AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Calendar No. 402

113TH CONGRESS
2d Session

SENATE

REPORT
113–176

CARL LEVIN NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

R E P O R T

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 2410]

ON

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 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

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

JUNE 2, 2014.—Ordered to be printed

CARL LEVIN NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

Calendar No. 402

113TH CONGRESS *2d Session*	SENATE	REPORT 113–176

CARL LEVIN NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

R E P O R T

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 2410]

ON

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 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

TOGETHER WITH

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

JUNE 2, 2014.—Ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
88–034 WASHINGTON : 2014

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

CARL LEVIN, Michigan, *Chairman*

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

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

PETER K. LEVINE, *Staff Director*
JOHN A. BONSELL, *Minority Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the bill	1
Committee overview	2
Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget authority implication	4
Budgetary effects of this Act (sec. 4)	5
Division A—Department of Defense Authorizations	7
Title I—Procurement	7
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations	7
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101)	7
Subtitle C—Navy Programs	7
Airborne electronic attack capabilities (sec. 121)	7
Report on test evaluation master plan for Littoral Combat Ship seaframes and mission modules (sec. 122)	8
Authority to transfer certain funds for refueling of aircraft carrier and construction of amphibious ship (sec. 123)	8
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs	9
Prohibition on retirement of MQ–1 Predator aircraft (sec. 131)	9
Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Air Force aircraft (sec. 132)	9
Temporary limitation on availability of funds for transfer of Air Force C–130H and C–130J aircraft (sec. 133)	9
Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of A–10 aircraft (sec. 134)	10
Limitation on transfer of KC–135 tankers (sec. 135)	10
Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft (sec. 136)	11
Report on status of air-launched cruise missile capabilities (sec. 137)	11
Report on C–130 aircraft (sec. 138)	11
Report on status of F–16 aircraft (sec. 139)	12
Report on options to modernize or replace the T–1A aircraft (sec. 140)	12
Budget Items	13
Army	13
Light Utility Helicopter	13
UH–60 Black Hawk M model	13
Common Missile Warning System	13
Bradley program modifications	14
Improved recovery vehicle	14
Joint assault bridge	14
M1 Abrams tank modifications	14
Carbine	14
Modular handgun reduction	15
40mm reduction	15
Precision Guidance Kit reduction	15
Warfighter Information Network—Tactical, increment 2	15
Joint tactical radio system	15
Mid-tier Networking Vehicular Radio	15
Family of weapon sights	16
Joint Battle Command—Platform	16
Counterfire radars	16
Army information technology	16
Modification of in-service equipment	17
Joint Improvised Explosive Defeat Fund	17
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	17

Page

Title I—Procurement —Continued
Budget Items —Continued
Navy 17
EP–3E Airborne Reconnaissance Integrated Electronic System 17
Aircraft spares and repair parts 18
Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests 18
Tomahawk 18
Navy enterprise information technology 19
Power equipment assorted 19
Air Force 19
RQ–4 19
MQ–9 19
C–5 Reliability Enhancement and Re-engining Program 20
U–2 20
C–130 aircraft modifications 21
C–130 engines 21
Lynx synthetic aperture radar 22
Small diameter bomb 22
General purpose bombs 22
Base information transportation infrastructure transfer 22
Procurement of additional ICBM training equipment 23
Defense-wide 23
MC–12 aircraft 23
MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle 23
Items of Special Interest 24
Air Force KC–46A Pegasus procurement 24
Armored vehicle transmission industrial base 24
Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Defense 25
Combatant command intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements 25
Commercial aircraft used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 26
Comptroller General of the United States review relating to remotely piloted aircraft 26
Distributed mission operations 27
Ejection seats 28
Enhanced position location reporting system 28
Family of medium tactical vehicles 28
Joint Light Tactical Vehicle 29
Joint Strike Fighter software development 29
Light weight cartridge case and ammunition development 29
Lightweight robots 29
MH–60R helicopters 30
Modular handgun 31
Report on the Navy's shipbuilding industrial base 31
RQ–21 unmanned aerial systems 32
Solid state radar upgrades 32
Technical study and business case analysis of body armor plates 33
Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 35
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 35
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201) 35
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 35
Modification of authority for prizes for advanced technology achievements (sec. 211) 35
Modification of Manufacturing Technology Program (sec. 212) 35
Limitation on retirement of Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems aircraft (sec. 213) 36
Limitation on significant modifications of Army test and evaluation capabilities (sec. 214) 37
Subtitle C—Reports 37
Study and reports on the technological superiority of the United States military (sec. 221) 37
Reduction in frequency of reporting by Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering (sec. 222) 37
Subtitle D—Other Matters 38
Pilot program on assignment to Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency of private sector personnel with critical research and development expertise (sec. 231) 38

Page

Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation —Continued
Subtitle D—Other Matters —Continued
Pilot program on enhancement of preparation of dependents of members of Armed Forces for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (sec. 232) 38
Modification to requirement for contractor cost-sharing in pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of certain defense systems (sec. 233) 39
Budget Items 39
University research initiatives 39
Indirect fire protection capability 40
Infantry support weapons 40
Kwajalein Atoll Reagan Test Site space situational awareness operations support 40
Marine Corps assault vehicles 41
Offensive anti-surface warfare weapon development 41
Integrated Personnel and Pay System 42
F–15 Eagle Passive/Active Warning and Survivability System 42
Airborne Signals Intelligence Payload 42
Network Centric Collaborative Targeting 42
Logistics information technology 44
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency programs 44
Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education for military children 45
Historically black colleges and universities and minority serving institutions 46
Applied research for the advancement of science and technology 46
Office of the Secretary of Defense Cyber Security Research 47
Foreign technology testing 47
Science and technology analytic assessments 47
Concept and technology demonstrations 47
Advanced sensor applications program 48
Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system 48
Ground-based Midcourse Defense reliability and maintenance funding 48
Funding for Iron Dome and U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs 49
Corrosion control and prevention funding increase 49
Defense research and development Rapid Innovation Program 50
Chemical and Biological Defense Program under-execution 51
Combatant Command exercise engagement and training transformation funding decrease 52
Sharkseer zero-day cybersecurity program 52
Defense Information Systems Agency cybersecurity research and development 53
MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle 53
Items of Special Interest 54
Advanced training technologies 54
Air Force Office of Scientific Research 54
Airborne signals intelligence enterprise 55
Anti-submarine warfare research and development 56
Cargo unmanned aerial system 56
Clear technical communications 56
Combat rescue helicopter 57
EC–130H Compass Call aircraft 57
Electronic warfare threat emitters 58
Improved turbine engine program 58
Inter-agency coordination on medical countermeasures development 59
National Security Agency cybersecurity research and development 59
Supporting commercialization of defense laboratory technologies 60
Technology transition of successful research initiatives 60
Unmanned underwater vehicles and the public shipyards 61
Title III—Operation and Maintenance 63
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 63
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 301) 63
Subtitle B—Energy and the Environment 63
Method of funding for cooperative agreements under the Sikes Act (sec. 311) 63

