		60,256
057	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	5,973		5,973
058	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	32,624		32,624
059	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	24,208		24,208
060	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	32,374		32,374
061	0604426F	SPACE FENCE	243,909		243,909
062	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	8,358		8,358
063	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	292,235	10,000	302,235
		Exploitation of SBIRS		[10,000]	
064	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	40,154		40,154
065	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,506		2,506
066	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	57,678		57,678

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
067	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	8,187		8,187
068	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	15,795		15,795
069	0604800F	F–35—EMD	589,441		589,441
071	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	84,438	100,000	184,438
		EELV Program—Launch Vehicle Development		[–84,438]	
		EELV Program—Rocket Propulsion System Development		[184,438]	
072	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	36,643		36,643
073	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	142,551		142,551
074	0605213F	F–22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	140,640		140,640
075	0605214F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	3,598		3,598
076	0605221F	KC–46	602,364	–200,000	402,364
		Program decrease		[–200,000]	
077	0605223F	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING	11,395		11,395
078	0605229F	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	156,085		156,085
080	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	228,230		228,230
081	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	72,084		72,084
082	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	56,343	–4,000	52,343
		Excess to need		[–4,000]	
083	0605458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E	47,629		47,629
084	0605931F	B–2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	271,961		271,961
085	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	212,121		212,121
086	0207171F	F–15 EPAWSS	186,481		186,481
087	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	18,082		18,082
088	0305176F	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	993		993
089	0307581F	NEXTGEN JSTARS	44,343		44,343
091	0401319F	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)	102,620		102,620
092	0701212F	AUTOMATED TEST SYSTEMS	14,563		14,563

		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**3,847,791**	**–94,000**	**3,753,791**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
093	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,844		23,844
094	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	68,302	5,000	73,302
		Airborne Sensor Data Correlation Project		[5,000]	
095	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	34,918		34,918
097	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	10,476		10,476
098	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	673,908		673,908
099	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	21,858		21,858
100	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	28,228		28,228
101	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	40,518		40,518
102	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,895		27,895
103	0606017F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	16,507		16,507
104	0606116F	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT	18,997		18,997
106	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	185,305		185,305
107	0308602F	ENTEPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS)	4,841		4,841
108	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	15,357		15,357
109	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,315		1,315
111	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	2,315		2,315
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,174,584**	**5,000**	**1,179,584**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
112	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	350,232		350,232
113	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	10,465		10,465
114	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	24,577		24,577
117	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	69,694		69,694
118	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	26,718		26,718
119	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	10,807		10,807
121	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	74,520		74,520
122	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	451		451
123	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	2,245		2,245

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
124	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	108,183		108,183
125	0101213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	178,929		178,929
126	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	28,481		28,481
127	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	87		87
128	0101316F	WORLDWIDE JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	5,315		5,315
131	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	8,090		8,090
132	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	123,439		123,439
134	0207131F	A–10 SQUADRONS		16,200	16,200
		A–10 restoration: operational flight program development		[16,200]	
135	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	148,297	40,000	188,297
		AESA Radar Integration		[50,000]	
		Unobligated balances		[–10,000]	
136	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	179,283	–10,000	169,283
		Duplicative effort with the Navy		[–10,000]	
137	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,860		14,860
138	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	262,552		262,552
139	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	115,395	–25,000	90,395
		Program delay		[–25,000]	
140	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	43,360		43,360
141	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	46,160		46,160
143	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	412		412
144	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	657		657
145	0207247F	AF TENCAP	31,428		31,428
146	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,105		1,105
147	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	14,249		14,249
148	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	103,942		103,942
149	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	12,793		12,793

150	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	21,193		21,193
151	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	559		559
152	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	161,812		161,812
153	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	6,001		6,001
155	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	7,793		7,793
156	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	12,465		12,465
157	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,681		1,681
159	0207452F	DCAPES	16,796		16,796
161	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	21,564		21,564
162	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	24,994		24,994
163	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	6,035		6,035
164	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,358		4,358
165	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	55,835		55,835
167	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	12,874		12,874
168	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	7,681		7,681
171	0301017F	GLOBAL SENSOR INTEGRATED ON NETWORK (GSIN)	5,974		5,974
177	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	13,815		13,815
178	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	80,360		80,360
179	0303001F	FAMILY OF ADVANCED BLOS TERMINALS (FAB-T)	3,907		3,907
180	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	75,062		75,062
181	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	46,599		46,599
183	0303142F	GLOBAL FORCE MANAGEMENT—DATA INITIATIVE	2,470		2,470
186	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	112,775		112,775
189	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,235		4,235
192	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	7,879	–2,000	5,879
		Unjustified increase in systems engineering		[–2,000]	
193	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	29,955		29,955
194	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	21,485		21,485
195	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	2,515		2,515
198	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	472		472
199	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	12,137		12,137
200	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	361		361

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
203	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,162		3,162
204	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,543		1,543
205	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	7,860		7,860
206	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	6,902		6,902
207	0305202F	DRAGON U–2	34,471		34,471
209	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	50,154	10,000	60,154
		Wide Area Surveillance Capability		[10,000]	
210	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,245		13,245
211	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	22,784		22,784
212	0305219F	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	716		716
213	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	208,053		208,053
214	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	21,587		21,587
215	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK EXECUTIVE AGENT (CDL EA)	43,986		43,986
216	0305238F	NATO AGS	197,486		197,486
217	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	28,434		28,434
218	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	180,902		180,902
220	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	81,911		81,911
221	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	3,149		3,149
222	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	14,447		14,447
223	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	20,077		20,077
225	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	853		853
226	0401115F	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	33,962		33,962
227	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	42,864		42,864
228	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	54,807		54,807
229	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	31,010		31,010
230	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	6,802		6,802
231	0401219F	KC–10S	1,799		1,799

232	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	48,453		48,453
233	0401318F	CV–22	36,576		36,576
235	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	7,963		7,963
236	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,525		1,525
237	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	112,676		112,676
238	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	12,657		12,657
239	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	1,836		1,836
240	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	121		121
241	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	5,911		5,911
242	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	3,604		3,604
243	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	4,598		4,598
244	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,103		1,103
246	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	101,840		101,840
246A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	12,780,142		12,780,142
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**17,010,339**	**29,200**	**17,039,539**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**26,473,669**	**–515,700**	**25,957,969**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	38,436		38,436
002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	333,119		333,119
003	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	42,022		42,022
004	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	56,544		56,544
005	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	49,453	10,000	59,453
		STEM program increase		[10,000]	
006	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	25,834	10,000	35,834
		Program increase		[10,000]	
007	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	46,261		46,261
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**591,669**	**20,000**	**611,669**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
008	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	19,352		19,352
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	114,262		114,262
010	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,026		51,026
011	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	48,226		48,226
012	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	356,358		356,358
014	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	29,265		29,265
015	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	208,111		208,111
016	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	13,727		13,727
018	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	314,582		314,582
019	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	220,115	–25,000	195,115
		Program decrease		[–25,000]	
020	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	174,798		174,798
021	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	155,415		155,415
022	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	8,824		8,824
023	1160401BB	SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	37,517		37,517
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,751,578**	**–25,000**	**1,726,578**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
024	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,915		25,915
026	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	71,171	65,000	136,171
		Anti-Tunneling Defense System		[40,000]	
		Increase for Combating Terrorism Technology Activities		[25,000]	
027	0603133D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	21,782		21,782
028	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	290,654		290,654
030	0603176C	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	12,139		12,139
031	0603177C	DISCRIMINATION SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	28,200		28,200
032	0603178C	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	45,389	–42,258	3,131

		High Power Directed Energy—Missile Destruct		[–30,291]	
		Move to support Multiple Object Kill Vehicle		[–11,967]	
033	0603179C	ADVANCED C4ISR	9,876		9,876
034	0603180C	ADVANCED RESEARCH	17,364		17,364
035	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	18,802		18,802
036	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	2,679		2,679
037	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	64,708		64,708
038	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	185,043		185,043
039	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	126,692		126,692
040	0603288D8Z	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS	14,645		14,645
041	0603289D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS	59,830	–10,000	49,830
		Program decrease		[–10,000]	
042	0603294C	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	46,753	–44,558	2,195
		MOKV Concept Development		[–44,558]	
043	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	140,094		140,094
044	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	118,666	–10,000	108,666
		Program decrease		[–10,000]	
045	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	43,966	–13,500	30,466
		Program decrease		[–13,500]	
046	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	141,540	–12,000	129,540
		Program decrease		[–12,000]	
047	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	6,980		6,980
050	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	157,056	–15,000	142,056
		Unjustified growth		[–15,000]	
051	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	33,515	10,000	43,515
		Efforts to counter-ISIL and Russian aggression		[10,000]	
052	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	16,543		16,543
053	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	29,888		29,888
054	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	65,836		65,836
055	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	79,037	20,000	99,037
		Trusted Source Implementation for Field Programmable Gate Arrays Study		[20,000]	
056	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	9,626		9,626

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
057	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	79,021		79,021
058	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	201,335		201,335
059	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	452,861	–25,000	427,861
		Excessive program growth		[–25,000]	
060	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	257,127		257,127
061	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,771		10,771
062	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	15,202		15,202
063	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	90,500	–20,000	70,500
		Unjustified growth		[–20,000]	
066	0603833D8Z	ENGINEERING SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	18,377		18,377
067	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	82,589		82,589
068	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	37,420		37,420
069	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	42,488		42,488
070	1160402BB	SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	57,741		57,741
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**3,229,821**	**–97,316**	**3,132,505**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES			
071	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	31,710		31,710
073	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	90,567		90,567
074	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM	15,900	4,000	19,900
		Advanced Sensors Application Program		[4,000]	
075	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	52,758		52,758
076	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	228,021		228,021
077	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,284,891		1,284,891
077A	0603XXXX	MULTIPLE-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE		86,525	86,525
		Adding from Weapons Technology Line		[11,967]	
		Establish MOKV Program of Record		[74,558]	

078	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	172,754		172,754
079	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	233,588		233,588
080	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	409,088		409,088
080A	0603XXXC	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY—HIGH POWER DE		30,291	30,291
		High Power Directed Energy—Missile Destruct		[30,291]	
081	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	400,387		400,387
082	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	843,355	27,320	870,675
		Undifferentiated Block IB costs		[27,320]	
083	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	31,632		31,632
084	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	23,289		23,289
085	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI	450,085		450,085
086	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	49,570		49,570
087	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	49,211		49,211
088	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	9,583		9,583
089	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	72,866		72,866
090	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	102,795	164,800	267,595
		Arrow 3		[19,500]	
		Arrow System Improvement Program		[45,500]	
		David's Sling		[99,800]	
091	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	274,323		274,323
092	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	513,256		513,256
092A	0603XXXC	INF RESPONSE OPTION DEVELOPMENT		25,000	25,000
		Program increase		[25,000]	
093	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	10,129		10,129
094	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	10,350		10,350
095	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	1,518	5,000	6,518
		Corrosion		[5,000]	
096	0604115C	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	96,300		96,300
097	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	469,798		469,798
098	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	3,129		3,129
103	0604826J	JOINT C5 CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT, INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY ASSESSMENTS	25,200		25,200
105	0604873C	LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR (LRDR)	137,564		137,564

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
106	0604874C	IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS	278,944		278,944
107	0604876C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT TEST	26,225		26,225
108	0604878C	AEGIS BMD TEST	55,148		55,148
109	0604879C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR TEST	86,764		86,764
110	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	34,970		34,970
111	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	172,645		172,645
112	0604887C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE SEGMENT TEST	64,618		64,618
114	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	2,660		2,660
115	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	963		963
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES	**6,816,554**	**342,936**	**7,159,490**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION			
116	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	8,800		8,800
117	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	78,817		78,817
118	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	303,647		303,647
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	23,424		23,424
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	14,285		14,285
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	7,156		7,156
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,542		12,542
123	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	191		191
124	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	3,273		3,273
125	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	5,962		5,962
126	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	13,412		13,412
127	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	2,223		2,223
128	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INTIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	31,660		31,660
129	0605090S	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS)	13,085		13,085
130	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	7,209		7,209

131	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	15,158		15,158
132	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	4,414		4,414
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	**545,258**		**545,258**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
133	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	5,581		5,581
134	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	3,081		3,081
135	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	229,125		229,125
136	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	28,674	–7,000	21,674
		Program decrease		[–7,000]	
138	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	45,235		45,235
139	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	24,936		24,936
141	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	35,471		35,471
144	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	37,655		37,655
145	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	3,015		3,015
146	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	5,287		5,287
147	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	5,289		5,289
148	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	2,120		2,120
149	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	102,264		102,264
158	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,169		2,169
159	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	13,960		13,960
160	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	51,775		51,775
161	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	9,533		9,533
162	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	17,371	4,000	21,371
		Program increase		[4,000]	
163	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	71,571		71,571
164	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,123		4,123
165	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	1,946		1,946
166	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	7,673		7,673
169	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	10,413		10,413
170	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	971		971
171	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	6,579		6,579

