

**Union Calendar No. 545**

113th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - House Report 113-714

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT  
ON THE ACTIVITIES  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
FOR THE  
ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS



DECEMBER 23, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House  
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

49-006

WASHINGTON : 2014

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

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

MAC THORNBERRY, Texas	ADAM SMITH, Washington
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia	MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
JEFF MILLER, Florida	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
ROB BISHOP, Utah	RICK LARSEN, Washington
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia	COLLEEN W. HANABUSA, Hawaii
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	JACKIE SPEIER, California
JOHN FLEMING, Louisiana	RON BARBER, Arizona
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	ANDRÉ CARSON, Indiana
E. SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia	CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	DANIEL B. MAFFEI, New York
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	DEREK KILMER, Washington
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada	JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	SCOTT H. PETERS, California
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi	WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
MO BROOKS, Alabama	PETE P. GALLEGO, Texas
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
PAUL COOK, California	
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio	
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana	
BRADLEY BYRNE, Alabama	

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*  
ZACH STEACY, *Director, Legislative Operations*

**LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL**

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, December 23, 2014.*

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,  
*Clerk of the House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MS. HAAS: Pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I present herewith the second annual report on the activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 113th Congress.

Sincerely,

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



## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Powers and Duties .....	1
Committee Rules .....	5
Composition of the Committee on Armed Services .....	17
Committee Staff .....	22
Committee Meetings and Hearings .....	24
Legislative Activities .....	25
Oversight Activities .....	32
Publications .....	120



## Union Calendar No. 545

113TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
113-714

---

---

### SECOND ANNUAL REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 113TH CON- GRESS

DECEMBER 23, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State  
of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

#### R E P O R T

#### POWERS AND DUTIES

#### BACKGROUND

The House Committee on Armed Services, a standing committee of Congress, was established on January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812), by merging the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. The Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs were established in 1882. In 1885, jurisdiction over military and naval appropriations was taken from the Committee on Appropriations and given to the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, respectively. This practice continued until July 1, 1920, when jurisdiction over all appropriations was again placed in the Committee on Appropriations.

In the 93rd Congress, following a study by the House Select Committee on Committees, the House passed H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, to be effective January 3, 1975. As a result of those amendments, the jurisdictional areas of the Committee on Armed Services remained essentially unchanged. However, oversight functions were amended to require each standing committee to review and study on a continuing basis all matters and jurisdiction of the committee. Also, the Committee on Armed Services was to review and study on a continuing basis all laws, programs, and Government activities dealing with or involving international arms control and disarmament and the education of military dependents in school.

The rules changes adopted by the House (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1977, placed new responsibilities in the field of atomic energy in the Committee on Armed Services. Those responsibilities involved the national security aspects of atomic energy previously within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Public Law 95-110, effective September 20, 1977, abolished the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

With the adoption of H. Res. 658 on July 14, 1977, which established the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Service over intelligence matters was changed.

That resolution gave the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence oversight responsibilities for intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs of the U.S. Government. Specifically, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has exclusive legislative jurisdiction regarding the Central Intelligence Agency and the director of Central Intelligence, including authorizations. Also, legislative jurisdiction over all intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs was vested in the permanent select committee except that other committees with a jurisdictional interest may request consideration of any such matters. Accordingly, as a matter of practice, the Committee on Armed Services shared jurisdiction over the authorization process involving intelligence-related activities.

The committee continues to have shared jurisdiction over military intelligence activities as set forth in rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

With the adoption of House rules (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1995, the Committee on National Security was established as the successor committee to the Committee on Armed Services, and was granted additional legislative and oversight authority over merchant marine academies, national security aspects of merchant marine policy and programs, and interoceanic canals. Rules for the 104th Congress also codified the existing jurisdiction of the committee over tactical intelligence matters and the intelligence related activities of the Department of Defense.

On January 6, 1999, the House adopted H. Res. 5, rules for the 106th Congress, in which the Committee on National Security was redesignated as the Committee on Armed Services.

On January 5, 2012, the House adopted H. Res. 5, rules for the 112th Congress, which clarified the Committee on Armed Services jurisdiction over Department of Defense administered cemeteries.

## CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES

The powers and duties of Congress in relation to national defense matters stem from Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which provides, among other things that Congress shall have power:

- To raise and support Armies;
- To provide and maintain a Navy;
- To make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;
- To provide for calling forth the Militia;



To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States;

To exercise exclusive Legislation . . . over all Places purchased . . . for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; and

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers.

### HOUSE RULES ON JURISDICTION

Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives established the jurisdiction and related functions for each standing committee. Under the rule, all bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of any standing committee shall be referred to such committee. The jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule X is as follows:

(1) Ammunition depots; forts; arsenals; and Army, Navy, and Air Force reservations and establishments.

(2) Common defense generally.

(3) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

(4) The Department of Defense generally, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, generally.

(5) Interoceanic canals generally, including measures relating to the maintenance, operation, and administration of interoceanic canals.

(6) Merchant Marine Academy and State Maritime Academies.

(7) Military applications of nuclear energy.

(8) Tactical intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of Defense.

(9) National security aspects of merchant marine, including financial assistance for the construction and operation of vessels, maintenance of the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair industrial base, cabotage, cargo preference, and merchant marine officers and seamen as these matters relate to the national security.

(10) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the Armed Forces.

(11) Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

(12) Selective service.

(13) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

(14) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

(15) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

(16) Cemeteries administered by the Department of Defense.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction and general oversight function, the Committee on Armed Services has special oversight functions with respect to international arms control and disarmament and the education of military dependents in schools.

## INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY AND LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

H. Res. 988 of the 93rd Congress, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, amended clause 1(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to provide general authority for each committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction. That amendment established a permanent investigative authority and relieved the committee of the former requirement of obtaining a renewal of the investigative authority by a House resolution at the beginning of each Congress. H. Res. 988 also amended rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives by requiring, as previously indicated, that standing committees are to conduct legislative oversight in the area of their respective jurisdiction, and by establishing specific oversight functions for the Committee on Armed Services.

The committee derives its authority to conduct oversight from, among other things, clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to general oversight responsibilities), clause 3(b) of rule X (relating to special oversight functions), and clause 1(b) of rule XI (relating to investigations and studies).

## COMMITTEE RULES

The committee held its organizational meeting on January 15, 2013, and adopted the following rules governing rules and procedure for oversight hearings conducted by the full committee and its subcommittees.

(H.A.S.C. 113–1; Committee Print No. 1)

### RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the “Committee”) and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

(b) Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee’s rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the chair of the committee is elected in each odd-numbered year.

### RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., when the House of Representatives is in session, and at such other times as may be fixed by the Chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to as the “Chairman”), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

### RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee Chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, other subcommittee Chairmen, and the Ranking Minority Member of the subcommittee with a view toward avoiding, whenever possible, simultaneous scheduling of Committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings.

### RULE 4. JURISDICTION AND MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEES

#### (a) Jurisdiction

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense policy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security and humanitarian assistance (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base

policy, technology transfer and export controls, joint interoperability, the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, Department of Energy nonproliferation programs, detainee affairs and policy, force protection policy and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (2), the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(2) The Committee shall be organized to consist of seven standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Military personnel policy, Reserve Component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, depot policy, civilian personnel policy, environmental policy, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces: Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborne unmanned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5, 6, and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs (including national intelligence space programs), ballistic missile defense, the associated weapons systems sustainment, and Department of Energy national security programs (except nonproliferation programs).

Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-prolifera-

tion and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations. In addition the subcommittee will be responsible for intelligence policy (including coordination of military intelligence programs), national intelligence programs (excluding national intelligence space programs), and DoD elements that are part of the Intelligence Community.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations: Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

(b) Membership of the Subcommittees

(1) Subcommittee memberships, with the exception of membership on the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively.

(2) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations shall be filled in accordance with the rules of the Majority party's conference and the Minority party's caucus, respectively. Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all other Majority members of the subcommittee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all other Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee and Ranking Minority Member thereof may sit as ex officio members of all subcommittees. Ex officio members shall not vote in subcommittee hearings or meetings or be taken into consideration for the purpose of determining the ratio of the subcommittees or establishing a quorum at subcommittee hearings or meetings.

(4) A member of the Committee who is not a member of a particular subcommittee may sit with the subcommittee and participate during any of its hearings but shall not have authority to vote, cannot be counted for the purpose of achieving a quorum, and cannot raise a point of order at the hearing.

#### RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

(a) Committee Panels

(1) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(2) No panel appointed by the Chairman shall continue in existence for more than six months after the appointment. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman for a period of time which is not to exceed six months.

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all Majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority members so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

(b) Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces

(1) The Chairman of the Committee, or a Chairman of a subcommittee with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee, may designate a task force to inquire into and take testimony on a matter that falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee or subcommittee, respectively. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall each appoint an equal number of members to the task force. The Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall choose one of the members so appointed, who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee, to serve as Chairman of the task force. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee shall similarly appoint the Ranking Minority Member of the task force.

(2) No task force appointed by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee shall continue in existence for more than three months. A task force may only be reappointed for an additional three months with the written concurrence of the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee whose Chairman appointed the task force.

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

#### RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and

other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

#### RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, shall make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing or meeting before that body at least one week before the commencement of a hearing and at least three days before the commencement of a meeting. However, if the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing or meeting sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources, and promptly made publicly available in electronic form.

(b) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of legislation, or at the time of an announcement under paragraph (a) made within 24 hours before such meeting, the Chairman of the Committee, or of any subcommittee, panel, or task force shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(g)(4) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

(a) Pursuant to clause 2(e)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings. The Committee shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(b) Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

#### RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because

disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the Committee or subcommittee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, one member of that member's personal staff, and an alternate, which may include fellows, with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s), panel(s), or task force(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member or fellow at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or



subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

#### RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

- (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;
- (2) Closing Committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;
- (3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;
- (4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and
- (5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

#### RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) Subject to rule 15, the time any one member may address the Committee or subcommittee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not more than five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or subcommittee.

(b)(1) Members who are present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the Majority to Minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(2) Pursuant to rule 4 and subject to rule 15, a member of the Committee who is not a member of a subcommittee may be recognized by a subcommittee chairman in order of their arrival and after all present subcommittee members have been recognized.

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the Majority and the Minority.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force hearings and meetings.

#### RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee is authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

(1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and

(2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and documents, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Committee.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a

classification of Secret or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of the submitted written statement.

(c) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(5) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, written witness statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

#### RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath:  
 “Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?”

#### RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose according to rule 11 of the Committee.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not more than five minutes to question each witness or panel of witnesses, the responses of the witness or witnesses being included in the five-minute period, until such time as each member has had an opportunity to question each witness or panel of witnesses. Thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are within the discretion of the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

#### RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, or panel will be published officially in substantially

verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

#### RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

(e) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member or the most senior Minority member who is present at the time, may elect to postpone requested record votes until such time or point at a markup as is mutually decided. When proceedings resume on a postponed question, notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

#### RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, Minority, additional or dissenting views, all members shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such written and signed views with the Staff Director of the Committee, or the Staff Director's designee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the

question, shall be included in the Committee report on the measure or matter.

(c) Not later than 24 hours after the adoption of any amendment to a measure or matter considered by the Committee, the Chairman shall cause the text of each such amendment to be made publicly available in electronic form as provided in clause 2(e)(6) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote pursuant to clause 2(e)(1)B(i) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Information so available shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

#### RULE 20. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of Secret or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information that is received which is classified as Secret or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives, staff of the Committee, or staff designated under rule 9(c) who have the appropriate security clearances and the need to know, who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee shall, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any proprietary information that is received by the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force. Such procedures shall be consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives and applicable law.

#### RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel or task force designated by the Chairman or chairmen of the subcommittees shall be subject to the Rules of the House of Representatives.

**RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS**

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

**RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES**

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

**RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS**

Not later than January 2nd of each year the Committee shall submit to the House a report on its activities, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

### FULL COMMITTEE

Pursuant to H. Res. 6 (agreed to on January 3, 2013), H. Res. 7 (agreed to on January 3, 2013), H. Res. 17 (agreed to on January 4, 2013), H. Res. 22 (agreed to on January 14, 2013), H. Res. 453 (agreed to on January 8, 2014), and H. Res. 537 (agreed to on April 3, 2014), the following Members have served on the Committee on Armed Services in the 113th Congress:

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

MAC THORNBERRY, Texas	ADAM SMITH, Washington
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia	MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
JEFF MILLER, Florida	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	ROBERT E. ANDREWS, <sup>3</sup> New Jersey
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
ROB BISHOP, Utah	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	RICK LARSEN, Washington
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	COLLEEN W. HANABUSA, Hawaii
JOHN FLEMING, M.D., Louisiana	JACKIE SPEIER, California
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	RON BARBER, Arizona
E. SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia	ANDRE CARSON, Indiana
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	DANIEL B. MAFFEI, New York
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada	DEREK KILMER, Washington
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey	JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi	SCOTT H. PETERS, California
MARTHA ROBY, <sup>1</sup> Alabama	WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
MO BROOKS, Alabama	PETE P. GALLEGO, Texas
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota	TULSI GABBARD, <sup>4</sup> Hawaii
PAUL COOK, California	
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio	
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana	
BRADLEY BYRNE, <sup>2</sup> Alabama	

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Roby resigned from the committee on December 11, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Byrne was elected to the committee on January 8, 2014.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Andrews resigned from the U.S. House of Representatives on February 18, 2014.

<sup>4</sup> Ms. Gabbard was elected to the committee on April 3, 2014.

## SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following subcommittees were established at the committee's organizational meeting on January 15, 2013.

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations. In addition the subcommittee will be responsible for intelligence policy (including coordination of military intelligence programs), national intelligence programs (excluding national intelligence space programs), and DOD elements that are part of the Intelligence Community.

MAC THORNBERRY, Texas, *Chairman*

JEFF MILLER, Florida	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida	ANDRÉ CARSON, Indiana
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	DANIEL B. MAFFEI, New York
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	DEREK KILMER, Washington
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	SCOTT H. PETERS, California
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada	

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Military personnel policy, Reserve Component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education, and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

JOE WILSON, South Carolina, *Chairman*

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JOSEPH J. HECK, Nevada	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio	DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota	



## SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, depot policy, civilian personnel policy, environmental policy, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process, and energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense.

ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia, *Chairman*

ROB BISHOP, Utah	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota	COLLEEN W. HANABUSA, Hawaii
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia	JACKIE SPEIER, California
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey	RON BARBER, Arizona
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
E. SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia	PETE P. GALLEGO, Texas
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi	

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Navy acquisition programs, Naval Reserve equipment, and Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, lift programs, seaborne unmanned aerial systems and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Maritime programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee as delineated in paragraphs 5, 6, and 9 of clause 1(c) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia, *Chairman*

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
E. SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi	RICK LARSEN, Washington
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	COLLEEN W. HANABUSA, Hawaii
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey	DEREK KILMER, Washington
KRISTI L. NOEM, South Dakota	SCOTT H. PETERS, California
PAUL COOK, California	TULSI GABBARD, <sup>2</sup> Hawaii
BRADLEY BYRNE, <sup>1</sup> Alabama	

<sup>1</sup>Mr. Byrne was assigned to the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on January 17, 2014.

<sup>2</sup>Ms. Gabbard was assigned to the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on April 3, 2014.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs (including national intelligence space programs), ballistic missile defense, the associated weapons systems sustainment, and Department of Energy national security programs (except non-proliferation programs).

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama, *Chairman*

TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
MO BROOKS, Alabama	RICK LARSEN, Washington
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio	HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
JOHN FLEMING, M.D., Louisiana	ANDRÉ CARSON, Indiana
RICHARD B. NUGENT, Florida	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR AND LAND FORCES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—All Army, Air Force and Marine Corps acquisition programs (except Marine Corps amphibious assault vehicle programs, strategic missiles, space, lift programs, special operations, science and technology programs, and information technology accounts) and the associated weapons systems sustainment. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs and the associated weapons systems sustainment, National Guard and Army, Air Force and Marine Corps Reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
JOHN FLEMING, M.D., Louisiana	MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
CHRISTOPHER P. GIBSON, New York	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey	JOHN GARAMENDI, California
MARTHA ROBY, <sup>1</sup> Alabama	RON BARBER, Arizona
PAUL COOK, California	DANIEL B. MAFFEI, New York
JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma	JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
BRAD R. WENSTRUP, Ohio	TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois
JACKIE WALORSKI, Indiana	WILLIAM L. ENYART, Illinois
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas	PETE P. GALLEGO, Texas
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	MARC A. VEASEY, Texas
ROB BISHOP, Utah	
BRADLEY BYRNE, <sup>2</sup> Alabama	

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Roby resigned from the committee on December 11, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Byrne was assigned to the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on January 17, 2014.

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Any matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee, subject to the concurrence of the Chairman of the Committee and, as appropriate, affected subcommittee chairmen. The subcommittee shall have no legislative jurisdiction.

MARTHA ROBY,<sup>1</sup> Alabama, *Chairman*

JOSEPH J. HECK,<sup>2</sup> Nevada, *Chairman*

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas

MO BROOKS, Alabama

WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina

AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia

JIM BRIDENSTINE, Oklahoma

NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts

ROBERT E. ANDREWS,<sup>3</sup> New Jersey

JACKIE SPEIER, California

TAMMY DUCKWORTH, Illinois

TULSI GABBARD,<sup>4</sup> Hawaii

<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Roby resigned from the committee on December 11, 2013.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Heck was appointed Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on January 15, 2014.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Andrews resigned from the U.S. House of Representatives on February 18, 2014.

<sup>4</sup> Ms. Gabbard was assigned to the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on April 3, 2014.

## COMMITTEE STAFF

By committee resolution adopted at the organizational meeting on January 15, 2013, or by authority of the chairman, the following persons have been appointed to the staff of the committee during the 113th Congress:

Bob Simmons, *Staff Director*  
 Roger Zakheim, *Deputy Staff Director/General Counsel (resigned Oct. 31, 2013)*  
 Jenness Simler, *Deputy Staff Director*  
 Catherine McElroy, *General Counsel*  
 Betty B. Gray, *Executive Assistant*  
 Michael R. Higgins, *Professional Staff Member (resigned Feb. 28, 2013)*  
 John D. Chapla, *Professional Staff Member (deceased Jan. 5, 2014)*  
 John F. Sullivan, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Nancy M. Warner, *Professional Staff Member (resigned May 1, 2013)*  
 Jesse D. Tolleson, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*  
 Debra S. Wada, *Professional Staff Member (resigned Oct. 1, 2014)*  
 Douglas C. Roach, *Professional Staff Member (deceased Jan. 11, 2013)*  
 Mark R. Lewis, *Professional Staff Member (resigned May 1, 2014)*  
 Paul Arcangeli, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Jeanette S. James, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Rebecca A. Ross, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Heath R. Bope, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Lynn M. Williams, *Professional Staff Member*  
 John Wason, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Cyndi Howard, *Security Manager*  
 Douglas Bush, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Vickie Plunkett, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Timothy McClees, *Professional Staff Member and Senior Advisor to the Ranking Member (resigned Dec. 13, 2013)*  
 Kevin Gates, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Mike Casey, *Professional Staff Member*  
 David Sienicki, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Zach Steacy, *Director, Legislative Operations*  
 Everett Coleman, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Craig Greene, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Phil MacNaughton, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Jack Schuler, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Scott Bousum, *Staff Assistant (resigned Jan. 4, 2013)*  
 Ryan Crumpler, *Professional Staff Member*  
 John N. Johnson, *Staff Assistant*  
 William S. Johnson, *Counsel*  
 Jaime Cheshire, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Peter Villano, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Jim Weiss, *Research Assistant (resigned Mar. 8, 2013)*  
 Paul Lewis, *Counsel (resigned Oct. 1, 2013)*  
 Leonor Tomero, *Counsel*  
 Jamie R. Lynch, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Michele Pearce, *Counsel*  
 Catherine Sendak, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Michael Amato, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Robert J. McAlister, *Deputy Spokesman*  
 Christopher J. Bright, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Thomas MacKenzie, *Professional Staff Member (resigned May 1, 2013)*  
 Lauren Hahn, *Research Assistant (resigned Mar. 7, 2014)*  
 Brian Garrett, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Elizabeth Conrad, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Elizabeth McWhorter, *Executive Assistant (resigned June 6, 2014)*  
 Nicholas Rodman, *Clerk (resigned May 8, 2014)*  
 Andrew T. Walter, *Professional Staff Member*  
 Claude Chafin, *Communications Director*  
 Aaron Falk, *Clerk*  
 Arthur Milikh, *Clerk (resigned Mar. 20, 2014)*  
 Tim Morrison, *Counsel*  
 Kimberly Shaw, *Professional Staff Member*

Stephen Kitay, *Professional Staff Member*  
James Mazol, *Staff Assistant (resigned Mar. 12, 2013)*  
Katie Thompson, *Clerk*  
Alexander Gallo, *Professional Staff Member*  
Eric L. Smith, *Clerk*  
Joe Sangiorgio, *Communications Assistant*  
John Noonan, *Deputy Communications Director*  
Colin Bosse, *Clerk (appointed Mar. 4, 2013)*  
Julie Herbert, *Clerk (appointed Mar. 13, 2013)*  
David Giachetti, *Professional Staff Member (appointed Sept. 1, 2013)*  
Kari Bingen, *Professional Staff Member (appointed Sept. 16, 2013)*  
David Baker, *Clerk (appointed Mar. 26, 2014, resigned Oct. 3, 2014)*  
Abigail P. Gage, *Clerk (appointed Apr. 28, 2014)*  
Lindsay Kavanaugh, *Professional Staff Member (appointed May 5, 2014)*  
Katie Rember, *Clerk (appointed June 17, 2014)*  
Joe Whited, *Professional Staff Member (appointed June 18, 2014)*  
Candace Wagner, *Executive Assistant (appointed July 1, 2014)*  
Mike Miller, *Professional Staff Member (appointed Sept. 2, 2014)*

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND HEARINGS

A total of 302 meetings and hearings have been held by the Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees during the 113th Congress. A breakdown of the meetings and hearings follows:

FULL COMMITTEE .....	98
SUBCOMMITTEES:	
Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities .....	35
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	31
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	34
Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces .....	29
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	35
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces .....	26
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	14

## LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

## PUBLIC LAWS

## Public Law 113–66 (H.R. 3304)—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014

H.R. 3304 was introduced on October 22, 2013, by Mr. Theodore E. Deutch. The bill's title, as introduced, was "To authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor to Bennie G. Adkins and Donald P. Sloat of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Vietnam Conflict and to authorize the award of the Medal of Honor to certain other veterans who were previously recommended for award of the Medal of Honor," and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The committee waived consideration of H.R. 3304, and on October 28, 2013, Mr. Mike Rogers (AL) moved to consider H.R. 3304 under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by voice vote. On October 29, 2013, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. On November 19, 2013, the Senate Committee on Armed Services was discharged and the bill was laid before Senate by unanimous consent. On November 19, 2013, H.R. 3304 was passed in the Senate with amendments and an amendment to the title by unanimous consent. The following day, a message on Senate action was sent to the House.

H.R. 1960 was introduced on May 14, 2013, by Chairman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon. The bill's title, as introduced, was "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes." The committee reported H.R. 1960 favorably to the House on June 7, 2013. The House considered H.R. 1960 on June 20, 2013, under a structured rule and agreed to the measure, as amended, by a recorded vote of 315–108 (Roll no. 244).

S. 1197 was introduced on June 20, 2013, by Chairman Carl Levin. The bill's title, as introduced, was "To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes." The Senate Committee on Armed Services reported S. 1197 out of committee on June 20, 2013. The Senate began consideration of S. 1197 on November 18, 2013, but did not complete consideration of S. 1197 and therefore was unable to initiate a formal conference with the House.

In lieu of a formal conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the legislative vehicle used for the agreed upon legislative text between the House and the Senate was an amendment to H.R. 3304. The provisions granting the President the authority to award the Medal of Honor to certain individuals were retained. On December 12, 2013, Mr. McKeon moved that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution H. Res. 441, which provided for the concurrence by the House

in the Senate amendments to H.R. 3304, with an amendment, which contained the agreed upon legislative text between the House and the Senate. Pursuant to H. Res. 441, the House agreed to Senate amendments to H.R. 3304, with an amendment, by the yeas and nays, 350–69 (Roll no. 641). On December 13, 2013, a message on House action was received in the Senate and held at the desk. On December 19, 2013, the Senate agreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3304 by yea-nay vote, 84–15 (Record Vote Number 284). On December 26, 2013, H.R. 3304 was signed by the President and became Public Law 113–66.

Public Law 113–66, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, does the following: (1) Authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorizes for fiscal year 2014: (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; and (c) the military training student loads for each of the Active and Reserve Components of the military departments; (4) Modifies various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorizes appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modifies provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for the Maritime Administration.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally, and over the military application of nuclear energy, to the Committee on Armed Services. The bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from the oversight activities of Committee on Armed Services in the previous year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

Public Law 113–130 (H.R. 272)—To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the “Major General William H. Gourley VA–DOD Outpatient Clinic

H.R. 272, “To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense joint outpatient clinic to be constructed in Marina, California, as the “Major General William H. Gourley VA–DOD Outpatient Clinic” was introduced on January 15, 2013, by



Mr. Sam Farr, and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel and the full committee waived consideration of H.R. 272. On November 1, 2013, Mr. Brad Wenstrup moved to consider H.R. 272, as amended, under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 388–0 (Roll no. 589). On November 19, 2013, H.R. 272 was received in the Senate. On July 9, 2014, H.R. 272 passed the Senate without amendment by unanimous consent. On July 25, 2014, H.R. 272 was signed by the President and became Public Law 113–130.

#### LEGISLATION PASSED BY BOTH HOUSES OF CONGRESS

H. Con. Res. 58—Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations

H. Con. Res. 58, “Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for the continued availability of religious services to members of the Armed Forces and their families during a lapse in appropriations” was introduced on October 5, 2013, by Mr. Doug Collins (GA) and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. On October 5, 2013, Mr. Joe Wilson (SC) moved to consider H. Con. Res. 58 under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 400–1 (Roll no. 526). On October 10, 2013, the resolution was laid before Senate by unanimous consent, and agreed to by the Senate with an amendment and an amended preamble by unanimous consent. On October 16, 2013, the House agreed to the Senate amendments by unanimous consent.

H.R. 3979—Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015

H.R. 3979 was introduced on January 31, 2014, by Representative Lou Barletta, and was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The title of the bill, as introduced, was: “To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that emergency services volunteers are not taken into account as employees under the shared responsibility requirements contained in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.” On February 25, 2014, the Committee on Ways and Means reported the bill, as amended, to the House. On March 11, 2014, H.R. 3979 was passed by the House under suspension of the rules by the yeas and nays, 410–0 (Roll no. 116). On April 7, 2014, H.R. 3979 passed the Senate with an amendment by Yea-Nay Vote, 59–38 (Record Vote Number: 101). On April 8, 2014, a message on Senate action was sent to the House.

In lieu of a formal conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the legislative vehicle used for the agreed upon legislative text between the House and the Senate was an amendment to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 3979. This legislation is substantially based on two bills: (1) HR. 4435, the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, which passed the House on May 22, 2014, by a vote of 325–98; and (2) S. 2410, the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, which was approved by the Senate Committee on Armed Services on the same day by a vote of 25–1.

On December 4, 2014, Mr. McKeon moved that the House concur with an amendment in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979. Pursuant to H. Res. 770, the House proceeded with 1 hour of debate on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979 with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 113–58 modified by the amendments printed in part A of House Report 113–646 and the amendment specified in section 5 of H. Res. 770, which contained the agreed upon legislative text between the House and the Senate. On December 4, 2014, the House agreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment by a vote of 300–119 (Roll no. 551). On December 8, 2014, a message on House action was received in Senate and held at the desk. On December 12, 2014, the Senate agreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 3979 by a vote of 89–11 (Record Vote Number: 325).

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2015: (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; and (c) the military training student loads for each of the Active and Reserve Components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the Department of Energy national security programs; and (8) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for the Maritime Administration.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally, and over the military

application of nuclear energy, to the House Committee on Armed Services. The bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from the oversight activities of Committee on Armed Services in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

#### LEGISLATION PASSED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H.R. 1864—To amend title 10, United States Code, to require an Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault

H.R. 1864, "To amend title 10, United States Code, to require an Inspector General investigation of allegations of retaliatory personnel actions taken in response to making protected communications regarding sexual assault" was introduced on May 7, 2013, by Mrs. Jackie Walorski (IN) and was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel and the full committee waived consideration of H.R. 1864. On June 26, 2013, Mrs. Walorski moved to consider H.R. 1864 under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 423–0 (Roll no. 294). On July 8, 2013, H.R. 1864 was received in the Senate, read twice, and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. No further action has been taken.

H.R. 1960—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014

On May 14, 2013, H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, was introduced by Chairman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On June 7, 2013, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H.R. 1960. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered reported H.R. 1960, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 59–2. The bill passed the House, as amended, on June 14, 2013, by recorded vote, 315–108 (Roll no. 244). On July 8, 2013, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice, and placed on Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders Calendar No. 126. For further action on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, please see Public Law 113–66 (H.R. 3304).

H.R. 4435—Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015

On April 9, 2014, H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, was introduced by Chairman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon (CA) and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On May 7, 2014, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H.R. 4435. The committee, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 4435, as amended, by a vote of 61–0. The bill passed the House, as amended, on May 22, 2014, by recorded vote, 325–98 (Roll no. 240). The title of the bill was amend-

ed to the “Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.” On June 5, 2014, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice, and placed on the Senate Legislative Calendar under General Orders Calendar No. 425. For further action on the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, please see H.R. 3979.

H. Res. 644—Condemning and disapproving of the failure of the Obama administration to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before transferring individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing concern about the national security risks over the transfer of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists

On June 25, 2014, Representative Scott E. Rigell introduced H. Res. 644, “condemning and disapproving of the Obama administration’s failure to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba [GTMO], and expressing national security concerns over the release of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists.” H. Res. 644 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services on June 25, 2014.