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance —Continued
Subtitle B—Energy and the Environment —Continued
Environmental Restoration at former Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Virginia (sec. 312) 63
Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of drop-in fuels (sec. 313) 64
Study on implementation of requirements for consideration of fuel logistics support requirements in planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes (sec. 314) 64
Comptroller General study of Department of Defense research and development projects and investments to increase energy security and meet energy goals requirements (sec. 315) 64
Decontamination of a portion of former bombardment area on island of Culebra, Puerto Rico (sec. 316) 65
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment 65
Modification of annual reporting requirement related to prepositioning of materiel and equipment (sec. 321) 65
Modification of quarterly readiness reporting requirement (sec. 322) .. 65
Elimination of authority to abolish arsenals (sec. 323) 66
Subtitle D—Reports 66
Repeal of annual report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums (sec. 331) 66
Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority 66
Limitation on MC–12 aircraft transfer to United States Special Operations Command (sec. 341) 66
Limitation on establishment of regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers (sec. 342) 67
Subtitle F—Other Matters 68
Repeal of authority relating to use of military installations by Civil Reserve Air Fleet contractors (sec. 351) 68
Revised policy on ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms (sec. 352) 68
Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas (sec. 353) 69
Budget Items 69
Army and Army Reserve readiness unfunded priorities increases 69
Facilities Sustainment 70
Foreign currency fluctuation reductions 70
Projected overstatement for Army civilian personnel 71
Undistributed travel reductions 71
Army National Guard readiness funding increase 71
Army National Guard advertising reduction 71
Navy readiness unfunded priorities increases 72
Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests 72
Aircraft carrier defueling planning funds 72
Marine Corps unfunded priorities increase 72
Marine Corps tuition assistance 73
Museum reduction 73
RC–135 Rivet Joint 73
Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support reduction 73
Joint Enabling Capabilities Command 73
United States Pacific Command unfunded priorities increases 74
U.S. Special Operations Command—National Capital Region 74
Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers 74
U.S. Special Operations Command unfunded readiness requirements 74
Department of Defense STARBASE program 75
Procurement technical assistance program 75
Defense Security Cooperation Agency 75
Funding for impact aid 76
Defense-wide funding decrease for ahead of need request 76
Defense-wide funding decrease for 2015 base realignment and closure support 76
Department of Defense rewards program reduction 76
Additional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to United States Africa Command 76
Defense Clandestine Service 77
Operational support to the Defense Clandestine Service 77
Review of operation of certain ships during Vietnam era 77
Support for international sporting competitions 77

Page

Title III—Operation and Maintenance —Continued
Items of Special Interest 78
Acoustic mixing 78
Active and Reserve funding efficiencies for training 78
Additive manufacturing 79
Afghanistan retrograde costs 79
Air tactical training 80
Army and Marine Corps equipment reset 80
Army Emergency Management Program 81
Availability of funds for readiness 81
Budget execution for Kwajalein Atoll 81
Category I ammunition items 81
Coal-to-liquid report 82
Combatant Command Support Agent accounting 82
Comptroller General of the United States report on the Department of the Army actions to determine the appropriate structure of the Army 83
Comptroller General review of readiness 83
Continued Defense-wide and interagency collaboration in the military working dog program 84
Depot capital investment program 85
Enhanced visibility for credentialing and installation access programs and systems 85
Humanitarian Demining Training Center 85
Improving energy efficiency and performance of military platforms 86
Incentivizing alternative fuel and fuel cell vehicle refueling stations .. 86
Jungle training 87
Management of conventional ammunition inventory 87
Marine Corps Prepositioning Program—Norway 88
Measuring Department of Defense use of commercial cloud computing capabilities and services 89
Mission-critical electricity infrastructure adoption of National Institute of Standards and Technology Cyber Security Framework 89
Multi-modal retrograde contracts 91
Navy fire control radar and replacement 91
Network upgrades to the Kwajalein Garrison 92
Operational assessment of the Defense Readiness Reporting System .. 93
Operational energy benefits 93
Soldier equipment modernization program 94
Strategic military infrastructure to support operation plans 95
Stryker sustainment 95
Training for the Air Force weather program 96
Use of power purchase agreements to meet requirements for military installations 96
War reserve stocks 97
Warrior power executive agent 98
Title IV—Military Personnel Authorizations 99
Subtitle A—Active Forces 99
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) 99
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 99
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) 99
End strengths for Reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412) 99
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) 100
Fiscal year 2015 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414) 100
Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415) 100
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 101
Military personnel (sec. 421) 101
Budget Item 101
Military personnel funding changes 101
Title V—Military Personnel Policy 103
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 103
Authority for three-month deferral of retirement for officers selected for selective early retirement (sec. 501) 103
Repeal of limits on percentage of officers who may be recommended for discharge during a fiscal year under enhanced selective discharge authority (sec. 502) 103

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy —Continued
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy —Continued
Elimination of requirement that a qualified aviator or naval flight officer be in command of an inactivated nuclear-powered aircraft carrier before decommissioning (sec. 503) 103
Authority to limit consideration for early retirement by selective retirement boards to particular warrant officer year groups and specialties (sec. 504) 103
Repeal of requirement for submittal to Congress of annual reports on joint officer management and promotion policy objectives for joint officers (sec. 505) 103
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 104
Retention on reserve active-status list following nonselection for promotion of certain health professions officers and first lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade) pursuing baccalaureate degrees (sec. 511) 104
Database on military technician positions (sec. 512) 104
Improved consistency in suicide prevention and resilience program for the reserve components of the Armed Forces (sec. 513) 104
Office of Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve (sec. 514) 105
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities 105
Enhancement of participation of mental health professionals in boards for correction of military records and boards for review of discharge or dismissal of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 521) 105
Extension of authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 522) 105
Sense of Senate on validated gender-neutral occupational standards for all military occupations (sec. 523) 106
Comptroller General of the United States report on impact of certain mental and physical trauma on discharges from military service for misconduct (sec. 524) 106
Sense of Senate on upgrade of characterization of discharge of certain Vietnam era members of the Armed Forces (sec. 525) 106
Subtitle D—Member Education and Training 107
Enhancement of authority for members of the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials (sec. 531) 107
Authority for Joint Special Operations University to award degrees (sec. 532) 107
Enhancement of information provided to members of the Armed Forces and veterans regarding use of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance and Federal financial aid through Transition Assistance Program (sec. 533) 107
Duration of foreign and cultural exchange activities at military service academies (sec. 534) 108
Subtitle E—Military Justice and Legal Matters 108
Ordering of depositions under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 541) 108
Modification of Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence, relating to the privilege against disclosure of communications between psychotherapists and patients (sec. 542) 108
Enhancement of victims' rights to be heard through counsel in connection with prosecution of certain sex-related offenses (sec. 543) ... 109
Eligibility of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for assistance of Special Victims' Counsel (sec. 544) 109
Additional enhancements of military department actions on sexual assault prevention and response (sec. 545) 109
Review of decisions not to refer charges of certain sex-related offenses for trial by court-martial if requested by chief prosecutor (sec. 546) 110
Modification of Department of Defense policy on retention of evidence in a sexual assault case to permit return of personal property upon completion of related proceedings (sec. 547) 110
Inclusion of information on assaults in the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database (sec. 548) 110
Technical revisions and clarifications of certain provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 relating to the military justice system (sec. 549) 111

Page

Title V—Military Personnel Policy —Continued
Subtitle E—Military Justice and Legal Matters —Continued
Applicability of sexual assault prevention and response and related military justice enhancements to military service academies (sec. 550) 111
Analysis and assessment of disposition of most serious offenses identified in unrestricted reports on sexual assaults in annual reports on sexual assaults in the Armed Forces (sec. 551) 111
Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces (sec. 552) 112
Collaboration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice in efforts to prevent and respond to sexual assault (sec. 553) 112
Modification of term of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (sec. 554) 112
Report on review of Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity role in sexual harassment cases (sec. 555) 112
Repeal of obsolete requirement to develop comprehensive management plan to address deficiencies in data captured in the Defense Incident-Based Reporting System (sec. 556) 112
Subtitle F—Decorations and Award 113
Medals for members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who were killed or wounded in an attack by a foreign terrorist organization (sec. 561) 113
Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters 113
Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 571) 113
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 572) 113
Amendments to the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012 (sec. 573) ... 113
Authority to employ non-United States citizens as teachers in Department of Defense Overseas Dependents' School system (sec. 574) 113
Inclusion of domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools among functions of Advisory Council on Dependents' Education (sec. 575) 114
Department of Defense suicide prevention programs for military dependents (sec. 576) 114
Subtitle H—Other Matters 114
Enhancement of authority to accept support for Air Force Academy athletic programs (sec. 581) 114
Items of Special Interest 115
Comptroller General of the United States report on the sexual assault prevention activities of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces 115
Comptroller General report on access to on-base services by junior enlisted personnel 115
Comptroller General report on feasibility and advisability of longer tour lengths 116
Comptroller General review of Department of Defense progress in expanding service opportunities for women 116
Continuation of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program 117
Cyber career field 118
Department of Defense policy and plan for prevention and response to sexual harassment in the Armed Forces 118
Funding for the United States Naval Sea Cadet Corps 119
Military chaplains 119
Online employment search-tool consolidation 119
Sexual Assault Bystander Prevention 120
Standardized survivor experience surveys 120
Use and adequacy of military leave for federal employees who are members of reserve components 120
Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits 123
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 123
Fiscal year 2015 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601) 123