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
173	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)—MHA	43,811		43,811
174	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	35,871		35,871
176	0903230D8W	WHS—MISSION OPERATIONS SUPPORT - IT	1,072		1,072
177A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	49,500		49,500
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**856,071**	**–3,000**	**853,071**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
178	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	7,929		7,929
179	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA	1,750		1,750
180	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	294		294
181	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	22,576		22,576
182	0607310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS: OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	1,901		1,901
183	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS)	8,474		8,474
184	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	33,561		33,561
186	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	3,061		3,061
187	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	64,921		64,921
189	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	3,645		3,645
193	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	963		963
194	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	10,186		10,186
195	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	36,883		36,883
196	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	13,735		13,735
197	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	6,101		6,101
198	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	43,867		43,867
199	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,957		8,957
200	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	146,890		146,890
201	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	21,503		21,503
202	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	20,342		20,342

203	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	444		444
205	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	1,736		1,736
206	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	65,060	–45,600	19,460
		Ahead of need		[–45,600]	
210	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	2,976		2,976
215	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	4,182		4,182
216	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	18,130		18,130
218	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,302		5,302
221	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,239		3,239
225	0305327V	INSIDER THREAT	11,733		11,733
226	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,119		2,119
234	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	24,605	4,000	28,605
		Casting Solutions for Readiness Program		[4,000]	
235	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,770		1,770
236	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	2,978		2,978
237	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	18,151	5,000	23,151
		Medium Altitude Long Endurance Tactical (MALET) MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle		[5,000]	
238	1105232BB	RQ–11 UAV	758		758
240	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	173,934	15,200	189,134
		MC–130 Terrain Following/Terrain Avoidance Radar Program		[15,200]	
241	1160405BB	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	6,866		6,866
242	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	63,008		63,008
243	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	25,342		25,342
244	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	3,401		3,401
245	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,212		3,212
246	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	63,597	1,000	64,597
		Combat Diver		[1,000]	
247	1160489BB	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,933		3,933
248	1160490BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	10,623		10,623
248A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,564,272		3,564,272
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**4,538,910**	**–20,400**	**4,518,510**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**18,329,861**	**217,220**	**18,547,081**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	76,838		76,838
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	46,882		46,882
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	46,838		46,838
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**170,558**		**170,558**
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**170,558**		**170,558**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**69,779,182**	**–1,426,673**	**68,352,509**

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 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
060	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	1,500		1,500
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,500**		**1,500**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**1,500**		**1,500**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
231A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	35,747		35,747
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**35,747**		**35,747**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**35,747**		**35,747**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
133	0205671F	JOINT COUNTER RCIED ELECTRONIC WARFARE	300		300
246A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	16,800		16,800
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**17,100**		**17,100**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**17,100**		**17,100**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
026	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT		25,000	25,000
		Combating Terrorism and Technical Support Office		[25,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT		**25,000**	**25,000**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
248A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	137,087		137,087
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**137,087**		**137,087**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**137,087**	**25,000**	**162,087**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**191,434**	**25,000**	**216,434**

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,094,429	500,000	1,594,429
	Force Readiness Restoration—Operations Tempo		[500,000]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,546,129	141,700	1,687,829
	Flying Hour Program Restoration Unfunded Requirement		[55,000]	
	H–60 A-L Conversion Acceleration		[86,700]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,158,606	114,000	3,272,606
	Army Reserve cyber education efforts		[6,000]	
	Insider Threat Unfunded Requirements		[80,000]	
	Open Source Intelligence/Human Terrain Systems Unfunded Requirements		[28,000]	
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,214,116	1,730	1,215,846
	Gun Tube Depot Maintenance Shortfall Recovery Acceleration		[1,730]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,616,008	–8,500	7,607,508
	Public Affairs at Local Installations Unjustified Growth		[–8,500]	
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,617,169	192,700	2,809,869
	GTMO Critical Building Maintenance		[20,500]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[172,200]	
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	448,633	21,000	469,633
	Afloat Forward Staging Base Unfunded Requirement		[21,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**17,695,090**	**962,630**	**18,657,720**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	981,000	9,800	990,800
	Cyber Defender (25D) Series Course		[9,800]	
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	940,872	43,600	984,472
	Cyber Basic Officer Leadership Course		[3,100]	
	Initial Entry Rotary Wing Training Backlog Reduction		[40,500]	
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	230,324	17,300	247,624
	Advanced Civil Schooling – Civilian Graduate School 10 Percent Reduction		[–3,000]	
	Unmanned Aircraft Systems Training		[20,300]	
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	603,519	28,000	631,519
	Intelligence Support for PACOM Unfunded Requirement		[28,000]	
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	491,922		491,922
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	170,118		170,118
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,417,755**	**98,700**	**3,516,455**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	714,781	360	715,141
	TRADOC Mobile Training Team (MTT) Support Unfunded Requirement		[360]	
390	ADMINISTRATION	384,813	–8,500	376,313
	Unjustified Growth in Public Affairs		[–8,500]	
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,119,848	–4,500	1,115,348
	Spirit of America program growth		[–4,500]	
530	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	490,368		490,368
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**2,709,810**	**–12,640**	**2,697,170**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			

540	UNDISTRIBUTED		–1,107,000	–1,107,000
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–83,400]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–431,000]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[3,300]	
	Unobligated balances		[–595,900]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–1,107,000**	**–1,107,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**23,822,655**	**–58,310**	**23,764,345**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
060	AVIATION ASSETS	87,587		87,587
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	59,574		59,574
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	570,852		570,852
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	245,686	13,600	259,286
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[13,600]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**963,699**	**13,600**	**977,299**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
140	ADMINISTRATION	18,390		18,390
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	52,928		52,928
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**71,318**		**71,318**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		–7,600	–7,600
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–7,600]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–7,600**	**–7,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**1,035,017**	**6,000**	**1,041,017**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
010	MANEUVER UNITS	709,433	385,100	1,094,533
	Increased Operations Tempo to Meet Readiness Objectives		[385,100]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	943,609	119,400	1,063,009
	C3 High Frequency Radio System Unfunded Requirement		[5,600]	
	Operational Support and Initial Entry Rotary Wing Training		[69,900]	
	Restoration of Flying Hours Unfunded Requirement		[43,900]	
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	166,848		166,848
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,022,970		1,022,970
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	673,680	35,200	708,880
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[35,200]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,516,540**	**539,700**	**4,056,240**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
140	ADMINISTRATION	59,629	–410	59,219
	National Guard State Partnership Program increase		[1,000]	
	NGB Heritage Painting Program		[–1,410]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**59,629**	**–410**	**59,219**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
200	UNDISTRIBUTED		–25,300	–25,300
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–25,300]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–25,300**	**–25,300**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**3,576,169**	**513,990**	**4,090,159**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			

010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,940,365	3,300	4,943,665
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—CH–53 Contract Maintenance		[3,300]	
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,830,611		1,830,611
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	103,456	6,800	110,256
	MV–22 Fleet Engineering Support Unfunded Requirement		[6,800]	
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	376,844	13,900	390,744
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—AV–8B Program Related Logistics		[4,000]	
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—CH–53 Program Related Logisitics		[1,900]	
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—MV–22 Program Related Logisitics		[1,200]	
	MV–22 Fleet Engineering Support Unfunded Requirement		[6,800]	
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	897,536	17,000	914,536
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—AV–8B Depot Maintenance		[11,200]	
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—CH–53 Depot Maintenance		[1,000]	
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—F–18 Depot Maintenance		[4,800]	
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	544,056	11,900	555,956
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—MV–22 Aviation Logisitics		[5,300]	
	KC–130J Aviation Logistics Unfunded Requirement		[6,600]	
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	4,287,658		4,287,658
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,960,951		5,960,951
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,554,863		1,554,863
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,443		2,443
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	73,110		73,110
230	CRUISE MISSILE	110,734		110,734
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,206,736		1,206,736
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	523,122	12,000	535,122
	Ship Self-Defense Systems Maintenance Backlog Reduction		[12,000]	
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	2,220,423	25,300	2,245,723
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[25,300]	
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,472,468		4,472,468
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**29,105,376**	**90,200**	**29,195,576**

MOBILIZATION

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,464	500	6,964
	Aviation Readiness Restoration—F–18 Aircraft Activations/Inactivations		[500]	
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	361,764		361,764
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**368,228**	**500**	**368,728**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
380	RECRUIT TRAINING	9,035		9,035
410	FLIGHT TRAINING	8,171		8,171
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	168,471	–15,500	152,971
	Civilian Institutions Graduate Education Program		[–16,500]	
	Naval Sea Cadets		[1,000]	
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	234,233	500	234,733
	1–800 US Navy Call Center		[500]	
470	JUNIOR ROTC	47,653		47,653
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**467,563**	**–15,000**	**452,563**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	923,771	–9,000	914,771
	Navy Fleet Band National Tours		[–5,000]	
	Unjustified Growth External Relations		[–3,500]	
	Unjustified Growth Navy Call Center		[–500]	
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	13,967	–3,500	10,467
	Navy External Relations		[–3,500]	
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	265,948	–5,000	260,948
	Navy Fleet Band National Tour		[–5,000]	
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	48,587		48,587
600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	25,599		25,599

610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	72,768		72,768
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	577,803		577,803
710	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	560,754		560,754
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**2,489,197**	**–17,500**	**2,471,697**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
720	UNDISTRIBUTED		–887,100	–887,100
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–591,400]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–87,000]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[2,300]	
	Unobligated balances		[–211,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–887,100**	**–887,100**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**32,430,364**	**–828,900**	**31,601,464**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	931,079		931,079
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	227,583		227,583
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	746,237	28,800	775,037
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[28,800]	
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,057,362		2,057,362
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,962,261**	**28,800**	**3,991,061**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	40,786		40,786
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	164,806		164,806
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,397		23,397
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**228,989**		**228,989**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
160	ADMINISTRATION	358,395	–15,800	342,595

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	Unjustified Growth Marine Corps Heritage Center		[–15,800]	
200	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	45,429		45,429
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**403,824**	**–15,800**	**388,024**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
210	UNDISTRIBUTED		–338,200	–338,200
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–24,600]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–28,000]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[800]	
	Unobligated balances		[–286,400]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–338,200**	**–338,200**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**4,595,074**	**–325,200**	**4,269,874**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	563,722	43,500	607,222
	Reversing the disestablishment of HSC–84 and HSC–85		[43,500]	
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	6,218		6,218
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	82,712		82,712
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	326		326
050	AVIATION LOGISTICS	13,436		13,436
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	557		557
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	48,513	700	49,213
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[700]	
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	102,858		102,858
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**818,342**	**44,200**	**862,542**

	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	ADMINISTRATION	1,505		1,505
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**1,505**		**1,505**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
210	UNDISTRIBUTED		–39,700	–39,700
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–39,700]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–39,700**	**–39,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**819,847**	**4,500**	**824,347**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	97,631		97,631
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,254		18,254
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	28,653	1,400	30,053
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[1,400]	
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	111,923		111,923
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**256,461**	**1,400**	**257,861**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	10,866		10,866
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,785		8,785
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**19,651**		**19,651**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
080	UNDISTRIBUTED		–1,000	–1,000
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–1,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–1,000**	**–1,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**276,112**	**400**	**276,512**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,336,868	275,600	3,612,468
	A–10 restoration: Force Structure Restoration		[249,700]	
	A–10 to F–15E Training Transition		[–1,400]	
	EC–130H Force Structure Restoration		[27,300]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,897,315	37,700	1,935,015
	Increase Range Use Support Unfunded Requirement		[37,700]	
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,797,549	–78,200	1,719,349
	A–10 to F–15E Training Transition		[–78,200]	
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,537,127		6,537,127
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,997,712	135,100	2,132,812
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[135,100]	
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,841,948		2,841,948
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	930,341		930,341
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	924,845		924,845
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	900,965		900,965
135	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	907,496		907,496
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**22,072,166**	**370,200**	**22,442,366**
	MOBILIZATION			
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,617,571		1,617,571
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	259,956		259,956
180	BASE SUPPORT	708,799		708,799
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**2,586,326**		**2,586,326**

	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	228,500		228,500
230	BASE SUPPORT	772,870		772,870
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	359,304	20,000	379,304
	Remotely Piloted Aircraft Flight Training Acceleration		[20,000]	
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	710,553	16,000	726,553
	Unmanned Aerial Surveillance (UAS) Training		[16,000]	
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	228,252	–930	227,322
	Air Force Civilian Graduate Education Program Unjustified Growth		[–930]	
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	375,513		375,513
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	79,690		79,690
330	JUNIOR ROTC	59,263		59,263
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**2,813,945**	**35,070**	**2,849,015**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,141,491		1,141,491
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	61,745		61,745
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	298,759		298,759
380	BASE SUPPORT	1,108,220		1,108,220
390	ADMINISTRATION	689,797	–20,700	669,097
	Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System		[–20,700]	
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL	25,411	2,500	27,911
	Civil Air Patrol		[2,500]	
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	519,626		519,626
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**3,845,049**	**–18,200**	**3,826,849**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
470	UNDISTRIBUTED		–813,600	–813,600
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–562,100]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–217,000]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[2,900]	
	Unobligated balances		[–37,400]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–813,600**	**–813,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**31,317,486**	**–426,530**	**30,890,956**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,779,378	2,500	1,781,878
	A–10 restoration: Force Structure Restoration		[2,500]	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	487,036		487,036
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	109,342	300	109,642
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[300]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	373,707		373,707
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,749,463**	**2,800**	**2,752,263**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	53,921		53,921
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,359		14,359
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**68,280**		**68,280**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
110	UNDISTRIBUTED		–101,000	–101,000
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–101,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–101,000**	**–101,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**2,817,743**	**–98,200**	**2,719,543**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			

	OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,526,471	82,200	3,608,671
	A–10 restoration: Force Structure Restoration		[42,200]	
	Aircraft Support Equipment Shortfall Restoration		[40,000]	
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	740,779		740,779
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,763,859		1,763,859
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	288,786	18,800	307,586
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[18,800]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	582,037		582,037
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,901,932**	**101,000**	**7,002,932**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	23,626	1,000	24,626
	National Guard State Partnership Program increase		[1,000]	
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	30,652		30,652
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	**54,278**	**1,000**	**55,278**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
080	UNDISTRIBUTED		–162,600	–162,600
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–162,600]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–162,600**	**–162,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**6,956,210**	**–60,600**	**6,895,610**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	534,795		534,795
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	4,862,368	84,600	4,946,968
	Global Inform and Influence Activities Increase		[15,000]	
	Increased Support for Counterterrorism Operations		[25,000]	
	USSOCOM Combat Development Activities		[44,600]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,397,163**	**84,600**	**5,481,763**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
060	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING	354,372		354,372
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**354,372**		**354,372**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
070	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	160,320	20,000	180,320
	STARBASE		[20,000]	
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,374,536		1,374,536
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	642,551	1,000	643,551
	Critical Language Training		[1,000]	
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,282,755	10,000	1,292,755
	SHARKSEER		[10,000]	
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	366,429		366,429
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	192,625		192,625
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	524,723		524,723
240	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	415,696		415,696
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,753,771		2,753,771
270	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	432,068		432,068
290	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	110,612		110,612
295	OFFICE OF NET ASSESSMENT		9,092	9,092
	Transfer from line 300		[9,092]	
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,388,285	–26,592	1,361,693
	Commission to Assess the Threat to the U.S. from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack		[2,000]	
	OUSD AT&L Congressional Mandate (BRAC Support)		[–10,500]	
	Program decrease		[–24,000]	
	Readiness environmental protection initiative—program increase		[15,000]	

	Transfer funding for Office of Net Assessment to line 295		[–9,092]	
310	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES	83,263		83,263
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	621,688		621,688
330	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,379,428	5,000	14,384,428
	Program increase		[5,000]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**24,728,750**	**18,500**	**24,747,250**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
340	UNDISTRIBUTED		–494,700	–494,700
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–29,700]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–78,400]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[2,700]	
	Unobligated balances		[–389,300]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–494,700**	**–494,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**30,480,285**	**–391,600**	**30,088,685**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
020	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	100,266		100,266
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**100,266**		**100,266**
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**100,266**		**100,266**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**138,227,228**	**–1,664,450**	**136,562,778**

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 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	257,900		257,900
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,110,836		1,110,836
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	261,943		261,943
060	AVIATION ASSETS	22,160		22,160
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,119,201		1,119,201
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	117,881		117,881
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	50,000		50,000
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	4,500,666	25,800	4,526,466
	Army expenses related to Syria Train and Equip program		[25,800]	
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	10,000	–5,000	5,000
	Program decrease		[–5,000]	
160	RESET	1,834,777		1,834,777
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT		100,000	100,000
	AFRICOM Intelligence, Surveilance, and Reconnissance		[100,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**9,285,364**	**120,800**	**9,406,164**
	MOBILIZATION			
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	40,000		40,000
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**40,000**		**40,000**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	529,891		529,891

380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	5,033		5,033
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	100,480		100,480
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	154,350		154,350
530	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,267,632		1,267,632
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**2,057,386**		**2,057,386**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**11,382,750**	**120,800**	**11,503,550**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	2,442		2,442
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	813		813
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	779		779
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	20,525		20,525
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**24,559**		**24,559**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**24,559**		**24,559**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	1,984		1,984
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	4,671		4,671
060	AVIATION ASSETS	15,980		15,980
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	12,867		12,867
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	23,134		23,134
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	1,426		1,426
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**60,062**		**60,062**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	783		783
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**783**		**783**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**60,845**		**60,845**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND			
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			
010	SUSTAINMENT	2,214,899	337,743	2,552,642
	Support for ANSF end strength		[337,743]	
030	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	182,751		182,751
040	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	281,555		281,555
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**2,679,205**	**337,743**	**3,016,948**
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
060	SUSTAINMENT	901,137		901,137
080	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	116,573		116,573
090	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	65,342		65,342
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**1,083,052**		**1,083,052**
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**3,762,257**	**337,743**	**4,100,000**
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
010	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	715,000		715,000
	SUBTOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**715,000**		**715,000**
	TOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**715,000**		**715,000**
	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			

010	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	600,000	–68,550	531,450
	Realignment to Air Force		[–42,750]	
	Realignment to Army		[–25,800]	
	SUBTOTAL SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**600,000**	**–68,550**	**531,450**
	TOTAL SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**600,000**	**–68,550**	**531,450**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	358,417		358,417
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	110		110
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	4,513		4,513
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	126,501		126,501
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	75,897		75,897
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,770		2,770
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	34,101		34,101
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,184,878		1,184,878
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	16,663		16,663
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,922,829		1,922,829
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	33,577		33,577
160	WARFARE TACTICS	26,454		26,454
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	22,305		22,305
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	513,969		513,969
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	10,007		10,007
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	60,865		60,865
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	275,231		275,231
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	7,819		7,819
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	61,422		61,422
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,738,328**		**4,738,328**
	MOBILIZATION			
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	5,307		5,307

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	160,002		160,002
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**165,309**		**165,309**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	44,845		44,845
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**44,845**		**44,845**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
480	ADMINISTRATION	2,513		2,513
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	500		500
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,309		5,309
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,469		1,469
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	156,671		156,671
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	8,834		8,834
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,490		1,490
710	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,320		6,320
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**183,106**		**183,106**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**5,131,588**		**5,131,588**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	353,133		353,133
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	259,676		259,676
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	240,000		240,000
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	16,026		16,026
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**868,835**		**868,835**

	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	37,862	37,862
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**37,862**	**37,862**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	43,767	43,767
200	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	2,070	2,070
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**45,837**	**45,837**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**952,534**	**952,534**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,033	4,033
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	60	60
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	20,300	20,300
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	7,250	7,250
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**31,643**	**31,643**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**31,643**	**31,643**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	OPERATING FORCES	2,500	2,500
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	955	955
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,455**	**3,455**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**3,455**	**3,455**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		
	OPERATING FORCES		

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,505,738	42,750	1,548,488
	Air Force expenses related to Syria Train and Equip program		[42,750]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	914,973		914,973
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	31,978		31,978
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,192,765		1,192,765
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	85,625		85,625
060	BASE SUPPORT	917,269		917,269
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	30,219		30,219
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	174,734		174,734
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	869		869
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,008		5,008
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	100,190	616,500	716,690
	Assistance for the border security of Jordan		[300,000]	
	Jordanian Military Capability Enhancement		[300,000]	
	Support to Jordanian Training and Operations		[16,500]	
135	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	22,893		22,893
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,982,261**	**659,250**	**5,641,511**
	MOBILIZATION			
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,995,703		2,995,703
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	108,163		108,163
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	511,059		511,059
180	BASE SUPPORT	4,642		4,642
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**3,619,567**		**3,619,567**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	92		92

240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	11,986		11,986
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**12,078**		**12,078**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	86,716		86,716
380	BASE SUPPORT	3,836		3,836
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	165,348		165,348
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	204,683		204,683
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	61		61
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,463		15,463
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**476,107**		**476,107**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**9,090,013**	**659,250**	**9,749,263**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	51,086		51,086
050	BASE SUPPORT	7,020		7,020
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**58,106**		**58,106**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**58,106**		**58,106**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	19,900		19,900
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**19,900**		**19,900**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**19,900**		**19,900**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	9,900		9,900

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	2,345,835	79,000	2,424,835
	Classified adjustment		[64,000]	
	Global Inform and Influence Activities Increase		[15,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,355,735**	**79,000**	**2,434,735**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	18,474		18,474
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	29,579		29,579
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	110,000		110,000
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	5,960		5,960
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,677,000		1,677,000
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	73,000		73,000
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	106,709	215,000	321,709
	U.S. Special Operations Command inform and influence activities		[15,000]	
	Ukraine Train & Equip		[200,000]	
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	2,102		2,102
330	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,427,074		1,427,074
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**3,449,898**	**215,000**	**3,664,898**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**5,805,633**	**294,000**	**6,099,633**
	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND			
	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND			
090	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	2,100,000	–2,100,000	0
	Program decrease		[–2,100,000]	
	SUBTOTAL COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	**2,100,000**	**–2,100,000**	**0**

TOTAL COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	2,100,000	–2,100,000	0
TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	39,738,283	–756,757	38,981,526

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	68,873		68,873
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	508,008		508,008
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	763,300		763,300
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,054,322		1,054,322
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	438,909		438,909
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	421,269		421,269
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	164,743		164,743
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,419,424**		**3,419,424**
	MOBILIZATION			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	401,638		401,638
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	261,683		261,683
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,532		6,532
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**669,853**		**669,853**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	131,536		131,536
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	47,843		47,843
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	42,565		42,565
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	490,378		490,378
300	EXAMINING	194,079		194,079
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	227,951		227,951

320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	161,048	161,048
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,295,400**	**1,295,400**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES		
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	485,778	485,778
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	813,881	813,881
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	322,127	322,127
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,781,350	1,781,350
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	292,532	292,532
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	375,122	375,122
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	225,358	225,358
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	239,755	239,755
460	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS	223,319	223,319
470	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	469,865	469,865
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	40,521	40,521
530	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	630,606	630,606
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**5,900,214**	**5,900,214**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**11,284,891**	**11,284,891**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	16,612	16,612
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	486,531	486,531
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	105,446	105,446
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	516,791	516,791
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	348,601	348,601
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	81,350	81,350
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	40,962	40,962
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,596,293**	**1,596,293**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,665		10,665
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	14,976		14,976
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,841		8,841
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**34,482**		**34,482**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**1,630,775**		**1,630,775**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	167,324		167,324
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	741,327		741,327
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	88,775		88,775
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	32,130		32,130
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	703,137		703,137
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	84,066		84,066
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	954,574		954,574
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,771,333**		**2,771,333**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	6,570		6,570
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	68,452		68,452
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,841		8,841
170	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	283,670		283,670
180	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	2,942		2,942
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**370,475**		**370,475**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**3,141,808**		**3,141,808**

	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY		
	OPERATING FORCES		
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	37,225	37,225
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	33,201	33,201
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	787,446	787,446
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	704,415	704,415
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	96,916	96,916
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	192,198	192,198
160	WARFARE TACTICS	453,942	453,942
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	351,871	351,871
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,186,847	1,186,847
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	123,948	123,948
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	98,914	98,914
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	141,664	141,664
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	371,872	371,872
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	896,061	896,061
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,476,520**	**5,476,520**
	MOBILIZATION		
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	422,846	422,846
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	69,530	69,530
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,237	2,237
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	21,823	21,823
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**516,436**	**516,436**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION	149,375	149,375
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	156,290	156,290
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	653,728	653,728
430	TRAINING SUPPORT	196,048	196,048
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	137,855	137,855

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	77,257		77,257
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,370,553**		**1,370,553**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	120,812		120,812
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	350,983		350,983
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	335,482		335,482
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	197,724		197,724
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	274,936		274,936
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,122,178		1,122,178
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,768		4,768
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**2,406,883**		**2,406,883**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**9,770,392**		**9,770,392**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	931,757		931,757
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	86,259		86,259
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,018,016**		**1,018,016**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	16,460		16,460
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	977		977
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	97,325		97,325
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	347,476		347,476
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	39,963		39,963

	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**502,201**	**502,201**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	37,386	37,386
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	76,105	76,105
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**113,491**	**113,491**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**1,633,708**	**1,633,708**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES		
	OPERATING FORCES		
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	14,499	14,499
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	117,601	117,601
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	29,382	29,382
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**161,482**	**161,482**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	13,782	13,782
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,437	3,437
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,210	3,210
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**20,429**	**20,429**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**181,911**	**181,911**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	924	924
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**924**	**924**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**924**	**924**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE		