On July 29, 2014, the Committee on Armed Services met in open session to consider H. Res. 644 and report the measure to the House. During the markup, Chairman Howard P. “Buck” McKeon offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute to H. Res. 644 that would condemn and disapprove of the failure of the Obama administration to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before transferring five GTMO detainees, and expressing concern about the associated national security risks and repercussions of negotiating with terrorists. The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Chairman McKeon was agreed to by record vote, 34–25. The committee ordered H. Res. 644, as amended, reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by voice vote, a quorum being present. On July 31, 2014, H. Res. 644 was placed on the House Calendar, Calendar No. 133.

Pursuant to the provisions of H. Res. 715, H. Res. 644 was considered in the House under a closed rule on September 9, 2014. The resolution provided for 1 hour of debate on H. Res. 644 equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. On September 9, 2014, H. Res. 644 was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 249–163 (Roll no. 485). The title of H. Res. 644 was amended to read: “Condemning and disapproving of the failure of the Obama administration to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before transferring individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing concern about the national security risks over the transfer of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists.”

## LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

H. Res. 649—Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011

On June 25, 2014, Representative Steve Stockman introduced H. Res. 649, a resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011.

Clause 7 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides for a committee to report on a qualifying resolution of inquiry, such as H. Res. 649, within 14 legislative days or a privileged motion to discharge the committee is in order. H. Res. 649 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services on June 25, 2014.

Under the rules and precedents of the House, a resolution of inquiry is one of the methods that the House can use to obtain information from the executive branch. As stated in volume 7, chapter 24, section 8 of ‘Deschler’s Precedents,’ a resolution of inquiry is a ‘simple resolution making a direct request or demand of the President or head of an executive department to furnish the House of Representatives with specific information in the possession of the executive branch.’ In addition, the resolution must seek facts rather than opinions and may not require an investigation.

On July 16, 2014, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H. Res. 649. No amendments were offered to the resolution. The committee ordered H. Res. 649 reported to the House without recommendation by voice vote, a quorum being present. On July 22, 2014, H. Res. 649 was placed on the House Calendar, Calendar No. 125. No further action has been taken.

## OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

### OVERVIEW

Pursuant to clause 2(d) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, described below are actions taken and recommendations made with respect to specific areas and subjects that were identified in the oversight plan for special attention during the 113th Congress, as well as additional oversight activities not explicitly enumerated by the oversight plan.

### POLICY ISSUES

#### National Defense Strategy, National Military Strategy, and Related Defense Policy Issues

During the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee has continued its traditional interest in the broad spectrum of national security challenges facing the United States and how the Nation might best prepare itself to face such challenges in the near- and long-term. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and the Joint Explanatory Statement that accompanies it, is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as enumerated in the U.S. Constitution. H.R. 3979 includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from the committee’s oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee’s existence.

H.R. 3979 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. Events of the last year serve to highlight what the National Defense Panel Review of the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review has observed: “the United States faces perhaps the most complex and volatile security environment since World War II.” These encompass the violence and brutality fomented by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic; continued security challenges in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; regional aggression by the Russian Federation; destabilizing actions by the People’s Republic of China in the South and East China Seas; continued tensions on the Korean peninsula; continued terrorism threats, instability, and the spread of global extremism particularly across the Middle East and North Africa; natural disasters; and the continued spread of lethal and disruptive technologies. They also serve to highlight the continued need for the U.S. military’s flexibility and responsiveness in defending the Nation’s interests and addressing security challenges, wherever and whenever they may arise. 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.

To shape the Nation's defense strategy, to include the longer-term direction of the Nation's forces, their missions and capabilities, and needed resources in this complex security environment, the committee looked to the March 2014 release of the Department of Defense's Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). However, as it 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 believes the 2014 QDR "missed a major opportunity" to do just that. The National Defense Panel (NDP), which independently assessed the QDR and released its report in July 2014, came to a similar conclusion that the "2014 QDR is not the long-term planning document envisioned by Congress." Thus, H.R. 3979 includes a provision that would reform the QDR process. A new Defense Strategy Review would require tradeoff analyses between missions, risks, and resources to better inform decisions on the longer-term direction of America's national security infrastructure, and the role of the NDP would be reshaped to provide inputs to the QDR process as well as review the final product.

The committee exercised its oversight of the QDR process and the defense strategy contained therein through a series of Member-level and staff briefings. It also sought views from outside experts, chiefly the National Defense Panel. These included a hearing on the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review on April 3, 2014, a roundtable discussion between Members and NDP panelists on September 10, 2014, and a hearing on the National Defense Panel Assessment of the 2014 QDR on December 2, 2014. The committee also conducted its traditional oversight of U.S. defense policy and strategy through its annual posture and budget hearings involving the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the service secretaries and chiefs, and the combatant commanders, that spanned from February to April 2014.

While the committee understands that the annual defense budget must remain consistent with the caps contained in the Budget Control Act (BCA) of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) and defense sequestration, it also continues to recognize the severe impacts these cuts have had, and will continue to have, on the military. These impacts were discussed in nearly every posture and budget hearing and briefing the committee conducted, as well as the QDR and NDP hearings. As the NDP concluded in its report, the BCA, on top of previous cuts to defense dating back to 2009, "constitute[s] a serious strategic misstep" and must be reversed. It further warned that these massive cuts will "lead to a high risk force in the near future," have "caused significant shortfalls in U.S. military readiness and both present and future capabilities," and have prompted allies and adversaries alike "to question our commitment and resolve." The committee shares these concerns and is committed to continuing to provide full authorization for the funding required for the readiness of our military; to enhance the quality of life of military service members and their families; to sustain and improve the Armed Forces; and to properly safeguard the national security of the United States. To this end, H.R. 3979 would authorize

\$521.3 billion in spending for national defense, consistent with the House budget, the President's budget request, and the Senate budget, and an additional \$63.7 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations. This legislation would help ensure our troops deployed in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world have the equipment, resources, authorities, training, and time needed to successfully complete their missions and return home; provide warfighters and their families with the resources and support they need, deserve, and have earned; invest in the capabilities and force structure needed to protect the United States from current and future threats; and mandate fiscal responsibility, transparency and accountability within the Department of Defense.

#### The War in Afghanistan

The committee maintained four areas of focus with respect to the war in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, including:

- (1) The efforts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat Al Qaeda and associated groups such as the Haqqani Network;
- (2) The performance of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) and the continuing retrograde of International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) equipment;
- (3) The progress and signing of the Bilateral Security Agreement between the United States and the Government of Afghanistan; and
- (4) The post-2014 mission and associated authorities.

The committee conducted numerous oversight activities, including Member-level and staff briefings and travel to Afghanistan and the region. Additionally, the committee convened hearings to complement the oversight of the policy, strategy, and post-2014 presence in Afghanistan, including a hearing with the ISAF commander on March 13, 2014, and a hearing with outside experts on July 29, 2014.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would extend a number of authorities that support congressional oversight of U.S. defense programs in Afghanistan. H.R. 3979 would reauthorize the Commanders' Emergency Response Program, the authority for reintegration activities in Afghanistan, and the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund. These authorities support the ISAF commander's campaign plan in Afghanistan. Additionally, H.R. 3979 would include a description of U.S. policy and approach in Afghanistan, including that a top national security priority for the United States continues to be to support the stability and sovereignty of Afghanistan and to help Afghanistan ensure that its territory is not used by Al Qaeda, the Haqqani Network, or other violent extremist groups to launch attacks against the United States or its interests and that any drawdown of such U.S. military forces and operations should be considered in relation to security conditions on the ground in Afghanistan at the time of the drawdown and the recommendations of senior U.S. military commanders. Additionally, H.R. 3979 would express support for the security and rights of Afghan women. Lastly, H.R. 3979 would provide for 4,000 additional Special Immigrant Visas and would amend section 602(b) of the Afghan Allies Act of 2009 (Public Law



111–8) to allow for translators and interpreters who worked with U.S. military personnel at ISAF to be eligible for such visas.

The committee will continue to conduct close oversight of the ANSF and understands the regional context that can influence outcomes in Afghanistan. As a result, H.R. 3979 includes a report on the post-2014 mission in Afghanistan as well as a report on the plan to sustain the ANSF through 2017 and on the bilateral cooperation between the United States and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on issues that relate to the war in Afghanistan. Also, H.R. 3979 would re-authorize the Coalition Support Fund (CSF), which reimburses certain countries, including Pakistan, for its direct support to Operation Enduring Freedom; however, this section also would require certifications from the Secretary of Defense on key aspects of the partnership with Pakistan before providing reimbursements through the CSF.

#### *Force Protection*

The committee continued to emphasize force protection as a high priority issue for special oversight during the 113th Congress. Particular focus areas included those having direct impact on the safety of military personnel engaged in operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and other overseas contingency operations. The committee helped to expedite the promulgation of policies and the fielding of technology and equipment that prevented and/or reduced combat casualties.

During the 113th Congress, through formal activity to include hearings, classified briefings, interaction with Government Accountability Office auditors and Department of Defense officials, the committee continued to maintain rigorous oversight of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), the Department of Defense's focal point for the battle against improvised explosive devices (IEDs). The committee continued to examine and provide oversight on JIEDDO's current roles and missions, operational functions, organizational and force structure requirements, as well as current metrics for measuring success against countering the global IED threat. Further, the committee continued to receive monthly updates on JIEDDO's financial management and funding rates of obligation and execution, as well as monitor the use of recent expanded authority to transfer limited funds to the Department of State for the purposes of monitoring, disrupting, and interdicting the movement of explosive precursors from the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to locations within Afghanistan. The committee also conducted oversight on the Department of Defense's many quick reaction capability (QRC) organizations, such as the Rapid Fielding Directorate and the Army's Rapid Equipping Force. In addition to this oversight of QRC organizations, the committee reviewed and examined the processes used by the Department of Defense to readily address urgent operational needs requested by the warfighter or combatant commanders currently involved in executing overseas contingency operations. The committee's intent was to ensure the warfighter had the necessary equipment, resources, authorities, and time required to successfully accomplish the mission. The committee also reviewed the Department of Defense's use

of current rapid acquisition authority, and analyzed the justification for a flexible joint urgent operational needs fund.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would authorize \$444.0 million for JIEDDO, as well as reauthorize existing transfer authorities and reporting requirements, to include JIEDDO’s ability to transfer limited funding to the Department of State for the purposes described in the above paragraph. H.R. 3979 would also direct the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan to consolidate and/or eliminate some of the more than 30 QRC organizations currently operating in the Department of Defense.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a classified briefing on March 5, 2014, to receive an update on current and future counter-IED initiatives, as well as to receive JIEDDO’s perspective on the recent Department of Defense Report relating to a National Security Agency contractor.

#### Asia

The United States has continued its Government-wide policy to “rebalance” to the Asia-Pacific region, and the committee has continued its oversight of the Department of Defense’s implementation of this policy. In particular, the committee has continued to monitor the Department of Defense’s strategy, force posture, and readiness, to ensure that U.S. forces are properly resourced and postured to protect U.S. national security interests.

Events of the last year continue to highlight the security challenges in the Asia-Pacific region, such as the continued unilateral efforts by the People’s Republic of China to assert regional influence, particularly in the South and East China Seas, and the sustained threat to stability on the Korean peninsula from the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. In response, the United States has sought to strengthen its relationships with traditional treaty allies while also forging new relationships, particularly with partners in southeast Asia. The committee has closely overseen the Department of Defense’s specific efforts to implement several posture and force structure initiatives in the region, including rotational deployments of Marines, naval, and air assets; forward pre-positioning; infrastructure realignments; and training and exercises.

The committee continued its Asia-Pacific oversight series that it began in 2013 under the leadership of Rep. J. Randy Forbes and Rep. Colleen W. Hanabusa. In addition to the posture hearing with the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, the committee held a classified intelligence-operations brief on the Asia-Pacific region on January 8, 2014, a hearing on “Rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific Region: Examining its Implementation” with senior defense officials on January 28, 2014, a classified briefing on the security situation on the Korean peninsula on April 2, 2014, a roundtable discussion between Members and senior defense officials on East Asia on July 24, 2014, and a roundtable discussion with commissioners from the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission on their 2014 Annual Report to Congress on November 20, 2014.

The subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces also held several oversight hearings and briefings as part of the Asia-Pacific oversight series, to include a hearing on China’s maritime disputes

on January 14, 2014, a hearing on China's counterspace program and the implications for U.S. national security on January 28, 2014, a briefing on "Air Force and Naval Aircraft of the People's Republic of China Liberation Army: Order of Battle and Capabilities" on February 4, 2014, and a hearing on "Seapower and Projection Forces Capabilities to Support the Asia Pacific Rebalance" on February 27, 2014.

The findings and conclusions from this oversight series informed H.R. 4495, the Asia-Pacific Region Priority Act, a bipartisan stand-alone bill introduced by Rep. J. Randy Forbes and Rep. Colleen W. Hanabusa in the House of Representatives on April 28, 2014. Much of this legislation is incorporated into H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, including the requirement for a Department of Defense (DOD) study on Taiwan's defense capabilities, an independent assessment on countering anti-access area denial capabilities, a DOD assessment on opportunities to increase regional missile defense cooperation, and a sense of Congress on the importance of the U.S.-Japan and U.S.-Republic of Korea security relationships. H.R. 3979 also contains provisions related to the Department of Defense's development of a maritime security strategy and a requirement for a briefing on U.S.-China military-to-military engagements.

The committee supplemented its hearings and briefings with official travel to the region, including a congressional delegation oversight trip led by Chairman Howard P. "Buck" McKeon to Japan, the Republic of Korea, China, and Taiwan, and several staff oversight trips to east and southeast Asia.

#### Global War on Terrorism

Since the 9/11 attacks, the United States has dealt Al Qaeda repeated and significant blows during the global war on terrorism. Despite many notable successes, however, Al Qaeda remains potent in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, with its organization's affiliates continuing to expand in locations such as Somalia, Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and North Africa. The committee continued to conduct extensive oversight, often in classified form, on terrorism issues and emerging threats, giving particular attention to special operations capabilities, the changing nature of Al Qaeda's organization and operations, as well as efforts to build partner nation counterterrorism capabilities. The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities held several related hearings in this area including a hearing on February 13, 2013, "The Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Command and U.S. Special Operations Forces"; on March 3, 2013, "The Posture of the U.S. Central Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and U.S. Transportation Command"; on June 28, 2013, "Past, Present, and Future Irregular Warfare Challenges"; on October 10, 2013, "Biodefense, Worldwide Threats and Countermeasures for the Department of Defense"; on March 13, 2014, "The Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the U.S. Special Operations Command and the Posture of the U.S. Special Operations Forces"; and on April 8,

2014, "Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reductions Agency and Chemical Biological Defense Program: Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction in a Changing Global Environment."

Similarly, the committee held several related briefings including: a classified briefing on March 20, 2013, "Counterterrorism Operations Update" which covered worldwide and current Department of Defense counterterrorism operations and authorities; on April 24, 2013, a classified briefing on "Weapons of Mass Destruction and Counterproliferation Programs"; on July 11, 2013, a classified briefing on "Exploitation of Materials Recovered during the Osama bin Laden Raid"; on July 31, 2013, a classified briefing on "Counterterrorism Policy and Operations Update"; on September 12, 2013, a classified briefing on "Counterterrorism Operations Update"; on October 16, 2013, a classified briefing on "Counterterrorism Operations Update"; on October 23, 2013, a briefing on the state of Al Qaeda; on January 15, 2014, a classified briefing on "Counterterrorism Operations and Intelligence Update"; and on July 9, 2014, a classified briefing on "Update on Counterterrorism Operations and 1208 Program Activity." The committee continued additional classified oversight functions on a continual basis including secure communications briefings and updates with senior Department of Defense officials on current activities most notably in cyber and global counterterrorism operations.

As the United States strengthens and builds partnership capacity with key allies around the world, the committee has remain focused on the Department of Defense's efforts to aggressively fight the global war on terror and counter radicalism in the greater Middle East and across the globe. Ensuring security and stability in volatile regions that cannot adequately govern themselves or secure their own territory remains a top priority for the committee. Given the key role of U.S. Special Operations Forces, the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued to work with the full committee on authorities and programs that build foreign partner capacity. Specific contributions of the subcommittee in this area are reported elsewhere in this report.

The Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities included several legislative provisions related to the global war on terrorism in H.R. 1960, that National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, and H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. These include: a provision to reauthorize DOD personnel recovery authorities used by our military commanders and Special Operations Forces to plan and execute the safe recovery of U.S. personnel isolated during military and contingency operations; a provision directing the Secretary of Defense to review the future role of U.S. Special Operations Forces and U.S. Special Operations Command; a provision that clarified certain acquisition authorities of U.S. Special Operations Command; a provision modifying the Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program; a provision directing the Comptroller General to review medical countermeasures and the threat posed by genetically engineered bio-terror agents; a provision directing the Comptroller General to review threats posed by non-traditional chemical agents; and several defense intelligence

provisions designed to support geographic combatant commander needs, requirements, and priorities. Additionally the subcommittee assisted the committee with several provisions within H.R. 3304 related to Weapons of Mass Destruction, Building Partnership Capacity, Security Force Assistance, Counterinsurgency, Sensitive Military Operations, Intelligence, and the regional conflicts in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Syrian Arab Republic, State of Libya, and East Africa, which are addressed elsewhere in this report.

In coordination with the committee, the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted additional oversight of specific issues related to the global war on terrorism, to include; special operations capabilities, counter-terrorism and counter-proliferation programs and activities; homeland defense and consequence management programs; intelligence policy, national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements part of the intelligence community. Further details on these subcommittee activities are provided elsewhere in this report.

H.R. 4435, the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as passed by the House, included several legislative provisions related to global war on terrorism, including: a section that would extend the authority through fiscal year 2015 for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or Government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. Armed Forces conducted outside the United States against international terrorism or providing such information or assistance that is beneficial to force protection associated with such an operation; a section that would extend through 2017 the authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism pursuant to section 1208 of the Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81); and a section that would extend by 1 year, the authority for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities for conventional and Special Operations Forces pursuant to subsection (h) of section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). Additionally, the subcommittee assisted the committee with several provisions within H.R. 4435 related to building partnership capacity, security force assistance, counterinsurgency, intelligence programs, and the regional conflicts in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Republic of Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic, State of Libya, and East Africa, which are addressed elsewhere in this report.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, contains many of the same provisions as the House-passed version of the bill, including: a section that would extend the authority through fiscal year 2015 for the Secretary of Defense to offer and make rewards to a person providing information or nonlethal assistance to U.S. Government personnel or Government personnel of allied

forces participating in a combined operation with U.S. Armed Forces conducted outside the United States against international terrorism or providing such information or assistance that is beneficial to force protection associated with such an operation; a section that would extend through 2017 and raise to \$75 million the authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism pursuant to section 1208 of the Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of Public Law 112–81; a section that would extend by 1 year the authority for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities for conventional and Special Operations Forces pursuant to subsection (h) of section 943 of Public Law 110–417, as amended most recently by section 1203(c) of Public Law 112–81; a provision that would provide additional rapid acquisition authorities to U.S. Special Operations Command; and a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense provide a plan for the transition of funding of U.S. Special Operations Command from supplemental funding for overseas contingency operations to recurring funding for future years defense programs. Additionally, the subcommittee assisted the committee with several provisions within H.R. 3979 related to building partnership capacity, security force assistance, counterinsurgency, intelligence programs, and the regional conflicts in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Republic of Iraq, Syrian Arab Republic, State of Libya, and East Africa, which are addressed elsewhere in this report.

#### Central and South America

The committee continued to oversee the programs and policies of the Department of Defense related to Central and South America. The committee maintained strong oversight of the security and stability of the United States' neighbors in the Western Hemisphere, including the Republic of Colombia, the United States of Mexico, the Republic of Honduras, El Salvador, the Republic of Guatemala, and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. In addition, the committee exerted oversight over the use of Department of Defense facilities in housing many unaccompanied alien children that were intercepted crossing the southern border of the United States in fiscal year 2014.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 contain several provisions that would reauthorize Department of Defense counternarcotics authorities for Colombia and provide additional resources for addressing counternarcotics and transnational organized crime in the region.

#### Europe

While the stability and security of Europe remain core U.S. national interests, recent aggression by the Russian Federation towards Ukraine and its neighbors has destabilized European security. Even though the Cold War ended in 1991 with the formal dissolution of the Soviet Union, Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea and its continued arming and support of separatist rebels in eastern Ukraine has forced the United States and Europe to re-evalu-

ate regional security and stability, as well as cooperation with Russia. In recent years, Russia has focused on reforming and modernizing its forces, with specific emphasis on the modernization of its conventional forces and improving the recruitment, training, and retention of its troops. The committee paid particular attention to the ongoing crisis in Ukraine and U.S.-Russia discussions on missile defense, conducting several committee briefings, staff-level briefings, and Member engagements with senior Department of Defense and Department of State officials. The committee also followed U.S.-Russia nonproliferation activities and held several staff-level briefings on the current and future status of U.S.-Russian cooperation on nuclear security.

European allies are strong partners of the U.S. military, contributing to a range of regional and global missions, including approximately 30 percent of the International Security Assistance Force training teams in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. European allies will continue to be a part of the Operation Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan. However, the continuing constrained fiscal environment has created pressures on the region's militaries, defense budgets, and investments in future capabilities. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies are concerned about the growing instability to their east and south, including Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea and continued support of pro-Russian separatists and the spread of violence and extremism in North Africa and the Middle East. At the Wales Summit in September 2014, NATO allies reaffirmed their commitment to "continue to invest in modern and deployable armed forces that can operate effectively together and at a high level of readiness to fulfill NATO tasks" and committed to work towards their nation's defense budget achieving the NATO guideline of the 2 percent of gross domestic product (GDP). The committee followed the NATO response to Russian aggression, including the development of the NATO Readiness Action Plan.

The U.S. military force presence in Europe has declined dramatically since the end of the Cold War. There are currently only two Army Brigade Combat Teams based permanently in Europe. There remain significant advantages that come from European-based U.S. troops, including the opportunity to train regularly with allied and partner forces at U.S. training centers in Europe, and the ability to plan and launch operations elsewhere in Europe, such as to reassure NATO allies, or in neighboring regions, such as the Middle East and Africa to respond to crises. The committee continued to examine overseas basing, including in Europe, to inform its views on a cost effective force posture to meet U.S. national security needs.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, includes several provisions that address the new security situation in Europe and the U.S. strategy for reassuring NATO allies and deterring further Russian aggression. H.R. 3979 would authorize \$1.0 billion for 2 years for the European Reassurance Initiative, including \$75.0 million for programs, activities, and support to the Government of Ukraine, and \$174.4 million for military construction to improve key Eastern Europe infrastructure and exercise-support facilities.

H.R. 3979 would also require the Department of Defense to conduct a review of existing U.S. and NATO force posture, and provide to Congress a strategy and plan to enhance European security. H.R. 3979 also includes a limitation on military cooperation between the United States and Russia, and an annual report through 2018 on military and security developments involving Russia.

#### Addressing Emerging Threats

The committee continued to focus attention on how the Department of Defense addresses the threats of terrorism, insurgency, and weapons of mass destruction proliferation, including how the Department addresses these threats in its strategic planning processes, how resources are arrayed to meet these threats, and how existing authorities are consistent with operational requirements. The committee also continued its oversight of numerous cross-cutting Department of Defense activities central to addressing these emerging and unforeseen threats, including counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, security force assistance, and building partnership capacity (BPC), all of which continue to receive attention in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review.

While there are roughly a dozen authorities that fall into the BPC category, the committee continued to devote particular attention to the global train and equip “1206” authority and the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF). Since 2006, the committee has been increasingly active in this area, and the last several National Defense Authorization Acts have reflected what Congress considers to be the appropriate balance of providing sufficient authority for the most pressing needs of the Department of Defense, while encouraging a more integrated interagency approach to building partnership capacity. Furthermore, the committee continued its close monitoring and assessment of the execution of these BPC authorities, both during the initial congressional notification process and during program execution.

The committee, as well as the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities (given the key role Special Operations Forces play in this area), continued its oversight of the full range of emerging threats to national security and U.S. military forces, and the capabilities needed to respond.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, includes several provisions that would reauthorize or expand existing authorities and require reports dealing with the Department of Defense’s BPC authorities. H.R. 3979 would codify the existing “1206” global train and equip authority in title 10, U.S. Code, but limit the fiscal year 2015 authorizing funding to \$350.0 million. H.R. 3979 would also expand the GSCF authority, section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to include small-scale military construction and the maintenance and sustainment of equipment provided, and extend the expiration of GSCF to September 30, 2017. H.R. 3979 would provide the Department of Defense with a global authority for 5 years to loan personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment to nations participating in coalition operations, but does not extend the existing authority limited to coalition operations in the Islamic Republic



of Afghanistan. H.R. 3979 would also reauthorize several global counternarcotics authorities including authorities relating to the Republic of Colombia and to combating illicit trafficking, including illicit activities involving transnational organized crime. H.R. 3979 would codify the recurring limitations on the use of funds for assistance to units of foreign security forces that have committed gross violations of human rights, and also includes a provision that provides authority for the training of foreign security forces and associated security-related ministries of foreign countries to promote human rights and rule of law. Finally, H.R. 3979 would require the Department of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a biennial report through 2020 on the Department's programs to provide training, equipment, or other assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces.

#### Detainee Policy, Military Commissions, and Related Matters

During the 113th Congress, the committee conducted extensive oversight of detainees who are being held in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (GTMO). The committee held several Member briefings relating to detention policy issues, in addition to numerous staff briefings.

With regard to detainee operations in Afghanistan, the committee focused on the transfer and release of detainees held in the Bagram detention facility, cases of recidivism, and the continued transition of detainees into Afghan custody. The committee specifically focused on the disposition of detainees who pose a continuing national security threat to the United States.

With respect to detention operations at GTMO, the committee continued to monitor transfer and release policies and practices, as well as the use of the Military Commissions Act (Public Law 109-366; Public Law 111-84) to try detainees for war crimes.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, includes a 1-year prohibition on the transfer of GTMO detainees to the United States and a 1-year prohibition on the construction or modification of facilities in the United States to house GTMO detainees.

#### Intelligence

The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted extensive oversight of defense intelligence activities. In the first session of the 113th Congress, the committee and subcommittee conducted one hearing and several Member briefings on defense intelligence aspects of emerging national security issues as well as numerous staff briefings. The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities placed particular attention on: resource allocation for intelligence-related programs both for effectiveness and affordability; defense intelligence strategies and policies in consideration of current and anticipated future threats; organization and management of the elements of the Department of Defense that are part of the intelligence community; and, the consideration and prioritization of defense intelligence requirements across the intelligence community. Additionally, the committee monitored the

Department's security practices and information-sharing policies following recent extensive unauthorized disclosures of classified information.

In the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee and Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued its oversight of defense intelligence activities. The committee received numerous Member briefings on defense intelligence aspects of emerging national security issues.

On February 5, 2014, the subcommittee received a briefing on the Interim Report on Department of Defense Information Compromised by Edward Snowden. The briefing was provided by officials from the Joint Staff and the Defense Intelligence Agency. On April 4, 2014, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Intelligence Activities. The witnesses were the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, and the Deputy Director of the National Security Agency. This hearing was followed up by a briefing to the subcommittee on April 10, 2014, with the intelligence chiefs of each of the Armed Services as well as U.S. Special Operations Command, regarding the budget request of their intelligence activities for fiscal year 2015. Additionally, on September 11, 2014, the subcommittee received a briefing regarding an update on the unauthorized disclosures by Edward Snowden of the Department of Defense information.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would direct several intelligence-related provisions, including: a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on the extent of unauthorized disclosures and mitigation efforts; improving personnel security procedure and insider threat monitoring; a prohibition on separation or consolidation of the portions of the Department of Defense budget that are identified as part of the National Intelligence Program; a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to appoint an executive agent to oversee the Tactical Exploitation of National Capabilities programs within the military services; and a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General to conduct a comprehensive review and assessment of intelligence activities, authorities and programs of U.S. Special Operations Command and Special Operations Forces.

#### National Guard and Reserves

The committee continued its oversight efforts focused on current equipment investment strategies for the National Guard and Reserve Components with particular emphasis on affordability and modernization of critical dual-use equipment platforms that are essential to the National Guard's title 32, United States Code, mission; defense support to civil authorities. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would direct an additional \$400.0 million to adequately resource under-funded critical dual-use equipment requirements for the National Guard and Reserve Component.

H.R. 4435, the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included a provision that pro-

vided pay and allowance parity for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau and the Senior Enlisted Adviser to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau among senior members of the Armed Forces. Additionally H.R. 4435 included a provision that allowed the per-fiscal year calculation of days of Active Duty for members of the Reserves to reduce eligibility age for retirement for non-regular service to cross fiscal years.

#### The Continent of Africa

The committee conducted regular oversight of the continent of Africa, including numerous staff level briefings and a hearing with the Commander of U.S. Africa Command on March 5, 2014.

The Department of Defense undertook Operation United Assistance to address the Ebola virus in West Africa in 2014. The Department requested and received approval for the reprogramming of \$750.0 million in Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid funds to conduct this mission. Approximately 3,200 U.S. troops have also been deployed to the region. The Department's mission includes conducting command and control of the operation, constructing 12 Ebola Treatment Units, delivering medical training, and providing air and sea lift of supplies. The committee continued to conduct close oversight of Operation United Assistance, including convening a classified Member-level briefing and holding numerous staff briefings.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would express support for the U.S. mission to assist the Republic of Uganda People's Defense Force as they combat the Lord's Resistance Army and attempt to remove or apprehend Joseph Kony. Additionally, H.R. 3979 would require a report by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense on the Marine Corps Security Guard program for diplomatic facilities globally, as well as a report on the "New Normal" and general mission requirements for U.S. Africa Command. H.R. 3979 also would provide an authority for the Secretary of Defense to provide preference for goods or services from the Republic of Djibouti. The committee recognizes the partnership between the United States and the Government of Djibouti. Finally, H.R. 3979 would authorize the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund, which would allow for the provision of support and assistance to foreign security forces, groups, or individuals for counterterrorism or crisis response missions within the region of U.S. Africa Command.

#### Department of Defense Response to the Attack on the Diplomatic Facilities in Benghazi, Libya

Immediately after the terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya on September 11, 2012, the committee, with support from the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, began an extensive effort to evaluate the Department of Defense's response. In addition to assessing how the Department reacted to the terrorist strike, the committee sought to determine what preparations the U.S. military had made for such an event, and what arrangements had subse-

quently been put into place to minimize the possibility of a recurrence.