Page

Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits —Continued
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances —Continued
Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau and Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau among senior members of the Armed Forces for the purposes of pay and allowances (sec. 602) 123
Modification of computation of basic allowance for housing inside the United States (sec. 603) 123
Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing under certain circumstances (sec. 604) . 123
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 123
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611) 123
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612) 124
One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613) 124
One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614) 124
One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615) 124
Subtitle C—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits 125
Inapplicability of reduced annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62 under the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 who first become members prior to January 1, 2016 (sec. 621) 125
Modification of determination of retired pay base for officers retired in general and flag officer grades (sec. 622) 125
Modification of per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service to reduce eligibility age for retirement for non-regular service (sec. 623) 125
Earlier determination of dependent status with respect to transitional compensation for dependents of certain members separated for dependent abuse (sec. 624) 126
Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for special needs trusts established for the benefit of dependent children incapable of self-support (sec. 625) 126
Subtitle D—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations 126
Procurement of brand-name and other commercial items for resale by commissary stores (sec. 631) 126
Items of Special Interest 126
Department of Defense pay and benefit proposals 126
Department of Defense proposal to modify commissary benefit 127
Secretary of Defense review of pay table 128
Survey of preferences of members of the Armed Forces regarding military pay and benefits 128
Title VII—Health Care Provisions 129
Subtitle A—TRICARE Program 129
Annual mental health assessments for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 701) 129
Modifications of cost-sharing and other requirements for the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program (sec. 702) 129
Parity in provision of inpatient mental health services with other inpatient medical services (sec. 703) 129
Availability of breastfeeding support, supplies, and counseling under the TRICARE program (sec. 704) 129
Authority for provisional TRICARE coverage for emerging health care products and services (sec. 705) 129
Report on status of reductions in TRICARE Prime service areas (sec. 706) 130
Repeal of requirement for ongoing Comptroller General of the United States reviews of viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra (sec. 707) 130
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration 130
Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund matters (sec. 721) 130

Page

Title VII—Health Care Provisions —Continued
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration —Continued
Extension of authority for Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (sec. 722) 131
Department of Defense-wide strategy for contracting for health care professionals for the Department of Defense (sec. 723) 131
Program on medication management in the Department of Defense (sec. 724) 131
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters 131
Report on military family planning programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 731) 131
Interagency working group on the provision of mental health services to members of the National Guard and the Reserves (sec. 732) 131
Report on improvements in the identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces (sec. 733) 132
Report on implementation of recommendations of Institute of Medicine on improvements to certain resilience and prevention programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 734) 132
Report on Department of Defense support of members of the Armed Forces who experience traumatic injury as a result of vaccinations required by the Department (sec. 735) 132
Comptroller General of the United States report on Military Health System Modernization Study of the Department of Defense (sec. 736) 132
Items of Special Interest 133
Autism spectrum disorder services 133
Behavioral health treatment of developmental disabilities under TRICARE 133
Consolidated TRICARE health plan 133
Department of Defense collaboration with the Department of Veterans Affairs on the disability claims processing backlog 134
Prosthetics for servicemembers 134
Treatment for obesity 135
Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters 137
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management 137
Open systems approach to acquisition of systems containing information technology (sec. 801) 137
Recharacterization of changes to Major Automated Information System programs (sec. 802) 138
Process map requirement for milestone approval of defense business system programs (sec. 803) 139
Governance of Joint Information Environment (sec. 804) 139
Report on implementation of acquisition process for information technology systems (sec. 805) 140
Revision of requirement for acquisition programs to maintain defense research facility records (sec. 806) 142
Rapid acquisition and deployment procedures for United States Special Operations Command (sec. 807) 142
Consideration of corrosion control in preliminary design review (sec. 808) 142
Repeal of extension of Comptroller General report on inventory (sec. 809) 142
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 143
Restatement and revision of requirements applicable to multiyear defense acquisitions to be specifically authorized by law (sec. 821) .. 143
Extension and modification of contract authority for advanced component development and prototype units and modification of authority (sec. 822) 143
Conditional temporary extension of comprehensive subcontracting plans (sec. 823) 143
Sourcing requirements related to avoiding counterfeit electronic parts (sec. 824) 144
Authority for Defense Contract Audit Agency to interview contractor employees in connection with examination of contractor records (sec. 825) 144

Page

Title VIII—Acquisition Policy, Acquisition Management, and Related Matters —Continued
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations —Continued
Enhancement of whistleblower protection for employees of grantees (sec. 826) 144
Prohibition on reimbursement of contractors for congressional investigations and inquiries (sec. 827) 144
Enhanced authority to acquire certain products and services produced in Africa (sec. 828) 144
Requirement to provide photovoltaic devices from United States sources (sec. 829) 144
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs ... 144
Program manager development strategy (sec. 841) 144
Tenure and accountability of program managers for program development periods (sec. 842) 145
Tenure and accountability of program managers for program execution periods (sec. 843) 145
Removal of requirements related to waiver of preliminary design review and post-preliminary design review before Milestone B (sec. 844) 145
Comptroller General of the United States report on operational testing programs for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 845) 145
Subtitle D—Other Matters 146
Extension to United States Transportation Command of authorities relating to prohibition on contracting with the enemy (sec. 861) 146
Reimbursement of Department of Defense for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers (sec. 862) 146
Three-year extension of authority for Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (sec. 863) 146
Items of Special Interest 146
Army Financial Management Optimization Initiative 146
Business systems modernization 147
Clarification on the use of energy savings performance contracts 147
Comptroller General of the United States report on counterfeit or suspect counterfeit electronic parts 148
Comptroller General review of the Department of Defense audit readiness efforts for property, plant, and equipment 149
Government Accountability Office review of Nunn-McCurdy reporting requirements applicable to major automated information systems experiencing cost or schedule overruns 149
Joint Information Environment 150
Next Generation Enterprise Network 150
Performance Based Logistics 151
Report on Statement of Budgetary Activity to assess progress toward auditability 151
Small businesses and the health of the U.S. defense industrial base .. 152
Title IX—Department of Defense Organization and Management 153
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management 153
Reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and related matters (sec. 901) 153
Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (sec. 902) 155
Subtitle B—Other Matters 156
Modifications to requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing (sec. 911) 156
Items of Special Interest 156
Headquarters Reductions of the Department of Defense 156
Plan on satisfying emergent warfighter needs 158
Title X—General Provisions 161
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 161
General transfer authority (sec. 1001) 161
National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund (sec. 1002) 161
Sense of Senate on sequestration (sec. 1003) 161
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities 161
Extension of authority to support unified counter-drug and counter-terrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1011) 161