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATING FORCES			
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	271,177		271,177
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	382,824		382,824
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	205,078		205,078
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**859,079**		**859,079**
	MOBILIZATION			
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,229,196		2,229,196
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	148,318		148,318
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**2,377,514**		**2,377,514**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	92,191		92,191
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	21,871		21,871
210	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	77,527		77,527
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	76,464		76,464
300	EXAMINING	3,803		3,803
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	180,807		180,807
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	167,478		167,478
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**620,141**		**620,141**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	862,022		862,022
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	498,053		498,053
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	900,253		900,253
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	89,148		89,148
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	668,233		668,233

	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**3,017,709**	**3,017,709**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**6,874,443**	**6,874,443**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	226,243	226,243
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**226,243**	**226,243**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	13,665	13,665
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,606	6,606
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**20,271**	**20,271**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**246,514**	**246,514**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE		
	OPERATING FORCES		
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	485,888	485,888
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**485,888**	**485,888**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
040	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	142,659	142,659
050	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	78,416	78,416
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**221,075**	**221,075**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES		
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	570,177	570,177
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	26,073	26,073
180	DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACCOUNTING AGENCY	115,372	115,372
200	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	508,396	508,396
230	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	33,577	33,577

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**1,253,595**		**1,253,595**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**1,960,558**		**1,960,558**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	14,078		14,078
030	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	358,496		358,496
040	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	84,140		84,140
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	234,829		234,829
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	292,453		292,453
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	368,131		368,131
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	8,232		8,232
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	203,717		203,717
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,564,076**		**1,564,076**
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,564,076**		**1,564,076**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**38,290,000**		**38,290,000**

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	**130,491,227**	**–291,492**	**130,199,735**
A–10 restoration: Military Personnel		[132,069]	
Basic Housing Allowance		[400,000]	
EC–130H Force Structure Restoration		[19,639]	
Financial Literacy Training		[85,000]	
Foreign Currency adjustments		[–480,500]	
National Guard State Partnership Program increase		[5,000]	
Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[12,000]	
Reversing the disestablishment of HSC–84 and HSC–85		[30,700]	
Unobligated balances		[–495,400]	
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	**6,243,449**		**6,243,449**

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	3,204,758		3,204,758

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
INDUSTRIAL OPERATIONS			
SUPPLY MANAGEMENT—ARMY	50,432	5,000	55,432
Pilot program for Continuous Technology Refreshment		[5,000]	
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**50,432**	**5,000**	**55,432**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, NAVY			
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS		5,000	5,000
Pilot program for Continuous Technology Refreshment		[5,000]	
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, NAVY		**5,000**	**5,000**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS	62,898	5,000	67,898
Pilot program for Continuous Technology Refreshment		[5,000]	
TRANSPORTATION OF FALLEN HEROES			
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**62,898**	**5,000**	**67,898**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
ENERGY MANAGEMENT—DEF			
SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT—DEF			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	45,084		45,084

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**45,084**		**45,084**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
COMMISSARY RESALE STOCKS			
COMMISSARY OPERATIONS	1,154,154	322,000	1,476,154
Restoration of Proposed Efficiencies		[183,000]	
Restoration of Savings from Legislative Proposals		[139,000]	
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,154,154**	**322,000**	**1,476,154**
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
LMSR			
T-AKE			
MPF MLP			
POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING	15,456	674,190	689,646
Transfer from SCN—TAO(X)		[674,190]	
NATIONAL DEF SEALIFT VESSEL			
LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE	124,493		124,493
DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS	8,243		8,243
TAH MAINTENANCE	27,784		27,784
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	25,197		25,197
READY RESERVE FORCE	272,991		272,991
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND	**474,164**	**674,190**	**1,148,354**
NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND			
DEVELOPMENT		971,393	971,393
Transfer from RDTE, Navy, line 050		[971,393]	
PROPULSION		419,300	419,300

Transfer from RDTE, Navy, line 045		[419,300]	
TOTAL NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND		**1,390,693**	**1,390,693**
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	139,098		139,098
RDT&E	579,342		579,342
PROCUREMENT	2,281		2,281
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**720,721**		**720,721**
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	739,009	50,000	789,009
Plan Central America		[50,000]	
DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	111,589		111,589
NATIONAL GUARD COUNTER-DRUG PROGRAM			
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**850,598**	**50,000**	**900,598**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	310,459		310,459
RDT&E	4,700		4,700
PROCUREMENT	1,000	–1,000	0
Program decrease		[–1,000]	
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**316,159**	**–1,000**	**315,159**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
IN-HOUSE CARE	9,082,298		9,082,298
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	14,892,683		14,892,683
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,415,658		2,415,658
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,677,827		1,677,827
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	327,967		327,967
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	750,614		750,614
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,742,893		1,742,893
RESEARCH	10,996		10,996

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
EXPLORATRY DEVELOPMENT	59,473		59,473
ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	231,356		231,356
DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	103,443		103,443
ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	515,910		515,910
MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	41,567		41,567
CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	17,356		17,356
INITIAL OUTFITTING	33,392		33,392
REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	330,504		330,504
THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM	1,494		1,494
IEHR	7,897		7,897
UNDISTRIBUTED		–508,000	–508,000
Foreign Currency adjustments		[–54,700]	
Unobligated balances		[–453,300]	
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**32,243,328**	**–508,000**	**31,735,328**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**35,917,538**	**1,942,883**	**37,860,421**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS			
TRANSPORTATION OF FALLEN HEROES	2,500		2,500
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**2,500**		**2,500**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT—DEF			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	86,350		86,350
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**86,350**		**86,350**
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	186,000		186,000
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**186,000**		**186,000**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	10,262		10,262
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**10,262**		**10,262**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
IN-HOUSE CARE	65,149		65,149
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	192,210		192,210
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	9,460		9,460
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT			
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES			

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	5,885		5,885
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**272,704**		**272,704**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**557,816**		**557,816**

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	ALASKA	Fort Greely	PHYSICAL READINESS TRAINING FACILITY	7,800		7,800
Army	CALIFORNIA	Concord	PIER	98,000		98,000
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	ROTARY WING TAXIWAY	5,800		5,800
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	COMMAND AND CONTROL FACILITY	90,000		90,000
Army	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	51,000		51,000
Army	NEW YORK	Fort Drum	NCO ACADEMY COMPLEX	19,000		19,000
Army	NEW YORK	U.S. Military Academy	WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT	70,000		70,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	RECEPTION BARRACKS COMPLEX PH2	56,000		56,000
Army	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	TRAINING SUPPORT FACILITY	13,400		13,400
Army	TEXAS	Corpus Christi	POWERTRAIN FACILITY (INFRASTRUCTURE/METAL)	85,000		85,000
Army	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	HOMELAND DEFENSE OPERATIONS CENTER	43,000	–43,000	0
Army	VIRGINIA	Fort Lee	TRAINING SUPPORT FACILITY	33,000		33,000
Army	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Myer-Henderson	INSTRUCTION BUILDING	37,000	–37,000	0
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	HOST NATION SUPPORT	36,000		36,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MINOR CONSTRUCTION	25,000		25,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	73,245		73,245
Military Construction, Army Total				**743,245**	**–80,000**	**663,245**
Navy	ARIZONA	Yuma	AIRCRAFT MAINT. FACILITIES & APRON (SO. CALA)	50,635		50,635
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	MINA SALMAN PIER REPLACEMENT	37,700	–37,700	0
Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	SHIP MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	52,091	–52,091	0
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	RAW WATER PIPELINE PENDLETON TO FALLBROOK	44,540		44,540

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	COASTAL CAMPUS UTILITIES	4,856		4,856
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	F–35C HANGAR MODERNIZATION AND ADDITION	56,497		56,497
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	F–35C TRAINING FACILITIES	8,187		8,187
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	RTO AND MISSION DEBRIEF FACILITY	7,146		7,146
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Point Mugu	E–2C/D HANGAR ADDITIONS AND RENOVATIONS	19,453		19,453
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Point Mugu	TRITON AVIONICS AND FUEL SYSTEMS TRAINER	2,974		2,974
Navy	CALIFORNIA	San Diego	LCS SUPPORT FACILITY	37,366		37,366
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Twentynine Palms	MICROGRID EXPANSION	9,160		9,160
Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	FLEET SUPPORT FACILITY ADDITION	8,455		8,455
Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	TRITON MISSION CONTROL FACILITY	8,296		8,296
Navy	FLORIDA	Mayport	LCS MISSION MODULE READINESS CENTER	16,159		16,159
Navy	FLORIDA	Pensacola	A-SCHOOL UNACCOPANIED HOUSING (CORRY STATION).	18,347		18,347
Navy	FLORIDA	Whiting Field	T–6B JPATS TRAINING OPERATIONS FACILITY	10,421		10,421
Navy	GEORGIA	Albany	GROUND SOURCE HEAT PUMPS	7,851		7,851
Navy	GEORGIA	Kings Bay	INDUSTRIAL CONTROL SYSTEM INFRASTRUCTURE	8,099		8,099
Navy	GEORGIA	Townsend	TOWNSEND BOMBING RANGE EXPANSION PHASE 2	48,279		48,279
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	LIVE-FIRE TRAINING RANGE COMPLEX (NW FIELD)	125,677		125,677
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE LANDFILL CLOSURE	10,777		10,777
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM RECAPITALIZATION	45,314		45,314
Navy	HAWAII	Barking Sands	PMRF POWER GRID CONSOLIDATION	30,623		30,623
Navy	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	UEM INTERCONNECT STA C TO HICKAM	6,335		6,335
Navy	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	WELDING SCHOOL SHOP CONSOLIDATION	8,546		8,546
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	AIRFIELD LIGHTING MODERNIZATION	26,097		26,097
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	BACHELOR ENLISTED QUARTERS	68,092		68,092
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	P–8A DETACHMENT SUPPORT FACILITIES	12,429		12,429
Navy	ITALY	Sigonella	P–8A HANGAR AND FLEET SUPPORT FACILITY	62,302	–62,302	0

Navy	ITALY	Sigonella	TRITON HANGAR AND OPERATION FACILITY	40,641	–40,641	0
Navy	JAPAN	Camp Butler	MILITARY WORKING DOG FACILITIES (CAMP HANSEN)	11,697		11,697
Navy	JAPAN	Iwakuni	E–2D OPERATIONAL TRAINER COMPLEX	8,716		8,716
Navy	JAPAN	Iwakuni	SECURITY MODIFICATIONS—CVW5/MAG12 HQ	9,207		9,207
Navy	JAPAN	Kadena AB	AIRCRAFT MAINT. SHELTERS & APRON	23,310		23,310
Navy	JAPAN	Yokosuka	CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER	13,846		13,846
Navy	MARYLAND	Patuxent River	UNACCOMPANIED HOUSING	40,935		40,935
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	2ND RADIO BN COMPLEX OPERATIONS CONSOLIDATION.	0		0
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	SIMULATOR INTEGRATION/RANGE CONTROL FACILITY	54,849		54,849
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	KC130J ENLSITED AIR CREW TRAINER FACILITY	4,769		4,769
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM FACILITIES	29,657		29,657
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	OPERATIONAL TRAINER FACILITY	3,312		3,312
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	RADAR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL FACILITY ADDITION	4,918		4,918
Navy	POLAND	RedziKowo Base	AEGIS ASHORE MISSILE DEFENSE COMPLEX	51,270	–51,270	0
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	Parris Island	RANGE SAFETY IMPROVEMENTS & MODERNIZATION	27,075		27,075
Navy	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	MARITIME SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM FACILITY	23,066		23,066
Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	COMMUNICATIONS CENTER	75,289		75,289
Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	ELECTRICAL REPAIRS TO PIERS 2,6,7, AND 11	44,254		44,254
Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	MH60 HELICOPTER TRAINING FACILITY	7,134		7,134
Navy	VIRGINIA	Portsmouth	WATERFRONT UTILITIES	45,513		45,513
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	ATFP GATE	5,840		5,840
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	ELECTRICAL DISTRIBUTION UPGRADE	8,418		8,418
Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	EMBASSY SECURITY GUARD BEQ & OPS FACILITY	43,941		43,941
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bangor	REGIONAL SHIP MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	0		0
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bangor	WRA LAND/WATER INTERFACE	34,177		34,177
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bremerton	DRY DOCK 6 MODERNIZATION & UTILITY IMPROVE.	22,680		22,680
Navy	WASHINGTON	Indian Island	SHORE POWER TO AMMUNITION PIER	4,472		4,472
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCON DESIGN FUNDS	91,649		91,649
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	22,590		22,590