In 2013, the committee sent the Department three requests for information. Hundreds of pages of written material, much of it classified, were received and reviewed. The committee also convened two open hearings and five classified Member briefings. General and flag officers and senior civilian defense officials appeared before the committee to provide information about the Department's actions in connection with the attack, and to describe constraints on deploying other forces, including drones and fighter aircraft during the attack. The committee also heard from field-grade officers who were in Libya at the time, or in contact with those who were, to discern their understanding of events and the Department's operational limitations.

The Benghazi attacks were the subject of two full committee events: one briefing and one hearing. The briefing, entitled "Intelligence and Operations in North and East Africa" was held on February 6, 2013. The witnesses were Ms. Amanda Dory, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for African Affairs; Mr. William Wechsler, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Combating Terrorism; Major General Michael Nagata, USA, Deputy Director for Special Operations, Joint Staff; and Mr. George Kuk, Intelligence Analyst, Defense Intelligence Agency. The hearing, entitled "The Posture of the U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command" was held on March 15, 2013. The witnesses were General Carter F. Ham, USA, Commander, U.S. Africa Command, and Admiral James G. Stavridis, USN, Commander, U.S. European Command.

Furthermore, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held four briefings and one hearing on Benghazi related issues. The first briefing was held on May 21, 2013, covering "DOD's Preparation for, and Response to, the Terrorist Attacks in Benghazi, Libya on September 11, 2012." Briefers were: Mr. Garry Reid, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, and Major General Darryl Roberson, USAF, Vice Director, Operations, Joint Staff. The next briefing in the series was held on June 26, 2013, and shared the same title as the first. It focused on the activities of U.S. Africa Command and U.S. Special Operations Command in connection with the response to the attack. Briefers were: General Carter F. Ham, USA (ret.), Commander of U.S. Africa Command at the time of the assault; Lieutenant Colonel S.E. Gibson, USA, former commander, Site Security Team, U.S. Embassy Tripoli; Rear Admiral Brian Losey, Commander, Special Operations Command Africa.

Colonel George Bristol, Commander of Joint Special Operations Task Force-Trans Sahara, appeared before the subcommittee in part three of the briefing series on July 31, 2013, to describe his role in responding to the attacks. The final briefing to date took place on October 10, 2013, when General Martin Dempsey, USA, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, appeared before the subcommittee to brief on "The Defense Department's force posture and response to the 2012 attacks in Benghazi, Libya."

The sole subcommittee hearing on Benghazi was held on September 19, 2013. Mr. Garry Reid, Principal Deputy Assistant Sec-

retary for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict and Major General Darryl Roberson, USAF, Vice Director, Operations, on the Joint Staff appeared before the subcommittee to testify on “The Defense Department’s Posture for September 11, 2013: What are the Lessons of Benghazi?”

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations continued this work in 2014.

Furthermore, as a result of the committee’s activities, H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, directed the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of State, to convey a report to the committee on lessons learned from the Benghazi attack. The report would assess the military’s posture and readiness, describe the ability of the U.S. military to respond to requests from the Department of State for supplemental embassy security forces, and identify possible related intelligence enhancements.

In addition, H.R. 4435, the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as passed by the House, would make a series of findings; express the sense of Congress; require a determination; and require the submission of a report regarding the individuals responsible for the attack against United States personnel in Benghazi, Libya and a counterterrorism strategy related to North Africa. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, includes this provision with an amendment that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on Department of Defense efforts to hold the individuals responsible for the attack against United States personnel in Benghazi, Libya accountable and require the President to submit a report on various security related matters in North Africa, West Africa, and the Sahel.

## Iran

The committee continued to conduct oversight of the threat posed by the Islamic Republic of Iran’s pursuit of a nuclear weapon to U.S. interests, U.S. allies, and countries in the region of Iran. The committee received numerous staff-level briefings and a Member-level briefing in closed session on Middle East intelligence and operations, which included analysis on Iran. Additionally, the committee held hearings on overall Middle East Policy on February 11, 2014, and on the P5+1 negotiations on Iran’s nuclear program on June 19, 2014. Further, the subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a classified briefing on November 18, 2014, on Iran and implications of sanctions relief.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would re-authorize the Iran Military Power Report through December 2016 and would authorize reports on the Joint Plan of Action or a final, comprehensive deal, including verification of whether Iran is complying with such agreement and an assessment of the overall state of the nuclear program of Iran for 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Act.

### Operation Inherent Resolve, Iraq, and Syria

U.S. force posture in the Republic of Iraq has changed significantly during fiscal year 2014. Formerly, U.S. forces deployed to Iraq were limited to those associated with the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC-I). Currently, U.S. forces continue to support OSC-I, but, now, the United States is engaged in a military campaign against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic.

The committee continues to conduct oversight of the security environment in Iraq and the activities of OSC-I, Operation Inherent Resolve, and broader policy issues in Syria and Iraq such as U.S. policy towards the Assad regime, the Syria train and equip program, and the Iraq train and equip program. The committee has received a number of staff-level briefings on OSC-I and the security situations in Iraq, Syria, and the region as well as the train and equip programs being contemplated in Iraq and Syria. Additionally, the committee received multiple Member-level briefings in closed session on Iraq, Syria, and the region, and held hearings on U.S. policy in the Middle East on February 11, 2014, the security situation in Iraq and Syria on July 29, 2014, and the Administration's strategy against ISIL on September 18, 2014, and November 13, 2014.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would re-authorize OSC-I and would allow for OSC-I to conduct operational training on bases of the Government of Iraq. Additionally, H.R. 3979 would authorize the training and equipping of the Iraq Security Forces, Kurdish Security Forces, tribal security forces, and local security forces through December 2016. H.R. 3979 would also allow for the training and equipping of appropriately vetted elements of the groups and individuals of the Syrian opposition through December 2016. Finally, H.R. 3979 would authorize the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund, which would allow for the provision of support and assistance to foreign security forces, groups, or individuals for counterterrorism or crisis response missions within the region of U.S. Central Command, but not to the Government of Iraq due to the authorization for the Iraq train and equip program.

### The Greater Middle East

The committee continued robust oversight of the security situation and U.S. policy and strategy within the greater Middle East region. The committee received a number of staff and Member-level briefings on this issue area and held a hearing on U.S. policy in the Middle East on February 11, 2014, and a hearing on the state of Al Qaeda on February 4, 2014. The committee also held hearings with the Commander of U.S. Central Command and the Commander of U.S. Africa Command on March 5, 2014.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would authorize the Counterterrorism Partnership Fund, which would allow for the provision of support and assistance to foreign security forces, groups, or individuals for counterterrorism or crisis response

missions within the region of U.S. Central Command and U.S. Africa Command, but not to the Government of the Republic of Iraq due to the separate authorization for the Iraq train and equip program. H.R. 3979 would also require the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, to provide an independent assessment on Al Qaeda, including its affiliates, its associated groups, and adherents since September 11, 2001. Finally, H.R. 3979 would require the President to provide a detailed summary of the planning guidance to deny safe haven to Al Qaeda and its violent extremist affiliates.

## FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND EFFICIENCY

### Overview

The committee scrutinized the Department of Defense's budget and identified inefficiencies to capture and reinvest savings into higher national security priorities. The Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, reflects the fact that the Nation must examine every aspect of the defense enterprise to find ways to accomplish the mission of providing for the common defense more effectively.

During the first session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of efforts by the Department of Defense (DOD) to improve its fiscal responsibility, transparency, and accountability, and to further identify opportunities to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse. The committee continued to monitor the Department's efforts to implement the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan, including holding a Member-level briefing with senior DOD financial officials to receive an update on the FIAR plan on December 9, 2014, and has continued to monitor efforts announced by the Secretary of Defense in July 2013, to identify cost savings through management efficiencies and overhead reductions within the Department's major headquarters. While such cost savings and efficiency efforts are "good government" measures to undertake under any budget conditions, they have taken on increased importance as the Department works to absorb the cuts to defense resulting from the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25).

Additional oversight in this area conducted during the second session of the 113th Congress follow below.

### Organization and Management of the Department of Defense

The committee continued to review the organization and management of the Department of Defense in order to ensure that it is properly postured to meet the complex and evolving security threats of the 21st century. Declining resources resulting from the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) and defense sequestration are driving the Department of Defense to reevaluate its organization and management structure to identify cost savings. The Department continues to implement organizational and management changes within the Department's major headquarters resulting from the announcement by the Secretary of Defense in July

2013, to identify cost savings through management efficiencies and overhead reductions. According to the Department, these management reforms, consolidations, personnel cuts, and spending reductions are planned to reduce the Department's overhead and operating costs by some \$10 billion over the next 5 years and almost \$40 billion over the next 10 years. In holding the Department to these objectives and ensuring these reductions are done smartly and strategically, H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, includes provisions that would require the Secretary of Defense to report on the feasibility of reducing or consolidating combatant command function and a plan to implement a periodic review and analysis of management headquarters.

Out of concern for some of the organizational changes being implemented by the Department, H.R. 3979 would restore the Office of Net Assessment (ONA) to its independent status, with the Office reporting directly to the Secretary of Defense, and increases the ONA budget for fiscal year 2015 by \$10 million to \$18.9 million. The Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3979 includes language expressing concern about organizational changes within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, specifically the abolishment of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs, and reservation about the potential for "less senior-level attention paid to nuclear forces, deterrence, nonproliferation, and terrorism."

#### Financial Management

The committee continues to oversee military effectiveness in this era of declining budgets. The Department of Defense has already identified a decrease of \$487.0 billion over a 10-year period based on fiscal constraints. Additional reductions to defense resources, to include mechanisms such as sequestration, could affect the quality of our military force as the Department looks to successfully perform its role in the National Security Strategy.

The Comptroller General of the United States has consistently identified the Department of Defense's financial management as a high-risk area since 1995. The Department's inability to track and account for billions of dollars in funding and tangible assets continues to undermine its management approach. It also creates a lack of transparency that significantly limits congressional oversight. The Department's inability to produce auditable financial statements undermines its efforts to reform defense acquisition processes and to realize efficiencies. Without these objective tools, neither the Department nor Congress can verify that greater value is being created. As a result, the committee continues to monitor the Department's efforts to implement the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan to correct the weaknesses in its financial statements, and monitor closely the interdependencies between FIAR and the hundreds of millions of dollars being spent on business systems modernization programs that the Department has proposed to address its financial management problems.

The committee received the statutorily mandated semi-annual updates on the FIAR plan in May and November in both 2013 and 2014. Supporting the Department's goal of achieving audit readi-



ness by the end of 2017, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) included a provision that would clarify the intent of the Department to have a full and complete audit on all fiscal year 2018 financial materials, with the results of the audit submitted to Congress by March 31, 2019.

The committee received notification that while a vast majority of appropriations will be able to have an audit performed on their Statement of Budgetary Activity, the Statement of Budgetary Resources would not be audit ready by September 30, 2014. The committee awaits a remediation strategy from the Department that describes an alternative deadline by which an auditable statement of budgetary resources will be achieved, and a description of the plan for meeting that alternative deadline, as instructed by section 1005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

#### Acquisition Issues

##### *Matters Related to Acquisition Policy*

The committee continued its long-standing efforts to improve the defense acquisition system and to address standing concerns about cost growth in major defense acquisition programs and the responsiveness of the system to compelling military needs. The committee worked to improve acquisition outcomes by addressing the acquisition environment with a focus on the culture, processes, regulations, and statutes driving acquisition decisions in the Department of Defense, industry, and Congress. The committee examined potential areas for improving defense acquisition activities to include reforming the process for reviewing and certifying requirements for major defense acquisition programs; reforming operational contract support; improving the education, skills and experience of the acquisition workforce; protecting supply availability of strategic materials; and establishing greater transparency and accountability in services contracting activities.

Despite the committee’s efforts in these areas, the committee remains concerned about significant shortcomings in the current acquisition system. Therefore, in October 2013, the committee initiated a long-term effort, led by Vice Chairman Mac Thornberry, to generate lasting improvements in the system. This reform effort started with an examination of acquisition reform efforts of the previous decades in order to understand why these well-intentioned reform efforts have not yet produced an improved acquisition system. The committee held a hearing on October 29, 2013, “Twenty-five years of acquisition reform: Where do we go from here?” where the committee received testimony from a panel of outside experts. This foundational hearing was followed by three additional scheduled hearings focused on the acquisition processes of the Department of Defense.

On February 12, 2014, the committee had planned a hearing on “Overcoming Obstacles in Acquisition Reform” which was canceled due to weather. Despite the cancellation, the chairman of the committee invited all available Members of the committee to meet at the allotted time to discuss the topic with the witnesses. Following that event, the committee met on June 24, 2014, to receive addi-

tional testimony from a panel of outside experts on “Case Studies in DOD Acquisition: Finding What Works”.

After hearing multiple testimonies from outside experts on these matters, the committee convened on July 8, 2014, to receive testimony from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics) and the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Readiness and Force Management) to discuss the Department’s efforts to improve the acquisition system.

In addition to the committee’s formal activities regarding acquisition policy improvements, the committee also sent letters to several industrial base representatives and union representatives to seek views of the defense industry on how to improve the Department of Defense acquisition system. In working to understand and fix the root causes behind why, after decades of various reform efforts, many Department of Defense acquisition programs continue to run over cost and behind schedule, the committee also sent a letter to all committee Members on July 30, 2014, asking for each Member to consult with local stakeholders and to provide specific suggestions on acquisition policy changes. Furthermore, the committee sent a letter to the Secretary of Defense on October 6, 2014, requesting the Department communicate any views, including any legislative or policy proposals related to this reform effort, on a rolling basis, rather than withhold those views to coincide with the release of the President’s budget request. Timely and actionable responses to these queries will be an invaluable contribution to the committee’s efforts moving forward.

The committee also continued to actively work with the Department of Defense to review the application of regulatory frameworks so as to begin eliminating unnecessary overhead, red tape, and bureaucracy. Furthermore, the committee recognizes that service contracting represents an increasingly important and large proportion of the acquisition expenditures of the Department of Defense and yet the majority of previous reform efforts have focused primarily on major defense acquisition programs. The Department currently lacks accurate and reliable data on contracted services, and the military departments have not developed plans to use that data to inform workforce planning, workforce mix, and budget decision making. Therefore, the committee has continued its efforts to strengthen oversight of these matters by reviewing the management structure for these contracts and increasing the visibility and transparency of these contracts by reviewing service contract inventories.

The committee also worked aggressively to improve the Department’s ability to contract in a contingency environment. The committee worked directly with the Joint Staff and others to improve requirements development and planning for operational contract support. However, the committee believes that more emphasis is needed in this area and the committee will continue to address this matter through visits to the individual combatant commands and other engagements. The committee notes that the Department conducted a joint exercise in early 2014 to specifically focus on planning, training, execution, and management of operational contract support. The committee applauds these efforts and expects this exercise and other events focused on developing the Department’s

ability to effectively and efficiently contract in support of contingency operations will greatly strengthen the competency of the acquisition workforce. Furthermore, the committee included several sections in H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, which would expand prohibitions on contracting with the enemy. These sections would expand the authorities provided in section 841 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to other Federal agencies.

The committee recognizes that a fundamental component in addressing most of the problems in the acquisition process is improving the composition and quality of the acquisition workforce. Therefore, the committee continued to closely monitor the development of the acquisition workforce, the execution and management of the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, and other efforts by the Department to expand and improve the acquisition workforce. As part of this effort, the committee included a provision, section 853 of H.R. 3979, requesting additional information on the effect of program manager tenure and career development on acquisition outcomes.

The committee is aware that the problems in the defense acquisition system have been persistent and resistant to past reform efforts, and the committee recognizes that there are no “silver bullet” reform packages that can immediately fix the current acquisition system in a holistic manner. Therefore, the committee believes its reform effort will be an ongoing and iterative process that will continue to be embedded in the committee’s regular work.

#### *Defense Industrial Base Matters*

The committee continued to monitor closely the health, security, and innovative capacity of the defense industrial base, especially in light of changes to the defense strategy, the need for recapitalization and modernization after 13 years of war, and continuing budget pressures. The committee is aware that the industrial base for complex major weapon systems has shrunk dramatically in the past decade, limiting the ability of the Department of Defense to control costs, encourage innovation, and reap the benefits of competition.

The weakening of the defense industrial base and the increasingly global nature of business will continue to challenge the capabilities of current systems used to monitor industrial security. In addition to overseeing the effectiveness of the Defense Security Service to carry out this mission, the committee continued to examine traditional mechanisms for industrial security, such as the personnel security clearance process, the National Industrial Security Program, and other areas where adversaries could exploit vulnerabilities or loopholes in the acquisition process to undermine the U.S. defense industrial base.

The committee also noted that industry is struggling in many cases to make the long-term investments that are vital to the health of the defense industrial base, notably so in the shipbuilding industry. Therefore, the committee continued its oversight activities in these areas and included provisions in H.R. 3979, the Carl

Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 that would:

- (1) Provide for a temporary extension of, and amendments to, the test program for negotiation of comprehensive small business subcontracting plans;
- (2) Require a plan for improving data on bundled or consolidated contracts;
- (3) Provide authority for Procurement Technical Assistance Centers to provide education to small businesses on certain requirements of Arms Export Control Act (Public Law 94–329);
- (4) Address matters related to the improper use of reverse auctions and other low-price contracting approaches; and
- (5) Improve contracting opportunities for women-owned small businesses.

#### *Information Technology and Business Systems*

Information technology (IT) systems are critical enablers for the Department of Defense. As the IT budget represents nearly \$32 billion of the Department of Defense’s total budget, it also represents a major investment area requiring the same rigorous planning and oversight as any other complex major weapon system. The Department recognized this area as a source of greater efficiencies and has managed to reduce spending in IT by several billion dollars across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued reviewing the Department’s IT investment planning and acquisitions to reduce unwarranted duplication and eliminate programs of little value to the warfighter. The committee has paid particular attention to the various IT business systems of the Department where egregious programmatic failures, such as the Air Force’s Expeditionary Combat Support System, have occurred, and which are also critical components in the Department’s strategy to achieve auditability.

The committee held related hearings on March 13, 2013, on “Information Technology and Cyber Operations: Modernization and Policy Issues to Support the Future Force” and on March 12, 2014, on “Information Technology and Cyber Operations: Modernization and Policy Issues in a Changing National Security Environment.” In addition to hearings, the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats, and Capabilities held briefings on a number of related topics, including: Department of Defense Electromagnetic Pulse as required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) on May 16, 2013; and Information Technology Acquisition Policy and Practices on January 9, 2014. Additionally, the subcommittee conducted detailed oversight of specific programmatic issues related to IT.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee included a directive related to information technology, requiring a briefing on the progress of implementing an IT-specific acquisition process for the Department of Defense.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, included several legislative provisions related to information technology, including: a strategy on improving asset track-

ing and in-transit visibility; a limitation on funds for Air Force Logistics modernization; a briefing on the biometric activities of the Department of Defense; a revision to the reporting requirement for annual submission of information regarding information technology capital assets; modification of reporting requirements for Department of Defense business systems; a change in the report for critical changes to major automated information systems; a revision to the definition for legacy systems in Defense business enterprise architecture; and an extension of the information technology exchange program.

H.R. 4435, the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as passed by the House, included several legislative provisions related to information technology, including: a section that would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a review of the Air Force Network-Centric Solutions II (NETCENTS II) contract and provide a certification that it is effective in delivering information technology capabilities for the joint force; a provision that would amend section 2222 of title 10, United States Code, to expand certification requirements, investment review processing and enterprise architecture requirements from defense business systems to all defense information technology systems; and a section that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a certification that defense mission-critical infrastructure requiring electromagnetic pulse protection that receives power supply from commercial or other non-military sources is protected from the adverse effects of man-made or naturally occurring electromagnetic pulse.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-446) accompanying the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee included several directives related to information technology, including: requiring a report on the findings of a review of the High Performance Computing Modernization Program; a plan to provide internet access to families on Kwajalein Atoll; a briefing on a comprehensive strategy for developing and fielding an information management architecture for the Department’s Chemical Biological Radiological Nuclear Response Enterprise; a review of MIL-STD 800-125-1 and -2 to determine if the standards are in need of updating based on the current and future projected threats; an Inspector General review of Department of Defense noncompetitive information technology contracts to determine whether they were properly justified as sole source; and a briefing that identifies all of the major funded activities within each of the military services and defense agencies that currently contribute to the Joint Information Environment.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included several legislative provisions related to information technology, including: a requirement to develop standards and define architectures necessary to enable open systems approaches in key mission areas of the Department of Defense; a report on implementation of acquisition processes for information technology systems; revisions to section 2222 of title 10, United States Code; development and implementation of operational effectiveness metrics for the Joint Information environment; a requirement to migrate the Army Dis-

tributed Common Ground System to open architecture; enhanced authority for Chief Information Officers of certain covered agencies; improved reporting and program reviews for certain information technology programs of the civilian agencies; and implementation of a Federal data center consolidation initiative.

## READINESS

### Strategic Military Readiness

The Subcommittee on Readiness focused strategic oversight efforts for the 113th Congress on Department of Defense military training, logistics, maintenance, military construction, installations, family housing, and the base closure and realignment process. The committee also focused oversight efforts on the civilian personnel workforce, energy security, and environmental issues that affect Department of Defense operations across the globe. The committee remains concerned about the detrimental impacts of the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) on military readiness and the budgetary constraints that led to lost training opportunities, delayed or deferred ship deployments, missed depot availabilities, and deferred maintenance requirements.

The committee visited numerous overseas bases to assess the skills of assigned forces, the material condition of equipment, the readiness challenges associated with forward deployed force presence, in addition to the appropriate application of military construction in the overseas and contingency operations environments. Oversight trips included visits to countries such as the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Turkey, and Jordan to examine U.S. Central Command’s plans to sustain operations while simultaneously withdrawing forces and equipment from Afghanistan. Additionally, the committee conducted close oversight of expanding operations in the U.S. Africa Command area of responsibility, the development of various crisis response capabilities under the “New Normal” execution order, and maiden deployments of new capabilities, such as the Littoral Combat Ship.

The Department’s readiness posture and ability to respond to new and emerging threats, such as terrorist movements in the Islamic Republic of Iraq and in Syria, an Ebola outbreak in West Africa, and the Russian incursion into Ukraine, remained key areas of oversight, particularly after implementation of the new Defense Strategic Guidance. The committee continues to assess Department of Defense force-generation capabilities, its ability to return to training for full-spectrum operations, and the alignment of military forces to fulfill two primary strategic demands: rotational presence and crisis contingency preparedness.

Despite short-term readiness gains in the past year, the return of sequestration-level funding in fiscal year 2016 will lead to a military that cannot continue to operate at current levels and provide a fully ready, globally responsive force in the manner that ensures the morale, welfare, and safety of U.S. Armed Forces. Consequently, the committee will continue to aggressively oversee and monitor the impacts of sequestration as a result of Public Law 112–25.

### Force Readiness

The preservation and restoration of force readiness remains the committee's highest priority. The committee will continue to examine the readiness of deployed personnel supporting ongoing contingencies worldwide, in addition to the ability of the services to conduct full-spectrum combat surge or contingency missions and the Department's ability to maintain capabilities in the decades to come. The committee monitored both the short-term and long-term impacts of sequestration on operational tempo and sought to correct current readiness shortfalls in equipment, personnel, and training to include flying hours, steaming days, and full-spectrum training miles through a series of briefings. Coinciding with this effort, the committee held hearings on the readiness posture of the individual military departments, Navy surface fleet maintenance, potential risks associated with sequestration, and the Department's over-reliance on Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding to fund base-level requirements.

The committee noted that, while slight improvements in readiness across the total force occurred in 2014, non-deployed units continued to face readiness challenges including equipment unavailability, personnel shortages, and lost training opportunities. The committee notes that the impacts of sequestration and top-line budget reductions will continue to pose a long-term risk to readiness for the foreseeable future. The committee remains concerned that these challenges pose a significant threat to national security and the safety and security of the Armed Forces.

To better understand the unique challenges sequestration presents to the total force readiness, the Joint Explanatory Statement to accompany H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review readiness trends and risks within the military departments with a particular focus on gaps between combatant commander requirements and operational plan execution. Further, the committee mandated changes to the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress, requiring the Department to provide greater clarity and visibility on changes to military readiness both within geographic combatant commands and the Defense combat support agencies, in addition to providing details on the efficacy of major exercises and data on the Nation's military readiness for cyber operations.

The committee also tasked GAO with key assessments on emerging readiness issues, such as forward-deployed naval forces and associated sustainment issues, the Department of Defense's Arctic capabilities, and contracts for services spending. Finally, H.R. 3979 would provide the Secretary of the Navy an exception to Title 10 maintenance requirements for the purpose of a 2-year pilot program, for no more than three Littoral Combat Ship vessels, in order to permit corrective and preventive maintenance during extended deployments.

With the drawdown of operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the escalation of operations elsewhere in the world, the committee anticipates a smaller decrease than forecast in the realignment of funds from the Department's Overseas Contingency

Operations budget to the operation and maintenance base budgets, which may present challenges to fully understanding and resourcing steady-state operations tempo. To address this issue, H.R. 3979 would require the Department of Defense to include an analysis of enduring mission requirements for equipping, training, sustainment, and other operation and maintenance activities that are financed by the OCO budget as part of the next Defense Strategy Review.

The committee also remains concerned that a full reset of the total force remains at risk in a constrained budget environment. Subsequently, the committee provided rigorous oversight of ongoing property accountability, retrograde, and depot maintenance efforts. Further, the committee will continue to monitor the disposition of non-standard equipment returning from Afghanistan to ensure that defense articles are budgeted for and sustained properly and that excess equipment is reutilized by partner nations or U.S. state and local entities to the maximum extent possible to minimize waste.

Overall, while the committee believes that readiness levels have improved across the military services, readiness remains fragile and is vulnerable to changes in mission, competing resource priorities, and is contingent upon forecasted deployments to support operations in Afghanistan and Syria and Iraq. This fragility is especially acute with respect to non-deployed ground-force units which have sacrificed their readiness in order to provide additional resources to deployed, or next-to-deploy, units. The committee remains concerned about the number of these non-deployed units reporting they are not ready for their core missions or would need additional time, personnel, and equipment to prepare for deployment. In response, the committee held a number of briefings and hearings, and conducted multiple oversight visits to affected units.

The committee remains concerned about future readiness levels, given the return of sequestration in fiscal year 2016 and a lower end-strength, which has reduced the Army's capacity to undertake additional missions, such as providing logistical and medical support to counter the spread of Ebola in West Africa or helping reassure allies in Europe through the European Reassurance Initiative, and has increased the risk to major contingencies. This increased risk includes the Army's new operational construct of a Regionally Aligned Force (RAF), which has seen success in supporting geographical combatant commanders and U.S. diplomatic missions abroad through smaller, tailored deployments. To help Congress better understand the RAF concept and better inform resourcing decisions, H.R. 3979 included an Army assessment of the RAF concept and tasked the Army with a re-evaluation of other strategic assets, such as prepositioned stocks, and their ability to support RAF operations.

Restoring equipment readiness is a key element of maintaining Army readiness. The committee notes the positive trends in the reset, retrograde, and refurbishment of Army equipment used in support of Operation Enduring Freedom and has provided additional resources in fiscal year 2015 to continue improving materiel readiness. However, the committee remains concerned about the Army's ability to absorb another round of sequestration-driven reductions without negatively affecting reset needed for current oper-



ations and those likely to be undertaken in the future and the growing long-term impacts of deferring higher-level maintenance in favor of 10/20 standards for units preparing to deploy or already forward deployed.

The committee also has growing concerns about the potential return of disproportionately high readiness shortfalls within the National Guard and Reserve Components after briefings and hearings reinforced and re-emphasized potential future-year issues. While these shortfalls have improved slightly over the past 2 years, further years of sequestration could seriously challenge the ability of the Reserve Component to remain operationally ready. To help address the most critical deficiencies in the Active and Reserve Components, H.R. 3979 would provide resources for additional flying hours, training miles, training center rotations, and depot maintenance.

The committee found that the Air Force continues to experience a high operational tempo, which has resulted in detrimental effects on equipment, such as engine and structural fatigue, deterioration, corrosion, and increased rates of component failures. The increased tempo also delays required routine maintenance. As a result, the committee intends to continue its review of the significant shortfalls experienced by the Air Force in depot maintenance, particularly in its baseline program for Active and Reserve forces which the Air Force has made up for through Overseas Contingency Operations funding. The committee also has found that challenges are expected to persist as operational tempo is anticipated to remain at high levels during the drawdown of U.S. forces supporting Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan, such as what occurred with Operation Northern Watch following Operation Desert Storm or, even more recently, with the simultaneous operations in the State of Libya. This will be particularly problematic for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve as they also continue to provide support for U.S. domestic operations, which was highlighted during the Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on the Army and Air Reserve Components.

Unforeseen commitments unfolding in both Ukraine and Iraq have led to increased operational tempo, despite the drawdown in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, as demand for naval assets continues to increase as a result of the rebalance to the Pacific and other regional commands. The committee continues to remain concerned about the size of the U.S. Navy fleet based on current downward demands, particularly in light of years of degraded maintenance on the Navy's non-nuclear surface fleet, sustained high operational tempo, and a reset cost associated with restoring those assets for which maintenance was deferred. In recent months, those trends seem to be negatively affecting the subsurface fleet as well.

The committee remains concerned about the Navy's readiness to meet combatant commander demands, particularly in light of sequestration, which is expected to degrade the Navy's ability to provide surge capacity. The committee requested GAO review the Navy's initiatives to improve amphibious and surface combatant ship material readiness. Additionally, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), the committee included additional funds for ship and aircraft depot mainte-

nance to address the backlog of requirements and to prevent further degradation to the fleet as well as funds to address the combat forces equipment shortfall. H.R. 3979 included additional funding to address depot maintenance shortfalls.

The committee also continues to monitor the impacts of higher-than-anticipated operational tempo imposed on the Marine Corps due to emerging requirements across the world. Like it has with the Army, the committee has monitored the Marine Corps' reset operations to replace and refurbish equipment and vehicles damaged in wartime operations as well as its collective training activities and "new normal" deployments in support of the Department of State.