Page

Title X—General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities—Continued
Extension and modification of authority for joint task forces supporting law enforcement agencies conducting activities to counter transnational organized crime to support law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities (sec. 1012) 162
Extension of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments (sec. 1013) 163
Extension and modification of authority of Department of Defense to provide additional support for counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies (sec. 1014) 163
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 164
Limitation on use of funds for inactivation of U.S.S. *George Washington* (sec. 1021) 164
Availability of funds for retirement or inactivation of Ticonderoga class cruisers or dock landing ships (sec. 1022) 165
Operational readiness of Littoral Combat Ships on extended deployments (sec. 1023) 166
Authority for limited coastwise trade for certain vessels providing transportation services under a shipbuilding or ship repair contract with the Secretary of the Navy (sec. 1024) 166
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 167
Limitation on the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1031) ... 167
Report on facilitation of transfer overseas of certain individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1032) 167
Authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment (sec. 1033) 167
Prohibition on transfer or release to Yemen of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1034) 168
Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 168
Reduction in Department of Defense civilian personnel and review of certain headquarters spending (sec. 1041) 168
Protection of Department of Defense installations (sec. 1042) 168
Authority to accept certain voluntary legal support services (sec. 1043) 169
Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau among leadership of the Department of Defense provided physical protection and personal security (sec. 1044) 169
Inclusion of regional organizations in authority for assignment of civilian employees of the Department of Defense as advisors to foreign ministries of defense (sec. 1045) 169
Extension of authority to waive reimbursement of costs of activities for nongovernmental personnel at Department of Defense regional centers for security studies (sec. 1046) 170
Subtitle F—Studies and Reports 170
Reports on recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force (sec. 1061) 170
Review of operation of certain ships during the Vietnam era (sec. 1062) 170
Assessment of the operations research tools, processes, and capabilities in support of requirements analysis for major defense acquisition programs and allocation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets (sec. 1063) 171
Review of United States military strategy and the force posture of allies and partners in the United States Pacific Command area of responsibility (sec. 1064) 173
Department of Defense policies on community involvement in Department community outreach events (sec. 1065) 173
Comptroller General of the United States briefing and report on management of the conventional ammunition demilitarization stockpile of the Department of Defense (sec. 1066) 173
Repeal and modification of reporting requirements (sec. 1067) 173
Repeal of requirement for Comptroller General of the United States annual reviews and report on pilot program on commercial fee-for-service air refueling support for the Air Force (sec. 1068) 173

Page

Title X—General Provisions—Continued
Subtitle G—Uniformed Services Voting 174
Part I—Provision of Voter Assistance to Members of the Armed Forces 174
Provision of annual voter assistance (sec. 1071) 174
Designation of voter assistance offices (sec. 1072) 174
Part II—Electronic Voting Systems 174
Repeal of electronic voting demonstration project (sec. 1076) 174
Subtitle H—Other Matters 174
Biennial surveys of Department of Defense civilian employees on workplace and gender relations matters (sec. 1081) 174
Transfer of administration of Ocean Research Advisory Panel from Department of the Navy to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (sec. 1082) 174
Authority to require employees of the Department of Defense and members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to occupy quarters on a rental basis while performing official travel (sec. 1083) 175
Expansion of authority for Secretary of Defense to use the Department of Defense reimbursement rates for transportation services provided to certain non-Department of Defense entities (sec. 1084) . 175
Pilot program to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans (sec. 1085) 175
Technical and clerical amendments (sec. 1086) 175
Items of Special Interest 175
Army force structure and installation alignment 175
Comptroller General of the United States review of burden-sharing agreements and posture costs 176
Comptroller General of the United States review of the National Guard Counterdrug Program 177
Detention of Third Country Nationals in Afghanistan 178
National Guard Counterdrug Program 179
Preparing for increased Arctic operations 179
Transfer of aircraft to other departments for wildfire suppression and other purposes 180
Title XI—Civilian Personnel Matters 181
Extension and modification of experimental program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1101) 181
Modifications of biennial strategic workforce plan relating to senior management, functional, and technical workforces of the Department of Defense (sec. 1102) 181
One-year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on premium pay and aggregate limitation on pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas (sec. 1103) 181
Personnel authorities for civilian personnel for the United States Cyber Command (sec. 1104) 181
Item of Special Interest 182
Assignment of Department of Defense civilian employees with cyber skills 182
Title XII—Matters Relating to Foreign Nations 183
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 183
Modification of Department of Defense authority for humanitarian stockpiled conventional munitions assistance programs (sec. 1201) . 183
Codification of recurring limitations on the use of funds for assistance for units of foreign security forces that have committed a gross violation of human rights (sec. 1202) 183
Codification and enhancement of authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces (sec. 1203) 183
Training of security forces and associated ministries of foreign countries to promote respect for the rule of law and human rights (sec. 1204) 185
Modification and extension of Global Security Contingency Fund authority (sec. 1205) 185
Use of acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend certain military equipment to certain foreign forces for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1206) 186
Cross servicing agreements for loan of personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment in coalition operations (sec. 1207) ... 186
Extension and modification of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism (sec. 1208) 186

Page

Title XII—Matters Relating to Foreign Nations—Continued
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training—Continued
Assistance to foster a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Syria (sec. 1209) 187
Limitations on security assistance for the Government of Burma (sec. 1210) 188
Biennial report on programs carried out by the Department of Defense to provide training, equipment, or other assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces (sec. 1211) 188
Sense of the Senate on multilateral humanitarian assistance and disaster relief exercises (sec. 1212) 188
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq 189
Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan (sec. 1221) 189
Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan (sec. 1222) 189
One-year extension of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan (sec. 1223) 190
Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1224) 190
One-year extension of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations (sec. 1225) 190
Prohibition on use of funds for certain programs and projects of the Department of Defense in Afghanistan that cannot be safely accessed by United States Government personnel (sec. 1226) 191
Semiannual report on enhancing the strategic partnership between the United States and Afghanistan (sec. 1227) 191
Report on bilateral security cooperation with Pakistan (sec. 1228) 191
Surface clearance of unexploded ordnance on former United States training ranges in Afghanistan (sec. 1229) 191
Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program (sec. 1230) 192
Extension and modification of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1231) ... 192
Subtitle C—Reports 192
Report on impact of end of major combat operations in Afghanistan on authority to use military force (sec. 1241) 192
United States strategy for enhancing security and stability in Europe (sec. 1242) 192
Report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation (sec. 1243) 193
Modification of matters for discussion in annual reports of United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission (sec. 1244) 193
Report on maritime security strategy and annual briefing on military to military engagement with the People's Republic of China (sec. 1245) 194
Report on military assistance to Ukraine (sec. 1246) 194
Subtitle D—Other Matters 195
Treatment of Kurdistan Democratic Party and Patriotic Union of Kurdistan under the Immigration and Nationality Act (sec. 1261) .. 195
Notification on potentially significant arms control noncompliance (sec. 1262) 195
Enhanced authority for provision of support to foreign military liaison officers of foreign countries while assigned to the Department of Defense (sec. 1263) 195
One-year extension of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1264) 195
Inter-European Air Forces Academy (sec. 1265) 195
Extension of limitations on providing certain missile defense information to the Russian Federation (sec. 1266) 196
Prohibition on direct or indirect use of funds to enter into contracts or agreements with Rosoboronexport (sec. 1267) 196
Items of Special Interest 196
Annual report on the military power of Iran 196
Comptroller General of the United States review of Department of Defense security assistance to the Republic of Yemen 197

Page

Title XII—Matters Relating to Foreign Nations—Continued
Items of Special Interest —Continued
Maritime security in West Africa ... 198
Nigeria and the threat posed by Boko Haram ... 198
Northeast Asian intelligence threats ... 199
Plans for bases in Afghanistan ... 200
Support of foreign forces participating in operations against the Lord's Resistance Army ... 200
United States-India Defense Security Cooperation ... 201
United States Strategy on the African Union Mission in Somalia ... 201
Title XIII—Cooperative Threat Reduction ... 203
Subtitle A—Funding Allocations ... 203
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds (sec. 1301) ... 203
Funding allocations (sec. 1302) ... 203
Subtitle B—Consolidation and Modernization of Statutes Relating to the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program ... 203
Consolidation and modernization of statutes relating to the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (secs. 1311–1352) ... 203
Title XIV—Other Authorizations ... 205
Subtitle A—Military Programs ... 205
Working Capital Funds (sec. 1401) ... 205
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1402) ... 205
Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1403) ... 205
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1404) ... 205
Defense Health Program (sec. 1405) ... 205
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile and Related Matters ... 205
Report on development of secure supply of rare earth materials (sec. 1411) ... 205
Subtitle C—Other Matters ... 206
Authority for transfer of funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois (sec. 1421) ... 206
Comptroller General of the United States report on Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, North Chicago, Illinois (sec. 1422) ... 206
Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1423) ... 206
Designation and responsibilities of Senior Medical Advisor for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1424) ... 206
Budget Items ... 206
Meals, ready-to-eat ... 206
Defense Commissary Agency ... 207
Additional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to United States Southern Command ... 207
Defense Health Program funding ... 208
Items of Special Interest ... 208
Defense working capital funds ... 208
Department of Defense Inspector General ... 208
Title XV—Authorization of Additional Appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations ... 211
Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations ... 211
Purpose (sec. 1501) ... 211
Overseas Contingency Operations (sec. 1502) ... 211
Subtitle B—Financial Matters ... 211
Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1511) ... 211
Special transfer authority (sec. 1512) ... 211
Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters ... 211
Plan for transition of funding of United States Special Operations Command from supplemental funding for overseas contingency operations to recurring funding for future years defense programs (sec. 1521) ... 211
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1522) ... 212
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1523) ... 212
Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (sec. 1524) ... 213
Sense of Congress regarding counter-improvised explosive devices (sec. 1525) ... 213