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Military Construction, Navy Total				**1,605,929**	**–244,004**	**1,361,925**
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F–35A FLIGHT SIM/ALTER SQUAD OPS/AMU FACILITY	37,000		37,000
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	RPR CENTRAL HEAT & POWER PLANT BOILER PH3	34,400		34,400
AF	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC–130J AGE COVERED STORAGE	4,700		4,700
AF	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC–130J WASH RACK	12,200		12,200
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35A ADAL FUEL OFFLOAD FACILITY	5,000		5,000
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35A AIRCRAFT MAINTENANCE HANGAR/SQ 3	13,200		13,200
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35A BOMB BUILD-UP FACILITY	5,500		5,500
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35A SQ OPS/AMU/HANGAR/SQ 4	33,000		33,000
AF	COLORADO	U.S. Air Force Academy	FRONT GATES FORCE PROTECTION ENHANCEMENTS	10,000		10,000
AF	FLORIDA	Cape Canaveral Afs	RANGE COMMUNICATIONS FACILITY	21,000		21,000
AF	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	F–35A CONSOLIDATED HQ FACILITY	8,700		8,700
AF	FLORIDA	Hurlburt Field	ADAL 39 INFORMATION OPERATIONS SQUAD FACILITY.	14,200		14,200
AF	GREENLAND	Thule AB	THULE CONSOLIDATION PH 1	41,965		41,965
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	APR—DISPERSED MAINT SPARES & SE STORAGE FAC.	19,000		19,000
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	APR—INSTALLATION CONTROL CENTER	22,200		22,200
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	APR—SOUTH RAMP UTILITIES PHASE 2	7,100		7,100
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PAR—LO/CORROSION CNTRL/COMPOSITE REPAIR	0		0
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC ROADS	2,500		2,500
AF	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	F–22 FIGHTER ALERT FACILITY	46,000		46,000
AF	JAPAN	Yokota AB	C–130J FLIGHT SIMULATOR FACILITY	8,461		8,461
AF	KANSAS	Mcconnell AFB	KC–46A ADAL DEICING PADS	4,300		4,300
AF	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	CYBERCOM JOINT OPERATIONS CENTER, INCREMENT 3.	86,000		86,000

AF	MISSOURI	Whiteman AFB	CONSOLIDATED STEALTH OPS & NUCLEAR ALERT FAC.	29,500		29,500
AF	MONTANA	Malmstrom AFB	TACTICAL RESPONSE FORCE ALERT FACILITY	19,700		19,700
AF	NEBRASKA	Offutt AFB	DORMITORY (144 RM)	21,000		21,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35A AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS	31,000		31,000
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35A LIVE ORDNANCE LOADING AREA	34,500		34,500
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35A MUNITIONS MAINTENANCE FACILITIES	3,450		3,450
AF	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	CONSTRUCT AT/FP GATE—PORTALES	7,800		7,800
AF	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	MARSHALLING AREA ARM/DE-ARM PAD D	3,000		3,000
AF	NEW MEXICO	Kirtland AFB	SPACE VEHICLES COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT LAB	12,800		12,800
AF	NIGER	Agadez	CONSTRUCT AIRFIELD AND BASE CAMP	50,000	–50,000	0
AF	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWER/BASE OPS FACILITY	17,100		17,100
AF	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	DORMITORY (120 RM)	18,000		18,000
AF	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	KC–46A FTU ADAL FUEL CELL MAINT HANGAR	10,400		10,400
AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL TOWER	12,900		12,900
AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	KC–46A DEPOT MAINTENANCE DOCK	37,000		37,000
AF	OMAN	Al Musannah AB	AIRLIFT APRON	25,000	–25,000	0
AF	SOUTH DAKOTA	Ellsworth AFB	DORMITORY (168 RM)	23,000		23,000
AF	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT CLASSROOMS/DINING FACILITY 3	35,000		35,000
AF	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT RECRUIT DORMITORY 5	71,000		71,000
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	Croughton RAF	CONSOLIDATED SATCOM/TECH CONTROL FACILITY	36,424		36,424
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	Croughton RAF	JIAC CONSOLIDATION—PH 2	94,191		94,191
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	F–35A FLIGHT SIMULATOR ADDITION PHASE 2	5,900		5,900
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	F–35A HANGAR 40/42 ADDITIONS AND AMU	21,000		21,000
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	HAYMAN IGLOOS	11,500		11,500
AF	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	LONG RANGE STRIKE BOMBER	77,130	0	77,130
AF	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	MUNITIONS STORAGE	3,000		3,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	89,164		89,164
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	22,900		22,900
AF	WYOMING	F. E. Warren AFB	WEAPON STORAGE FACILITY	95,000		95,000
Military Construction, Air Force Total				**1,354,785**	**–75,000**	**1,279,785**

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	ALABAMA	Fort Rucker	FORT RUCKER ES/PS CONSOLIDATION/REPLACEMENT	46,787		46,787
Def-Wide	ALABAMA	Maxwell AFB	MAXWELL ES/MS REPLACEMENT/RENOVATION	32,968		32,968
Def-Wide	ARIZONA	Fort Huachuca	JITC BUILDINGS 52101/52111 RENOVATIONS	3,884		3,884
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	SOF COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT FACILITY	10,181		10,181
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton	SOF PERFORMANCE RESILIENCY CENTER-WEST	10,371	–10,371	0
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF LOGISTICS SUPPORT UNIT ONE OPS FAC. #2	47,218	–47,218	0
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Fresno Yosemite IAP ANG	REPLACE FUEL STORAGE AND DISTRIB. FACILITIES	10,700		10,700
Def-Wide	COLORADO	Fort Carson	SOF LANGUAGE TRAINING FACILITY	8,243		8,243
Def-Wide	CONUS CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	OPERATIONS SUPPORT FACILITY	20,065	–20,065	0
Def-Wide	DELAWARE	Dover AFB	CONSTRUCT HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	21,600		21,600
Def-Wide	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier	CONSTRUCT FUEL STORAGE & DISTRIB. FACILITIES	43,700	–43,700	0
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Hurlburt Field	SOF FUEL CELL MAINTENANCE HANGAR	17,989		17,989
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Macdill AFB	SOF OPERATIONAL SUPPORT FACILITY	39,142		39,142
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Moody AFB	REPLACE PUMPHOUSE AND TRUCK FILLSTANDS	10,900		10,900
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Garmisch	GARMISCH E/MS-ADDITION/MODERNIZATION	14,676		14,676
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	GRAFENWOEHR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REPLACEMENT.	38,138		38,138
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	MEDICAL CENTER REPLACEMENT INCR 5	85,034		85,034
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	CONSTRUCT FUEL PIPELINE	5,500		5,500
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC ADDITION	34,071		34,071
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Stuttgart-Patch Barracks	PATCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REPLACEMENT	49,413		49,413
Def-Wide	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	MEDICAL/DENTAL CLINIC REPLACEMENT	122,071	–31,814	90,257
Def-Wide	HAWAII	Schofield Barracks	BEHAVIORAL HEALTH/DENTAL CLINIC ADDITION	123,838	–36,038	87,800
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Kadena AB	AIRFIELD PAVEMENTS	37,485		37,485
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell	SOF COMPANY HQ/CLASSROOMS	12,553		12,553
Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Knox	FORT KNOX HS RENOVATION/MS ADDITION	23,279		23,279
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW CAMPUS FEEDERS PHASE 2	33,745		33,745

Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW RECAPITALIZE BUILDING #2 INCR 1	34,897		34,897
Def-Wide	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	REPLACE HYDRANT FUEL SYSTEM	39,900		39,900
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	CONSTRUCT PUMPHOUSE AND FUEL STORAGE	20,400		20,400
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	11,565		11,565
Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF ST OPERATIONAL TRAINING FACILITIES	13,146		13,146
Def-Wide	NEW YORK	West Point	WEST POINT ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REPLACEMENT	55,778		55,778
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	SOF COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT FACILITY	14,036		14,036
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	SOF MARINE BATTALION COMPANY/TEAM FACILITIES	54,970		54,970
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	BUTNER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REPLACEMENT	32,944		32,944
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF 21 STS OPERATIONS FACILITY	16,863	–2,529	14,334
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF BATTALION OPERATIONS FACILITY	38,549		38,549
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF INDOOR RANGE	8,303		8,303
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF INTELLIGENCE TRAINING CENTER	28,265		28,265
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF SPECIAL TACTICS FACILITY (PH 2)	43,887		43,887
Def-Wide	OHIO	Wright-Patterson AFB	SATELLITE PHARMACY REPLACEMENT	6,623		6,623
Def-Wide	OREGON	Klamath Falls IAP	REPLACE FUEL FACILITIES	2,500		2,500
Def-Wide	PENNSYLVANIA	Philadelphia	REPLACE HEADQUARTERS	49,700		49,700
Def-Wide	POLAND	RedziKowo Base	AEGIS ASHORE MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM COMPLEX	169,153	–169,153	0
Def-Wide	SOUTH CAROLINA	Fort Jackson	PIERCE TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL REPLACEMENT.	26,157		26,157
Def-Wide	SPAIN	Rota	ROTA ES AND HS ADDITIONS	13,737		13,737
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT INCR 7	239,884	–50,000	189,884
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	AMBULATORY CARE CENTER PHASE 4	61,776		61,776
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Arlington National Cemetery	ARLINGTON CEMETERY SOUTHERN EXPANSION (DAR)	0	30,000	30,000
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	CONSTRUCT VISITOR CONTROL CENTER	5,000		5,000
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	REPLACE GROUND VEHICLE FUELING FACILITY	4,500		4,500
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	REPLACE FUEL PIER AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITY	28,000		28,000
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story	SOF APPLIED INSTRUCTION FACILITY	23,916		23,916
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	CONTINGENCY CONSTRUCTION	10,000	–10,000	0
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ECIP DESIGN	10,000		10,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM	150,000		150,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	EXERCISE RELATED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	8,687		8,687
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	3,041		3,041
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	31,628		31,628
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	1,078		1,078
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	27,202		27,202
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	42,183		42,183
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	13,500		13,500
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	5,000		5,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	15,676		15,676
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	EAST COAST MISSLE SITE PLANNING AND DESIGN	0	30,000	30,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	PLANNING & DESIGN	31,772		31,772
Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total				**2,300,767**	**–360,888**	**1,939,879**
NATO	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Nato Security Investment Program	NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM	120,000	30,000	150,000
NATO Security Investment Program Total				**120,000**	**30,000**	**150,000**
Army NG	CONNECTICUT	Camp Hartell	READY BUILDING (CST-WMD)	11,000		11,000
Army NG	DELAWARE	Dagsboro	NATIONAL GUARD VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP	10,800	–10,800	0
Army NG	FLORIDA	Palm Coast	NATIONAL GUARD READINESS CENTER	18,000		18,000
Army NG	ILLINOIS	Sparta	BASIC 10M–25M FIRING RANGE (ZERO)	1,900		1,900
Army NG	KANSAS	Salina	AUTOMATED COMBAT PISTOL/MP FIREARMS QUAL COUR.	2,400		2,400
Army NG	KANSAS	Salina	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	4,300		4,300
Army NG	MARYLAND	Easton	NATIONAL GUARD READINESS CENTER	13,800		13,800

Army NG	NEVADA	Reno	NATIONAL GUARD VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP ADD/A.	8,000		8,000
Army NG	OHIO	Camp Ravenna	MODIFIED RECORD FIRE RANGE	3,300		3,300
Army NG	OREGON	Salem	NATIONAL GUARD/RESERVE CENTER BLDG ADD/ALT (J.	16,500		16,500
Army NG	PENNSYLVANIA	Fort Indiantown Gap	TRAINING AIDS CENTER	16,000		16,000
Army NG	VERMONT	North Hyde Park	NATIONAL GUARD VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SHOP ADDIT.	7,900		7,900
Army NG	VIRGINIA	Richmond	NATIONAL GUARD/RESERVE CENTER BUILDING (JFHQ).	29,000		29,000
Army NG	WASHINGTON	Yakima	ENLISTED BARRACKS, TRANSIENT TRAINING	19,000	–19,000	0
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	20,337		20,337
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	15,000		15,000
Military Construction, Army National Guard Total				**197,237**	**–29,800**	**167,437**
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Miramar	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	24,000		24,000
Army Res	FLORIDA	Macdill AFB	AR CENTER/ AS FACILITY	55,000		55,000
Army Res	MISSISSIPPI	Starkville	ARMY RESERVE CENTER	9,300	–9,300	0
Army Res	NEW YORK	Orangeburg	ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP	4,200		4,200
Army Res	PENNSYLVANIA	Conneaut Lake	DAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT	5,000		5,000
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	9,318		9,318
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	6,777		6,777
Military Construction, Army Reserve Total				**113,595**	**–9,300**	**104,295**
N/MC Res	NEVADA	Fallon	NAVOPSPTCEN FALLON	11,480		11,480
N/MC Res	NEW YORK	Brooklyn	RESERVE CENTER STORAGE FACILITY	2,479		2,479
N/MC Res	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	RESERVE TRAINING CENTER COMPLEX	18,443		18,443
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR PLANNING & DESIGN	2,208		2,208
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	1,468		1,468
Military Construction, Naval Reserve Total				**36,078**	**0**	**36,078**
Air NG	ALABAMA	Dannelly Field	TFI—REPLACE SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	7,600		7,600