While Marine Corps readiness has improved over the past 2 years, progress remains fragile, and the committee continues to be concerned about the impacts of another round of sequestration on a Marine Corps that is supporting a growing set of enduring missions, such as greater support to U.S. embassies, crisis response elements across multiple regions of the world, and the resumption of the Unit Deployment Program in support of U.S. Pacific Command. To ensure that the Marine Corps remains ready for current operations, H.R. 3979 contains additional resources for the creation of a Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force in both U.S. Southern Command and U.S. Central Command, as well as increased funding for depot maintenance, training days, and exercises.

The committee also continues to monitor the risk the Marine Corps has accepted in its heavy reliance on Overseas Contingency Operations funding to maintain its required end strength supporting geographic combatant command requirements, as outlined in the Department of Defense's New Defense Strategic Guidance.

#### Depot and Arsenal Capability

The committee continues to conduct oversight of the health of the organic industrial base in a declining workload environment, particularly as the end of combat operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan draws near. A critical aspect of equipment sustainment is the capability provided by the Nation's organic arsenals and depots, including air logistics centers and shipyards. Realizing the resultant strain on the organic industrial base, accompanied by the cuts required by sequestration, the committee continues to closely monitor the volume, location, and types of maintenance and manufacturing performed at the depots and arsenals in the United States and in forward-deployed locations. While some military departments have completed an organic industrial base sustainment plan, the committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense continues to lack a comprehensive strategy to ensure U.S. military depots and arsenals have the workforce, equipment, and facilities for efficient operations to meet the Nation's current requirements, as well as those in the future. The committee will continue oversight of depot and arsenal operations and management, focusing on capital investment in facilities and equipment, the implementation methodology and use of sustainment concepts such as performance-based logistics, the role of public-private partnerships, the use of working capital funds for

timely product improvement, and the services' logistics enterprise resource planning systems. Furthermore, the committee will continue to examine how recent efficiency initiatives and workforce reductions impact depot and arsenal capability, as well as programs and initiatives designed to assure availability of critical organic manufacturing capabilities.

The committee has directed that arsenals be utilized for defense manufacturing to a greater extent when no commercial alternative can be found and provided authority for arsenals to submit proposals to solicitations for critical manufacturing within their respective areas of expertise as part of H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. Members and staff have also visited several depot and arsenal locations to provide oversight and more fully assess current operational impacts of sequestration.

#### Civilian Personnel

The Department of Defense has long relied on the Federal civilian workforce to support its missions around the world, often requiring civilians to serve in active combat zones, and it is clear that the Department's civilian workforce plays a critical role in the readiness of U.S. military forces. The committee included provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) and H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, to extend authorities for premium pay and allowances, benefits and gratuities for deployed civilians. The committee has also continued to closely monitor the implementation of each military department's efficiencies initiatives, including the Department's Strategic Choices and Management Review, which focuses on the civilian workforce. These initiatives included a civilian hiring freeze for all the military departments as well as significant personnel restrictions which started in 2010 and remain in effect.

The committee focused significant oversight efforts on the decision announced by the Secretary of Defense on May 14, 2013, to impose an 11-day furlough (later decreased to 6 days) on the civilian workforce. The committee remains concerned about the effects of the furlough and Government shutdown on the morale of the force which has already suffered from the civilian hiring freeze, layoffs of temporary workers, cuts in facilities maintenance and other disruptive factors on the working environment. Additionally, the committee remains concerned about the negative effect furloughs of working capital fund employees have on military readiness. The furlough of working capital fund employees when monies and workload are available only delays delivery times and raises rates, imposes unnecessary costs to taxpayers and reducing military readiness.

#### Energy and Environment

##### *Energy Security*

The committee conducted vigorous oversight of the Department of Defense's energy activities and closely examined the strategies and policies for both installation energy and operational energy to

reduce consumption and dependence on foreign oil while promoting good stewardship of taxpayer money with demonstrated returns on investment. The committee believes that Department of Defense installations provide significant opportunity for reducing energy demand through appropriate use of renewable energy technologies combined with energy security. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the final Quadrennial Defense Review assessment include details regarding the importance of, and funding necessary to achieve, energy security. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) included several provisions regarding energy policy, to include a focus on alternative fuel and installation energy specifically. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would prohibit the use of Department of Defense funds for large-scale purchases of drop-in fuels unless it is cost competitive, and it also requires the Department to provide a business case analysis to Congress before constructing a biofuel refinery. Additionally, the report directs the Comptroller General to review the Department’s Annual Energy Management report, and directs the Secretary of Defense to report on how the Department of Defense is considering the operational impact of energy logistics.

As directed by the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee received briefings from the Department of Defense regarding power and energy research at University Affiliated Research Centers, alternative power applications on military installations, direct solar and other energy efficient technologies on military installations, decentralized steam generation, and energy collaboration and technology transition. 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 received briefings from the Department of Defense regarding the infrastructure and operational requirements associated with the Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility.

### *Environment*

The committee conducted oversight of environmental issues resulting from Department of Defense activities on military installations, training ranges, and operational activities to include the military services’ environmental restoration program and adherence to Federal, state, and local cleanup, compliance, and pollution prevention requirements. There have been several areas of emerging concern to include protecting DOD training, testing, and operations from encroachment, the ability for DOD to operate in the Arctic, and persisting concerns regarding the use of burn pits in contingency environments.

H.R. 1960, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, addressed modifications to the Sikes Act to include a 5-year reauthorization and permitting the ability to use funds to match for cost-sharing requirements. The committee also continued its oversight and provided clarification regarding the prohibition of burn pits. Additionally, in the committee

report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee continues its oversight regarding the Department of Defense’s ability to operate in the Arctic by directing a roadmap for 2020–2030, as well as concerns regarding the Military Ocean Terminal Concord, California, and finally directs an audit of the impacts of encroachment on national security and the Department of Defense’s ability to train and operate on its defense installations.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, includes several provisions, to include a Department of Defense report regarding compliance with applicable laws and DOD Instructions regarding the disposal of covered waste in burn pits in addition to a Comptroller General review. Additionally, there is a Sikes Act modification to permit lump-sum payments, as well as a provision that permits DOD to clean up the former naval bombardment area on the Island of Culebra, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

As directed by the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee received a briefing from the Department of Defense regarding environmental exposures and the Department of Defense’s processes to minimize exposure and seek technological solutions. 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 received a briefing from the Department of Defense regarding invasive species management and coconut rhinoceros beetles.

## MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

### Basing

The Department of Defense is undergoing a significant change in force structure both in the United States and overseas as a result of the drawdown of military forces from the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Global Defense Posture Review, and budgetary pressures being placed on the Department of Defense. These rebasing movements affect not only U.S. global presence, but they may also have significant repercussions for readiness, surge capability, military construction, and quality of life for military members and their families.

The committee has been specifically interested in ensuring the Department of Defense has the requisite tools and capabilities to support the Pacific rebalance effort. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), included a legislative section that restricted certain construction funds to support the realignment of military forces from Okinawa to Guam or Hawaii until specific conditions are completed including: submission of a report required by section 1068(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239); master plans for the Marine Corps distributed laydown on Guam and Hawaii; and, a coordinated Federal agencies plan to provide public infrastructure on Guam. The Act included several exceptions to the restrictions to allow the expenditure of funds to support a certain military construction project, funds to support planning and design

activities on Guam, and funds to continue environmental analyses associated with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 support the realignment of Marine Corps assets to Guam.

Public Law 113–66 Act also included specific authority to initiate certain Air Force military construction projects that would harden certain hangars and fuel points to ensure the survivability of these critical nodes. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included restrictions that would amend section 2822 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) and would remove certain restrictions limiting the movement of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa, Japan. H.R. 3979 would specifically eliminate the prohibition on construction activities and replace it with an overall cost cap on such construction, reflecting the Department’s July 2014 submitted Master Plan for Guam. H.R. 3979 would continue the restrictions on the development of public infrastructure on Guam unless a grant, transfer, cooperative agreement, or supplemental funding for the development of public infrastructure is specifically authorized by law and would be used to carry out a project included in the report of the Economic Adjustment Committee required by section 2831(d) of Public Law 113–66.

The committee also assessed the Department of Defense’s request for two additional rounds of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). After contemplating information provided by the Department of Defense that supports two additional rounds of BRAC, Public Law 113–66 included language that stated nothing in the Act shall be construed to authorize a future BRAC round. For fiscal year 2015, H.R. 3979 retained this BRAC restriction and the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3979 noted that the Department of Defense’s and military departments’ current estimates of excess infrastructure capacity associated with military installations are based on outdated data from the analysis done in support of the 2005 BRAC round. Due to the force structure changes and infrastructure investments and management strategies that have occurred since the 2005 BRAC round, the committee believes that the Department’s excess infrastructure capacity assessments should be based on current infrastructure data and informed by current force structure projections. As a result, the President’s budget request for fiscal year 2015 was reduced for Defense-Wide Operation and Maintenance by \$8.0 million, which represented the funding requested by the Department to develop recommendations and manage a new BRAC round.

The committee is concerned about the use of host-nation funding sources on military construction projects and potential concerns to this program that have occurred over the past several years. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) included a requirement to obtain a specific congressional authorization to use host-nation funding in support of a project in excess of the military construction authority provided in section 2805 of title 10, United States Code. For fiscal year 2015, H.R. 3979 included language that would clarify the requirement of section 2687a of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 2807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

2014 (Public Law 113–66), that military construction projects built with in-kind payments or in-kind contributions required by bilateral agreements be specifically authorized by law. This provision also included an enactment date effective the later of September 30, 2016, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017. The provision also exempted military construction projects funded with payments-in-kind or in-kind contributions that were the subject of negotiation between the U.S. and a host country as of the date of enactment of this Act. Until the enactment date, H.R. 3979 requires notification to the congressional defense committees at least 30 days prior to initiating any military construction project built for Department of Defense personnel outside the U.S. using payments-in-kind or in-kind contributions and make other conforming changes.

#### Military Construction Programming

With regard to construction programming, the committee continued its efforts to provide combatant commanders limited authority to rapidly implement contingency construction to address emerging construction requirements. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) contained a provision that authorized the use of operations and maintenance funds for contingency construction. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would extend this authorization to the combatant commanders for another year.

Further, the committee increased the Department of Defense’s flexibility with regard to the authority to carry out unspecified minor military construction. H.R. 3979 modified section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, by increasing the threshold associated with operation and maintenance funding for minor military construction purposes from \$750,000 to \$1.0 million. H.R. 3979 also unified the threshold for application of unspecified minor construction from \$2.0 million to \$3.0 million and increased the maximum amount of unspecified minor military construction funding that can be used to correct facility deficiencies that threaten the life, safety, or health of personnel from \$3.0 million to \$4.0 million.

The committee continues to support initiatives to streamline the existing military construction programming authorities, and Public Law 113–66 included language that expanded the authority for military laboratories to implement construction projects and required local installation security assessments to determine the appropriate level of anti-terrorism/force protection criteria to insert in future construction projects. This Act also deleted certain outdated reporting requirements previously provided to Congress. H.R. 3979 also included language to modify section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Secretary concerned notify the congressional defense committees at least 15 days prior to the initiation of any construction, land acquisition, or defense-access road project by a military department, defense agency, or Department of Defense Field Activity on a military installation that will be carried out pursuant to a provision of law other than a Military Construction Authorization Act.

### Real Property Acquisition, Maintenance, and Disposal

The real property management process requires extensive oversight to maintain more than \$850.3 billion in infrastructure at an annual cost of almost \$37.0 billion, or nearly 7.5 percent, of the Department of Defense's budget. To ensure proper oversight of this real property inventory, in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee expressed concern about the extensive use of existing leasing authorities and requested the Comptroller General assess the magnitude of Department of Defense leasing efforts. The committee report also included a requirement for the Comptroller General to submit a report on the Department of Defense's efforts to improve the accuracy of its real property inventory database and the impact on consolidations activities to this database. Additionally, the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying the H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, required a report to assess the current use utilization rates of the Department of Defense real property inventory.

With regard to the execution of previous BRAC rounds, the committee remained concerned that the efficiencies associated with the process are offset with the inability to quickly dispose of excess property and the potential lack of overall savings to the federal government. Therefore, the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2015, as to the overall effectiveness of the property disposal process from each prior BRAC round. In addition, the committee is concerned that previous recommendations were not effectively implemented, thus obviating certain cost saving opportunities, and directed the Comptroller General to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the BRAC 2005 recommendations to merge or consolidate functions to become more joint.

The committee also reviewed the Department of Defense facility sustainment accounts and found that significant shortfalls needed to be addressed to manage basic services. The committee proposed increased funding to these accounts in both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and H.R. 3979 to address shortfalls in the facility sustainment accounts to partially support systemic facility sustainment deficits.

### Military Infrastructure Privatization

The Department of Defense has made extensive use of privatization of military assets including family housing, bachelor quarters, and utility-related infrastructure. The Department has leveraged available capital in Department of Defense infrastructure and entered into long-term contracts with private property managers. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) provided additional oversight and accountability in the pursuit of military family housing privatization projects to include an assessment of litigation costs that are being pursued by the privatization partners.



## TOTAL FORCE, PERSONNEL, AND HEALTH CARE ISSUES

## Manpower Sufficient in Quantity and Quality to Meet Global Commitments

The committee continued to provide oversight of military manpower levels and force structure during the first session of the 113th Congress. The committee remains concerned with the impact sequestration will have on the ability of the services to maintain manpower levels sufficient to meet the National Military Strategy.

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on February 27, 2013, to receive testimony from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the service personnel chiefs regarding the impact of sequestration, the continuing resolution and the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25) on end strength draw-down plans. At the time of the hearing, there was much uncertainty over the future of sequestration and the committee had not yet received the President's budget request.

The committee supported the end strengths of the military services as requested in the President's budget in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House on June 14, 2013. Following House passage of H.R. 1960, the Secretary of Defense's Strategic Choices and Management Review (SCMR) was released, which recommended further adjustments to the services' force structure and end strength plans. These adjustments were primarily based on projected budgetary concerns, instead of strategic analysis of national security mission requirements. The SCMR recommended accelerating the reductions for the Army and Marine Corps to the pre-sequester end strength targets of 490,000 for the Army and 182,100 for the Marine Corps by the end of fiscal year 2015, 2 years before originally anticipated. Based on these changes, as part of H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee supported the Army and Marine Corps adjusted reductions by lowering the minimum end strength levels for fiscal year 2014, as well as adjusted the limitations on annual reductions for the Army and Marine Corps imposed in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239).

The new, most optimistic end-state based on the SCMR recommendations would shrink the Army to 420,000 from 450,000; and the Marine Corps to between 170,000 and 175,000. The committee remains concerned that unfettered reductions in end strength will have a detrimental impact on force structure and ultimately, operational mission capability and capacity among the services, and harm the morale of the force.

In the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee remained concerned with the continued reduction of military manpower and force structure. The committee supported the end strengths of the services requested in the President's budget, in H.R. 4435, the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as passed by the House, but limited the reductions by placing a floor on the military services end strength since there remains concern with the future projected manning levels based on testimony from the service chiefs. They testified that sequestration forced reductions of end strength will drive readiness

of the force down decreasing the ability to accomplish assigned missions putting our Nation's defense at high risk.

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on January 16, 2014, to receive testimony on future recruiting challenges in the fiscally constrained environment. The subcommittee also held a hearing on March 25, 2014, to receive testimony on the Military Personnel Overview from Department of Defense and service personnel chiefs about military personnel issues addressed in the President's budget submission for fiscal year 2015. The subcommittee also held a hearing September 17, 2014, to receive a briefing from GAO on their report on the cost of General and Flag Officers.

### Military Benefits

The committee continued to closely monitor compensation programs during the first and second session of the 113th Congress to ensure an adequate quality of life for service members and their families and to ensure that pay and benefits meet the needs of the wartime military and keep pace with private sector standards. The committee's active oversight of these issues led the committee as part of H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House on June 7, 2013, and again as part of H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 as passed by the House on May 22, 2014, to recommend no change to current law, which would allow a 1.8 percent raise in basic pay during fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 based on section 1009 of title 37, United States Code. It is the intent of the underlying law to ensure military pay raises match the rate of compensation increases in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index. Following passage of H.R. 1960, the President used his authority and notified Congress that he was setting the 2014 military basic pay raise at 1.0 percent, well below the Employment Cost Index. Again, following the passage of H.R. 4435 the President used his authority and notified Congress that he was setting the 2015 military basic pay raise at 1.0 percent, again, well below the Employment Cost Index. Consistent with the position of the House, H.R. 3304 and H.R. 4435 neither affirms nor rejects the President's decision. However, in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-103) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and the committee report (H. Rept. 113-446) accompanying Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee expressed concern that future pay raise proposals that are below the Employment Cost Index may have long term adverse consequences on the recruiting and retention of a high-quality All-Volunteer Force.

The committee extended the authorities to pay bonuses and special pays during fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 and monitored the value of those bonuses and special pays to ensure they were sufficient to achieve the recruiting and retention objectives for which they were developed. The committee also included legislation that reforms and prevents a retired pay inversion for members whose retired pay is computed under the high-three average. Further, the committee included legislation that would require the De-

partment of Defense to use the services of an independent organization experienced in grocery retail analysis to assess any proposed changes to the defense commissary system. The committee continues to closely monitor the progress of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), as they continue their work to develop recommendations for the modernization of the military compensation and retirement system. On September 12, 2013, pursuant to section 674(c) of Public Law 112–239, the President transmitted his principles for modernizing the military compensation and retirement systems.

On April 8, 2014, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive testimony on the Beneficiary and Advocacy Overview of the fiscal year 2015 President’s Budget. On September 17, 2014, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing from Government Accountability Office on their report on the cost of General and Flag Officers.

#### Military Family Readiness

The United States remains a Nation at war. Consequently, the families of the members of the Armed Forces continue to experience the strains associated with repeated deployments. In this regard, the committee focused on the needs of military families to identify the programs and policies that can be developed or enhanced to improve their lives.

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, and the committee report (H. Rept. 113–103) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 continued the effort to provide family programs as the Department of Defense and the military services conducted reviews of existing family programs in light of end strength reductions and shrinking resources. Recognizing the unique challenges faced by families of service members assigned to special operations forces, H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, authorized the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command to conduct pilot programs to assess the benefits of U.S. Special Operations Command providing family support activities in addition family support programs provided by the military services.

In addition, to assist in the committee’s oversight efforts regarding stress on military families related to multiple deployments, the committee included the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to review the ability of the military services to collect and analyze suicide among family members and report on the feasibility of collecting and retaining such data.

Continuing the committee’s efforts towards addressing deployment related stress on the family, H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would direct requirements for the Secretary of Defense to develop a standard method for collecting, reporting and assessing any suicide or attempted suicide of members of the Armed Forces, including Reserve Components, and any death reported as a suicide of a dependent of a member of the Armed Forces.

To further support service members who are deployed, H.R. 3979 includes an amendment to the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (50 U.S.C.) that would require temporary custody orders rendered by a court based solely on the deployment of the parent to last only for the period justified by the deployment.

#### Mental Health Services for Members of the Armed Forces

The committee continued to focus on the adequacy and effectiveness of mental health services provided to members of the Armed Forces and their families. Of particular concern are the mental health resources for members of the military services especially while they are deployed. H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, addressed this concern by including a provision that requires person-to-person mental health exams every 180 days while a service member is deployed. In addition, the House passed bill provided for the continuity of mental health care for services members leaving military service by including a provision that extends the Transitional Assistance Management Program (TAMP) an additional 180 days for behavioral health care using telemedicine.

Particular attention was given to the suicide prevention efforts undertaken by each military service and the development of the comprehensive Department of Defense policy on prevention of suicide among members of the Armed Forces. In this regard, the committee also focused on mental health issues that may ultimately result in suicide, such as the incidence of alcohol abuse among service members and their families and treatment for post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and traumatic brain injury (TBI). H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, included the recommendation that the Department of Defense consider a systems medicine approach to improve the research and development of PTSD and TBI.

On March 21, 2013, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel conducted a hearing to receive testimony from the military services on the current status of suicide prevention programs in the military. The hearing provided Members with the opportunity to examine the implementation of suicide prevention programs in each of the military services. On April 10, 2013, the subcommittee conducted a hearing to receive testimony from the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services on how DOD funded research on mental health related matters, specifically PTSD and TBI, has improved the treatment of mental health conditions for members of the military and their family members. On September 17, 2013, the subcommittee received a briefing from the Defense Center of Excellence on Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury. On November 15, 2013, the subcommittee received a briefing on the research findings conducted under the Mindfulness-Based Mind Fitness Training Pilot Research in cooperation with the Army and Marine Corps.

During the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued oversight on mental health support for members of the Armed Forces and their families. To that end, H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would direct requirements for the Secretary of Defense to provide a face-to-face mental health assess-

ment to all members of the Armed Forces, including the Selected Reserve, once each calendar year. In addition, H.R. 3979 requires a mental health assessment once every 180 days while a service member is deployed. H.R. 3979 also requires the Secretary evaluate specific tools, processes and best practices to improve the identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces.

### Military Health Care System

The committee remained committed to a robust military health system which provides quality health care for service members, retirees, and their families. As such, the committee continued to exercise vigorous oversight on the military health system. Committee oversight activities included staff visits to several military medical facilities, including medical facilities that are currently under construction. The committee continued to address the cost of providing health care to military beneficiaries as well as the out-of-pocket cost of health care for beneficiaries. Additionally, the committee focused on the reforms to the military health system through briefings by the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) on the congressional mandated reports on the military health system governance reform implementation plan.

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, and the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 included several legislative provisions and reporting requirements on the military health system. Among others, these include provisions relating to the shortcomings of the March 2013 Department of Defense report on the Military Health System (MHS) governance reform, a GAO review of consolidated medical training at the Medical Education Training Campus, a one-time opt-in for TRICARE prime for beneficiaries who live in certain zip codes and requirements for the DOD–VA integrated electronic health record.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, directed the Secretary of Defense to complete implementation of the Healthcare Artifact and Image Management Solution (HAIMS) within 180 days following enactment of the Act.

During the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued to exercise the oversight plan through visits to medical facilities both overseas and in the United States. The committee staff continued aggressive oversight on the progress toward implementing the DOD–VA integrated electronic health record through monthly meetings with the Program Executive Officer. The committee remains concerned with the depth of analysis undertaken by the Department of Defense to inform major decisions affecting the structure of the military health system and ultimately the availability of and access to military health care. As such, H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from restructuring a military medical treatment facility until the Comptroller General reviews a report submitted to the Congressional defense committees, by the Secretary, that in-

cludes detailed information on the medical treatment facilities included in the Military Health System Modernization Study.

On February 26, 2014, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive testimony on the defense health agency. On March 4, 2014, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on the Progress in Modernizing DOD Electronic Health Records. On April 3, 2014, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on Progress in Modernizing DOD Electronic Health Records.

#### Morale, Welfare and Recreation Programs and Military Resale Programs

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) and military resale programs (commonly known as commissary and exchange stores) are a valuable benefit to the All-Volunteer force. Critics have continued to target these programs as being unnecessary and wasteful, and have proposed to reduce or eliminate appropriated funding. The committee rejects such assertions and believes cost efficient sustainment of MWR and military resale programs (commissaries and exchanges) is required to protect quality of life for military families and their communities and help ensure the readiness of the force. In its oversight efforts, the committee held several meetings with the Department of Defense to discuss initiatives to gain efficiencies in the management and delivery of MWR programs at every level, to include installation level. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel met in an open hearing on November 20, 2013, titled “Military Resale Programs Overview” in order to discuss how the military resale community will continue to provide benefits to service members, families and retirees in a fiscally constrained environment.

The committee continued to provide oversight of these vitally important programs in the second session of the 113th Congress. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included a provision that would direct a review of commissary management, food and pricing operations to help answer the committee’s concern about arbitrary budgetary decisions and future sustainability of the commissary system.

#### Prisoner of War and Missing in Action

Over the past several years, the committee has maintained active oversight of the Department of Defense’s Prisoner of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) activities, as the committee of jurisdiction. That oversight led to the requirement that the Department of Defense reform the POW/MIA accounting effort and achieve significantly higher levels of identification by 2015. The committee continued its oversight role by receiving updates from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for POW/Missing Personnel Affairs and the Commander of Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC) on their plans to achieve the legislative mandate to increase the number of identifications to a rate of 200 per year by 2015. The committee also received the Comptroller General of the United States review as directed by committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2013 to conduct a review of the Secretary of Defense's efforts to significantly increase the capability and capacity of the Department of Defense to account for missing persons in accordance with section 1509 of title 10, United States.

Based on the Comptroller General's review and media reports on an internal study completed by JPAC, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on August 1, 2013, to discuss the results of both studies and the challenges of the POW/MIA accounting community to increase identifications. The committee is pleased the Secretary of Defense concurred with the Comptroller General's recommendations but remains concerned with the Secretary's efforts to increase the effectiveness, integration, capability, and capacity to account for missing persons. The committee eagerly awaits the Director of the Cost, Assessment and Program and Evaluation (CAPE) review and recommendation on how the Department should proceed, as well as the results of the Department of Defense Inspector General's investigation into allegations of fraud, waste and abuse at JPAC in order to determine if further legislation is required. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel is expected to continue its active oversight of POW/MIA issues.

In March 2014, the Secretary of Defense made the decision to consolidate the POW/MIA accounting community into a single defense agency in order to create a single chain of command and increase efficiency. This decision was based on the GAO review and CAPE's recommendations. On July 15, 2014, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive testimony from the Department of Defense on their review of the Prisoner of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) community and the restructuring of these agencies as directed by the Secretary of Defense. As a result, H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would direct modifications to the requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing by establishing a single defense agency for POW/MIA affairs and provide additional authorities to enhance recovery efforts and provide family members information.

#### Sexual Assault in the Military

The committee continued to hold the Department of Defense and the military services accountable to address sexual assaults in the military and ensure victims are provided the appropriate care and support. As a result of this aggressive oversight, H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act, as passed by the House, contained substantial, bipartisan reforms, especially to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Reforms to the Uniform Code of Military Justice would:

- (1) Strip commanders of their authority to dismiss a finding by a court martial, a power they have held since the earliest days of our military;
- (2) Prohibit commanders from overturning or reducing guilty findings to guilty of a lesser offense;
- (3) Limit commander's authority to modify adjudged sentences;

(4) Establish minimum sentencing guidelines where service members are found guilty of sexual assault related offenses. Currently, such guidelines only exist in the military for the crimes of murder and espionage.

(5) Enable the victim of a crime to provide the convening authority materials for the convening authority's post-trial for consideration;

(6) Set guidelines for defense council interviews of the victim; and,

(7) Require the provision of victims' counsels, qualified and specially trained lawyers in each of the services, to be made available to provide legal assistance to the victims of sex-related offenses;

(8) Articulate the rights of a crime victim; and

(9) Require both the Secretary of Defense and the independent panel established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 to assess the current role and authorities of commanders in the administration of military justice and the investigation, prosecution, and adjudication of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, included other reforms to complement the reforms made to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Those additional reforms would:

(1) Allow victims of sexual assault to apply for a permanent change of station or unit transfer, while authorizing the Secretary of Defense to inform commanders of their authority to remove or temporarily reassign service members who are the alleged perpetrators of sexual assault;

(2) Add rape, sexual assault, or other sexual misconduct to the protected; communications of service members with a Member of Congress or an Inspector General;

(3) Increase commander accountability, and help establish a military culture intolerant of sexual assaults through improved security as well as health and welfare inspections;

(4) Mandate the processing for administrative separation of any service member guilty of an inappropriate and prohibited relationship, communication, conduct, or contact, including when such an action is consensual, with a prospective member of the Armed Forces or a member undergoing entry-level processing or training; and

(5) Direct the Government Accountability Office to review implementation of the Air Force corrective actions following the sexual misconduct at Lackland Air Force Base.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, further strengthens the reforms. These reforms would:

(1) Require the completion of a preliminary hearing, (Article 32, UCMJ) prior to referral to a general court-martial for trial of any charge or specification;

(2) Change Article 32, UCMJ proceedings to a preliminary hearing to determine probable cause; and

(3) Require decisions by a convening authority not to refer charges of sex-related offenses to trial by court-martial in cases where the staff judge advocate recommends that the charges



be referred to be reviewed by the secretary of the military service.

During the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued to conduct aggressive oversight on sexual assault among members of the military and to work with the Department of Defense and the military services to address accountability, prosecution of offenders and victim support. Committee oversight included a series of briefings on key issue areas, including: on March 6, 2014, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive a briefing on Sexual Assault Prosecution and Conviction Rates; on June 25, 2014, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on Status of the Implementation of the Sexual Assault Provisions in the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 2012, 2013 and 2014 and the Secretary of Defense Initiatives Announced in August 201; and, on July 31, 2014 the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on the Recommendations from the Response Systems to Adult Sexual Assault Crimes Panel.

In addition, further reforms were included in H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, to include:

(1) Changes to when and under which circumstances depositions may be ordered under the Uniformed Code of Military Justice;

(2) Expanding access to Special Victims Counsel to members of the reserve components if an alleged sex-related offense occurred while the member was serving on active duty, full-time National Guard duty or inactive duty training, or if the circumstances of the sex-related offense has a nexus to the military service of the victim;

(3) Requiring that a victim be consulted regarding their preference whether the offense should be prosecuted by court-martial or in a civilian court with jurisdiction over the offense and that the convening authority consider the victim’s preference when making a determination whether to refer the charge for the offense to a court-martial for trial;

(4) Eliminating “good soldier defense” for the purpose of showing the probability of innocence for sex-related offenses;

(5) Modification of Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence to include communication between a psychotherapist and patient under privileged communications; and

(6) Expanded the specified personnel who may be assigned to duty as a Sexual assault Forensic Examiner to include physicians, nurse practitioners, nurse midwives, physician’s assistants and registered nurses.

#### Wounded Warrior Care

The committee devoted substantial attention on the adequacy of the Department of Defense (DOD) policies and programs for wounded and disabled service members and their families. In this regard, the committee oversight activities included several staff visits to the military service’s units responsible for the care, recovery and transition of wounded, ill and injured service members. Committee staff also visited several defense centers of excellence to assess the progress towards providing wounded, ill and injured serv-

ice members new and innovative treatment and technology to improve recovery and quality of life.