Page

Title XV—Authorization of Additional Appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations —Continued
Budget Item 213
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 213
Title XVI—Strategic Programs, Cyber, and Intelligence Matters 215
Subtitle A—Nuclear Forces 215
Procurement authority for certain parts of intercontinental ballistic missile fuses (sec. 1601) 215
Form of and cost estimates relating to annual reports on plan for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons complex, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons command and control system (sec. 1602) 215
Reports on installation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems at the United States Strategic Command headquarters (sec. 1603) 215
Reports on potential reductions to B61 life extension program (sec. 1604) 216
Sense of Congress on deterrence and defense posture of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (sec. 1605) 216
Subtitle B—Missile Defense Programs 216
Homeland ballistic missile defense (sec. 1611) 216
Regional ballistic missile defense (sec. 1612) 217
Availability of funds for missile defense programs of Israel (sec. 1613) 218
Acquisition plan for re-designed Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle (sec. 1614) 219
Testing and assessment of missile defense systems prior to production and deployment (sec. 1615) 220
Subtitle C—Space Activities 221
Update of National Security Space Strategy to include space control and space superiority strategy (sec. 1621) 221
Allocation of funds for the Space Security and Defense Program; Report on Space Control (sec. 1622) 221
Prohibition on contracting with Russian suppliers of critical space launch supplies for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program (sec. 1623) 221
Assessment of Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program (sec. 1624) 222
Report on reliance of Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program on foreign manufacturers (sec. 1625) 222
Availability of additional rocket cores pursuant to competitive procedures (sec. 1626) 222
Competitive procedures required to launch payload for mission number five of the Operationally Responsive Space program (sec. 1627) 222
Limitation on funding for storage of Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites (sec. 1628) 222
Plan for development of liquid rocket engine for medium or heavy lift launch vehicle; transfer of certain funds (sec. 1629) 223
Study of space situational awareness architecture (sec. 1630) 224
Sense of the Senate on resolution limits on commercial space imagery (sec. 1631) 224
Subtitle D—Cyber Warfare, Cyber Security, and Related Matters 225
Cyberspace mapping (sec. 1641) 225
Review of cross domain solution policy and requirement for cross domain solution strategy (sec. 1642) 226
Budgeting and accounting for cyber mission forces (sec. 1643) 227
Requirement for strategy to develop and deploy decryption service for the Joint Information Environment (sec. 1644) 227
Reporting on penetrations into networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors (sec. 1645) 228
Sense of Congress on the future of the Internet and the .mil top level domain (sec. 1646) 229
Subtitle E—Intelligence-Related Matters 230
Extension of Secretary of Defense authority to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities (sec. 1651) 230
Authority for Secretary Of Defense to engage in commercial activities as security for military operations abroad (sec. 1652) 230

Page

Title XVI—Strategic Programs, Cyber, and Intelligence Matters —Continued
Subtitle E—Intelligence-Related Matters —Continued
Extension of authority relating to jurisdiction over Department of Defense facilities for intelligence collection or special operations activities abroad (sec. 1653) 230
Personnel security and insider threat (sec. 1654) 230
Migration of Distributed Common Ground System of Department of the Army to an open system architecture (sec. 1655) 232
Budget Items 232
Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites 232
Mobile Ground System 232
Space Based Infrared System 232
Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle engine development 232
Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellite 233
Operationally Responsive Space 233
Items of Special Interest 233
Air Force, Navy, National Nuclear Security Administration collaboration on strategic systems 233
Ammonium Perchlorate 234
Analysis of satellites available for open competition 234
Analytic support to cyber policy and planning 234
Assessment of cost of Space Situational Awareness system 235
Authorities and responsibilities of the Department of Defense Inspector General 235
Electro-optical infrared capabilities for the follow on weather satellite 236
Foreign interest in United States air and missile defense technology . 236
Information assurance and certified workforce training 236
Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense System 237
Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor 237
Mobile User Objective System Ground Terminals 238
New START Treaty Force Structure 238
Ohio Replacement Program 239
Processes for the secure provision of sensitive compartmented information to congressional committees 239
Projected workload at wide band satellite operations centers 240
Replacement of the Mission Planning and Analysis System 240
Report on Intercontinental Ballistic Missile readiness 240
Report on the Reconstitution of Air Force Weapons Storage Areas 241
Review of GPS III Operational Ground Control 242
Science and technology talent options for the Missile Defense Agency 242
Security of Department of Defense industrial control systems 242
Standing and Implementation of Nuclear Forces 243
Update on nuclear command, control, and communications systems acquisition 243
Title XVII—National Commission on the Future of the Army 245
National commission on the future of the Army (secs. 1701–1709) 245
Division B—Military Construction Authorizations 247
Summary and explanation of funding tables 247
Short title (sec. 2001) 247
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002) 247
Title XXI—Army Military Construction 249
Summary 249
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) 249
Family housing (sec. 2102) 250
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2103) 250
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project (sec. 2104) 250
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2105) 250
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2106) 251
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2107) 251
Limitation on construction of cadet barracks at United States Military Academy, New York (sec. 2108) 251

Page

Title XXI—Army Military Construction —Continued
Limitation on funding for family housing construction at Camp Walker, Republic of Korea (sec. 2109) ... 251
Title XXII—Navy Military Construction ... 253
Summary ... 253
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) ... 253
Family housing (sec. 2202) ... 253
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) ... 253
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) ... 254
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2205) ... 254
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project (sec. 2206) ... 254
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects (sec. 2207) ... 254
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2208) ... 254
Item of Special Interest ... 254
Quarterly reports on Naval Sea Systems Command Headquarters restoration ... 254
Title XXIII—Air Force Military Construction ... 257
Summary ... 257
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) ... 257
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2302) ... 257
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2008 project (sec. 2303) ... 257
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2304) ... 258
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2305) ... 258
Title XXIV—Defense Agencies Military Construction ... 259
Summary ... 259
Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations ... 259
Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) ... 259
Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402) ... 259
Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403) ... 259
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2404) ... 260
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2405) ... 260
Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization Authorizations ... 260
Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide (sec. 2411) ... 260
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 project (sec. 2412) ... 260
Title XXV—North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program ... 261
Summary ... 261
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) ... 261
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) ... 261
Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities ... 263
Summary ... 263
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations ... 263
Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) ... 263
Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602) ... 263
Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603) ... 264
Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604) ... 264
Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605) ... 264
Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606) ... 264