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Air NG	ARKANSAS	Fort Smith Map	CONSOLIDATED SCIF	0		0
Air NG	CALIFORNIA	Moffett Field	REPLACE VEHICLE MAINTENANCE FACILITY	6,500		6,500
Air NG	COLORADO	Buckley Air Force Base	ASE MAINTENANCE AND STORAGE FACILITY	5,100		5,100
Air NG	GEORGIA	Savannah/Hilton Head IAP	C–130 SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	9,000		9,000
Air NG	IOWA	Des Moines MAP	AIR OPERATIONS GRP/CYBER BEDDOWN-RENO BLG 430.	6,700		6,700
Air NG	KANSAS	Smokey Hill ANG Range	RANGE TRAINING SUPPORT FACILITIES	2,900		2,900
Air NG	LOUISIANA	New Orleans	REPLACE SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	10,000		10,000
Air NG	MAINE	Bangor IAP	ADD TO AND ALTER FIRE CRASH/RESCUE STATION	7,200		7,200
Air NG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC–46A ADAL FLIGHT SIMULATOR BLDG 156	2,800		2,800
Air NG	NEW JERSEY	Atlantic City IAP	FUEL CELL AND CORROSION CONTROL HANGAR	10,200		10,200
Air NG	NEW YORK	Niagara Falls IAP	REMOTELY PILOTED AIRCRAFT BEDDOWN BLDG 912	7,700		7,700
Air NG	NORTH CAROLINA	Charlotte/Douglas IAP	REPLACE C–130 SQUADRON OPERATIONS FACILITY	9,000		9,000
Air NG	NORTH DAKOTA	Hector IAP	INTEL TARGETING FACILITIES	7,300		7,300
Air NG	OKLAHOMA	Will Rogers World Airport	MEDIUM ALTITUDE MANNED ISR BEDDOWN	7,600		7,600
Air NG	OREGON	Klamath Falls IAP	REPLACE FIRE CRASH/RESCUE STATION	7,200		7,200
Air NG	WEST VIRGINIA	Yeager Airport	FORCE PROTECTION- RELOCATE COONSKIN ROAD	3,900		3,900
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	5,104		5,104
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR CONSTRUCTION	7,734		7,734
Military Construction, Air National Guard Total				**123,538**	**0**	**123,538**
AF Res	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	GUARDIAN ANGEL OPERATIONS	0		0
AF Res	CALIFORNIA	March AFB	SATELLITE FIRE STATION	4,600		4,600
AF Res	FLORIDA	Patrick AFB	AIRCREW LIFE SUPPORT FACILITY	3,400		3,400
AF Res	OHIO	Youngstown	INDOOR FIRING RANGE	9,400		9,400
AF Res	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	CONSOLIDATE 433 MEDICAL FACILITY	9,900		9,900
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	13,400		13,400

AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	UNSPECIFIED MINOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	6,121		6,121
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve Total				**46,821**	**0**	**46,821**
FH Con Army	FLORIDA	Camp Rudder	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	**8,000**		**8,000**
FH Con Army	GERMANY	Wiesbaden Army Airfield	FAMILY HOUSING IMPROVEMENTS	**3,500**		**3,500**
FH Con Army	ILLINOIS	Rock Island	FAMILY HOUSING REPLACEMENT CONSTRUCTION	**20,000**		**20,000**
FH Con Army	KOREA	Camp Walker	FAMILY HOUSING NEW CONSTRUCTION	**61,000**		**61,000**
FH Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FAMILY HOUSING P & D	**7,195**		**7,195**
Family Housing Construction, Army Total				**99,695**	**0**	**99,695**
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS	25,552		25,552
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASED HOUSING	144,879		144,879
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY FACILITIES	75,197		75,197
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	3,047		3,047
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	45,468		45,468
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MILITARY HOUSING PRIVITIZATION INITIATIVE	22,000		22,000
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MISCELLANEOUS	840		840
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SERVICES	10,928		10,928
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES	65,600		65,600
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Army Total				**393,511**	**0**	**393,511**
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IMPROVEMENTS	150,649		150,649
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PLANNING AND DESIGN	9,849		9,849
Family Housing Construction, Air Force Total				**160,498**	**0**	**160,498**
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	38,746		38,746
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	HOUSING PRIVATIZATION	41,554		41,554
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASING	28,867		28,867
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE	114,129		114,129
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	52,153		52,153
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	2,032		2,032
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SERVICES ACCOUNT	12,940		12,940

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Agreement
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	40,811		40,811
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Air Force Total				**331,232**	**0**	**331,232**
FH Con Navy	VIRGINIA	Wallops Island	CONSTRUCT HOUSING WELCOME CENTER	438		438
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DESIGN	4,588		4,588
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	IMPROVEMENTS	11,515		11,515
Family Housing Construction, Navy And Marine Corps Total				**16,541**	**0**	**16,541**
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	17,534		17,534
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASING	64,108		64,108
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	99,323		99,323
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	56,189		56,189
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MISCELLANEOUS ACCOUNT	373		373
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	PRIVATIZATION SUPPORT COSTS	28,668		28,668
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SERVICES ACCOUNT	19,149		19,149
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	67,692		67,692
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Navy And Marine Corps Total				**353,036**	**0**	**353,036**
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	3,402		3,402
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	20		20
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	FURNISHINGS ACCOUNT	781		781
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASING	10,679		10,679
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	LEASING	41,273		41,273
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	1,104		1,104
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MAINTENANCE OF REAL PROPERTY	344		344
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT	388		388
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	SERVICES ACCOUNT	31		31

FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	474		474
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	UTILITIES ACCOUNT	172		172
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Defense-Wide Total				**58,668**	**0**	**58,668**
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Closure, Army	BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE	29,691		29,691
Base Realignment and Closure—Army Total				**29,691**	**0**	**29,691**
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Closure, Navy	BASE REALIGNMENT & CLOSURE	118,906		118,906
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–100: PLANING, DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT	7,787		7,787
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–101: VARIOUS LOCATIONS	20,871		20,871
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–138: NAS BRUNSWICK, ME	803		803
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–157: MCSA KANSAS CITY, MO	41		41
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–172: NWS SEAL BEACH, CONCORD, CA	4,872		4,872
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–84: JRB WILLOW GROVE & CAMBRIA REG AP	3,808		3,808
Base Realignment and Closure—Navy Total				**157,088**	**0**	**157,088**
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DOD BRAC ACTIVITIES—AIR FORCE	64,555		64,555
Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force Total				**64,555**	**0**	**64,555**
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	AIR FORCE	0	–52,600	–52,600
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ARMY	0	–96,000	–96,000
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DEFENSE-WIDE	0	–134,000	–134,000
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	HOUSING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM	0	–103,918	–103,918
Prior Year Savings Total				**0**	**–386,518**	**–386,518**
Total, Military Construction				**8,306,510**	**–1,155,510**	**7,151,000**

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	Cuba	Guantanamo Bay	UNACCOMPANIED PERSONNEL HOUSING	0	76,000	76,000
Military Construction, Army Total				**0**	**76,000**	**76,000**
Navy	Bahrain	Bahrain Island	MINA SALMAN PIER REPLACEMENT	0	37,700	37,700
Navy	Bahrain	Bahrain Island	SHIP MAINTENANCE SUPPORT FACILITY	0	52,091	52,091
Navy	Italy	Sigonella	P–8A HANGAR AND FLEET SUPPORT FACILITY	0	62,302	62,302
Navy	Italy	Sigonella	TRITON HANGAR AND OPERATION FACILITY	0	40,641	40,641
Navy	Poland	Redzikowo	AEGIS SHORE MISSILE DEFENSE COMPLEX	0	51,270	51,270
Military Construction, Navy Total				**0**	**244,004**	**244,004**
AF	Niger	Agadez	CONSTRUCT AIR FIELD AND BASE CAMP	0	50,000	50,000
AF	Oman	Al Mussanah AB	AIRLIFT APRON	0	25,000	25,000
Military Construction, Air Force Total				**0**	**75,000**	**75,000**
Def-Wide	Djibouti	Camp Lemonier	CONSTRUCT FUEL STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES.	0	43,700	43,700
Def-Wide	Poland	Redzikowo	AEGIS SHORE MISSILE DEFENSE COMPLEX	0	93,296	93,296
Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total				**0**	**136,996**	**136,996**
Total, Military Construction				**0**	**532,000**	**532,000**

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 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies			
Appropriation Summary:			
Energy Programs			
Nuclear Energy	135,161	0	135,161
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	8,846,948	237,700	9,084,648
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,940,302	–39,000	1,901,302
Naval reactors	1,375,496	12,000	1,387,496
Federal salaries and expenses	402,654	–6,000	396,654
Total, National nuclear security administration	**12,565,400**	**204,700**	**12,770,100**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental cleanup	5,527,347	–384,197	5,143,150
Other defense activities	774,425	4,200	778,625
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**6,301,772**	**–379,997**	**5,921,775**
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**18,867,172**	**–175,297**	**18,691,875**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, Discretionary Funding	**19,002,333**	**–175,297**	**18,827,036**
Nuclear Energy			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	126,161		126,161
Used nuclear fuel disposition	9,000		9,000
Total, Nuclear Energy	**135,161**	**0**	**135,161**
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
B61 Life extension program	643,300		643,300
W76 Life extension program	244,019		244,019
W88 Alt 370	220,176		220,176
W80–4 Life extension program	195,037		195,037
Total, Life extension programs	**1,302,532**	**0**	**1,302,532**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	52,247	21,000	73,247
W76 Stockpile systems	50,921		50,921
W78 Stockpile systems	64,092		64,092
W80 Stockpile systems	68,005		68,005
B83 Stockpile systems	42,177	9,000	51,177
W87 Stockpile systems	89,299		89,299
W88 Stockpile systems	115,685		115,685
Total, Stockpile systems	**482,426**	**30,000**	**512,426**
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			

Operations and maintenance	48,049		48,049
Stockpile services			
Production support	447,527		447,527
Research and development support	34,159		34,159
R&D certification and safety	192,613	11,200	203,813
Management, technology, and production	264,994		264,994
Total, Stockpile services	**939,293**	**11,200**	**950,493**
Nuclear material commodities			
Uranium sustainment	32,916		32,916
Plutonium sustainment	174,698	8,400	183,098
Tritium sustainment	107,345		107,345
Domestic uranium enrichment	100,000		100,000
Total, Nuclear material commodities	**414,959**	**8,400**	**423,359**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**3,187,259**	**49,600**	**3,236,859**
Research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E)			
Science			
Advanced certification	50,714		50,714
Primary assessment technologies	98,500	21,600	120,100
Dynamic materials properties	109,000		109,000
Advanced radiography	47,000		47,000
Secondary assessment technologies	84,400		84,400
Total, Science	**389,614**	**21,600**	**411,214**
Engineering			
Enhanced surety	50,821	1,100	51,921
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	17,371		17,371
Nuclear survivability	24,461	2,400	26,861
Enhanced surveillance	38,724		38,724
Total, Engineering	**131,377**	**3,500**	**134,877**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield			
Ignition	73,334	–6,000	67,334
Support of other stockpile programs	22,843		22,843
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	58,587		58,587
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	4,963		4,963
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	8,900		8,900
Facility operations and target production	333,823	–11,000	322,823
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield	**502,450**	**–17,000**	**485,450**
Advanced simulation and computing	623,006	–6,000	617,006
Advanced manufacturing			
Component manufacturing development	112,256		112,256
Processing technology development	17,800		17,800
Total, Advanced manufacturing	**130,056**	**0**	**130,056**
Total, RDT&E	**1,776,503**	**2,100**	**1,778,603**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operating			
Program readiness	75,185		75,185
Material recycle and recovery	173,859		173,859
Storage	40,920		40,920
Recapitalization	104,327		104,327
Total, Operating	**394,291**	**0**	**394,291**
Construction:			

15–D–302, TA–55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL	18,195		18,195
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL	3,903		3,903
07–D–220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL	11,533		11,533
07–D–220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL	40,949		40,949
06–D–141 PED/Construction, Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project Y–12	430,000		430,000
04–D–125 Chemistry and metallurgy replacement project, LANL	155,610		155,610
Total, Construction	**660,190**	**0**	**660,190**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,054,481**	**0**	**1,054,481**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	146,272		146,272
Program direction	105,338		105,338
Total, Secure transportation asset	**251,610**	**0**	**251,610**
Infrastructure and safety			
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant	100,250		100,250
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	70,671		70,671
Los Alamos National Laboratory	196,460		196,460
Nevada National Security Site	89,000		89,000
Pantex	58,021		58,021
Sandia National Laboratory	115,300		115,300
Savannah River Site	80,463		80,463
Y–12 National security complex	120,625		120,625
Total, Operations of facilities	**830,790**	**0**	**830,790**
Safety operations	107,701		107,701
Maintenance	227,000	24,000	251,000
Recapitalization	257,724	150,000	407,724
Construction:			
16–D–621 Substation replacement at TA–3, LANL	25,000		25,000
15–D–613 Emergency Operations Center, Y–12	17,919		17,919