The committee continued to provide oversight and expressed concern about the backlog of cases in the Integrated Disability Evaluation System. The committee monitored, through quarterly briefings with DOD and the military services, progress toward reducing the time a service member remains in the Integrated Disability Evaluation System and the backlog of cases awaiting completion. Committee staff visited the Department of Veterans Affairs Disability Rating Activity Site (DRAS) to assess the progress in reducing the number of backlogged disability claims submitted by service members.

On September 17, 2013, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel received a briefing from the DOD–VA Centers of Excellence for Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury, Hearing and Vision on research regarding visual dysfunction related to traumatic brain injury and implementation of the Comptroller General’s recommendations to prevent hearing loss. On July 17, 2014, the subcommittee met to receive a briefing on Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs Formularies and Medication Management for Transitioning Service Members.

## MODERNIZATION AND INVESTMENT ISSUES

### Overview

During the 113th Congress, particular attention was given by the committee to the examination of military equipment modernization strategies with respect to military capability. The committee conducted oversight of the full range of modernization and investment issues facing the Department of Defense, to include the impacts of budget uncertainty and sequestration. How Congress chooses to fund Department of Defense future acquisition programs will dramatically affect the size, health, age, and supporting industrial base of the air, sea, and land force structure available to U.S. forces in support of the National Military Strategy and current strategic defense planning guidance, as well as the Nation’s vital interests. The committee remained concerned by continued cost growth and schedule delays among all categories of acquisition programs. The committee continued to assess the need for legislative action by examining causes of these problems including: late determination of requirements, requirements growth, failure to properly control requirements changes; inadequate analyses of alternatives, concurrency in test and evaluation, military services proceeding prematurely with development of immature technology; poor cost estimating; inadequate funding profiles; over-estimation of potential production rates; and program instability.

In particular, the committee examined whether the military services have the appropriate authorities, capabilities, and force structure to defend against any potential challenges posed by the advanced anti-access capabilities of countries such as the People’s Republic of China and the Islamic Republic of Iran, consistent with the report of the 2010 Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review which found that, “Anti-access strategies seek to deny outside countries the ability to project power into a region, thereby al-

lowing aggression or other destabilizing actions to be conducted by the anti-access power. Without dominant capabilities to project power, the integrity of U.S. alliances and security partnerships could be called into question, reducing U.S. security and influence and increasing the possibility of conflict.”

#### Army and Marine Corps Armored Vehicle Modernization

The committee conducted rigorous oversight of the Army and Marine Corps’ evolving plans to modernize their entire fleets of armored combat vehicles. In particular, the committee focused on ensuring that the existing fleet of armored vehicles is properly upgraded and reset after very heavy use in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and that the Army continues to field vehicles with effective survivability requirements that mitigate the evolving anti-vehicle threat posed by improvised explosive devices (IEDs), as well as protect against advances in anti-tank guided missiles. In addition to ensuring modernization of existing armored vehicles such as the M1 Abrams Tank, the Bradley Fighting Vehicle, and Stryker Combat Vehicle, the committee also continued aggressive efforts to oversee and shape the evolving Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) program, as well as the follow-on effort to the Marine Corps Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV) program, the Amphibious Combat Vehicle (ACV) program, through formal activities to include hearings, briefings, official correspondence and travel, as well as senior level meetings with Army and Marine Corps officials.

The committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces and the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces have focused on understanding the basis of these requirements for the GCV and ACV as they pertain to their respective Analysis of Alternatives, containing program costs, ensuring realistic operational requirements are validated, as well as ensuring appropriate and thorough testing is complete for both systems before moving forward in development and procurement. The committee has also worked closely with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) to conduct rigorous oversight and evaluation of major armored vehicle programs as necessary. These oversight efforts also included official hearings, site visits, close coordination with Army and Marine Corps leadership as well as the office of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, and careful scrutinization of reprogramming requests. The committee remained concerned about the Army’s proposal to let the Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT) vehicle production lines go “cold” for 3-to-4 years and the associated impact this decision would have on the industrial base at both the prime contractor and vendor level.

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, authorized full funding for the GCV program. The bill would also restrict the Army from obligating technology development funds until the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the defense committees that provides Congress with more detailed information regarding the current program requirements and acquisition strategy. H.R. 1960 also mandates an annual reporting requirement on the ACV program by the

Government Accountability Office (GAO). Finally, H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, authorized \$243.0 million in additional funding to allow for the continued sustainment of the Army's ABCT vehicle production base by maintaining at least minimum sustained production for Abrams tank upgrades and heavy improved recovery vehicles. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, directs an additional \$165.0 million for ABCT industrial base sustainment, and supported the provisions contained in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, with minor technical and clarifying amendments.

As part of the legislative process for the development of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee continued to express concerns about the ABCT industrial base, as well as future development efforts for next generation combat vehicles such as the Marine Corps' ACV 1.1 program, and the Army's Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle (AMPV) program, respectively. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, authorized an additional \$309.0 million for the continued sustainment of the ABCT industrial base. In addition, H.R. 3979 would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds to not more than 80 percent for the Army's AMPV program until the Secretary of the Army submits a report to the congressional defense committees on the Army's plan to eventually replace all M-113 Armored Personnel Carriers (APC) within Echelons-Above-Brigade (EAB) formations. The Army's current AMPV plan addresses a critical shortfall within Echelons-Below-Brigade (EBB) formations, but not survivability shortfalls within EAB formations.

#### Army and Marine Corps Tactical Wheeled Vehicles

The committee remained concerned over the challenges facing the Army and Marine Corps in managing the magnitude of their tactical wheeled vehicle (TWV) fleet, to include the associated industrial bases at all levels, during this economic downturn and fiscally constrained environment. During the 113th Congress, the committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, through formal hearings, briefings, and active engagement with senior Department of Defense officials, as well as auditors from the Government Accountability Office continued to provide oversight on DOD's TWV fleets. The committee focused oversight efforts on the Army and Marine Corps' TWV modernization strategies for their families of light, medium, and heavy TWVs, the family of mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicles, line haul tractor trailers, and construction equipment. In particular, the committee focused on ensuring that the existing fleet of TWVs and MRAPs are properly modernized and reset after very heavy operational use in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee also ensured the National Guard and Reserve Component received modernized TWVs to address current modernization shortfalls.

During the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee expressed significant concerns about the long-term viability of the TWV industrial base, as a result of severe impacts of sequestration on the TWV industrial base, specifically the medium and heavy

TWV base. The committee recommended several TWV industrial base risk mitigation efforts and noted the Department's current strategy of stopping and restarting mature production lines is inefficient and problematic for the TWV industrial base. The committee believes that smooth and predictable funding levels, and not abrupt and large swings in funding and production requirements, would result in the best outcome for taxpayers, the industrial base, the military services, and, ultimately, the warfighter. As such, H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, authorized an additional \$100.0 million for medium and heavy TWVs as part of a comprehensive industrial base risk mitigation effort.

The committee also continued to closely monitor the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program. The JLTV program represents a significant investment by the Army and Marine Corps in developing a new light tactical vehicle that would address current capability gaps in performance, protection and payload. JLTV is the only new major defense acquisition program for TWVs across the Future Years Defense Program and is critical for the sustainment of the industrial base. H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, authorized \$134.6 million, the full amount requested for the JLTV program. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would direct \$134.6 million, the full amount requested for JLTV program. H.R. 3979 authorizes \$229.3 million, the full amount requested for the JLTV program that continues to remain on cost and on schedule.

#### Army Aviation Programs

During the 113th Congress, the committee provided oversight on legacy rotorcraft platforms, including the CH-47, UH-60, AH-64, and OH-58 platforms, and continued to note the importance of these platforms, as well as indicate that they will likely continue operation at high operational tempos in very challenging environments. The committee has highlighted the need to continue to upgrade and reset these critical equipment platforms for both the Active and Reserve Components through formal activities that included a field hearing. In addition to its oversight of aviation requirements for, and performance in combat operations, the committee has closely monitored the Army's Aviation Restructure Initiative (ARI) as well as future Army combat aviation programs. In particular, the committee has focused on the Army's restructured acquisition plan resulting from the cancellation of the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter, the divestment of the OH-58 Kiowa Warrior fleet, and the possible transfer of AH-64 Apache helicopters from the National Guard to the Active Component. The committee engaged in senior level discussions with Army and National Guard leadership, the Government Accountability Office, and retired General officers in order to gain a better understanding of the Army's intent with the ARI. The committee also conducted oversight on the initiation of modernization programs such as the Joint Future Theater Lift (JFTL) program and the critical need for aircraft survivability equipment upgrades to provide warning and protection against evolving surface-to-air missile threats.

With regard to the JFTL program, the committee continued to support ongoing research efforts to develop next-generation rotorcraft capabilities. The committee has expressed concerns that senior leadership of the military services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense have yet to establish a set of validated, reconciled, tested, and achievable technology requirements for the JFTL program.

H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, fully supported the budget request for Army Aviation. H.R. 1960 also provided an additional \$135.0 million for the Light Utility Helicopter (LUH). H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, directed an additional \$75.0 million for the LUH program.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, fully supported the budget request for Army Aviation with funding for 197 new rotorcraft. In addition, the H.R. 3979 addressed critical shortfalls in Army National Guard rotorcraft modernization and authorized an additional \$103.0 million for the most modernized version of the UH-60 Blackhawk helicopter, solely for the Army National Guard. H.R. 3979 would establish a National Commission on the Future of the Army and prevent the transfer of any National Guard AH-64 Apache helicopters in fiscal year 2015. H.R. 3979 also clarifies the limitations on the authority of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army with respect to the potential transfer of up to 48 AH-64 Apache attack helicopters in fiscal year 2016 from the Army National Guard to the regular Army pending certification from the Secretary of Defense.

#### Army Communications Programs

During the 113th Congress, the committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, continued to place emphasis on the growing importance of battlefield communications networks in global combat operations. The committee has aggressively monitored the Army’s plans for its future battlefield network and the supporting research programs now being resourced by the Army and Marine Corps. In particular, the committee has focused oversight efforts on the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T) and the follow-on efforts resulting from the restructured Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) programs. The committee continued to work with the Army to ensure that the future battlefield capabilities it creates result in a network-enabled, rather than a network-dependent, Army. The committee also closely monitored the Army’s ongoing Network Integration Exercises that occur at Fort Bliss, Texas; the committee worked with the tactical network industrial base, as well as the Army, to help mitigate any potential barriers to participation in the these exercises. The committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, provided oversight on the Army’s Tactical Network Modernization roadmap. The roadmap is a blueprint for industry and Government to focus development efforts and bring forward innovations to fill potential capability gaps. It will also help direct the Army’s limited modernization resources to investments that will have the greatest short-, mid- and long-term impact for the end user.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a briefing on the Army's Tactical Network on July 30, 2014. The purpose was to allow Members to gain a better understanding of the core capabilities provided by the Army's Tactical Network, as well as to discuss the issues and challenges facing those network programs and associated industrial base.

#### Organizational Clothing and Individual Equipment

During the 113th Congress, the committee, in particular the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, continued to devote substantial attention to the oversight of individual body armor, personnel protection equipment, and other complementary individual equipment programs through: legislation; informal and formal discussions with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Army and Marine Corps senior leadership; briefings and hearings; coordination with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) audit teams; and other formal and informal activities. Focus areas included but were not limited to: advances in weight reduction ("lightening the load") for clothing and individual equipment, especially personnel protection equipment; development of specific body armor systems for military servicewomen; small arms and small caliber ammunition modernization with particular emphasis on the Army's individual carbine program and handgun program; improved combat helmets to better protect against ballistic threats as well as prevent traumatic brain injury; improved camouflage uniforms, and flame resistant/fire retardant uniforms; long-term management and viability of these associated niche industrial bases to include ways to incentivize industry to invest in research and development.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 112-479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide an assessment of the long term sustainment requirements for the body armor industrial base, to include supply chains for combat helmets, soft armor, and hard armor components. The committee finally received this assessment in March 2014 and the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces reviewed this assessment extensively. The report's findings influenced the legislation of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, and the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, addressed the critical need to reduce the weight of individual warfighter equipment, improve acquisition practices used for this gear, and requires the Secretary of Defense to assess options for providing personnel protection equipment specifically fitted for the female warfighter. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, supports the legislation contained in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, supports weight reduction initiatives, fully funds body armor and personal protection equipment (PPE) programs, as well as notes the importance of treating PPE as a weapon system rather than an expendable commodity. H.R. 3304 would also require more detailed budget exhibits for PPE programs.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, addressed committee concerns regarding the body armor industrial base. Based on the required assessment mentioned above, as well as other assessments the committee reviewed from the Defense Logistics Agency, the committee believed there was significant risk to the body armor industrial base both in the near-term and the long-term. H.R. 3979 authorized an additional \$80.0 million as an industrial base risk mitigation effort for body armor. The committee believes the additional funds would prevent any unnecessary breaks in production, and help maintain a competitive industrial base.

#### Tactical Aircraft Force Structure

During the 113th Congress, the committee continued to investigate the adequacy of fighter force structure in both the Navy and the Air Force. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on these issues on March 26, 2014. The Navy witness testified that F/A-18A/B/C/D aircraft are reaching the end of their projected service-life and will require replacement or modifications to further extend their service-life to eventual deployment of the F-35 aircraft, and noted that the Department of the Navy’s strike fighter shortfall would reach a manageable level of 35 aircraft in 2023. Also at the hearing on March 26, 2014, the Air Force witness testified to an Air Force requirement for 1,900 fighter aircraft, but fiscal constraints resulted in a need to retire 334 fighter aircraft leaving the Air Force significantly below its requirement of 1,900 fighter aircraft. The Air Force noted that it planned to retire about 100 A-10 aircraft in fiscal year 2015. To maintain remaining force structure, Air Force officials informed the subcommittee that any shortfall mitigation will include executing funded sustainment and fleet management actions for older F-16 Block 25, 30 and 32 aircraft, newer block 40 and 50 service life extension, and targeted modernization and examination of the overall force structure to ensure viable warfighting capabilities are maintained. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, authorized an increase of 5 EA-18G aircraft for the Navy and the requested procurement to extend the life of the legacy F/A-18 and AV-8B fleets. H.R. 3979 also authorized the entire Air Force request for modifications to its A-10, F-15, F-16, F-22A, and F-35 fleets. H.R. 3979 also included a provision that would prohibit the Air Force from retiring any A-10 aircraft in fiscal year 2015, but would allow 36 A-10 aircraft to be placed into back-up inventory (BAI) status subject to a certification by the Secretary of Defense concerning the requirement to place these aircraft into BAI status to enable readiness of the Air Force’s fighter aircraft fleets. Additionally, H.R. 3979 authorized the budget request of \$6.7 billion for 34 F-35 aircraft and \$1.6 billion for F-35 development.

#### F-35/Joint Strike Fighter

During the 113th Congress, the committee continued oversight of the F-35 program.



At a hearing on March 26, 2014, before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) Director of Acquisition and Sourcing testified that as a result of the F-35 acquisition baseline determined in early 2010, costs and schedule have been relatively stable. The GAO witness also testified that delays in developmental flight testing of the F-35's critical software may hinder delivery of expected warfighting capabilities to the military services. The GAO witness noted that F-35 developmental flight testing comprises two key areas: mission systems and flight sciences. Mission systems testing verifies that the software-intensive systems that provide critical warfighting capabilities function properly and meet requirements, while flight sciences testing verifies the aircraft's basic flying capabilities. Challenges in development and testing of mission systems software continued through 2013, due largely to delays in software delivery, limited capability in the software when delivered, and the need to fix problems and retest multiple software versions. The GAO witness also testified that aircraft manufacturing continued to improve in 2013, and management of the supply chain is evolving. As the number of aircraft in production has increased, critical learning has taken place and manufacturing efficiency has improved. As an example, the GAO witness cited the fact that the prime contractor has seen reductions in overall labor hours needed to manufacture the aircraft, as expected. Moreover, in 2013, the GAO witness noted that the contractor delivered 35 aircraft to the Government, 5 more than it delivered in 2012, and 26 more than it delivered in 2011, and that the prime contractor has put in place a supplier management system to oversee key supplier performance. The GAO witness also noted that to execute the program as planned, the DOD will have to increase funds steeply over the next 5 years and sustain an average of \$12.6 billion per year through 2037, and that annual funding of this magnitude poses long-term affordability risks given the current fiscal environment.

In June 2014, the committee received the independent software report required by section 218 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66). The independent software review team reported timelines for completing F-35 software blocks were longer than expected or predicted by the F-35 Joint Program Office. The committee has recently received briefings from the F-35 Program Executive Officer who has assured the committee that recommendations of the report are being carefully considered by the F-35 Joint Program Office, and most have been implemented. The F-35 Program Executive Officer (PEO) recently reported to the committee that the timelines identified by the independent software team are still overly pessimistic, and that earlier software releases will occur much earlier than the independent software team predicted. The F-35 PEO also reported that estimated releases for later software blocks continue to improve and will also be much earlier than those predicted by the independent software review team. The committee will continue to receive quarterly updates on F-35 software progress.

On June 23, 2014, an F-35A stationed at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida had a serious flight mishap resulting from an engine failure and fire. The cause of the engine failure and fire has been de-

terminated to be due to excessive rubbing between an engine stator and adjacent plate seals. The F-35 Joint Program Office and the engine manufacturer have identified both short-term and long-term corrections to this problem. The flight test schedule has been minimally affected. The committee continues to monitor both the short-term and long-term corrections to F-35 engines.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would authorize the budget request of \$6.7 billion for 34 F-35 aircraft and \$1.6 billion for F-35 development.

#### Aviation Programs

Through its oversight activities, the committee noted that the B-52 strategic radar replacement (SRR) program replaced the current B-52 radar fielded in the 1960s and then upgraded in the 1970s and 1980s. Although sustainable through the current service life of the B-52, the legacy radar system mean-time-between-failure continues to degrade, and sustainment costs are expected to significantly increase after 2017. The SRR program is a radar replacement program that may take advantage of the advanced capabilities of modern non-developmental radars, maximizing commonality with other platforms. However, the SRR program was terminated in the budget request for fiscal year 2013 due to Air Force budget constraints and the need to fund other, higher priorities. Although the committee understands that affordability concerns were the primary driver for the SRR program termination, it is unclear to the committee how the Secretary of the Air Force intends to afford the legacy radar system knowing that sustainment costs are predicted to significantly increase after 2017. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to develop and implement an affordability strategy for maintaining radar capability on the B-52 aircraft through its predicted service-life of 2040 and to communicate that strategy to the congressional defense committees soon after the affordability strategy is developed. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would authorize the budget request of \$180.4 million for B-52 modifications and \$55.5 million for B-52 system development.

Through its oversight activities, regarding the previously terminated B-52 CONECT program in the budget request for fiscal year 2013, the committee supported the Secretary’s decision reinstating the program in the fiscal year 2014 budget request and is pleased that the Secretary supports modifying all 76 B-52 aircraft, instead of originally just 28 aircraft, with CONECT capability. A dissimilar capability configuration would have added complexity to supply chain management, aircrew certification, training and employment, and would have inherently complicated combatant commander operational planning and execution by having to account for dissimilar aircraft capabilities.

Through its classified oversight activities, the committee maintains oversight of the Long Range Strike Bomber (LRSB) acquisition program.

Through its oversight activities, the committee notes that the Secretary of the Air Force invested nearly \$1.5 billion of taxpayer

dollars for engineering, manufacturing, development, and testing of the C-130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) and has entered Low Rate Initial Production, but has no plans to continue procurement and installation of C-130 AMP onto legacy C-130H aircraft. The Secretary had no plans to modernize or upgrade the C-130H propulsion system in order to increase reliability, capability, fuel efficiency and on-wing time of the engine, as well as to decrease the overall cost and maintenance burden of the current propulsion system. The Secretary has also not articulated to the committee a coherent plan for fleet-wide recapitalization of the C-130H fleet or how the Department of the Air Force plans to maintain medium-sized intra-theater airlift capacity and capability within both the Active and Reserve Components. Knowing that the majority of the C-130H fleet resides within the Reserve Components of the Air Force and that the C-130H should remain reliable, capable, and relevant to meeting current and future warfighter needs, the committee is concerned with the lack of initiative that the Secretary has taken with regard to the modernization and upgrade of C-130H aircraft. The committee also notes that through cost reduction initiatives and efficiencies gained in the C-130 AMP over the past year, the cost data that the Secretary used as justification for canceling the C-130 AMP in the budget request was no longer relevant. H.R. 3979 includes a provision that would prohibit the Department of the Air Force from taking any action to cancel or modify the C-130 AMP, but would allow the Air Force to conduct communication, navigation and surveillance and air traffic management programs subject to a Secretary of Defense certification to the congressional defense committees. H.R. 3979 also included an increase of \$30.0 million for C-130H propulsion system upgrades and an increase of \$35.8 million for the C-130 AMP.

Through its oversight activities, the committee closely monitors the KC-46A engineering, manufacturing, and development program. The KC-46A program office has complied with the committee request that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics provide the committee quarterly reviews of the Air Force's KC-46A program to maintain sufficient and effective oversight. The committee also requested that the Comptroller General of the United States provide the committee with an annual review of the development program. Through an oversight hearing, the committee gained a further understanding of the KC-46 program and was provided a thorough update of the KC-46 program completed milestones. The committee will continue oversight of the KC-46 program through staff level briefings and future hearings.

Through its oversight activities, the committee recognizes the challenges associated with the development of a new U.S. Navy threat target system, Multi-Stage Supersonic Target (MSST), given the assessed complexity and capabilities of the actual threat missile. However, the committee also remains concerned that the Navy still does not have a threat representative target fielded in order to assess vulnerabilities and susceptibilities of naval air defense systems, as well as to assess the effectiveness of potential countermeasures that could be developed to defend against an MSST threat. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary to maintain a robust and fully resourced MSST development strategy and

encouraged the Secretary to provide the committee frequent updates as the MSST program progresses toward its May 2016 IOC milestone.

Through its oversight activities, the committee notes that in 2009, the U.S. Pacific Fleet validated an Urgent Operational Needs Statement for an over-the-horizon surface warfare missile that can be launched from aircraft or surface vessels and strike well-defended, moving maritime targets without the reliance on external inputs. The committee supports the Secretary of the Navy's pursuit for the rapid development and deployment of a long-range, anti-ship missile that is capable of penetrating sophisticated enemy air-defense systems from long range and provided an authorization of appropriations for this program in H.R. 3979.

Through its oversight activities, the committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy has not fully leveraged technology development activities in the Unmanned Combat Air System (UCAS) program that would reduce Unmanned Carrier-Launched Aircraft Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) system program risk. The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy again reduced the planned scope of technology development activities in fiscal year 2014 for the UCAS program by deleting the requirement for the X-47B aircraft to demonstrate unmanned autonomous aerial refueling from an airborne tanker, thereby increasing the development risk in the UCLASS program. The committee disagreed with the Secretary's approach to the UCAS program and disagreed with increasing the concurrency and developmental risk being sewn into the acquisition strategy of the UCLASS program. To address these issues, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) includes a provision for UCLASS that would: limit the acquisition to no more than six prototype aircraft prior to a Milestone B award; require the Navy to provide quarterly cost, schedule, and execution reports to the congressional defense committees; and, require the Comptroller General to provide the congressional defense committees annual reports on the acquisition strategy and execution of the UCLASS program. The committee was also concerned about requirements associated with the UCLASS program and included section 217 of H.R. 3979 that would require the Secretary of Defense to certify the current set of requirements.

#### Shipbuilding Programs

The committee continues its oversight of the Department of Defense's shipbuilding programs to ensure balanced investments are made and the Navy achieves the force structure, with appropriate capabilities, needed to meet requirements. Protection of the sea lanes of communication, projection of credible combat power, global presence, and humanitarian assistance are all core Navy missions that the committee remains focused on during this time of economic constraints.

Through its oversight activities, the committee faces the challenge of balancing current demands on an aging fleet within current economic constraints. As of December 8, 2014, the Navy indicated they currently support 289 deployable battle force ships. This available force structure contrasts the Navy's 2013 requirements

projection of 306 ships and the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review Independent Panel requirement of 346 ships. Despite these shortfalls, the committee seeks to obtain the required capability and provide stability to the shipbuilding industrial base.

Preeminent in this Navy force structure is the aircraft carrier, which represents the embodiment of the United States' ability to project power. Congress reiterated this support in the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, and indicated that "we believe that Congress has been unambiguous about the support of operational aircraft carriers and have provided sufficient authorization of appropriations in this Act to maintain this [11] carrier force structure. We fully anticipate that the administration will support a budget request for fiscal year 2016 that is consistent with title 10, United States Code."

Supporting this aircraft carrier force structure is the USS *Gerald R. Ford* (CVN-78), which is the lead ship of the Ford-class of aircraft carriers. Technologies introduced with the USS *Gerald R. Ford* have challenged the Navy to maintain cost controls on the lead ship. To address these cost issues, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) includes a provision that would amend section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) by: (1) adjusting the cost cap for CVN-78 from \$10,500.0 million to \$12,887.0 million; (2) adjusting the cost cap for subsequent ships in the class from \$8,100.0 million to \$11,498.0 million; (3) adding a new factor for adjustment, allowing increases or decreases in the cost of CVN-78 that are attributable to the shipboard test program, but only when the changes result for urgent and unforeseen testing problems that would delay delivery or initial operating capability of the ship; (4) requiring quarterly updates on the cost of CVN-79; and (5) directing the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that each prime contract for CVN-79 includes an incentive fee structure that will, throughout the entire period of performance of the contract, provide incentives for each contractor to meet the portion of the cost of the ship for which the contractor is responsible.

The Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces also continues its oversight of the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program. Public Law 113-66 includes a provision that would restrict funding associated with LCS-25 and LCS-26 until: (1) the Navy provides certain reports about the LCS program; and (2) the Joint Requirements Oversight Council makes certain certifications about the LCS program. Section 122 of H.R. 3979 also includes additional restrictions associated with mission modules for the Littoral Combat Ship.

Finally, section 1026 of H.R. 3979 would limit the obligation and expenditure of funds for fiscal year 2015 associated with 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 2015.

### Military Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Programs

Manned and unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) system programs have come to constitute a significant component of the overall Department of Defense force structure. The capability provided by these assets is critical to sustaining deterrence and warfighting capability of U.S. forces. The committee has continued to focus on the budget, cost, schedule, and performance outcomes of major manned and unmanned aerial systems programs and examine the ISR enterprise for balance in collection and analysis capabilities. Also, close scrutiny of Office of the Secretary of Defense ISR policy formulation and oversight have been and will continue to be of interest to the committee. Long-standing concerns of the committee remain: lack of an adequate long-term ISR architecture and acquisition strategy; lack of supporting analysis for programmatic decisions; failure to balance collection programs data output with adequate resources to process, exploit, and disseminate data and analysis; and unnecessary proliferation of manned and unmanned vehicles and sensors. The committee will expect the Joint Staff and Joint Requirements Oversight Council to take a more active role in coordinating ISR system acquisition and coordinating employment with the combatant commanders.

In the second session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on March 26, 2014, on Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force combat aviation programs. Witnesses for this hearing included the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition; Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Aviation; Director of the Navy Air Warfare Division; Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition; and the Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Plans and Requirements. Among other issues, this hearing reviewed the Department of Defense budget requests for unmanned aerial systems for fiscal year 2015 including the requests for the RQ-4 Global Hawk and MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems, and the U-2. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, provided the amounts of the budget request for the RQ-4 and U-2, added \$98.0 million for additional MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems, and included a provision that would prohibit the Air Force from taking any action to retire, or prepare to retire, U-2 aircraft in fiscal year 2015.

### Directed Energy Programs

Each of the military services and the Office of the Secretary of Defense within the Department of Defense have continued to fund numerous directed energy research and development efforts for the last three decades. While some limited capabilities have been successfully demonstrated, in most cases the results achieved have not lived up to expectations. The committee continued to support promising efforts within science and technology programs, as they also support missile defense and other emerging concepts for countering anti-access and area denial threats. The committee has closely examined organizing concepts provided by the military services and the Office of Secretary of Defense to determine how best to support

the transition of these capabilities from demonstrations to programs of record. Additionally, the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted detailed oversight of specific Directed Energy programs and activities within Defense-wide and Service science and technology programs and activities.

H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, included several legislative provisions related to directed energy weapons, specifically: a plan for protecting tier one task critical assets of the Department of Defense from electromagnetic pulse and high powered microwave systems; a requirement to establish a funding line and fielding plan for Navy laser weapons systems; and a sense of Congress on the counter-electronic high power microwave missile project.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee also included several directives related to directed energy weapons, including a briefing on Army directed energy testing; a briefing on the Maritime Laser Weapons System; a briefing on foreign directed energy threats to U.S. military systems; and a briefing on test and evaluation capabilities for electromagnetic pulse (EMP) and high powered microwave (HPM) systems.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, includes several legislative provisions related to directed energy weapons, including a sense of Congress on the counter-electronic high power microwave missile project, and a directive to the Defense Intelligence Agency for a report on EMP and HPM threats to military infrastructure.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee also included several directives related to directed energy weapons, including a briefing on the plan for the future of the Army’s High Energy Laser Mobile Demonstrator; a briefing on the performance of the Navy Laser Weapon System after deployment aboard the USS *Ponce* this fiscal year; a briefing on the near-term needs of the combatant commanders for a counter-electronics capability; and a briefing by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the impact of funding reductions for non-lethal systems on current contingency operations planning.

#### Nuclear Deterrence and the Nuclear Security Enterprise

In the 113th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy and nuclear policies and programs of the Department of Defense to ensure the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the U.S. nuclear deterrent. Particular emphasis has been placed on Department of Energy and Department of Defense nuclear modernization plans and associated funding requirements, proposed changes to nuclear weapons policy and posture, and the effectiveness of institutional structures that support the nuclear security enterprise and interagency decision-making related to nuclear weapons.

In the first session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on February 28, 2013, “Nuclear Security: Actions, Accountability, and Reform.” This hearing continued the subcommittee’s oversight of the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration’s (NNSA) efforts to ad-

dress the problems highlighted by the July 2012 security intrusion at the Y-12 National Security Complex. On March 19, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on “The U.S. Nuclear Deterrent: What are the Requirements for a Strong Deterrent in an Era of Defense Sequester?” This hearing featured non-governmental expert witnesses and discussed future plans for the U.S. nuclear deterrent in an age of increasingly scarce resources.