Page

Title XXVI—Guard and Reserve Forces Facilities —Continued
Subtitle B—Other Matters 264
Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2611) 264
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2612) 264
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2613) 265
Title XXVII—Base Realignment and Closure Activities 267
Summary and explanation of tables 267
Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account (sec. 2701) 267
Prohibition on conducting additional base realignment and closure (BRAC) round (sec. 2702) 267
HUBZones (sec. 2703) 267
Title XXVIII—Military Construction General Provisions 269
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes 269
Clarification of authorized use of in-kind payments and in-kind contributions (sec. 2801) 269
Residential building construction standards (sec. 2802) 270
Modification of minor military construction authority for projects to correct deficiencies that are life-, health-, or safety-threatening (sec. 2803) 270
Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2804) 270
Limitation on construction projects in European Command area of responsibility (sec. 2805) 270
Limitation on construction of new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 2806) 271
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 271
Deposit of reimbursed funds to cover administrative expenses relating to certain real property transactions (sec. 2811) 271
Renewals, extensions, and succeeding leases for financial institutions operating on Department of Defense installations (sec. 2812) 271
Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment 272
Realignment of Marine Corps forces in Asia-Pacific region (sec. 2821) 272
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances 273
Land conveyance, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii (sec. 2831) 273
Land exchange, Arlington County, Virginia (sec. 2832) 273
Transfers of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Frank D. Merrill and Lake Lanier, Georgia (sec. 2833) 273
Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Gruber, Oklahoma (sec. 2834) 273
Subtitle E—Other Matters 274
Establishment of memorial to the victims of the shooting at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013 (sec. 2841) 274
Items of Special Interest 274
Design build contracts 274
Laboratory revitalization 274
Privatized lodging 275
Report on military construction unfunded requirements 275
Reprogramming packages for military construction projects 276
Scope of work variations 276
Division C—Department of Energy National Security Authorizations and Other Authorizations 279
Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs 279
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 279
Overview 279
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) 280
Weapons activities 280
Directed stockpile work 280
Campaigns 281
Site Stewardship and Nuclear Operations 282
Secure transportation asset 283

Page

Title XXXI—Department of Energy National Security Programs —Continued
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations —Continued
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) —Continued
Defense Nuclear Security and Chief Information Officer 283
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs 283
Nonproliferation and verification research and development 284
Nonproliferation and international security 284
International nuclear materials protection and cooperation 284
Fissile Materials Disposition program 284
Global threat reduction initiative 284
Naval Reactors 284
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response 285
Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs 285
Office of the Administrator 285
Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102) 285
Savannah River Site 285
Waste Treatment Plant and Tank Farm Activities 286
Hanford Site 286
Idaho National Laboratory 286
Los Alamos National Laboratory 286
Oak Ridge Reservation 286
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant 286
Safeguards and Security 286
Technology Development 287
Program Direction and Support 287
Other defense activities (sec. 3103) 287
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 287
Life-cycle cost estimates of certain atomic energy defense capital assets (sec. 3111) 287
Expansion of requirement for independent cost estimates on life extension programs and new nuclear facilities (sec. 3112) 287
Implementation of Phase I of Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project (sec. 3113) 287
Establishment of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health (sec. 3114) 288
Comments of Administrator for Nuclear Security on reports of Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 3115) 288
Identification of amounts required for uranium technology sustainment in budget materials for fiscal year 2016 (sec. 3116) 288
Budget Items 288
Cruise Missile Warhead Life Extension Program 288
Environment Safety and Health 289
Legacy Management 289
Establishment of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health 289
Inertial confinement facility operations and target production 289
Federal salaries and expenses 289
Items of Special Interest 289
Efforts to meet the 2019 move of plutonium capabilities from the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research facility 289
Laboratory Scientific Equipment Sustainment 290
National Nuclear Security Administration Governance 290
Procurement of unencumbered special nuclear material for tritium production 290
Title XXXII—Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board 293
Authorization (sec. 3201) 293
Title XXXV—Maritime Administration 293
Maritime Administration (sec. 3501) 293
Division D—Funding Tables 293
Authorization of amounts in funding tables (sec. 4001) 293
Funding tables (secs. 4101–4701) 293
Legislative Requirements 434
Departmental Recommendations 434
Committee Action 434
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate 436
Regulatory Impact 436
Changes in Existing Law 436

Page

Division D—Funding Tables —Continued
Additional Views 436
Additional Views of Mr. Inhofe 436
Additional Views of Ms. Ayotte 441
Additional Views of Messrs. Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ms. Ayotte, and Mr. Vitter 443

Calendar No. 402

113TH CONGRESS *2d Session* | SENATE | REPORT 113–176

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015 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

JUNE 2, 2014.—Ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany S. 2410]

The Committee on Armed Services reports favorably an original bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and recommends that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

(1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015;

(2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2015;

(3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2015;

(4) impose certain reporting requirements;

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

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

(6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2015; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2015.

Committee overview

Five years ago, the United States had almost 200,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan. Now, after almost 12 years of continuous conflict, U.S. forces are drawing down in Afghanistan and are no longer deployed in Iraq.

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

- Russia has violated international law and undermined 3 decades of peaceful development in Eastern Europe by seizing Crimea and massing tens of thousands of troops near the Ukrainian border.
- Al Qaeda leadership has been significantly degraded in Afghanistan and Pakistan, but terrorist organizations with links to al Qaeda continue to demonstrate an ability to exploit safe havens in ungoverned areas, including parts of North Africa, the Horn of Africa, Syria, Iraq, and Yemen.
- Despite an international agreement to remove chemical weapons from Syria, the Assad regime continues to systematically attack civilian population centers, leading to thousands of casualties and millions of refugees and increasing the risk of regional instability.
- In Iraq, the disturbing seizure by al Qaeda-affiliated militants of control in portions of Fallujah and Ramadi reflects in part the failure of a sectarian-influenced government to reach out to disenfranchised Sunni groups.
- The new North Korean regime has adopted the same destructive policies as its predecessors, pursuing its nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs with callous disregard for the well-being of its own people and the region.
- China's pursuit of new military capabilities raises concerns about its intentions, particularly in the context of the country's increasing willingness to assert its controversial claims of sovereignty in the South China and East China seas.

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

The men and women of our Armed Forces—as well as the civilians and contractors who support them—have worked honorably and courageously to take on these challenges on our behalf, often at great personal risk and significant sacrifice to themselves and their families. The committee, Congress, and the American people owe them a debt of gratitude for this service.

Despite the challenges we face and our commitment to the men and women of the Department of Defense (DOD), the President's budget for fiscal year 2015 proposes reductions in force structure and compensation that increase risk for our nation and for the men and women who protect us. These reductions are driven by the top line of the budget—a topline that Congress dictated when we en-

acted the Budget Control Act of 2011 and reaffirmed (with minor relief in fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for DOD and other agencies) in the Bipartisan Budget Act that we enacted earlier this year.

The top line of $496.0 billion established in law for the fiscal year 2015 defense budget is unchanged from the funding level in fiscal years 2013 and 2014, and remains more than $30.0 billion below the funding provided to DOD in fiscal years 2010, 2011, and 2012. In real terms, the drop is even deeper, with a reduction of $75.0 billion since fiscal year 2010 and virtually no projected growth in inflation-adjusted dollars through the balance of the future years defense program.

This shortfall requires painful trade-offs in just about every area of the defense budget. For example, the President's budget proposes significantly lower end strengths for the ground forces, including a further reduction of 50,000 in active-duty Army end strength, with smaller reductions in the Guard and Reserve. The budget restricts the pay raise for servicemembers below the rate of inflation; freezes pay for general and flag officers; begins a phased reduction in the growth of the housing allowance that could result in increased out of pocket expenses for servicemembers' housing costs; reduces support to commissaries; and makes significant changes to TRICARE benefits.

The budget also calls for retiring the Air Force's A–10 and U–2 aircraft, inactivating half of the Navy's cruiser fleet, reducing the size of the Army's helicopter fleet by 25 percent, and terminating the Ground Combat Vehicle Program. Military construction funding has been reduced by more than 40 percent compared to last year's budget request and facilities sustainment accounts are funded at only 65 percent of the requirement in this year's request. If the budget caps remain unchanged in fiscal year 2016 and beyond, DOD has informed us that it will request further reductions in end strength, the retirement of the entire KC–10 tanker fleet and the Global Hawk Block 40 fleet, reduced purchases of Joint Strike Fighters and unmanned aerial vehicles, the inactivation of additional ships, reduced purchases of destroyers, and the elimination of an aircraft carrier and a carrier air wing.