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Total, Construction	**42,919**	**0**	**42,919**
Total, Infrastructure and safety	**1,466,134**	**174,000**	**1,640,134**
Site stewardship			
Nuclear materials integration	17,510		17,510
Minority serving institution partnerships program	19,085		19,085
Total, Site stewardship	**36,595**	**0**	**36,595**
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	619,891	12,000	631,891
Construction:			
14–D–710 Device assembly facility argus installation project, NV	13,000		13,000
Total, Defense nuclear security	**632,891**	**12,000**	**644,891**
Information technology and cybersecurity	157,588		157,588
Legacy contractor pensions	283,887		283,887
Total, Weapons Activities	**8,846,948**	**237,700**	**9,084,648**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs			
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D			
Global material security	426,751	–90,000	336,751
Material management and minimization	311,584	20,000	331,584
Nonproliferation and arms control	126,703		126,703
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D	419,333	20,000	439,333

Nonproliferation Construction:			
99–D–143 Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, SRS	345,000		345,000
Total, Nonproliferation construction	**345,000**	**0**	**345,000**
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs	**1,629,371**	**–50,000**	**1,579,371**
Legacy contractor pensions	94,617		94,617
Nuclear counterterrorism and incident response program	234,390	11,000	245,390
Use of prior-year balances	–18,076		–18,076
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,940,302**	**–39,000**	**1,901,302**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	445,196		445,196
Naval reactors development	444,400		444,400
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	186,800		186,800
S8G Prototype refueling	133,000		133,000
Program direction	45,000		45,000
Construction:			
15–D–904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3	900		900
15–D–903 KL Fire System Upgrade	600		600
15–D–902 KS Engineroom team trainer facility	3,100		3,100
14–D–902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL	30,000		30,000
14–D–901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	86,000	12,000	98,000
10-D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL	500		500
Total, Construction	**121,100**	**12,000**	**133,100**
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,375,496**	**12,000**	**1,387,496**
Federal Salaries And Expenses			
Program direction	402,654	–6,000	396,654
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**402,654**	**–6,000**	**396,654**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	4,889		4,889
Hanford site:			
River corridor and other cleanup operations:			
River corridor and other cleanup operations	196,957	72,000	268,957
Central plateau remediation:			
Central plateau remediation	555,163		555,163
Richland community and regulatory support	14,701		14,701
Construction:			
15–D–401 Containerized sludge removal annex, RL	77,016		77,016
Total, Hanford site	**843,837**	**72,000**	**915,837**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	357,783		357,783
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,000		3,000
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**360,783**	**0**	**360,783**
NNSA sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,366		1,366
Nevada	62,385		62,385
Sandia National Laboratories	2,500		2,500
Los Alamos National Laboratory	188,625		188,625
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**254,876**	**0**	**254,876**

Oak Ridge Reservation:			
OR Nuclear facility D & D			
OR Nuclear facility D & D	75,958		75,958
Construction:			
14–D–403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility	6,800		6,800
Total, OR Nuclear facility D & D	**82,758**	**0**	**82,758**
U233 Disposition Program	26,895		26,895
OR cleanup and disposition:			
OR cleanup and disposition	60,500		60,500
Total, OR cleanup and disposition	**60,500**	**0**	**60,500**
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,400		4,400
Solid waste stabilization and disposition			
Oak Ridge technology development	2,800		2,800
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**177,353**	**0**	**177,353**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
01–D–416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction	595,000		595,000
01–D–16E Pretreatment facility	95,000		95,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**690,000**	**0**	**690,000**
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	649,000		649,000
Construction:			
15–D–409 Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford	75,000		75,000
Total, Tank farm activities	**724,000**	**0**	**724,000**
Total, Office of River protection	**1,414,000**	**0**	**1,414,000**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Savannah River sites:			
Savannah River risk management operations	386,652	11,600	398,252
SR community and regulatory support	11,249		11,249
Radioactive liquid tank waste:			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	581,878		581,878
Construction:			
15–D–402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6	34,642		34,642
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	194,000		194,000
Total, Construction	**228,642**	**0**	**228,642**
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**810,520**	**0**	**810,520**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,208,421**	**11,600**	**1,220,021**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	212,600		212,600
Construction:			
15–D–411 Safety significant confinement ventilation system, WIPP	23,218		23,218
15–D–412 Exhaust shaft, WIPP	7,500		7,500
Total, Construction	**30,718**	**0**	**30,718**
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**243,318**	**0**	**243,318**
Program direction	281,951		281,951
Program support	14,979		14,979
Safeguards and Security:			
Oak Ridge Reservation	17,228		17,228
Paducah	8,216		8,216

Portsmouth	8,492		8,492
Richland/Hanford Site	67,601		67,601
Savannah River Site	128,345		128,345
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,860		4,860
West Valley	1,891		1,891
Technology development	14,510	4,000	18,510
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,055,550**	**87,600**	**5,143,150**
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	471,797	–471,797	0
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,527,347**	**–384,197**	**5,143,150**
Other Defense Activities			
Specialized security activities	221,855	4,200	226,055
Environment, health, safety and security			
Environment, health, safety and security	120,693		120,693
Program direction	63,105		63,105
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security	**183,798**	**0**	**183,798**
Enterprise assessments			
Enterprise assessments	24,068		24,068
Program direction	49,466		49,466
Total, Enterprise assessments	**73,534**	**0**	**73,534**
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	154,080		154,080
Program direction	13,100		13,100
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**167,180**	**0**	**167,180**
Defense-related activities			

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Defense related administrative support			
Chief financial officer	35,758		35,758
Chief information officer	83,800		83,800
Management	3,000		3,000
Total, Defense related administrative support	**122,558**	**0**	**122,558**
Office of hearings and appeals	5,500		5,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**774,425**	**4,200**	**778,625**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**774,425**	**4,200**	**778,625**

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

MARCH 2, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find a draft of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016", that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress.

The purpose of each provision in the proposed bill is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis.

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. STELLA.

Enclosure: As Stated.

MARCH 17, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016."

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. STELLA.

Enclosure: As Stated.

MARCH 23, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016."

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. STELLA.

Enclosure: As Stated.

APRIL 3, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. STELLA.

Enclosure: As Stated.

APRIL 10, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each

proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. STELLA.

Enclosure: As Stated.

APRIL 15, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. STELLA.

Enclosure: As Stated.

APRIL 23, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Dear Mr. Speaker: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL J. STELLA.

Enclosure: As Stated.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ALGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I am writing concerning H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

This legislation contains provisions within the Committee on Agriculture's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Agriculture has a valid jurisdictional claim to a provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Agriculture is not

waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016." While the legislation does contain provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee will not request a sequential referral so that it can proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee takes this action with the understanding that its jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as such legislation moves forward. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on such legislation and requests your support when such a request is made.

Finally, I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

HON. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 1735 on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 1735, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my Committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 1735 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, which contains substantial matter that falls within the Rule X legislative jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I appreciate the cooperation that allowed us to work out mutually agreeable text on numerous matters prior to your markup.

Based on that cooperation and our associated understandings, the Foreign Affairs Committee will not seek a sequential referral or object to floor consideration of the bill text approved at your Committee markup. This decision in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interests of the Foreign Affairs Committee in this bill, any subsequent amendments, or similar legislation. I request your support for the appointment of House Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Finally, I respectfully request that you include this letter and your response in your committee report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In recognition of the importance of expediting the passage of H.R. 1735, the "Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act", the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence hereby waives further consideration of the bill. The Committee has jurisdictional interests in H.R. 1735, including intelligence and intelligence-related authorizations and provisions in the amendment.

The Committee takes this action only with the understanding that this procedural route should not be construed to prejudice the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence's jurisdictional interest over this bill or any similar bill and will not be considered precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to the Committee in the future, including in connection with any subsequent consideration of the bill by the House. In addition, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence will seek conferees on any provisions in the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation.

Finally, I would ask that you include a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter in the Congressional Record during the House debate on H.R. 1735. I appreciate the constructive work between our committees on this matter and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made.

Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. That bill,

as ordered reported, contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Natural Resources Committee, including those noted in addendum A.

In the interest of permitting you to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this very important bill, I am willing to waive this committee's right to a sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that the Natural Resources Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of the Natural Resources committee to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you and your staff have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees, and congratulations on this significant achievement.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in matters being considered in H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 1735 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to

request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business pursuant to Rule X(q) of the House of Representatives.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the right of the Committee on Small Business to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Small Business does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject mat-

ters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X(q) jurisdiction, including future bills that the Committee on Armed Services will consider. I request that you urge the Speaker to appoint members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this issue and others between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology takes this action only with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your

including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write concerning H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R.

1735 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 30, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding several provisions contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill on the following provisions.

Title 5, Section 562—Availability of Additional Training Opportunities under Transition Assistance Program

Title 5, Section 565—Recognition of Additional Involuntary Mobilization Duty Authorities Exempt from Five-Year Limit on Reemployment Rights of Persons who Serve in the Uniformed Services

Title 5, Section 566—Job Training and Post-Service Placement Executive Committee

Title 5, Section 592—Honoring Certain Members of the Reserve Components as Veterans

Title 5, Section 701—Joint Uniform Formulary for Transition of Care

Title 7, Section 721—Extension of Authority for DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund

Title 7, Section 722—Extension of Authority for Joint Department of Defense–Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund

Title 12, Section 1251—Sense of Congress Recognizing the 70th Anniversary of the End of Allied Military Engagement in the Pacific Theater

Title 14, Section 1431—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

The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JEFF MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. Jeff Miller,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. How-

ever, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 1735 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

PAUL RYAN,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has a valid jurisdictional claim to a provision in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

FISCAL DATA

Pursuant to clause 3(d) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee attempted to ascertain annual outlays resulting from the bill during fiscal year 2016 and each of the following 5 fiscal years. The results of such efforts are reflected in the committee cost estimate, which is included in this report pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE

MAY 4, 2015.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has completed a preliminary estimate of the direct spending effects of H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on April 30, 2015. This preliminary estimate is based on legislative language for H.R. 1735 that was provided to CBO on May 1, 2015. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 1735, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

H.R. 1735 would make several major changes to the military retirement system beginning in 2018. One such change, requiring the Department of Defense to make matching contributions to the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) on behalf of military personnel, would encourage service members to increase their contributions to the TSP, thereby reducing their taxable income. CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation estimate that enacting this bill would reduce revenues by about $1.3 billion over the 2018–2025 period (see attached table). Several other provisions would change direct spending by less than $500,000 over the 2016–2025 period. Because the bill would affect revenues and direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures apply.

In the decade after 2025 and in subsequent decades, CBO expects that other changes to the military retirement system in the bill would reduce mandatory spending from the Military Retirement Trust Fund by more than the revenue losses from expanded participation in the TSP in those years.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is David Newman, who can be reached at 226–2840.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF THE IMPACT OF H.R. 1735 ON REVENUES AND DIRECT SPENDING

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars											
	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2016–2020	2016–2025
Thrift Savings Plan Changes in Revenues [a]	0	0	−51	−125	−154	−168	−183	−198	−214	−230	−330	−1,323

Sources: CBO and the Staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT).

Notes: Sections 631–634 would make several major changes to the military retirement system beginning in 2018. One such change, requiring the Department of Defense to make matching contributions to the Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) on behalf of military personnel, would encourage service members to increase their contributions to the TSP, thereby reducing their taxable income. As a result, CBO and JCT expect that revenues would decline relative to current law. In the decade after 2025 and in subsequent decades, CBO expects that other changes to the military retirement system in sections 631–634 would reduce mandatory spending from the Military Retirement Trust Fund by more than the revenue losses from expanded participation in the TSP in those years.

Other provisions of H.R. 1735 would change direct spending by less than $500,000 over the 2016–2025 period.

[a] Negative numbers signify a reduction in revenues.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

Pursuant to clause (3)(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344):

(1) This legislation does not provide budget authority subject to an allocation made pursuant to section 302(b) of Public Law 93–344;

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Estimate included in this report pursuant to clause (3)(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives contains CBO's projection of how this legislation will affect the levels of budget authority, budget outlays, revenues, and tax expenditures for fiscal year 2016 and for the ensuring 5 fiscal years; and

(3) The CBO Estimate does not identify any new budget authority for assistance to state and local governments by this measure at the time that this report was filed.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause (3)(d)(2)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Congressional Budget Office Estimate included in this report satisfies the requirement for the committee to include an estimate by the committee of the costs incurred in carrying out this bill.

ADVISORY OF EARMARKS

The committee finds that H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, as reported, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the general goal and objective of H.R. 1735 is to meet the national security needs of a nation at war, while preparing our warfighters for the threats of tomorrow, wherever and whenever they might emerge. This legislation would meet that goal while taking initial steps to reform the Department of Defense and balance the responsibilities of fiscal stewardship incumbent upon Congress in a time of economic stress. Only by providing for the common defense in an efficient, fiscally responsible manner can the Nation address our national security challenges.