On May 9, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the “Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Nuclear Forces Programs.” At this annual budget request hearing, Members inquired about Department of Energy and Department of Defense nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization plans, implementation of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), defense environmental cleanup, and the proposed resources for these and other nuclear programs. On October 29, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on “Nuclear Weapons Modernization Programs: Military, Technical, and Political Requirements for the B61 Life Extension Program (LEP) and Future Stockpile Strategy” that focused on a key subset of such programs. The witness panel, comprised of the key Government and national laboratory leaders with responsibility for the B61 LEP, discussed the requirements driving the ongoing LEP, the policies and decisions that led to the LEP, the current status of the LEP, and the funding required to successfully execute the program.

In addition to hearings, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a classified briefing on February 5, 2013, on the status and future of nuclear weapons programs in foreign nations. The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces also assisted the committee by supporting a classified briefing on June 27, 2013, on arms control treaty violations by the Russian Federation and how such violations may impact the Administration’s proposals for U.S. nuclear weapons policy. On July 18, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a classified briefing on the same topic at the subcommittee-level. Finally, on September 10, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a classified briefing on the status of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile with the directors of the Nation’s three nuclear weapons laboratories.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, included several legislative provisions related to nuclear deterrence and the nuclear security enterprise. This includes provisions that would provide additional congressional oversight mechanisms for nuclear force structure decisions, strengthen interagency coordination on nuclear weapons decision-making, provide momentum and increase congressional oversight of efforts to reform security practices at the Department of Energy and National Nuclear Security Administration, require a long-term plan for cleanup of the Nation’s largest defense nuclear waste site, and continue reforms to create a more effective and efficient nuclear security enterprise.

In the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of nuclear deterrence and the nuclear security enterprise with a series of hearings and briefings. On February 11, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a closed briefing



on nuclear weapon and missile developments in South Asia. On March 5, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces conducted another classified briefing in the ongoing series of updates on arms control compliance. On March 26, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held an open hearing to discuss the “Interim Report of the Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise,” where Members discussed the initial findings of a congressionally-mandated independent advisory panel exploring longstanding problems at the Department of Energy and NNSA.

On April 8, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on “Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense and Nuclear Forces,” where members reviewed the annual budget request for all nuclear weapons related activities in DOE and DOD. The subcommittee also held a classified briefing on June 26, 2014 on Russia’s strategic forces programs in which members received the latest intelligence information on Russia’s nuclear weapons and missile operations and modernization programs. On July 15, 2014, the subcommittee supported a classified for the full committee on the nuclear weapons capabilities and programs of foreign nations.

On July 17, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing with nongovernmental expert witnesses to explore and discuss “Russian Violations of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty: After detection—what?” The subcommittee held a follow-on classified briefing on this same topic, but with government witnesses, on September 17, 2014. On September 18, 2014, the subcommittee received a classified briefing from the directors of the Nation’s nuclear weapons laboratories and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command on their annual assessments of the health of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile. On November 18, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a closed briefing to discuss the ongoing nuclear negotiations with the Islamic Republic of Iran and explore the implications of providing Iran relief from sanctions. On December 4, 2014, the subcommittee held a classified briefing on strategic capabilities in foreign countries and foreign efforts to gain technological superiority over U.S. military forces.

Finally, on December 10, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held both an open hearing and a classified briefing, together with the Committee on Foreign Affairs’ Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade on “Russian Arms Control Cheating and the Administration’s Responses.” These two oversight events allowed Members to explore, in detail and all levels of classification, all aspects of Russia’s violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and the Administration’s subsequent actions and plans.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, includes several provisions related to nuclear forces and the nuclear security enterprise. These include provisions that would: require that all existing intercontinental ballistic missile silos be kept in a “warm” status that enables them to be made fully operational in the future; ensure delays in development and production of the long-range standoff weapon are minimized; strengthen congressional oversight of nuclear infrastructure modernization projects; require dem-

onstration of a responsive plutonium pit production capability by certain dates in the 2020s; create an Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health; require regular cost estimates by the Congressional Budget Office on the cost of operating, sustaining, and modernizing the nuclear deterrent; and, authorize a program for the design and use of prototypes of nuclear weapons to further intelligence estimates with respect to foreign nuclear weapons activities.

### Missile Defense

The committee oversees the Department of Defense's efforts to develop, test, and field layered missile defense capabilities to protect the United States, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies against the full range of ballistic missile threats. Particular emphasis has been placed on U.S. homeland missile defense capabilities, European Phased Adaptive Approach implementation and ensuring an adequate hedging strategy for the protection of the U.S. homeland, developmental and operational testing, force structure and inventory requirements, sensor-to-shooter integration, and science and technology investments in areas such as directed energy. The committee closely watched the Administration's funding of the missile defense program, seeking the cost-effective application of resources, and looking for opportunities to bring greater stability to the industrial base.

The committee continued to monitor foreign ballistic missile threats and identified opportunities to strengthen international missile defense cooperation with allies and partners such as the State of Israel, Japan, and North Atlantic Treaty Organization member states. Department of Defense oversight and management of missile defense activities, including the roles, responsibilities, and acquisition policies and procedures of the Missile Defense Agency and military services was also reviewed. The committee provided oversight of the Administration's missile defense policy and posture, including close examination of any Administration efforts that may limit missile defenses as part of a treaty or agreement, and implications for United States, regional, and global security.

In the first session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on May 8, 2013, regarding the "Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Program." In addition to the hearing, the subcommittee also held a classified briefing on February 13, 2013, regarding the long-range missile threat to the United States. On April 26, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a missile defense briefing from Admiral Syring, Director, Missile Defense Agency, including the agency's classified programs.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, directs important oversight on homeland and regional missile defense programs, Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, as well as the Israeli Iron Dome program. H.R. 3304 increases funding for the development of a new kill vehicle for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense program as well as provides funding for continued planning activities related to an additional homeland missile defense site, and the deployment of an additional

homeland missile defense radar site to defend against threats including from the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea.

In the second session of the 113th Congress, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on March 25, 2014, regarding the "Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs." In addition to the hearing on the President's budget request, the subcommittee held a hearing on July 23, 2014 on "Adapting U.S. Missile Defense for Future Threats: Russia, China and Modernizing the NMD Act."

Further, the subcommittee held numerous classified briefings concerning U.S. missile defenses: January 15, 2014, on "Cruise Missile Threats to the United States and Homeland Defense Options and Plans"; February 11, 2014, a briefing on "Pakistan: Strategic Forces Developments"; July 9, 2014, a briefing with Missile Defense Agency Director Vice Admiral James Syring, USN, on "Missile Defense Classified Programs"; November 18, 2014, a briefing on "Iran and Implications of Sanctions Relief"; and, December 4, 2014, a briefing on "Implications to United States Strategic Capabilities of Foreign Capability Development."

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would direct important oversight on homeland and regional missile defense programs, Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, as well as the Israeli Iron Dome program and requirements for U.S.-based co-production with U.S. industry. H.R. 3979 includes funding for the development of a redesigned kill vehicle for the Ground-based Mid-course Defense program, as well as increased funding for the reliability and maintenance of that system. Further, it requires a plan for the robust acquisition of the redesigned kill vehicle, as well as requirements to increase the reliability of future missile defense programs.

#### National Security Space

In the first session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense's national security space programs, which includes the military services, combat support agencies, and elements of the Department of Defense that are part of the intelligence community.

On April 25, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. Members' oversight questions addressed a range of areas including space policy, the impact of sequestration on space programs, space launch, commercial satellite services, space threats, and space situational awareness. Additionally, on July 31, 2013, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a briefing on commercial satellite services. The briefing addressed new acquisition methods to reduce the cost of acquisition of commercial satellite services as well as the identification of satellite services being procured from certain foreign countries.

H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, contained several national security space-related legislative provisions, funding recommendations, and reporting requirements to include: a requirement that

the Secretary of the Air Force develop and implement a plan to ensure the fair evaluation of competing contractors in the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program; a requirement that the Secretary of Defense notify Congress regarding each attempt by a foreign actor to disrupt, deny, or destroy a U.S. national security space capability; direction that Department officials develop a strategy to enable the multi-year procurement of commercial satellite services; and a prohibition on the Department from entering into a contracts for satellite services with certain foreign entities under a set of defined circumstances.

In the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the Department's national security space programs.

On January 9, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces received a briefing from the National Intelligence Officer for Science and Technology, and the Director of the Department of Defense Space Security and Defense Program regarding directed energy threats and foreign counterspace activity. Following this briefing, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces on the People's Republic of China's counterspace program and the implications for U.S. national security. The witnesses were non-governmental experts. These subcommittee events led up to a counterspace briefing on February 6, 2014, with the full committee, with briefers from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Air Force, and the Joint Staff.

On April 3, 2014, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. The witnesses were the Commander of Air Force Space Command, officials in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office, and the Commander of the Joint Functional Component Command for Space in the U.S Strategic Command. The members' oversight questions addressed a variety of topics including space launch, acquisition of commercial space services, space situational awareness, threats to national security space systems, among other pertinent topics.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would direct several national security space-related policy provisions, funding recommendations, and reporting requirements to include \$220.0 million for the development of a next generation rocket propulsion system to transition from the use of non-allied space launch engines to a domestic alternative for national security space launches and several provisions related to space security and defense.

Members of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces also participated in several congressional delegations to oversee the national security space program. The members traveled to two National Reconnaissance Office ground stations, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency headquarters, the Army Space and Missile Defense Command headquarters, Vandenberg Air Force Base, Buckley Air Force Base, the Air Force Space and Missiles System Center, and several industry facilities.

## EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

## Investment in Future Capabilities Science and Technology

The Department of Defense faces difficult choices as it balances the competing needs of capabilities for current operations and those projected for future conflicts. In order to address the latter, investments must be made in the Department's Science and Technology (S&T) programs and aligned appropriately with continued development and procurement programs to position the Department to meet those future challenges. Preparing for the challenges of the future, the Department must create a portfolio of technological options that can address the perceived threats identified in the defense planning process, as well as the emergence of unanticipated events or strategic competitors. Overcoming the bureaucratic inertia of existing acquisition road maps should be more properly balanced with capabilities to institutionalize adaptability. With the emergence of nontraditional adversaries pursuing "complex irregular warfare," the Department of Defense recognized that true transformation required investment in additional capability areas that will address low-end threats as well as nation-state peer competitors. The committee continued to encourage the Department to plan and execute a balanced S&T program that ensures the U.S. military can retain superiority for future generations.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted several hearings and briefings within this area, including: a briefing on "Perspectives on the Future National Security Environment: Technological, Geopolitical and Economic Trends Affecting the Defense Strategic Guidance" on February 13, 2013; a hearing on "Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of Defense (DOD) Science and Technology Programs" on April 16, 2013; a hearing on Biodefense: Worldwide Threats and Countermeasure Efforts for the Department of Defense on October 11, 2013; a briefing on Non-Lethal Weapons Systems Policy and Programs on February 28, 2014; a hearing on Department of Defense (DOD) Fiscal Year 2015 Science and Technology Programs: Pursuing Technology Superiority in a Changing Security Environment on March 26, 2014; and a hearing on Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and Chemical Biological Defense Program: Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction in a Changing Global Environment on April 8, 2014.

The committee incorporated several legislative provisions related to science and technology in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, to include: extension of authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements; extension of a pilot program on technology protection features; establishment of a new authority for enhanced technology transfer of software developed at Department of Defense laboratories; clarification on eligibility for the defense experimental program to stimulate competitive research; extension and expansion of section 219 authority for defense laboratories; establishment of a pilot program on proof of concept commercialization; and establishment of a defense science initiative for personnel. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National De-

fense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee included several directives related to science and technology, including a briefing on sustainment of sociocultural capabilities of the Department of Defense.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, included several legislative provisions related to science and technology, including: extension of authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements; extension of a pilot program on technology protection features; establishment of a new authority for enhanced technology transfer of software developed at Department of Defense laboratories; extension and expansion of section 219 authority for defense laboratories; establishment of a pilot program on proof of concept commercialization; modification to the biennial strategic plan of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency; and temporary hiring authority for personnel in the defense laboratories.

H.R. 4435, the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included several legislative provisions related to science and technology, including: revision of the service requirement for the Science, Mathematics and Research for Transformation (SMART) program; revision of the requirement for acquisition programs to maintain defense research facility records; modifications to the cost-sharing requirement for defense exportability features program; extension of the contract authority for advanced capability development; amendments to the authority for the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to carry out certain prototype projects; establishment of a government-wide authority for commercialization of basic research through the Small Business Technology Transfer program; additions to the list of science and technology reinvention labs; and permanent authority for the experimental hiring authority for scientific and technical personnel.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee included several directives related to science and technology, including: a briefing on the rationale and impact on the decision to cease reimbursable work for Federal agencies outside of the Navy; a briefing on the Department’s technical capabilities to experimentally study military relevant High Reynolds Number turbulent boundary layers; a requirement to issue updated policy guidance related to the use of non-profit research institutions that clarifies their role in the research ecosystem; an assessment of the organization, missions, authorities, and health of the defense research and development enterprise; a briefing on the measures and metrics used by the Department to better understand how the Department is fulfilling the guidance related to historically black colleges and universities; a briefing on the status of the associated Spectrum Roadmap and Action Plan, as well as a science and technology roadmap for technologies that are needed to improve spectrum efficiency; and a briefing on the coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of Health and Human Services through the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise (PHEMCE).

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included several legislative provisions related to science and technology, including: modification of the authority to offer prizes for advanced technology achievements; modifications to the manufacturing technology program; modifications to the reporting for the deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering; revision of the service requirement for the SMART program; revision of the requirement for acquisition programs to maintain defense research facility records; modifications to the cost-sharing requirement for defense exportability features program; extension of the contract authority for advanced capability development; amendments to the authority for DARPA to carry out certain prototype projects; establishment of a pilot program for DARPA to assign private sector personnel as program managers; establishment of a pilot program to enhance preparation of military dependent children for careers in scientific fields; modifications to the pilot program for proof of concept commercialization centers; additions to the list of science and technology reinvention labs; and permanent authority for the experimental hiring authority for scientific and technical personnel.

#### Cyber Operations Capabilities

Cyber operations have taken on an increasingly important role in military operations as well as national security. Accordingly, the committee continued to closely examine the Department of Defense’s cyber operations, organization, manning and funding to ensure the military has the freedom of maneuver to conduct the range of missions in the Nation’s defense, and when called upon, to support interagency and international partners. An important oversight role for the committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities regarding the conduct of defensive and offensive cyber operations has been to ensure proper legal and policy frameworks are in place and are followed. The committee continued to oversee military cyber operations to ensure they are properly integrated into combatant commander’s operational plans so that adequate capabilities exist, or are in development, to employ these cyberspace operational tools with rigor and discretion to support a full range of options for national decision makers. In the course of monitoring the cybersecurity posture of the military, the committee also continued to examine the effects of globalization on the assured integrity of microelectronics and software.

The committee and the Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted several hearings and briefings within this area, including: a hearing on “Information Technology and Cyber Operations: Modernization and Policy Issues to Support the Future Force” on March 13, 2013; cyber operations briefings on March 20, 2013, December 4, 2013, and December 3, 2014; and, a hearing on Information Technology and Cyber Operations: Modernization and Policy Issues in a Changing National Security Environment on March 12, 2014.

The committee included several legislative provisions related to cyber operations capabilities in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, to

include: limitation on availability of funds for defensive cyberspace operations of the Air Force; establishment of a cryptographic modernization oversight and advisory board; an assessment of United States Cyber Command by the Defense Science Board; a mission analysis for cyber operations of Department of Defense; creation of a small business cybersecurity solutions office; and establishment of a small business cyber education program.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee also included several directives related to cyber operations capabilities, including: an assessment of the cyber centers of academic excellence; a briefing on coordination of cyber and electronic warfare capabilities; and a briefing on actions being considered to encourage adoption of the cybersecurity framework.

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, included several legislative provisions related to cyber operations, including: limitation on availability of funds for defensive cyberspace operations of the Air Force; establishment of a communications security oversight and advisory board; a mission analysis for cyber operations of Department of Defense; a briefing on cyber threat awareness and outreach; synchronization of cryptographic systems for major defense acquisition programs; new supervision authorities for the acquisition of cloud computing capabilities; an assessment of cyber vulnerabilities of Department of Defense weapon systems and tactical communications systems; establishment of joint federated centers of excellence for trusted defense systems; development of a policy on controlling the proliferation of cyber weapons; development of a policy on cyber deterrence; an assessment of the cyber centers of academic excellence; and new authorities and oversight for U.S. Cyber Command.

H.R. 4435, the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as passed by the House, included several legislative provisions related to cyber operations, including: establishment of an executive agent for cyber test and training ranges; promotion of an outreach and education program to assist small businesses in understanding and responding to cyber threats; notification by the Secretary of Defense or Director of National Intelligence when a company suspected of being influenced by a foreign country is competing for, or has been awarded, a contract affecting certain covered networks; a sense of Congress on the role of the National Guard in defending against cyber attacks; a certification by the Director of National Intelligence related to the activities of certain cyber operations capabilities needs; and a briefing on the ten National Guard cyber protection teams being created in this 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 included several directives related to cyber operations, including: an analysis and briefing on the Department’s strategy for utilizing field programmable gate-arrays in the Department’s microelectronics strategy; a report by the Comptroller General of the United States reviewing the Department’s program related to trusted foundry, trusted suppliers, and other supply chain risk management activities; a briefing assessing the



approaches currently taken to mitigate counterfeit parts in the supply system; a report on the Air Force investment in cyber; a report by the Comptroller General of the United States on the organization, missions, and authorities of U.S. Cyber Command and its operational relationship with the geographic combatant commands; a report by the Comptroller General of the United States evaluating the Department's efforts at protecting against insider threats; and a plan for improving cyber situational awareness tools.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included several legislative provisions related to cyber operations, including: establishment of an executive agent for cyber test and another for cyber training ranges; a sense of Congress on the role of the reserve components in defending against cyber attacks; notification when the Secretary of Defense determines there is a national security threat against an information technology or telecommunications network that might cause a risk to Department of Defense operations or programs; require designation of a network to conduct a pilot program for cyberspace mapping; submit a review of cross domain solution policy and strategy; establish a major force program for the budgeting and accounting of resources supporting cyber mission forces; a strategy to develop and deploy decryption services for the Joint Information Environment; reporting on penetrations into networks of operationally critical contractors; a plan for education of members of the Armed Forces on cyber matters; and establishment of a regime to identify and potentially sanction entities determined to be conducting economic or industrial espionage in cyberspace.

In addition, in the Joint Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 3979, includes directives that would require: a briefing on the ten National Guard cyber protection teams being created in the current fiscal year and an assessment by the Comptroller General of the United States of the cyber threat outreach and education activities of the Department of Defense.

#### Information Operations

Engagement with foreign audiences and nuanced understanding of the information environment is pivotal in countering violent extremists, interrupting the radicalization process, and identifying and countering efforts at deception and misinformation. As such, strategic engagement is a key element to success on the battlefield and an important tool to prevent or deter conflict before escalation. The committee continued to pay particular attention to the Department of Defense's information operations strategy and how these tools are being further developed and adapted to support warfighter needs in a changing security environment. These activities enable military operations and military support to diplomacy, and the committee conducted oversight of these critical capabilities as they transition from a wartime to a peacetime security posture.

The committee held a related hearing on June 28, 2013 on "Past, Present, and Future Irregular Warfare Challenges: Private Sector Perspectives."

The committee included a legislative provision related to information operations in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, that

would require a strategy for future information operations capabilities. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, included several legislative provisions related to information operations, including: a strategy for future information operations capabilities and limitation on funding for the Trans-Regional Web Initiative.

## ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

### Full Committee Hearings and Briefings

During the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee held a series of budget and posture hearings in preparation for the fiscal year 2015 budget. These hearings, combined with the committee's responsibility for assembling the annual defense authorization bill, are a central element in the discharge of the committee's oversight responsibilities. In upholding its responsibilities to mitigate waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Federal Government programs, and pursuant to House rule XI, clauses 2(n), (o), and (p), the committee met several times to conduct oversight of Department of Defense activities, as noted elsewhere in this report.

On March 6, 2014, the committee received testimony from the Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense; and General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to review the budget request for funding and authorities during fiscal year 2015.

In addition to this hearing, the committee held budget hearings in which it sought and received testimony from each of the military departments. On March 12, 2014, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from the Honorable Ray Mabus, Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Jonathan Greenert, Chief of Naval Operations; and General James F. Amos, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps, on the United States Navy and Marine Corps' portion of the fiscal year 2015 budget request. On March 14, 2014, the Honorable Deborah Lee James, Secretary of the Air Force; and General Mark A. Welsh III, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, appeared before the committee to discuss the U.S. Air Force's portion of the fiscal year 2015 budget request. On March 25, 2014, the Honorable John McHugh, Secretary of the Army; and General Raymond T. Odierno, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, testified on the budget as it related to the U.S. Army.

In addition to the uniformed services, which are primarily responsible for training and equipping their respective forces, commanders of the unified combatant commands appeared before the committee to discuss the security situation and posture in their respective areas of responsibility. These hearings began with testimony from General Charles H. Jacoby, Jr., Commander of U.S. Northern Command; and General John F. Kelly, Commander of U.S. Southern Command, on February 26, 2014. This hearing was followed on March 5, 2014, by Admiral Samuel J. Locklear, Commander of U.S. Pacific Command; General Lloyd J. Austin III, Commander of U.S. Central Command; and General David M. Rodriguez, Commander of U.S. Africa Command, who testified on their commands' posture and budget requests for fiscal year 2015.

On April 2, 2014, the committee received testimony from Admiral Cecil D. Haney, Commander of U.S. Strategic Command; and General Curtis M. Scaparrotti, Commander of U.S. Forces Korea. General Philip M. Breedlove, Commander of U.S. European Command, did not testify before the committee on the posture and budget request for U.S. European Command due to a request by the Administration that he remain in Europe amidst aggressive actions by Russia in Europe, to specifically include its illegal annexation of Crimea. The committee also convened on March 13, 2014, to receive testimony from General Joseph Dunford, Commander of the International Security and Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan on recent developments in Afghanistan.

This year, the committee also convened a hearing to receive testimony from Members of Congress on their national defense priorities for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, which took place on April 9, 2014.

The Department of Defense had not submitted its fiscal year 2015 budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) at the time the committee marked up the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 on May 7, 2014. Upon receiving the fiscal year 2015 OCO request in late June 2014, the committee held a hearing on the request with the Honorable Robert O. Work, Deputy Secretary of Defense; Admiral James A. "Sandy" Winnefeld, Jr., Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and the Honorable Michael J. McCord, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), on July 16, 2014.

As events transpired in the Middle East, specifically relating to the rise of the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic, the committee met several times to conduct oversight hearings and briefings on the threat and the Administration's policy and strategy to defeat ISIL. These included classified briefings on the security situation in Iraq on June 18, 2014, June 26, 2014, and July 9, 2014, with senior defense and intelligence community officials, and hearings on the strategy and campaign against ISIL with the Honorable Chuck Hagel, Secretary of Defense, on September 18, 2014, and the Secretary of Defense and General Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on November 13, 2014. The committee also received inputs from outside experts in a hearing on July 29, 2014, and a roundtable discussion on September 17, 2014. Finally, to develop its understanding of the Syria train and equip authority requested by the President in September 2014, the committee held a classified briefing with officials from the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of State on September 16, 2014, and a classified intelligence-operations briefing on November 19, 2014.

Additionally, the committee held a series of hearings and briefings in accordance with its legislative and oversight roles focused on the United States' ongoing military operations and related strategies beyond Iraq and Syria. Relating to the U.S. mission in Afghanistan, the committee held a classified intelligence-operations briefing on Afghanistan and Pakistan on January 14, 2014; a hearing with outside experts on "Risks to Stability in Afghanistan: Politics, Security, and International Commitment" on July 30, 2014;

and a classified briefing on the situation in Afghanistan, including developments relating to post-2014 authorities, on December 10, 2014. The committee also examined the legal authorities for military operations against Al Qaeda in a classified briefing on June 25, 2014, and a hearing on the “State of Al-Qaeda, its Affiliates, and Associated Groups” with outside experts on February 4, 2014.

Remaining mindful of emerging and evolving security challenges around the globe, the committee also held several hearings and briefings related to developments in the broader Middle East, Europe and Russia, Africa, and the Asia-Pacific, as well as the Department’s release of its 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review and its defense strategy contained therein. The committee has also continued to oversee developments ranging from the transfers of detainees to third countries, to those relating to the committee’s ongoing defense reform initiative. Many of these oversight events are noted elsewhere in this report. Of particular note, the committee closely monitored developments relating to the Joint Plan of Action regarding Iran’s nuclear program and held a hearing with outside experts on the “P5+1 Negotiations over Iran’s Nuclear Program and Its Implications for United States Defense” on June 19, 2014. The committee also held several classified briefings on the security situation in eastern Europe, specifically the Ukraine, and a hearing on “Russian Military Developments and Strategic Implications” with senior defense officials on April 8, 2014. Lastly, the committee has also continued to oversee DOD activities and funding relating to the Ebola virus outbreak in West Africa, including convening a closed briefing with representatives from the Department of Defense and the interagency on November 18, 2014, as it works to ensure the DOD mission remains scoped to its unique capabilities and Department of Defense personnel are adequately equipped and protected.

#### Budget Oversight

On March 1, 2013, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services forwarded his views and estimates regarding the budget request for National Defense Budget Function (050) for fiscal year 2014 to the Committee on the Budget. The committee noted that the President’s fiscal year 2014 budget request had not yet been received as statutorily mandated, discussing that section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, states, “[O]n or after the first Monday in January but not later than the first Monday in February of each year, the President shall submit a budget of the United States Government for the following fiscal year.” Therefore, the committee discussed its views of the current funding levels for the National Defense Budget Function (050) as dictated by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), as well as the possibility that full sequestration under this legislation will be applied to national defense.

Under the Budget Control Act (BCA), the fiscal year 2014 funding level for discretionary spending under budget function 050 is capped at \$552.0 billion. While the committee maintained reservations about the adequacy of the “BCA Cap,” the Administration stated that this level of funding was sufficient to support the new defense strategy, which was released in January 2012. The new de-

fense strategy was developed over the course of 8 months and reflected both the President's guidance, as well as the \$487.0 billion in cuts to the military under the BCA. The efforts of the Department to implement this change in strategy and these funding cuts had just begun. The Deputy Secretary of Defense testified to the committee on February 13, 2013, "we are just beginning to make that big move represented by the \$487.0 [billion] and the Gates cuts before that, the huge strategic adjustment from the era of Iraq and Afghanistan to the era that is going to define our security future. So we have laid in those plans, but we have to actually carry them out. They are challenging managerially, they are challenging budgetarily. They are challenging for everybody at this table actually to carry out, and we are just embarking on them." Based on the needs brought forward by both civilian and military leaders of the Department, the committee requested the current BCA levels be maintained as the minimum required to support our national defense needs.

The committee discussed that over the last 3 years, the level of funding requested for defense has seen significant decline. In fiscal year 2013, defense spending would decrease by 17 percent under sequestration when compared with the level projected for fiscal year 2013 in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) that was submitted in February 2010. Even prior to sequestration, defense spending had already been reduced by 9 percent from the plan submitted just 2 years earlier.

The committee noted that the President and Congress had failed to reach an agreement to avert sequestration. The committee stated that it has held more hearings and briefings on sequestration than any other committee in Congress. Time and again over the last 18 months, the committee received testimony that the effects of sequestration will be devastating, not only for our Armed Forces, their family members, and the defense industrial base, but also for local communities and the economy. The committee also noted that although sequestration will be destructive to our national security and economy, it does not significantly change the drivers of national spending. The committee emphasized that it will continue its oversight of the National Defense Budget Function, preventing a hollow force wherever possible, despite external fiscal pressures.

The committee's ranking member did not join the chairman in his views and estimates. Instead, the ranking member was joined by twelve other Members of the committee in submitting alternative views and estimates that encouraged the elimination of sequestration to: dispel economic uncertainty, empower economic recovery, enable the passage of appropriations legislation in regular order within a clear discretionary spending budget, and grant the legislative and executive branches of government the flexibility needed to identify and to implement savings in a responsible and deliberate manner. The ranking member's views and estimates letter also encouraged congressional passage of a comprehensive, long-term, deficit-reduction plan to solve the country's fiscal challenges and to promote national security, economic stability, and the continued growth and prosperity of the United States. The ranking member asserted that deficit-reduction goals cannot be effectuated through cuts alone. Rather, the solution must include increased

revenues and changes in mandatory spending. The ranking member noted, however, that, due to the likely need for additional cuts to discretionary spending, Congress must establish a manageable, long-term, discretionary spending plan that advances national interests. In the absence of an agreed comprehensive, long-term, deficit-reduction solution or a long-term, discretionary spending plan that could be incorporated into such a solution, the ranking member could not advocate maintaining top-line allocations for the national defense budget function at, or above, the funding levels established by the BCA, as amended. In that case, further reductions to national defense spending might still be necessary.

On March 25, 2014, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services forwarded his views and estimates regarding the budget request for National Defense Budget Function (050) for fiscal year 2015 to the Committee on the Budget. The President's fiscal year 2015 budget requested \$521.3 billion in discretionary budget authority for national defense. Of this total, \$495.6 billion is for the Department of Defense, \$18.0 billion is for the Department of Energy's defense activities, and \$7.7 billion is for other defense-related activities. The President's budget also includes \$8.2 billion in mandatory budget authority. The budget submission complies with the limitations mandated by Public Law 112-25, as amended by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (BBA) for funding levels in fiscal year 2015.

In addition to the base budget request, as required by section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the President's budget for fiscal year 2015 included a separate request of \$79.4 billion for war-related expenditures in support of ongoing military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, forward presence in other critical areas, and the resetting of equipment, presented again this fiscal year as Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO). However, details of this request will be delayed. The Department of Defense has stated that justification materials will be available 2-3 months after the post-2014 strategy in Afghanistan is determined.