The committee-reported bill attempts to address some of these issues, subject to the requirement that any increase to the proposed budget be accompanied by an offsetting reduction. The civilian and military leaders of DOD have cautioned us, however, that it will be extremely difficult to provide adequate funding for the national defense and for our men and women in uniform unless Congress acts to increase the budget caps established by the Budget Control Act of 2011, as amended.

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

(1) Ensure the long-term viability of the all-volunteer force by sustaining the quality-of-life of the men and women of the total force (active-duty, National Guard, and Reserves) and

their families, as well as DOD civilian personnel, through fair pay, policies and benefits, and by addressing the needs of the wounded, ill, and injured servicemembers and their families.

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

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

(4) Successfully conclude the U.S. combat mission in Afghanistan, while enhancing the capability of the U.S. Armed Forces to support other nations in their efforts to increase their capacity to provide for their domestic and regional security and contribute to international security.

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

(6) Improve the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces to counter emerging and nontraditional threats, focusing on terrorism, cyber warfare, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

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

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

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

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

Summary of discretionary authorizations and budget authority implication

The administration's budget request for national defense discretionary programs within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services for fiscal year 2015 was $513.7 billion. Of this amount, $495.5 billion was requested for base Department of Defense (DOD) programs and $17.9 billion was requested for national security programs in the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB).

The committee recommends an overall discretionary authorization of $513.6 billion in fiscal year 2015, including $496.0 billion for

base DOD programs and $17.7 billion for national security programs in the DOE and the DNFSB.

The two tables preceding the detailed program adjustments in Division D of this bill summarize the direct discretionary authorizations in the committee recommendation and the equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2015 defense programs. The first table summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2015 and compares these amounts to the request. The second table summarizes the total budget authority implication for national defense by including national defense funding for items that are not in the jurisdiction of the defense committees or are already authorized.

Budgetary effects of this Act (sec. 4)

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

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101)

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

Subtitle C—Navy Programs

Airborne electronic attack capabilities (sec. 121)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Navy to take whatever steps the Secretary deems appropriate and are available to the Navy to ensure that the Navy retains the option of buying more EA–18G aircraft if further analysis of whether to expand the airborne electronic attack (AEA) force structure indicates the Navy should include more EA–18G aircraft in carrier air wings. The provision would also authorize the Navy, subject to appropriation, to use $75.0 million in funds authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2014 for advance procurement funds of F/A–18 E/F aircraft for the purpose of retaining such an option. The committee also recommends an increase of $25.0 million in section 4101 for these purposes.

The provision would direct the Secretary of the Navy to provide briefings to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2014, on the options available to the Navy for ensuring that the Navy will not be precluded from buying more EA–18G aircraft if that is what the Navy analysis concludes should be done. The provision would also require the briefings to include an update on the Navy's progress in conducting its analysis of emerging requirements for airborne electronic attack.

The committee is aware of the Navy's recent efforts to assess emerging and future operational requirements for airborne electronic attack capability. Specifically, the Navy has conducted some preliminary analysis that indicates that there may be a requirement to have more than five EA–18G aircraft in each carrier air wing. Deploying aircraft carrier air wings with a five-plane EA–18G squadron was the basis for concluding that the EA–18G production should end in fiscal year 2014. If the Navy analysis indicates that EA–18G squadrons should be larger, the Navy may need to buy more aircraft.

This preliminary analysis done by the Navy was the basis of the decision by the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) to include buying

22 more EA–18G aircraft at a cost of $2.1 billion as the number one item on his unfunded priority list for fiscal year 2015. Separately, the CNO has stated that the need for electronic attack capability is critical, and also testified before the committee that the operational requirement for airborne electronic attack capacity is increasing, not receding.

The committee is concerned that the Navy may complete the analysis after the option of buying more EA–18G aircraft is closed. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to complete that ongoing analysis promptly and to report the study's findings to the congressional defense committees. The committee also urges the Navy to provide the necessary funds in the fiscal year 2016 budget and future years defense program to meet its requirements for airborne electronic attack requirement, based on that analysis.

In the meantime, the committee believes that the Navy should take action to delay the point at which a pending decision to close the EA–18G line may be made until the Navy makes a decision on the appropriate size of the AEA force structure.

Report on test evaluation master plan for Littoral Combat Ship seaframes and mission modules (sec. 122)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the test evaluation master plan for the seaframes and mission modules for the Littoral Combat Ship program.

The report will include a description of the Navy's progress with respect to the test evaluation master plan, and an assessment of whether or not completion of the test evaluation master plan will demonstrate operational effectiveness and operational suitability for both seaframes and each mission module.

Authority to transfer certain funds for refueling of aircraft carrier and construction of amphibious ship (sec. 123)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer funds available in the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN), or other Navy procurement account for either or both of the following purposes:

(1) Up to $650.0 million to conduct a refueling and complex overhaul of the USS *George Washington* (CVN–73).

(2) Up to $650.0 million to build a *San Antonio*-class amphibious ship.

The provision would require that the Secretary make a determination that unobligated balances to be transferred are available due to slower than expected program execution, and the transfer of funds will fill a high priority military need and is in the best interest of the Department of the Navy.

It is the committee's intent that the Navy proceed with the refueling and complex overhaul of the USS *George Washington* (CVN–73) should additional funds be made available in fiscal year 2015 for that purpose.

Finally, the provision would authorize the Secretary to use incremental funding for a *San Antonio*-class ship if additional funds are made available in fiscal year 2015 for that purpose and the Sec-

retary determines that such procurement will fill a high priority military need and is in the best interest of the Department of the Navy.

The committee expects that, if the Secretary chooses to transfer funds for the *San Antonio*-class program in fiscal year 2015, the Secretary will use funds from fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016 to fully fund any new *San Antonio*-class ship put on contract during fiscal year 2015 or fiscal year 2016.

Subtitle D—Air Force Programs

Prohibition on retirement of MQ–1 Predator aircraft (sec. 131)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Air Force from retiring any MQ–1 Predator aircraft during fiscal year 2015.

Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Air Force aircraft (sec. 132)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report including an analysis and recommendations for not less than 80 percent of the Air Force missions and aircraft before retiring any Air Force aircraft. The Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force testified to the committee that the Air Force would complete an analysis of 80 percent of the Air Force missions and aircraft by the end of calendar year 2014. That ongoing analysis is assessing the appropriate contributions of the regular Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve to the total force structure of the Air Force. The National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force found that the Air Force could save as much as $2.0 billion per year by realigning its forces between the active and reserve components. The committee wants to ensure that any planned retirements are reassessed in view of any savings that may be achievable as a result of that analysis.

Temporary limitation on availability of funds for transfer of Air Force C130H and C–130J aircraft (sec. 133)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report before implementing any transfers of C–130H or C–130J aircraft. That report would include: (1) A recommended basing alignment of the C–130H2, C–130H3, and C–130J aircraft; (2) An identification of how that plan deviates from the basing plan approved by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239); (3) An explanation of what that plan deviates, if in any detail, from the plan approved by that Act; (4) An assessment of the national security benefits and any other expected benefits of the proposed transfers, including benefits for the facility or facilities expected to receive the transferred aircraft; (5) An assessment of the costs of the proposed transfers, including the impact of the proposed transfers on the facility or facilities from which the aircraft will be transferred; (6) An analysis of the recommended basing alignment that demonstrates that the recommendation is the most effective

and efficient alternative for such basing alignment; and (7) For units equipped with special capabilities, such as the modular airborne firefighting system capability, an analysis of the impact of the proposed transfers on the ability to satisfy missions that utilize those capabilities.

The provision would also require that the Comptroller General conduct a review of the sufficiency of the Air Force report within 45 days after the Air Force submits the report. It is the committee's intent for Congress to have sufficient time to review the Air Force report and the findings of the Comptroller General's review before the Air Force acts.

The committee expects the Air Force to act in the spirit of this provision for the rest of fiscal year 2014 until enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of A–10 aircraft (sec. 134)

The committee recommends a provision that would prevent using any funds during fiscal year 2015 to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any A–10 aircraft.