The bill would sustain equipment and weapon systems vital to the success of our service men and women, while taking steps to provide them more efficiently. The committee took steps to initiate

reforms within the acquisition system, military compensation and benefits, and the organizational overhead of the Department of Defense. The committee's intent is not only to procure services and equipment more cost-effectively, but also to increase the flexibility of the institution to address emerging threats and to put the military on a sustainable fiscal footing while ensuring the military services can recruit and retain a highly qualified, all-volunteer force.

The reforms to the defense acquisition system were previewed earlier this year as H.R. 1597, the Agile Acquisition to Retain Technological Edge Act, sponsored by Chairman Thornberry and Ranking Member Smith. The measures would streamline the acquisition process, advancing critical decisions to the initial stages of the acquisition process, reducing the number of required legal certifications while maintaining needed accountability, and empowering program managers and other Department of Defense decision makers to make judgments in the best interests of our troops and the taxpayer. The bill would make changes to the acquisition strategy required for major defense programs, including the consolidation of at least six separate reporting requirements into a single, living document. Furthermore, these reforms would empower the workforce by removing obstacles that make it difficult for military personnel to serve in acquisition roles; make the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund permanent; require training on the commercial market, including on commercial market research, to expand access to this valuable sector; and expand ethics training for the acquisition workforce. The bill would also simplify the chain of command for acquisition decisions, reforming a process currently mired in layers of bureaucracy.

The committee recognizes that an agile military depends on recruiting and retaining the best talent. This means the military must compete with the private sector, high-tech firms, and industry, to bring in or to hold onto top talent. To compete effectively, the Department of Defense must offer benefits on par with or better than the private marketplace. The committee is grateful to the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission for its work in recommending needed reforms. The committee believes that after years of study, it is appropriate to take the initial steps to modernize the military's retirement system. However, the committee is acutely aware of the potential for unintended consequences and the need to give the Department time to do its own assessment of these important recommendations.

An agile military also efficiently manages the workforce and keeps the size of headquarters in balance with the force in the field. The committee supports efforts by the Department to reduce headquarters budgets and personnel, if those reductions are taken in a strategic manner, preserving critical competencies, such as organic maintenance and the acquisition workforce. However, it is not clear if these efforts are resulting in efficiencies, since the Department lacks a baseline from which to measure reductions against, as noted by the Government Accountability Office. Therefore, the committee would mandate the implementation of certain reductions to headquarters budgets and personnel and require a baseline from which to hold the Department accountable.

The committee also shares the concerns expressed by the Secretary of Defense and other current and former senior defense officials that they need additional tools and flexibility to shape the workforce and to retain the best and brightest, particularly under the current budgetary environment. The legislation would express a sense of Congress on the need for a performance management system to assist managers in managing the workforce. Elsewhere in this report, the committee requires the Secretary to brief the committee on additional authorities required to shape and manage the total workforce.

The committee is aware that Congress can often be the source of inefficiency in the Department of Defense. To free up vital manpower, the legislation would take a number of actions that eliminate over 460 congressionally mandated reports over the next 6 years that provide little value to the military or Congress.

Finally, while the committee supports national defense funding consistent with the President's request, it also cuts excessive or wasteful expenditures and dedicates those resources to more urgent needs. For example, the committee freed resources from within the Foreign Currency Fluctuation, Defense (FCF,D) Account and the reserve account for fuel. In the committee report accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (H. Rept. 113–446), the committee encouraged the Department to consider the current foreign currency balance when determining future currency levels. The fund has been at its statutory limit of $970.0 million since 2012. The current budget request failed to change how foreign currency rates are calculated. Moreover, the Department continues to rely on rates calculated in 2009 for fuel, rather than estimated market prices for the upcoming fiscal year. The committee would re-direct these and other funds to higher priority programs.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no Federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no Federal intergovernmental mandates.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

Consistent with the requirements of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the committee finds that the functions of the proposed advisory committee authorized in the bill are not currently being nor could they be performed by one or more agencies, an advisory committee already in existence or by enlarging the mandate of an existing advisory committee.

APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee finds that this legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104–1).

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

No provision of H.R. 1735 establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTED RULE MAKINGS

The committee estimates that H.R. 1735 requires no directed rule makings.

COMMITTEE VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 1735. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 1735 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60–2, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 1

H.R. 1735

On Courtney Log 042

Description: Strikes section 1023, a provision that reduces the term of a cruiser maintenance availability, that was included in the Seapower and Projection Forces subcommittee mark.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson			
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard		x	

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**24**	**38**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 2

H.R. 1735

On Bishop Log 089

Description: Provision would permanently extend the land withdrawals for certain military reservations.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**36**	**27**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 3

H.R. 1735

On Wilson Log 092

Description: Amend existing law to allow an agency to object to the inclusion of certain property on the National Register or its designation as a National Historic Landmark for reasons of national security.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner				Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**35**	**27**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 4

H.R. 1735

On Tsongas Log 006

Description: Strikes the provision regarding the greater sage grouse in Section 2862.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner				Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**36**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 5

H.R. 1735

On Rogers 061

Description: Would allow the Army to transfer excess .45 caliber M1911A1 pistols to the Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety, also known as the Civilian Marksmanship Program (CMP).

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**42**	**21**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 6

H.R. 1735

On Conaway Log 293

Description: Only allows the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract to plan, design, refurbish, or construct a biofuels facility if authorized by law to do so.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**32**	**31**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 7

H.R. 1735

On Gibson Log 257

Description: Add a sense of congress thanking the commission for their work and requesting time for members to engage servicemembers and families about retirement and healthcare reform. Require an assessment and report from the DoD on retirement and healthcare reform.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**8**	**55**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 8

H.R. 1735

On Gallego Log 280

Description: Sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should consider allowing Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA)-eligible individuals to serve in the military.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**30**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 9

H.R. 1735

On Veasey Log 021r1

Description: Evaluation of whether allowing those who are considered Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals could expanded pool of potential recruits, and estimation of how making eligible for enlistment of DACA applicants would impact military readiness.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**34**	**29**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 10

H.R. 1735

On Speier Log 157r1

Description: Requires prosecution of military training instructors accused of sexual contact with trainees during basic training.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**14**	**49**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 11

H.R. 1735

On Speier Log 201

Description: Directs that all prosecutorial decisions for sexual assault cases be made by the Office of the Chief Prosecutor, independent of the defendant's or victim's chain of command.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**23**	**40**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 12

H.R. 1735

On Franks Log 207r1

Description: This amendment would task MDA to commence initial concept development for a space-based missile defense intercept and defeat layer.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne							
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**35**	**27**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 13

H.R. 1735

On Cooper Log 51r1

Description: Strikes section 3117, the prohibition on funding fixed portal monitors.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne							
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 14

H.R. 1735

On Sanchez Log 164

Description: Requires an independent study on extended nuclear deterrence and assurance.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne							
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**36**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 15

H.R. 1735

On Sanchez Log 241r1
Description: Authorize DoD funding transfer for non-proliferation.
Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn				Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne							
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**35**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 16

H.R. 1735

On Sanchez Log 311r3

Description: Increases funding for Army O&M, Base Operations Support by $237.7 million and increases funding for several computing and ignition efforts at NNSA by $23.0 million; with offset from NNSA Weapons Activities.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne							
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**22**	**40**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 17

H.R. 1735

On Sanchez 168r1

Description: Cost-sharing arrangements with NATO for the deployment of forward-based nuclear weapons in states of NATO.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**36**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 18

H.R. 1735

On Cooper Log 289
Description: Cuts $125M from MOX and adds $125M to Infrastructure and Safety related to Recapitalization.
Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**23**	**40**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 19

H.R. 1735

On Moulton Log 211r1

Description: Substitute Amendment to Log 274 - Would allow the Air Force to partially retire the A-10 aircraft in FY16 (164 out of 283 a/c). As a result, this amendment makes available $682.7 million for unfunded requirements of the military services for counter-IED technology, MQ-9 Reapers, F-16 upgrades, etc.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**37**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 20

H.R. 1735

On Speier Log 246r1

Description: Prohibits tax inverted companies from operating on military installations.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks				Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**13**	**48**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 21

H.R. 1735

On Takai Log 180r1

Description: Amends section 904 of the FY14 NDAA, as further amended by section 905 of the Full Committee Mark, to require the DOD to implement its own goal of reducing DOD management headquarters budgets and personnel by 20 percent for certain organizations in the National Capital Region.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks				Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**45**	**16**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 22

H.R. 1735

On Bordallo Log 183r2

Description: Amendment would strike section 906 and replace with Sense of Congress language highlighting existing federal law that requires the DOD to develop and implement a workforce performance management system.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**43**	**19**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 23

H.R. 1735

On Duckworth Log 143

Description: Strike section 594, which requires Department of Defense report on rulemaking under the Military Lending Act and delays implementing new lending rules under the Act pending submission of such report.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**32**	**30**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 24

H.R. 1735

On Fleming Log 269r1

Description: Prevents further reductions in Army end strength until 180 days after SecDef certification report provided to Congress.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**12**	**50**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 25

H.R. 1735

On Johnson Log 230

Description: This amendment prohibits the transfer, through the 1033 program, of MRAP's and M16's.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**20**	**42**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 26

H.R. 1735

On Johnson Log 229

Description: This amendment repeals a requirement that law enforcement use militarized equipment within one year of receipt.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**24**	**38**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 27

H.R. 1735

On Johnson Log 228

Description: This amendment requires a report to Congress certifying that all militarized equipment transferred through the 1033 program can be accounted for.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur		x					
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 28

H.R. 1735

On Final Passage

Description: On motion by Mr. Forbes to report the bill H.R. 1735 as amended, favorably to the House, with a recommendation that it do pass.

Apr 29, 2015.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones				Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur	x						
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**60**	**2**	**0**				

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee has taken steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and will make the analysis available as soon as possible.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN GARAMENDI'S DISSENTING VIEWS FOR H.R. 1735, THE FISCAL YEAR 2016 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

The committee has worked long and hard on the passage of the 54th National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. The NDAA is usually a time when my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee work together to prepare a committee mark that provides for a smart and strong defense. Instead, the committee refused to make many of the hard choices necessary to keep our military ready and responsive. The committee's reckless refusal to accept my amendments, which would have provided the basic information we need to make smart decisions about our nuclear enterprise, prevented me from supporting this bill.

I would like to note that there are some areas of the bill that I support. I commend the committee's continued recognition of the important role that both the RQ–4 Global Hawk and the U–2 Dragon Lady play in our fulfilling our nation's intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements. In addition, I appreciate the committee's acknowledgement that the Air Force's long-range air refueling recapitalization plans must not cause any gaps in our nation's robust air refueling capabilities. Finally, I'm pleased that the committee supports efforts to create a terrestrial-based backup to the Global Positioning System. GPS is a critical national asset, but it is potentially vulnerable to attack and efforts to create backup systems should receive the strongest backing.

Unfortunately, the committee refused to agree to even the most basic requests for information like the justification for expanding our plutonium pit capacity or maintaining a nuclear triad. Nor did the committee agree to a modest cut to the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility, which is significantly over budget and far behind schedule. Maintaining and modernizing our nuclear arsenal is expected to cost over $1 trillion over the next 25–30 years. It's becoming increasingly clear that we may not be able to afford this. We will have to make hard choices, but we run the risk of making the wrong choices if we do not have a clear picture of what the future looks like. Yet the committee has decided to continue spending billions of dollars on nuclear weapons programs that are fueling a new nuclear arms race with a willful ignorance.

Some may point out that we cannot be in a nuclear arms race because treaties like New START have reduced the number of warheads in our inventory. The number of warheads may be going down, but the weapons that remain are becoming more lethal, more precise, and harder to detect. We may not have as many active warheads as we used to, but the net effect is the same. We are spending increasingly large sums of money to upgrade our nuclear arsenal. China, Russia, France, and the United Kingdom are doing the same in response. We on the committee are the ones that must

make decisions about our trillion dollar nuclear enterprise. Shouldn't we want to get as much useful information as we can? Or are we going to just stick our heads in the sand and hope that everything works out?

Beyond the nuclear issues, I am also deeply concerned about the committee's use of the Overseas Contingency Operations account to get around the Budget Control Act's discretionary spending caps. While we all agree that sequestration harms the readiness of our military and should be repealed, we should not be using the emergency war spending account to fund long-term national security priorities that are not war-related. Using OCO in this manner does not give our military the certainty it needs, making multi-year planning difficult and hampering its ability to effectively carry out critical missions and programs. It is irresponsible and does not help us improve our national security.

I hope we can find ways to address these concerns through the floor amendment and conference processes so that we can shape the current draft legislation into a bill that is consistent with American values and that does not embroil us in yet another costly nuclear arms race. At the same time, this legislation provides the strongest support to all of our defense personnel—both civilian and military. As the representative for servicemembers at Travis Air Force Base, in Fairfield, California, which carries out a critical Air Mobility mission, and Beale Air Force Base near Marysville, which conducts a vital Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance mission, I will continue to advocate for investing in the technologies and military capabilities that are effective against 21st century threats.

JOHN GARAMENDI.

○