The Department of Defense's \$495.6 billion base budget for fiscal year 2015 is presented as "repositioning the military for the new strategic challenges and opportunities that will define our future: new technologies, new centers of power, and a world that is growing more volatile, more unpredictable, and in some instances more threatening to the United States". In the aggregate, the Department's budget submission for fiscal year 2015 is equivalent to the fiscal year 2014 appropriation, \$31.0 billion below the fiscal year 2014 budget request, and \$45.2 billion or 8.4 percent below the fiscal year 2015 estimate presented in last year's FYDP.

The committee discussed that over the last 4 years, the committee has seen the level of funding requested and appropriated for national defense decline. Under sequestration, national defense spending would decrease over 19 percent in fiscal year 2015, when compared with the level projected for fiscal year 2015 in the FYDP included in the first budget request prepared by President Obama's administration, submitted in February 2010.

The committee noted its concern with the current trend of funding for defense spending. Over the prior 3 years, base defense

spending has been essentially flat, which has caused a loss of buying power within the Department as inflationary influences take effect across multiple years. If this trend continued, defense spending will be at sequestration levels in fiscal year 2016, and will be below sequestration levels beginning in fiscal year 2017. The committee supported a path to restoring national defense to pre-sequestration levels for fiscal year 2016 onward, urging support for adequate funding for national defense associated with the 2012 defense strategy.

The committee's ranking member did not join the chairman in his views and estimates. Instead, the ranking member was joined by ten other members of the committee in submitting alternative views and estimates that expressed support for the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request, because it offered the Congress a solid basis for cost-effective planning and decision-making and because it supported current and future military requirements. The alternative views and estimates letter voiced the ranking member's call to eliminate the threat of sequestration to: dispel economic uncertainty, empower economic recovery, enable the passage of appropriations legislation within a clear discretionary spending budget, and grant the legislative and executive branches of Government the flexibility needed to identify and to implement savings in a responsible and deliberate manner. The ranking member's views and estimates letter once again encouraged passage of a comprehensive, long-term, deficit-reduction plan to solve the country's fiscal challenges and to promote national security, economic stability, and the continued growth and prosperity of the United States. The ranking member re-asserted that deficit-reduction goals cannot be effectuated through cuts alone. The solution must include increased revenues and changes in mandatory spending. The ranking member stated that Congress must establish a manageable, long-term, discretionary spending plan that advances national interests on a broad front.

#### ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES

##### Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities

The Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued its oversight of several critical areas of the Department of Defense, including Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counterterrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling activities and programs such as cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations. In addition, the subcommittee conducted oversight of intelligence policy, coordination of military and national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements that are part of the intelligence community.

Subcommittee members and staff made numerous trips to countries impacted by terrorism, to include areas where U.S. forces are

engaged in combat operations, in order to conduct oversight; to further understand the resources leveraged against terrorism and other emerging threats, the authorities applied in these efforts, and the Department of Defense's interaction with its interagency and international partners. These congressional and staff delegations were preceded by operational and intelligence oversight briefings to members and staff by senior officials from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the intelligence community and represented an important part of oversight conducted by the subcommittee.

The subcommittee considered and reported several legislative provisions in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, and H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66). The legislative provisions covered a range of issues within the subcommittee's jurisdiction including: counter-terrorism and counter-proliferation programs and activities; U.S. Special Operations Forces; science and technology policy and programs, including the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency; information technology and programs; homeland defense and consequence management programs; as well as intelligence policy, national intelligence programs, and Department of Defense elements part of the intelligence community. In addition, H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, and H.R. 3304 included: a provision that directed additional reporting requirements for humanitarian mine action to include Counter-Improvised Explosive Device technology; a provision to extend the authority to award prizes for advanced technology achievements; a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to create a policy that governs defense intelligence priorities; a provision that provides new authorities to strengthen the ability of Department of Defense laboratories to support the continued development and expansion of its workforce and facilities; a provision to limit funding on the establishment of Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers; a technical correction relating to funding for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Special Operations Headquarters; and a provision to limit funding for United States Special Operations Command National Capital Region.

In addition, H.R. 4435, the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, included several other provisions within the subcommittee's jurisdiction, including: a section that would modify the current oversight requirements for the undersea mobility acquisition program of U.S. Special Operations Command, and require the Secretary of the Navy to review a transition plan for the undersea mobility capabilities developed by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command; a section that would modify the reporting requirements and definitions contained in section 407 of title 10, United States Code, regarding humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance and expand this definition to include man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS); a section that would prohibit U.S. Special Operations Command from obligating any funds available for fiscal year 2015 for the Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program until the Secretary of Defense provides a certification to the congressional defense committees that validates program re-



quirements; and a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to Congress an annual report on human rights vetting and verification procedures of the Department of Defense; would require the Secretary of Defense, through the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, to conduct a review of Department of Defense efforts regarding suicide prevention among members of the Special Operations Forces and their dependents; and a provision that directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an outside review and assessment of the Preservation of the Force and Families (POTFF) program and suicide prevention programs for U.S. Special Operations Forces and U.S. Special Operations Command.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113-446) accompanying the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee included: a directive requiring the Secretary of Defense to provide a copy of the Analysis of Alternatives report in its entirety and a briefing on undersea clandestine insertion mission of U.S. Special Operations Forces; language directing the Secretary of Defense to improve coordination for and to provide a briefing on the Tactical Assault Light Operator Suits (TALOS) project for U.S. Special Operations Forces; and a directive requiring the Secretary of Defense to brief the committee on proposed transfer of the United States Naval Ship Sumner from Military Sealift Command to U.S. Special Operations Command.

H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 included: a section that would modify the current oversight requirements for the undersea mobility acquisition program of U.S. Special Operations Command, and require the Secretary of the Navy to review a transition plan for the undersea mobility capabilities developed by the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command; a section that would modify the reporting requirements and definitions contained in section 407 of title 10, United States Code, regarding humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance and expand this definition to include man-portable air defense systems (MANPADS); a section that would prohibit U.S. Special Operations Command from obligating any funds available for fiscal year 2015 for the Aviation Foreign Internal Defense Program until the Secretary of Defense provides a certification to the congressional defense committees that validates program requirements; and a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to Congress an annual report on human rights vetting and verification procedures of the Department of Defense; and a provision requiring a comprehensive review and assessment of the Preservation of the Force and Families (POTFF) program and suicide prevention programs for U.S. Special Operations Forces and U.S. Special Operations Command; a provision that would limit the transfer of MC-12 aircraft to U.S. Special Operations Command and direct a review and assessment of requirements; an extension of authority related to Department of Defense facilities for intelligence collection or special

operations activities abroad; and rapid acquisition procedures for U.S. Special Operations Command.

#### Subcommittee on Military Personnel

##### *Transition Assistance*

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel provided extensive oversight on the Department of Defense's Transition Assistance Program (TAP) to ensure implementation of the Veterans' Opportunity to Work (VOW) Act was proceeding expeditiously. The subcommittee held several meetings with the Department of Defense and the military services to monitor their implementation plans. The subcommittee held a hearing on April 24, 2013, entitled "Status of Implementation of the Requirements of the Veterans Opportunity to Work Act and the recommendations of the Presidential Veteran Employment Initiative Task Force for the DOD Transition Assistance Program: Goals, Plans, and Success (GPS)" to discuss the implementation. The hearing also provided the opportunity to determine whether additional legislative changes were needed to further improve the quality of the program provided to service members and their families.

The subcommittee addressed several aspects of transition, including expanding opportunities to gain civilian credentials in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, as well as in the committee report (H. Rept. 113-102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, and in H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. Finally, the committee received a briefing on the preliminary Comptroller General's report on the implementation of the VOW Act, which indicated the program was progressing according to plan with some minor adjustments required.

During the second session of the 113th Congress, the committee continued to address the needs of service members transitioning from the military. H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, would direct the Secretary of Defense to enhance the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program (TAP) of the Department by providing more complete and accurate information regarding post-secondary education to individuals who apply for educational assistance to pursue a program of education at an institution of higher learning. In addition, H.R. 3979 would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide information in electronic format, such as military service and separation data and contact information, to State veterans agencies to facilitate the transition of service members to civilian life.

##### *"Don't Ask, Don't Tell"*

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel continued the process of closely monitoring the ongoing implementation of the laws and policies surrounding the 2011 repeal of the law limiting the military service of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals known as "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" through briefings from the Department of Defense

on the roll out of the Department of Defense policies concerning the repeal of “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.”

#### *Religious Freedom*

H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, contained a provision that would strengthen and clarify the extent of the protections for the sincerely held conscience, moral principles or religious beliefs of service member and a member’s individual expression of those beliefs. The provision amended section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) and would expand the accommodation and prohibition against adverse personnel action based on a member’s individual expression of those beliefs. Furthermore, it would enforce the standard that would trigger disciplinary action from expressions of those beliefs that could have an impact on military readiness, unit cohesion or good order and discipline. H.R. 4435, the Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as passed by the House, contained a provision that would protect the religious freedom of military chaplains to close a prayer outside of a religious service according to the traditions, expressions and religious exercises of their endorsing faith group.

On January 29, 2014, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive testimony from the Department of Defense on religious accommodation in the Armed Services, and on November 19, 2014, the subcommittee also met to receive testimony from outside advocacy organizations on religious accommodations in the Armed Services.

#### *Toxic Leadership*

The committee became concerned about toxic leadership among high-ranking officers in the military services after what appeared to be an increase in press reports of investigations of senior officers for behaviors that included toxic leadership practices. On July 24, 2014, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel met to receive a briefing on the Department of Defense and military services efforts to reduce toxic leadership.

#### Subcommittee on Readiness

The Subcommittee on Readiness continued oversight of military readiness, training, logistics, and maintenance issues; military construction, installations, and family housing issues; energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense; and civilian personnel and service contracting issues.

On February 28, 2013, the committee met to receive testimony on “Assuring the viability of the sustainment industrial base” in order to understand the immediate impacts of a continuing resolution and sequestration on workload trends for depots and arsenals, forward-deployed logistics, new weapon system maintenance, and the Army’s new Organic Industrial Base Strategy. On March 14, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Is Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) appropriate at this time?” The purpose of the hearing was to determine whether or not the Department of

Defense completed an overseas basing assessment and to understand the rationale behind a possible future BRAC round.

The committee met on April 14, 2013, to receive testimony on the “Readiness of the U.S. Army.” The subcommittee then met in a follow-on session to receive testimony on the “Readiness of the U.S. Air Force” on April 24, 2013. On April 26, the subcommittee also met to receive testimony on the “Readiness of the U.S. Navy and U.S. Marine Corps in the context of the President’s Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request.” These three hearings examined the impacts of sequestration, including Department of Defense civilian employee furloughs, on the overall readiness of the services. On August 1, 2013, the Subcommittees on Readiness and Seapower and Projection Forces held a joint hearing on “Ensuring Navy Surface Force Effectiveness with Limited Maintenance Resources,” specifically how operational demands and sequestration affect the Navy’s ability to conduct the needed maintenance for surface ships to achieve their expected service life in support of achieving the Navy’s 30-year shipbuilding plan. On October 2, 2013, the subcommittee received testimony on “Resetting the Force for the Future: Risks of Sequestration,” with regard to the materiel reset and reconstitution efforts of the U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps in light of the drawdown of U.S. Armed Forces in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

The committee met on October 10, 2013, to receive testimony on “The interpretation of H.R. 3210: Pay Our Military Act,” which provided that members of the Armed Forces, the Reserve Components (full-time National Guard), and civilian employees and contractors supporting the Armed Forces received pay and allowances in spite of the United States Government shutdown of 2013.

The committee met on March 27, 2014, to receive testimony on “Operation and Maintenance without OCO Funds,” in order to understand when the reset and enduring requirements for funds that traditionally came from OCO would return to the base O&M accounts. On April 10, 2014, the committee received testimony on “The Department of Defense’s Readiness Posture.”

#### Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces

The Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces conducted a series of hearings to review programs included in the President’s budget requests for fiscal years 2014 and 2015.

In addition, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings on the following topics: February 26, 2013, The Future of Seapower; April 24, 2013, Oversight of U.S. Naval and U.S. Air Force Acquisition Programs in the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request; July 25, 2013, Acquisition and Development Challenges Associated with the Littoral Combat Ship; September 12, 2013, Undersea Warfare Capabilities and Challenges; October 10, 2013, Department of Defense Development and Integration of Air/Sea Battle Strategy, Governance and Policy into the Services’ Annual Program, Planning, Budgeting and Execution Process; October 23, 2013, an Independent assessment of the Navy’s 30-year Shipbuilding Plan; December 11, 2013, U.S. Asia-Pacific Strategic Considerations related to PLA Naval Forces Modernization. The subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces also held a joint

hearing with the Subcommittee on Readiness on August 1, 2013, Ensuring Navy Surface Force Effectiveness with Limited Maintenance Resources.

Additional hearings were: January 14, 2014, People's Republic of China Maritime Disputes; January 28, 2014, Hearing on the People's Republic of China's Counterspace Program and the Implications for U.S. National Security; February 27, 2014, Seapower and Projection Forces Capabilities to Support the Asia Pacific Rebalance; March 12, 2014, Independent Assessments of the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces; March 26, 2014, Independent Assessments of the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces; April 2, 2014, Air Force Projection Forces Aviation Programs and Capabilities related to the 2015 President's Budget Request; July 10, 2014, Cruiser and Destroyer Modernization and Large Surface Combatant Force Structure Assessment; July 16, 2014, Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) Requirements Assessment; July 25, 2014, Amphibious Fleet Requirements; July 30, 2014, Logistics and Sealift Force Requirements and Force Structure Assessment; and December 2, 2014, the Role of Maritime and Air Power in DOD's Third Offset Strategy.

In addition to hearings, the subcommittee conducted numerous briefings on the following topics: February 14, 2013, Underpinning of the 30-year Shipbuilding Plan; April 10, 2013, Seapower and Projection Forces Strategy, Tactics and Challenges Associated with Conducting Full-Spectrum Maritime and Aerospace Operations in an Anti-Access/Area Denial Threat Environment; April 17, 2013, Requirements, Cost, Schedule, Acquisition Strategy and Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request regarding the new Long-Range Strike Bomber; October 2, 2013, Undersea Conventional Strike; October 29, 2013, Unmanned Carrier-based Aircraft Development Activities of the U.S. Navy; February 4, 2014, Air Force and Naval Aircraft of the People's Republic of China Liberation Army: Order of Battle and Capabilities; and June 10, 2014, Integration of Advanced Weapons on Large Surface Combatants.

#### Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held three hearings regarding the President's fiscal year 2014 budget request. On April 25, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. On May 8, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2013 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs. On May 9, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Nuclear Forces Programs.

In addition to budget request hearings, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held additional oversight hearings. On February 28, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on Nuclear Security: Actions, Accountability, and Reform. On March 19, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on "The U.S. Nuclear Deterrent: What Are the Requirements for A Strong Deterrent In an Era of Defense Sequester?" On October 29, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing on Nuclear Weapons Modernization Programs: Military, Technical,

and Political Requirements for the B61 Life Extension Program and Future Stockpile Strategy.

The subcommittee also held numerous briefings. On February 5, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing regarding foreign nuclear weapons programs. On February 13, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on the long range missile threat to the United States. On March 5, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing regarding National Security Space. On April 26, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a missile defense briefing from Admiral Syring, Director, Missile Defense Agency. On July 18, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on the President's Nuclear Weapons Employment Guidance and Russian Arms Control Violations. On July 31, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on Commercial Satellite Services. On September 10, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on the annual assessments of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile. On September 18, 2013, the subcommittee met to receive a classified briefing on military requirements for conventional prompt global strike capability.

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held three hearings regarding the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request. On March 25, 2014, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs. On April 3, 2014, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. On April 8, 2014, the subcommittee held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Nuclear Forces Programs.

In addition to oversight of the President's fiscal year 2015 budget request, the subcommittee held several oversight hearings. On March 26, 2014, the subcommittee held a hearing on the "Interim Report of the Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise." On July 17, 2014, the subcommittee held a hearing on "Russian Violations of the INF Treaty: After Detection—What?" On July 23, 2014, the subcommittee held a hearing on "Adapting U.S. Missile Defense for Future Threats: Russia, China and Modernizing the NMD Act." And, on December 10, 2014, the subcommittee held a hearing on "Russian Arms Control Cheating and the Administration's Responses."

Further, the subcommittee held numerous briefings with the Administration as part of its oversight of strategic forces programs and related policy matters: on January 15, 2014, a briefing on "Cruise Missile Threats to the United States and Homeland Defense Options and Plans"; on February 11, 2014, a briefing on "Pakistan: Strategic Forces Developments"; an "Arms Control Compliance Briefing" on March 5, 2014; on June 26, 2014, a briefing on "Russian Strategic Forces Programs"; on July 9, 2014, a briefing on "Missile Defense Classified Programs"; a September 17, 2014 briefing on "Russian Arms Control Violations: National Security in the Face of Russian Violation of the INF Treaty and Other Violations"; on September 18, 2014, a briefing on the "Report on Stockpile Assessments—The Health of the U.S. Nuclear Weapons Stockpile"; on November 18, 2014, a briefing on "Iran and Implications

of Sanctions Relief”; and, on December 4, 2014, a briefing on “Implications to United States Strategic Capabilities of Foreign Capability Development.”

#### Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces provided oversight of all Departments of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Office of the Secretary of Defense Acquisition programs providing tactical aircraft and missile; armor and ground vehicle; munitions; rotorcraft; individual equipment to include tactical networks and radios; counter improvised explosive device (IED) equipment; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance platforms to include unmanned aerial systems, and associated support equipment, including National Guard and Reserve equipment programs. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also provided oversight on policy, such as threats and force structure requirements, as appropriate within the subcommittee’s jurisdiction. This would include current or future acquisition programs that relate to gaps in the capabilities required to execute current national military strategies, as well as the allocation of acquisition resources. This would also include military service specific acquisition policies as long as there is a nexus to the subcommittee’s jurisdiction. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces also raised concerns over the impact of sequestration on acquisition programs, in particular the impacts to all levels of the industrial base.

The subcommittee conducted six oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2014 budget request, including the following: February 28, 2013: Impacts of a Continuing Resolution and Sequestration on Acquisition, Programming, and the Industrial Base; March 19, 2013: Equipping, Modernizing, and Sustaining the National Guard, Army Reserve, and Air Force Reserve as an Operational Force in a Time of Budget Uncertainty; April 11, 2013: Equipping the Individual Soldier and Marine: Current and Future Year Acquisition and Modernization Strategies and the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request; April 17, 2013: Fiscal Year 2014 Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force Combat Aviation Programs; April 23, 2013: Post Iraq and Afghanistan: Current and Future Roles for Unmanned Aerial Systems and the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget request; April 26, 2013: Fiscal Year 2014 Army Modernization Programs; April 4, 2014: Fiscal Year 2015 Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force Combat Aviation Programs; April 2, 2014: Fiscal Year 2015 Ground Modernization Programs.

In addition to hearings, the subcommittee held various briefings and events to conduct oversight including classified briefings: July 23, 2013: Emerging Threats to Air Superiority and Contribution of 5th Generation Capability; August 1, 2013: Global IED Threat Assessment with Emphasis on the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan; September 18, 2013: Current and Future Threats to Ground Forces and the Critical Need to Sustain Modernization Efforts; October 9, 2013: Program Updates on Army and Marine Corps Body Armor, Combat Helmets, and Small Arms Programs; March 5, 2014: Update on Current and Future Counter-IED Initiatives and the Joint IED Defeat Organization’s Perspective on the recent DOD Report relating to an NSA contractor; March 13, 2014: Air Force Analysis

to Support the Fiscal Year 2015 President's Budget; and July 16, 2014: Department of Defense Munitions—Issues and Challenges.

The subcommittee also held unclassified briefings on February 14, 2013: Joint Strike Fighter 101; January 14, 2014: Army Total Force Structure; February 26, 2014: Tactical Air and Land Defense Industrial Base—Challenges and Opportunities; March 27, 2014: Department of Defense Munitions—Issues and Challenges; April 4, 2014: Tactical Air and Land Defense Industrial Base—Challenges and Opportunities; and July 30, 2014: The Army's Tactical Network: Issues and Challenges.

Lastly, the subcommittee met informally to gather information on the following topics: February 13, 2013: Adversary Fifth Generation Threats and the Value of Stealth; March 12, 2013: Acquisition 101 by the Government Accountability Office; and February 5, 2014: NATO 101: Issues and Challenges for NATO Tactical Air and Land Forces.

The subcommittee also held a field hearing on April 23, 2013: Post Iraq and Afghanistan: Current and Future Roles for Unmanned Aerial Systems and the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request in Dayton, Ohio; and in December held an open Panel Discussion at Fort Rucker, Alabama on "The State of Army Aviation and the Effects of Sequester on Aviation Force Structure and Modernization."

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 23, 2013, and on May 7, 2014 that was included in H.R. 1960, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, as passed by the House, and H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, as passed by the House, respectively. The legislation in both bills covered a range of issues, including authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test and evaluation programs for the Department of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Reserve Components.

Of note, the subcommittee recommended in H.R. 1960, as passed by the House, an additional \$400.0 million for critically needed National Guard and Reserve Component equipment. H.R. 3304, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, would support the legislation included in H.R. 1960, and also would direct an additional \$400.0 million to adequately resource under-funded critical dual-use equipment requirements for the National Guard and Reserve Component. Similar to the legislative efforts in H.R. 3304, H.R. 3979, the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, authorized an additional \$1.25 billion for National Guard and Reserve Component equipment modernization, based on the recommendation from the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces.

#### Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations was reestablished by the 113th Congress to conduct studies and investigations as directed by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services after coordination with the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. The subcommittee undertakes comprehensive, in-depth oversight



activities of major issues and makes recommendations to the committee for consideration and potential legislative action.

#### *Afghanistan Oversight*

The subcommittee convened two hearings and one briefing in connection with its continued oversight efforts of U.S. progress in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

To focus attention on the risks Afghan women face as U.S. troops withdraw, the subcommittee held two hearings on the challenges for securing the gains Afghan women have made in education, security, rights and opportunities during the last decade. On April 25, 2013, the subcommittee held a hearing entitled “Transitioning to Afghan Security Lead: Protecting Afghan Women?” Witnesses were: Mr. David Sedney, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Afghan, Pakistan, and Central Asia; Major General Michael Shields, USA, Director of the Pakistan-Afghanistan Coordination Cell, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Ms. Stephanie Sanok, Deputy Director and Senior Fellow, International Security Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies; and Ms. Clare Lockhart, Co-Founder and Director, Institute for State Effectiveness. On October 29, 2013, the subcommittee held a second hearing entitled “Report from SIGAR: Challenges to Securing Afghan Women’s Gains in a Post-2014 Environment.” Witnesses were: Mr. John Sopko, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; Dr. Kenneth Katzman, Specialist in Middle Eastern Affairs, Congressional Research Services; and Ms. Michelle Barsa, Senior Manager for Policy, Inclusive Security Action.

The subcommittee continued its oversight into Afghanistan by focusing on reconstruction to ensure that appropriate accountability measures are taken. On July 31, 2013, the subcommittee received a briefing on recent audits of U.S.-funded reconstruction projects from Mr. John Sopko, Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; Mr. Gene Aloise, Deputy Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction; Ms. Elizabeth Field, Assistant Inspector General for Audits and Inspections; Ms. Sharon Woods, Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Investigations; and Ms. Monica J. Brym, Director of Special Projects.

#### *Levels of military, contractor, and civilian staffing at the Office of the Secretary of Defense*

In March 2013, Chairman Howard P. “Buck” McKeon and Ranking Minority Member Adam Smith directed the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations to conduct a study of how military, civilian and contractor personnel are utilized in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) as part of its continued oversight of the organization and management of the Department of Defense. Specifically, the subcommittee was tasked to identify: the extent to which military personnel hold positions in OSD that alternatively could be filled by civilian or contractor personnel; the historical reasons and current justifications for assigning military personnel to such positions; the feasibility and advisability of eliminating some of those positions held by military personnel or filling them with military or contractor personnel; potential recommendations for legislative changes that could be incorporated into the fiscal year 2015

national defense authorization bill; and the extent to which the manpower requirements are comparable to other staffs in the Department of Defense so that findings and recommendations could be more broadly applied.

In conducting this study, staff received briefings from the Department of Defense and reviewed hundreds of pages of studies on OSD's previous efforts to identify or reduce its staffing levels. In addition, subcommittee Members convened a briefing and issued a report on its findings.

The subcommittee's staff report concluded that despite consistent and recurring attention by OSD, historical efforts to cut the number of personnel have not resulted in overall reductions in the numbers of civilians or contractors assigned to the office. In addition, OSD faces challenges implementing the current round of reductions as directed by the Secretary of Defense. Until the Department can provide an accurate accounting of the number of civilian, military and contracted personnel supporting it and their associated costs, it is not clear how the Department will be able to execute the necessary task of reducing and rightsizing its staff.

#### *Quadrennial Defense Review*

On February 26, 2013, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing to receive information about the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) planning process underway at the Department of Defense. The committee received recommendations from outside experts on the issues that should be considered and the scope of the Department's current review. Hearing witnesses were: Mr. Shawn Brimley, Vice President and Director of Studies, Center for a New American Security; Mr. Jim Thomas, Vice President and Director of Studies, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments; and Dr. Colin Dueck, Associate Professor, Department of Public and International Affairs, George Mason University.

On March 5, 2014, the subcommittee conducted a closed briefing with former U.S. Government expert witnesses to receive information about their perspectives on the planning, execution, findings and recommendations of the 2014 QDR which had been conducted by the Department of Defense. The committee received recommendations from these outside experts on the issues that should be considered inherent to the committee's oversight of the planning, programming, budgeting, and execution (PPBE) of the Department related to the national defense strategy. Briefing witnesses were: Ms. Michele Flournoy, Senior Advisor at The Boston Consulting Group; U.S. Marine Corps General (ret.) James M. Mattis, Visiting Fellow at the Hoover Institution; and, Dr. Catherine Dale, Specialist in International Security at the Congressional Research Service.

This work supplemented other activities at the full committee.

#### *Department of Defense Section 1033 Surplus Property Program in Support of U.S. Law Enforcement Agencies*

On November 13, 2014, the subcommittee conducted a hearing with Department of Defense and outside expert witnesses titled, "The Department of Defense Excess Property Program in Support

of U.S. Law Enforcement Agencies: An Overview of Department of Defense Authorities, Roles, Responsibilities, and Implementation of Section 1033 of the 1997 National Defense Authorization Act.” The purpose of the hearing was to receive testimony about the administration, oversight, and accountability mechanisms for the Department of Defense program that provides excess property to selected state and local law enforcement agencies. The committee received testimony from two panels. Panel one was comprised of Vice Admiral Mark D. Harnitchek, U.S. Navy, Director, Defense Logistics Agency, and Mr. Alan F. Estevez, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisitions, Technology, and Logistics. Panel two was comprised of Mr. Jim Bueermann, President, Police Foundation, and Mr. Mark Lomax, Executive Director, National Tactical Officers Association.

#### *Personnel Security Clearance Process Reform Efforts*

In July 2014, Chairman Howard P. “Buck” McKeon directed the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations to report to the vice chairman of the committee about the security clearance background investigation and adjudication processes as they apply to the Department of Defense, as part of the committee’s broader reform effort. Specifically, the subcommittee was tasked to summarize the various governmental and non-governmental assessments of the existing process, review internal and external proposals for improving the process, evaluate the effectiveness of these various reforms planned or underway and to suggest which, if any, of these proposals the committee should consider further.

In conducting this study, staff reviewed hundreds of pages of documents including governmental and non-governmental reports, analyses, and assessments of existing processes and internal and external proposals for improvements. Subcommittee staff also reviewed and analyzed applicable Executive Orders, Department of Defense directives, and details of planned efforts to address reform of the security clearance process. In addition, committee staff met with and was briefed by representatives from the Department.

The subcommittee’s staff report summarized the ongoing efforts of the Department to improve the re-investigation and adjudication process. This includes, among other steps, exploring the potential for automated continuous evaluation and the considering reducing the number of individuals with access to classified information. In addition, the study noted that the Department had various reports set for completion in coming months that may provide a clearer picture of future plans for improving the process as they apply to the Department of Defense.

#### *Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund*

On June 24, 2014, the subcommittee conducted a hearing with Government and outside witnesses titled “Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund: Examining the Department of Defense and Interagency Process for Verifying Eligibility.” The purpose of the hearing was to receive testimony about the Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund, including how it had performed to date, how the eligibility verification process had operated, and how it had changed over time.

The committee received testimony from two panels. Panel one was comprised of: Brigadier General David K. “Mac” MacEwan, the 59th Adjutant General of the U.S. Army; Mr. Brad Flohr, Senior Advisor for Compensation Service, Veterans Benefits Administration, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs; and, Mr. Scott Levins, Director of the National Personnel Records Center, National Archives and Records Administration. Panel two was comprised of: Mr. Celedino Almeda, Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund Claimant; Mr. Jesse Baltazar, Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund Claimant; and, Mr. Eric Lachica, Executive Director, American Coalition for Filipino Veterans, Inc.

#### *Taliban Five Transfer*

On July 17, 2014, Chairman McKeon directed the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations to conduct an investigation of the rationale for the May 2014 transfer of five Taliban detainees from U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (GTMO), the process by which the transfer decision was made, the national security implications of the transfer, and related topics. The subcommittee has since conducted bipartisan transcribed interviews of nine senior Department officials involved in or knowledgeable of the transfer and related events. The subcommittee also received 2,750 pages of classified and unclassified documents from the Department of Defense and other agencies, conducted a staff oversight trip to Qatar, and facilitated a Congressional Delegation to GTMO. Although Chairman McKeon intended for the investigation to be completed by December 9, 2014, he subsequently extended the subcommittee’s inquiry to allow time for additional materials to be gathered and assessed.

#### *Department of Defense Response to the Attack on the Diplomatic Facilities in Benghazi, Libya*

In February 2014, the committee released a majority interim report entitled “Benghazi Investigation Update,” expressing the views of Chairman McKeon, Vice Chairman Mac Thornberry, Rep. Martha Roby (who was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations until December 2013), and the five majority members of that subcommittee. The report assessed the Department of Defense’s response to the attack, preparations the U.S. military made for the possibility of an attack, and the arrangements that were subsequently put into place to minimize the possibility of a similar recurrence. The report highlighted six findings.

The February report also identified several topics for further investigation. Accordingly, Chairman McKeon directed staff to conduct nine classified transcribed interviews with military officers who were in Libya during the attack or were involved in assessing events and shaping the military’s response. These interviews were conducted in conjunction with staff from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Committee staff interviewed individuals at every level of command: an Army lieutenant colonel who was the Director of Current Operations at Special Operations Command-Africa (SOCAFRICA); in addition to Lieutenant Colonel S.E. Gibson, Team Libya, Embassy Tripoli; Lieutenant Colonel Keith Phillips, Defense Attaché,

Embassy Tripoli; Lieutenant Colonel Greg Arndt, Director of the Office of Security Cooperation, Embassy Tripoli; Colonel George Bristol, Commander of Joint Task Force-Trans Sahara; Rear Admiral Brian Losey, Commander, SOCAFRICA; Brigadier General Scott Zobrist, commander, 31st Fighter Wing, Aviano Air Base, Italy; Rear Admiral Richard Landolt, Deputy Commander for Operations, United States Africa Command (AFRICOM); Vice Admiral Charles Leidig, Deputy Commander, AFRICOM; and General Carter Ham, Commander, AFRICOM. In sum, these interviews comprised over 30 hours and 1100 pages of transcripts. Unclassified redacted versions of these transcripts were later released to the public.

Pursuant to requirements of the House of Representatives, committee records and materials held in connection with this investigation were transmitted to the Select Committee on the Events Surrounding the 2012 Terrorist Attack in Benghazi, Libya, established on May 8, 2014, pursuant to H. Res. 567.

## PUBLICATIONS

## HOUSE REPORTS

Report Number	Date Filed	Bill Number	Title
113-102 .....	June 7, 2013 .....	H.R. 1960 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.
113-102 Part 2 .....	June 11, 2013 .....	H.R. 1960 .....	National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.
113-309 .....	December 27, 2013 .....	N/A .....	First Annual Report on the Activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 113th Congress.
113-446 .....	May 13, 2014 .....	H.R. 4435 .....	Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.
113-446 Part 2 .....	May 19, 2014 .....	H.R. 4435 .....	Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.
113-547 .....	July 22, 2014 .....	H. Res. 649 .....	Directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any emails in the possession of the Department of Defense or the National Security Agency that were transmitted to or from the email account(s) of former Internal Revenue Service Exempt Organizations Division Director Lois Lerner between January 2009 and April 2011.
113-569 .....	July 31, 2014 .....	H. Res. 644 .....	Condemning and disapproving of the Obama administration's failure to comply with the lawful statutory requirement to notify Congress before releasing individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and expressing national security concerns over the release of five Taliban leaders and the repercussions of negotiating with terrorists.

## COMMITTEE PRINTS

Committee Print No. 1—Rules of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives of the United States, 113th Congress 2013–2014, adopted January 15, 2013.

Committee Print No. 2—National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. Legislative Text and Joint Explanatory Statement to accompany H.R. 3304 (Public Law 113–66). December 2013.

Committee Print No. 3—A Ceremony Unveiling the Portrait of the Honorable Howard P. "Buck" McKeon. September 18, 2014.

## PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS

H.A.S.C. 113-1—Full Committee hearing on Committee Organization. Jan. 15, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-2—Full Committee hearing on A Review of Sexual Misconduct by Basic Training Instructors at Lackland Air Force Base. Jan. 23, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-3—Full Committee hearing on The Impacts of a Continuing Resolution and Sequestration on Defense. Feb. 13, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-4—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Perspectives on the Future National Security Environment: Technological, Geopolitical, and Economic Trends Affecting the Defense Strategic Guidance. Feb. 13, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-5—Full Committee hearing on Framework for Building Partnership Capacity Programs and Authorities to Meet 21st Century Challenges. Feb. 14, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-6—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on The Quadrennial Defense Review: Process, Policy, and Perspectives. Feb. 26, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-7—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on The Future of Seapower. Feb. 26, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-8—Full Committee hearing on Transition in Afghanistan: Views of Outside Experts. Feb. 27, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-9—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on The Impact of the Current Budget-Constrained Environment on Military End Strength. Feb. 27, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-10—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on The Role of Intelligence in the Department of Defense. Feb. 27, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-11—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Assuring Viability of the Sustainment Industrial Base. Feb. 28, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-12—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Impacts of a Continuing Resolution and Sequestration on Acquisition, Programming, and the Industrial Base. Feb. 28, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-13—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Nuclear Security: Actions, Accountability and Reform. Feb. 28, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-14—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Posture of the U.S. Strategic Command and U.S. Pacific Command. Mar. 5, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-15—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Posture of the U.S. Central Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and U.S. Transportation Command. Mar. 6, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-16—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Impact of the Continuing Resolution, Sequestration, and Declining Operations and Maintenance Budgets on Military Personnel and Family Related Programs. Mar. 13, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-17—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Information Technology and Cyber Operations: Modernization and Policy Issues to Support the Future Force. Mar. 13, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-18—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Is Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Appropriate at this Time? Mar. 14, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-19—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Posture of the U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command. Mar. 15, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-20—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Equipping, Modernizing, and Sustaining the National Guard, Army Reserve, and Air Force Reserve as an Operational Force in a Time of Budget Uncertainty. Mar. 19, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-21—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on The U.S. Nuclear Deterrent: What are the Requirements for a Strong Deterrent in an Era of Defense Sequester? Mar. 19, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–22—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Posture of the U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command. Mar. 20, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–23—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Update on Military Suicide Prevention Programs. Mar. 21, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–24—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Mental Health Research. Apr. 10, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–25—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of Defense. Apr. 11, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–26—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Equipping the Individual Soldier and Marine: Current and Future Year Acquisition and Modernization Strategies and the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request. Apr. 11, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–27—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force. Apr. 12, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–28—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Navy. Apr. 16, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–29—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on The Readiness Posture of the U.S. Army. Apr. 16, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–30—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Department of Defense (DOD) Science and Technology Programs. Apr. 16, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–31—Full Committee hearing on Recent Developments in Afghanistan. Apr. 17, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–32—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2014 Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force Combat Aviation Programs. Apr. 17, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–33—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for U.S. Special Operations Command and U.S. Special Operations Forces. Apr. 17, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–34—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Post Iraq and Afghanistan: Current and Future Roles for UAS and the Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request. Apr. 23, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113–35—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Oversight of U.S. Naval and U.S. Air Force Acquisition Programs



in the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Budget Request. Apr. 24, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-36—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on The Readiness Posture of the U.S. Air Force. Apr. 24, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-37—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Status of Implementation of the Requirements of the VOW Act and the Recommendations of the Presidential Veterans Employment Initiative Task Force for the DOD Transition Assistance Program—Goals, Plans, and Success (GPS). Apr. 24, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-38—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Army. Apr. 25, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-39—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Transitioning to Afghan Security Lead: Protecting Afghan Women? Apr. 25, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-40—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. Apr. 25, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-41—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on The Readiness Posture of the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps. Apr. 26, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-42—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2014 Army Modernization Programs. Apr. 26, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-43—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—National Defense Priorities from Members for the Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act. May 8, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-44—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs. May 8, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-45—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Request for Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Nuclear Forces Programs. May 9, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-46—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Past, Present, and Future Irregular Warfare Challenges: Private Sector Perspectives. June 28, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-47—Full Committee hearing on DOD and VA Collaboration to Assist Servicemembers Returning to Civilian Life (joint with House Committee on Veterans' Affairs). July 10, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-48—Full Committee hearing on The Security Situation in the Syrian Arab Republic—Implications for U.S. National Security and U.S. Policy Options. July 17, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-49—Full Committee hearing on Rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific Region and Implications for U.S. National Security. July 24, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-50—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Women in Service Reviews. July 24, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-51—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Acquisition and Development Challenges Associated with the Littoral Combat Ship. July 25, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-52—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Department of Defense's Challenges in Accounting for Missing Persons from Past Conflicts. Aug. 1, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-53—Full Committee hearing on Initial Conclusions Formed by the Defense Strategic Choices and Management Review. Aug. 1, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-54—Subcommittees on Readiness and Seapower and Projection Forces joint hearing on Ensuring Navy Surface Force Effectiveness with Limited Maintenance Resources. Aug. 1, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-55—Full Committee hearing on Proposed Authorization to Use Military Force in Syria. Sept. 10, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-56—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Undersea Warfare Capabilities and Challenges. Sept. 12, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-57—Full Committee hearing on Planning for Sequestration in Fiscal Year 2014 and Perspectives of the Military Services on the Strategic Choices and Management Review. Sept. 18, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-58—Full Committee hearing on The U.S. Presence in Afghanistan Post-2014: Views of Outside Experts. Sept. 19, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-59—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on The Defense Department's Posture for September 11, 2013: What are the Lessons of Benghazi? Sept. 19, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-60—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Resetting the Force for the Future: Risks of Sequestration. Oct. 2, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-61—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on The Interpretation of H.R. 3210: Pay Our Military Act. Oct. 10, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-62—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Department of Defense Development and Integration of Air-Sea Battle Strategy, Governance and Policy into the Services' Annual Program, Planning, Budgeting and Execution (PPBE) Process. Oct. 10, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-63—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Biodefense: Worldwide Threats and Countermeasure Efforts for the Department of Defense. Oct. 11, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-64—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on An Independent Assessment of the Navy's 30-Year Shipbuilding Plan. Oct. 23, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-65—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Impacts of a Continuing Resolution and Sequestration on Acquisition and Modernization. Oct. 23, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-66—Full Committee hearing on Twenty-Five Years of Acquisition Reform: Where Do We Go From Here? Oct. 29, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-67—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Report from SIGAR: Challenges to Securing Afghan Women's Gains in a Post-2014 Environment. Oct. 29, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-68—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Nuclear Weapons Modernization Programs: Military, Technical, and Political Requirements for the B61 Life Extension Program and Future Stockpile Strategy. Oct. 29, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-69—Full Committee hearing on 2013 Report to Congress of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission. Nov. 20, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-70—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Resale Programs Overview. Nov. 20, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-71—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on U.S. Asia-Pacific Strategic Considerations Related to People's Liberation Army Naval Forces Modernization. Dec. 11, 2013.

H.A.S.C. 113-72—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Maritime Sovereignty in the East and South China Seas (joint with Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on Foreign Affairs). Jan. 14, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-73—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Future Recruiting Challenges in the Fiscally Constrained Environment. Jan. 16, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-74—Full Committee hearing on Rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific Region: Examining Its Implementation. Jan. 28, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-75—Subcommittees on Strategic Forces and Seapower and Projection Forces joint hearing on People's Republic of China's Counterspace Program and the Implications for U.S. National Security. Jan. 28, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-76—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Religious Accommodations in the Armed Services. Jan. 29, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-77—Full Committee hearing on The State of Al Qaeda, Its Affiliates, and Associated Groups: View from Outside Experts. Feb. 4, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-78—Full Committee hearing on United States Security Policy and Defense Posture in the Middle East. Feb. 11, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-79—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Posture of the U.S. Northern Command and U.S. Southern Command. Feb. 26, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-80—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Defense Health Agency. Feb. 26, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-81—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Posture of the U.S. Special Operations Command and U.S. Transportation Command. Feb. 27, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-82—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Seapower and Projection Forces Capabilities to Support the Asia-Pacific Rebalance. Feb. 27, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-83—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests from the U.S. Pacific Command, U.S. Central Command, and U.S. Africa Command. Mar. 5, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-84—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously

Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense. Mar. 6, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–85—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of the Navy. Mar. 12, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–86—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Independent Assessments of the Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces. Mar. 12, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–87—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Information Technology and Cyber Operations: Modernization and Policy Issues in a Changing National Security Environment. Mar. 12, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–88—Full Committee hearing on Recent Developments in Afghanistan. Mar. 13, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–89—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the U.S. Special Operations Command and the Posture of the U.S. Special Operations Forces. Mar. 13, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–90—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force. Mar. 14, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–91—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of the Army. Mar. 25, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–92—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Personnel Overview. Mar. 25, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–93—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 Missile Defense Hearing. Mar. 25, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–94—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Interim Report of the Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise. Mar. 26, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–95—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force Combat Aviation Programs. Mar. 26, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–96—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of Defense (DOD) Fiscal Year 2015 Science and Technology Programs: Pursuing Technology Superiority in a Changing Security Environment. Mar. 26, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-97—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Department of the Navy Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for Seapower and Projection Forces. Mar. 26, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-98—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Operation and Maintenance Without OCO Funds: What Now? Mar. 27, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-99—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests from U.S. Forces Korea and U.S. Strategic Command. Apr. 2, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-100—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 Ground Force Modernization Programs. Apr. 2, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-101—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Air Force Projection Forces Aviation Programs and Capabilities Related to the 2015 President's Budget Request. Apr. 2, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-102—Full Committee hearing on the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review. Apr. 3, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-103—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. Apr. 3, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-104—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Intelligence Activities. Apr. 4, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-105—Full Committee hearing on Russian Military Developments and Strategic Implications. Apr. 8, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-106—Subcommittee on Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and the Chemical Biological Defense Program: Combating Weapons of Mass Destruction in a Changing Global Environment. Apr. 8, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-107—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Fiscal Year 2015 Atomic Energy Defense and Nuclear Forces. Apr. 8, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-108—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—National Defense Priorities from Members for the Fiscal Year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act. Apr. 9, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113-109—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Beneficiary and Advocacy Overview of the Fiscal Year 2015 President's Budget. Apr. 9, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–110—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Department of Defense’s Readiness Posture. Apr. 10, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–111—Full Committee hearing on The May 31, 2014 Transfer of Five Senior Taliban Detainees. June 11, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–112—Full Committee hearing on P5+1 Negotiations over Iran’s Nuclear Program and Its Implications for United States Defense. June 19, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–113—Full Committee hearing on Case Studies in DOD Acquisition: Finding What Works. June 24, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–114—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Filipino Veterans Equity Compensation Fund: Examining the Department of Defense and Interagency Process for Verifying Eligibility. June 24, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–115—Full Committee hearing on Defense Reform: Empowering Success in Acquisition. July 10, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–116—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Cruiser and Destroyer Modernization and Large Surface Combatant Force Structure Assessment. July 10, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–117—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Government Accountability Office Review of the Prisoner of War/Missing in Action (POW/MIA) Community and the Restructuring of These Agencies as Proposed by the Department of Defense. July 15, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–118—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2015 Overseas Contingency Operations Budget Request. July 16, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–119—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) Requirements Assessment. July 16, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–120—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Russian Violations of the INF Treaty: After Detection—What? July 17, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–121—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Adapting U.S. Missile Defense for Future Threats: Russia, China and Modernizing the National Missile Defense (NMD) Act. July 23, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–122—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Amphibious Fleet Requirements. July 25, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–123—Full Committee hearing on Security Situation in Iraq and Syria: U.S. Policy Options and Implications for the Region. July 29, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–124—Full Committee hearing on Risks to Stability in Afghanistan: Politics, Security, and International Commitment. July 30, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–125—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Logistics and Sealift Force Requirements and Force Structure Assessment. July 30, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–126—Full Committee hearing on The Administration’s Strategy for the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). Sept. 18, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–127—Full Committee hearing on The Administration’s Strategy and Military Campaign against Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). Nov. 13, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–128—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on The Department of Defense Excess Property Program in Support of U.S. Law Enforcement Agencies: An Overview of DOD Authorities, Roles, Responsibilities, and Implementation of Section 1033 of the 1997 National Defense Authorization Act. Nov. 13, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–129—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Religious Accommodations in the Armed Services. Nov. 19, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–130—Full Committee hearing on National Defense Panel Assessment of the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review. Dec. 2, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–131—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on The Role of Maritime and Air Power in DOD’s Third Offset Strategy. Dec. 2, 2014.

H.A.S.C. 113–132—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Russian Arms Control Cheating and the Administration’s Responses (joint with Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs). Dec. 10, 2014.

## PRESS RELEASES

### FIRST SESSION

January 3, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on President Obama Signing the FY2013 NDAA into law

January 7, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Sen. Hagel Nomination

January 16, 2013—Chairman McKeon Responds to Service Chiefs’ Letter to Congress

January 22, 2013—McKeon Announces Roby As Chair of O&I Subcommittee

January 29, 2013—McKeon Announces National Defense Panel Selections for Quadrennial Defense Review

January 29, 2013—McKeon, Smith Announce Subcommittee Membership for 113th Congress

January 30, 2013—McKeon Awaits Answers from Hagel During Nomination Hearing

January 31, 2013—McKeon Opposes Hagel As Secretary of Defense

February 5, 2013—McKeon and Inhofe on President’s Expected Proposal to Replace Sequester

February 6, 2013—McKeon and HASC Republicans To Propose “Down Payment” to Protect National Security

February 8, 2013—McKeon Responds To White House Fact Sheet On Sequester

February 12, 2013—McKeon Statement on White House Plan to Withdraw Forces from Afghanistan

February 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on President Obama’s 2013 State of the Union Address

February 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on North Korean Detonation

February 13, 2013—Chairman McKeon: President’s Plan for More Defense Cuts at Odds with Testimony

February 20, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Civilian Furloughs

February 28, 2013—McKeon and Subcommittee Chairs Will Host Morning Press Conference on March 1st

March 6, 2013—Remaining Hearings POSTPONED

March 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on House Republican Budget

March 15, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Deployment of New Missile Defense Interceptors

April 3, 2013—HASC Leadership Appoints Members to National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force

April 3, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Secretary Hagel’s Speech at National Defense University

April 8, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on the Passing of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher

April 10, 2013—Statement by the Chairman on the President’s Budget Submission

April 22, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Disposition of Suspected Terrorist Dzhokhar Tsarnaev

April 25, 2013—McKeon Releases the FY14 NDAA Markup Schedule

April 25, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Situation in Syria

April 25, 2013—McKeon Letter to Secretary Hagel on Benghazi

April 26, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Secretary Donley

April 30, 2013—Chairman McKeon Responds to President Obama’s Guantanamo Claim

May 7, 2013—Chairman McKeon Announces Nomination to Military Sexual Assault Review Panel

May 8, 2013—McKeon Statement on DoD Denial of Vital Benghazi Oversight Information

May 9, 2013—McKeon: HASC Will Act to Combat Sexual Assault

May 14, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Allegations of Further Sexual Misconduct in the Military

May 15, 2013—McKeon Continues Benghazi Oversight

May 15, 2013—McKeon, Smith Begin FY 2014 Defense Authorization Process

May 21, 2013—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee Mark Released

May 21, 2013—Strategic Forces Subcommittee Mark Released

May 21, 2013—Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee Mark Released

May 21, 2013—Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee Mark Released

May 22, 2013—Readiness Subcommittee Mark Released

May 22, 2013—Military Personnel Subcommittee Mark Released

May 23, 2013—Background Material on Guantanamo Bay

May 24, 2013—Myth vs Fact: Obama’s Strained View Of National Security



- June 3, 2013—Chairman McKeon Releases Full Committee Mark
- June 5, 2013—Opening Statement of Chairman McKeon for Full Committee Markup
- June 6, 2013—House Armed Services Committee Passes Fiscal Year 2014 National Defense Authorization Act
- June 7, 2013—Chairman McKeon writing in Washington Post: Budget cuts chip away at military readiness
- June 13, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Latest Developments in Syria
- June 14, 2013—McKeon Statement On House Passage Of National Defense Authorization Act For 2014
- June 19, 2013—Chairman McKeon on the President’s Berlin Remarks
- June 26, 2013—Readout of House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Classified Briefing on Benghazi
- June 27, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Unanimous House Action to Combat Sexual Assault in the Military
- July 8, 2013—McKeon Statement on Pentagon Furloughs
- July 9, 2013—McKeon on “Zero Option”
- July 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Sends Letter to President Regarding “Zero Option”
- July 19, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Second Circuit Ruling Regarding NDAA
- July 30, 2013—McKeon Comments on Manning Verdict
- July 31, 2013—McKeon Statement on Strategic Choices and Management Review
- July 31, 2013—Readout of House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Classified Briefing on Benghazi
- August 6, 2013—McKeon Statement on DoD Furlough Update
- August 15, 2013—McKeon Statement on New DoD Sexual Assault Policies
- August 21, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Bradley Manning Sentence
- August 23, 2013—McKeon Statement on Hasan Verdict
- August 26, 2013—McKeon Statement on Developments in Syria
- September 11, 2013—McKeon Statement on 9/11 Anniversary
- September 16, 2013—McKeon, Smith Joint Statement on Navy Yard Shootings
- September 17, 2013—McKeon Statement on Defense Department Inspector General Report on Contractor Access to Naval Installations
- September 30, 2013—McKeon Statement on Military Pay and Potential Government Shutdown
- October 4, 2013—Rep. Wilson Urges Secretary of Defense to Follow Pay Our Military Act
- October 4, 2013—McKeon Announces Changes to Armed Services Committee Staff
- October 5, 2013—Chairman McKeon on the Reinstatement of Furloughed DOD Civilians
- October 6, 2013—McKeon Statement on the Capture of Abu Anas al-Libi
- October 8, 2013—McKeon Statement on Death Gratuity

October 8, 2013—McKeon Statement on the Departure of Paul M. Lewis

October 9, 2013—HASC Vice Chairman Thornberry: Pentagon playing political games with death benefits

October 9, 2013—McKeon Statement on Rep. Bill Young's Retirement Announcement

October 11, 2013—Roby Comments On Benghazi Briefing With General Dempsey

October 19, 2013—McKeon Comments On The Passing Of Congressman Bill Young

October 24, 2013—HASC Republicans Stress Need to Maintain National Defense in Budget Conference

October 28, 2013—McKeon Statement On The Passing Of Chairman Ike Skelton

October 29, 2013—Forbes, Hanabusa Lead Asia Pacific Oversight Series

October 29, 2013—McKeon Taps Thornberry to Lead Reform Effort

November 1, 2013—McKeon Urges President to Adopt Comprehensive Policy in Iraq

November 6, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Rep. Runyan

November 9, 2013—McKeon Statement On Reported Iran Nuke Deal

November 13, 2013—HASC Leaders Statement on Asia Pacific Ambassadors Roundtable

November 21, 2013—HASC Leaders Comment On NDAA Progress

November 22, 2013—McKeon Reacts to Iran Nuclear Deal

December 5, 2013—McKeon Statement on Rep. Martha Roby

December 6, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Pearl Harbor Anniversary

December 9, 2013—McKeon Releases FY14 NDAA Summary Fact Sheet

December 10, 2013—McKeon, Smith Release FY14 Defense Bill

December 12, 2013—Chairman McKeon Statement on Passage of the 52nd National Defense Authorization Act

December 12, 2013—McKeon Statement on Passage of Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013

#### SECOND SESSION

January 6, 2014—Chairman McKeon Statement on al-Qaeda in Iraq

January 6, 2014—Armed Services Committee Mourns The Passing of John Chapla

January 8, 2014—McKeon Welcomes Rep. Bradley Byrne to the House Armed Services Committee

January 10, 2014—McKeon Statement on Pentagon's Finding on Snowden

January 13, 2014—Declassified Transcripts of Benghazi Briefings Released Files

January 13, 2014—Committee Members React to Chinese Hyper Sonic Missile Test

January 15, 2014—McKeon Taps Heck As Oversight And Investigations Chair

January 16, 2014—McKeon, Smith on the Passing of former Rep. Ben Blaz

January 30, 2014—HASC Leaders Call on Obama Administration to Act on Russia's Cheating on Nuclear Agreements

February 10, 2014—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Releases Report on DOD Response to Benghazi

February 12, 2014—McKeon Statement on Karzai Government's Planned Release of Enemy Combatants in Afghanistan

February 17, 2014—McKeon Queries Services and COCOMs On Unfunded Requirements Files

March 1, 2014—McKeon Statement on Russian Military Action in Ukraine

March 4, 2014—McKeon Statement on DoD Budget

March 4, 2014—Chairman McKeon Rejects QDR

March 12, 2014—McKeon Comments On Menendez Bill

March 26, 2014—ARMED SERVICES LEADERS URGE PRESIDENT TO ACT ON UKRAINE

March 27, 2014—Chairman McKeon Statement on the Passing of Former Defense Secretary James Schlesinger

April 1, 2014—McKeon Statement on Ryan Budget

April 2, 2014—Bipartisan National Security Leaders Reach Out to Stakeholders on DoD Reform

April 3, 2014—McKeon, Smith Welcome Rep. Tulsi Gabbard to the House Armed Services Committee

April 4, 2014—McKeon Statement on ENLIST Act and the NDAA

April 7, 2014—McKeon Releases the FY15 NDAA Markup Schedule

April 7, 2014—McKeon, Turner To Discuss Russia, Ukraine, and U.S. Military Posture

April 7, 2014—McKeon Statement on Afghanistan Elections

April 10, 2014—McKeon, Smith Begin FY 2015 Defense Authorization Process

April 23, 2014—Committee to Add Electronic Amendment Distribution to Press for NDAA Markup

April 29, 2014—Intelligence, Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee Mark Released

April 29, 2014—Strategic Forces Subcommittee Mark Released

April 29, 2014—Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee Mark Released

April 29, 2014—Military Personnel Subcommittee Mark Released

April 30, 2014—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces Mark Released

April 30, 2014—Readiness Subcommittee Mark Released

April 30, 2014—Opening Statement of Chairman Rogers

April 30, 2014—Opening Statement of Chairman Forbes

April 30, 2014—Opening Statement of Chairman Wilson

May 1, 2014—Opening Statement of Chairman Turner

May 1, 2014—Opening Statement of Chairman Wittman

May 1, 2014—McKeon Responds to Oversight and Government Reform Committee Witness on Benghazi

- May 2, 2014—Chairman McKeon in Washington Post: Obama's inaction invites challenges to the U.S.
- May 2, 2014—McKeon Congratulates Wada
- May 5, 2014—McKeon Releases Full Committee Mark Files
- May 8, 2014—Chairman McKeon on Passage of NDAA
- May 8, 2014—Chairmen Rogers, Poe and Heck Statement on NDAA INF Treaty Provision
- May 22, 2014—Chairman McKeon Statement on Passage of the 53rd National Defense Authorization Act
- May 27, 2014—McKeon Statement on President's Troop Level Announcement
- May 28, 2014—Chairman McKeon Statement on Secretary Shinseki
- May 31, 2014—McKeon, Inhofe, Statement On Release Of Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl In Exchange For Release Of Five Guantanamo Detainees
- June 2, 2014—Fact Sheet on Guantanamo Transfers
- June 3, 2014—McKeon Invites Secretary Hagel to testify on Transfer of Senior Taliban Detainees
- June 5, 2014—McKeon on Dunford Nomination
- June 11, 2014—McKeon Responds To New White House Claims On Terrorist Transfer
- June 11, 2014—Opening Statement of Chairman McKeon on The May 31, 2014 Transfer of Five Senior Taliban Detainees
- June 13, 2014—Chairman McKeon Statement on Situation in Iraq
- June 17, 2014—Chairman McKeon on Capture of Ahmed Abu Khattala
- June 18, 2014—Readout of House Armed Services Committee Taliban Transfer Briefing
- June 19, 2014—McKeon on President Obama's Iraq Statement
- June 20, 2014—Chairman McKeon Statement on Passage of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for FY2015
- June 23, 2014—McKeon Statement on Successful Ballistic Missile Defense Test
- June 26, 2014—McKeon Comments On Overseas Contingency Operations Request
- June 27, 2014—McKeon Statement on President Obama's Land Mine Announcement
- July 9, 2014—Additional Declassified Benghazi Transcripts Released
- July 24, 2014—Armed Services Committee to Consider Rigell Taliban 5 Resolution
- July 25, 2014—McKeon Responds to Ambassador Susan Rice's Letter to Speaker Boehner
- July 28, 2014—JUST THE FACTS: How the Transfer of the Taliban Five Violated The Law
- July 30, 2014—JUST THE FACTS: Obama Administration's Long-Overdue Recognition of Russian Cheating on the INF Treaty
- July 30, 2014—McKeon Statement on HASC Markup of H. Res 644
- August 1, 2014—HASC Members Urge Senator Harry Reid to Support Israel by Bringing SASC NDAA Mark to the Floor
- August 5, 2014—McKeon Statement on Afghanistan Attack

August 7, 2014—McKeon Statement on Situation in Iraq  
August 21, 2014—McKeon Calls for Leak Investigation Around  
Foley Rescue Attempt  
August 27, 2014—Chairman McKeon Statement on ISIS  
August 28, 2014—McKeon, Turner Statement on Reports of Rus-  
sian Troops in Ukraine  
September 5, 2014—Full House to Vote on HASC-passed Resolu-  
tion of Condemnation by Rep. Rigell  
September 10, 2014—FACT SHEET: 5 Elements Of A Successful  
Strategy To Destroy ISIL  
September 10, 2014—McKeon on ISIL: Politics Must Not Be A  
Limiting Factor  
September 11, 2014—McKeon Statement On Obama Strategy To  
Defeat ISIL  
September 11, 2014—McKeon Statement on 9/11 Anniversary  
September 11, 2014—McKeon Presents Strategy to Defeat ISIL  
at AEI  
September 15, 2014—Chairman McKeon Amendment on Syria  
Train and Equip Mission  
September 18, 2014—Chairman McKeon Statement on Passage  
of Syria Train and Equip Amendment  
September 23, 2014—McKeon Statement on Action Against ISIL  
Terrorists in Syria  
September 26, 2014—McKeon, Thornberry Seek Answers from  
National Security Advisor Susan Rice  
September 29, 2014—McKeon Statement on Bilateral Security  
Agreement with Afghan Government  
October 23, 2014—McKeon Statement on Terrorist Attack In  
Canada  
October 30, 2014—McKeon Calls on Secretary Hagel to Imme-  
diately Suspend All Terror Detainee Transfers  
November 7, 2014—McKeon Statement on Potential White House  
Funding Request  
November 14, 2014—McKeon Comments On Hagel Nuclear Force  
Recommendations  
November 18, 2014—McKeon Congratulates HASC Chairman-Se-  
lect Thornberry  
November 20, 2014—McKeon: GTMO Releases Must Stop  
December 2, 2014—HASC, SASC Release Text of FY 2015 NDAA  
Agreement  
December 4, 2014—McKeon Delivers Farewell Address to House  
as NDAA passes 300–119  
December 5, 2014—McKeon Statement on Misconduct Aboard  
the USS Wyoming  
December 9, 2014—Chairman-Elect Thornberry Welcomes New  
Members To The House Armed Services Committee