The committee expects the Air Force to execute the fiscal year program in accordance with the spirit of this provision. Specifically, the Secretary of the Air Force should ensure that the Air Force does not close or consolidate A–10 units, make changes to standard sustainment processes; or reduce A–10 pilot training or A–10 flying disproportionally to reductions applied to pilots or flying hours for other Air Force aircraft.

The committee believes that the Air Force is making this decision purely on a basis of the fiscal environment and not on grounds of effectiveness of the forces. The National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force indicated that shifting to a greater reliance on the Air Reserve components could save roughly $2.0 billion per year that could be reinvested to maintain greater capabilities. The committee does not want the Air Force to execute any decision to retire the entire A–10 fleet until the Air Force has an opportunity to chart a specific course for implementing the Commission's recommendations.

The committee also recommends an increase of $256.5 million for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, and $82.8 million for Air Force military personnel accounts.

Limitation on transfer of KC–135 tankers (sec. 135)

The committee recommends a provision that would delay the Air Force's plan to transfer KC–135 aircraft from Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, pending a report on the costs and benefits of that transfer.

It has come to the attention of the committee that the Air Force intends to move four KC–135 tanker aircraft from a forward-based position at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam to base in the continental United States (CONUS).

With the administration's stated goal of rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific region and the continued need for tanker support throughout the region, the Air Force's planned transfer may not make economic sense.

With the Department of Defense's emphasis on energy and costs efficiencies, the Air Force should consider the resources required to move CONUS-based KC–135s to the Asia-Pacific region for exercises and requirements versus the cost of maintaining the assets in theater.

Limitation on availability of funds for retirement of Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft (sec. 136)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Air Force from retiring or preparing to retire any Airborne Warning and Control Aircraft (AWACS) aircraft or making any significant changes in manning levels in AWACS units in 2015.

The committee is concerned about the Air Force's plans to retire aircraft from some of its high-demand, low-density (HD/LD) weapon systems. Aircraft such as the E–3 AWACS, the E–8C Joint Surveillance Targeting and Reconnaissance System (JSTARS), and the EC–130 Compass Call have been under constant, heavy demand, supporting overseas contingency operations as well as homeland defense missions for the past two decades. The committee believes these systems will continue to play a critical role in our national defense until the Department of Defense is able to field capabilities to replace these HD/LD systems.

The committee understands that the proposed cuts are a result of the budget caps enacted by Congress. However, the planned retirement of seven E–3 AWACS in fiscal year 2015 from a total fleet of 31 aircraft without a planned replacement is risky and should be reconsidered. Accordingly, the committee recommends provision that would delay this action for 1 year to give the Air Force time to fully consider the recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force and determine whether additional savings made available by shifting force structure from the active component to the reserve component could free up additional resources to make the premature retirement of these critical aircraft unnecessary.

The committee also recommends an increase of $34.6 million for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, and $24.9 million for Air Force military personnel accounts.

Report on status of air-launched cruise missile capabilities (sec. 137)

The committee recommends a provision that requires a report on the existing air-launched cruise missile system (AGM–86) and the plan for the replacement of the system referred to as the long-range standoff missile.

Report on C–130 aircraft (sec. 138)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Air Force to submit a complete fielding plan for the C–130 aircraft, and specific details of the Air Force's plan to maintain intra-theater capacity within both the active and the reserve components, including its modernization and recapitalization plan for all C–130H and C–130J aircraft.

One of the recommendations in the report of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force was recommendation number 11: "As the Air Force acquires new equipment, force integration plans should adhere to the principle of proportional and concurrent fielding across the components."

The committee wants to ensure that there will be concurrent and proportional fielding of new aircraft and new capabilities across the components. Elsewhere in another provision in this Act, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Air Force to report on its implementation plans for recommendations of the Commission. The committee will review closely how the Air Force plans to implement recommendation number 11.

Report on status of F–16 aircraft (sec. 139)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the congressional defense committees on the status of the F–16 fleet, including the status, location, and planned actions across the future years defense program for all F–16s in the Air Force inventory. This report shall be delivered not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

Report on options to modernize or replace the T–1A aircraft (sec. 140)

The committee is concerned about the Air Force's aging fleet of training aircraft used in its specialized undergraduate pilot training. The committee supports the Air Force's plan to develop a T–X aircraft to replace its 45-year-old T–38C trainer. However, there is currently no plans or budget to replace the T–1A, used to train all future tanker and transport pilots.

While the T–1A came into service after the T–38C, it has not received similar upgrades and service life extensions. The T–1A now requires an avionics upgrade for the aircraft to be certified to fly in the National Airspace past 2020. The committee understands that the Commander of the Air Education and Training Command has questioned the Air Force's ability to afford both the T–X program and an upgrade to the T–1A at the same time.

The committee is aware of an ongoing study by the Air Force to determine whether the Air Force will return to generalized training, with all pilots training in both T–6s and T–38s (or the replacement T–X), in lieu of maintaining a separate training syllabus for tanker and transport pilots. However, the committee believes it prudent for the Air Force to conduct a near-term evaluation of options to replace or modernize the T–1A capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the options for replacing or upgrading the T–1A aircraft's capability, to include options of leased aircraft or services, not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Budget Items

Army

Light Utility Helicopter

The budget request included $416.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for the UH–72A Light Utility Helicopter (LUH). The committee recommends an increase of $196.0 million in APA for procurement of additional LUH. The committee notes that during analysis and development of options for program and force structure savings required under the Budget Control Act, the Army would divest its aviation force of all single engine helicopters, including its older TH–67 Creek training aircraft at the aviation school at Fort Rucker, Alabama. To replace the TH–67, the Army selected the LUH aircraft that has been procured over the last 6 years and is now widely used by the Army and the Army National Guard (ARNG).

To quickly divest itself of the TH–67 and provide its training base with sufficient numbers of LUH, the Army initially considered transferring 100 LUH aircraft from the ARNG to the aviation school. The committee understands that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau expressed concerns about the loss of LUH in the ARNG and the resulting reduction in capability to provide domestic helicopter support to civil authorities. The Secretary of Defense responded by directing that the ARNG keep its aircraft and authorizing the Army instead to procure 100 new LUH.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113–76), included an additional $75.0 million in APA for the procurement of 10 more LUH aircraft for a total of 20 in that year. The fiscal year 2015 budget request would procure another 55 of the 100 LUH authorized by the Secretary of Defense. The committee's recommendation would allow the Army to complete procurement of the needed additional aircraft and reduce future operational and fiscal risk to replace older legacy training aircraft with new build LUH. By funding the procurement of 35 more LUH in fiscal year 2015, the Army would replace all of its legacy training aircraft and reduce the risk of having to take any from the ARNG should procurement funds not be available in fiscal year 2016 or beyond due to full sequestration.

UH–60 Black Hawk M model

The budget request included $1.2 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for the UH–60M Black Hawk helicopter. The committee recommends an increase of $145.0 million in APA for procurement of additional UH–60M Black Hawks only for the Army National Guard. Additional funding was included in the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list.

Common Missile Warning System

The budget request included $107.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for the Common Missile Warning System (CMWS). At the Army's request, the committee recommends a decrease of $47.2 million for CMWS. Also at the Army's request, the committee recommends an increase in APA of $7.8 million for ad-

vanced threat infrared countermeasures in aircraft survivability equipment and $32.4 million for radio frequency countermeasure in survivability countermeasures.

Bradley program modifications

The budget request included $107.5 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for M2 Bradley modifications. The committee recommends an increase of $37.0 million in WTCV for M2 Bradley modifications. Additional funding was included in the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee directs the Army to use the additional funds to reduce risk in the armored vehicle industrial base.

Improved recovery vehicle

The budget request included $50.5 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for the improved recovery vehicle (M88A2 Hercules). The committee recommends an increase of $75.9 million in WTCV for M88A2 Hercules. Additional funding was included in the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list.

Joint assault bridge

The budget request included $49.5 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for the joint assault bridge. Funds requested are early to need; therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $41.2 million in WTCV for joint assault bridge.

M1 Abrams tank modifications

The budget request included $237.0 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for M1 Abrams tank modifications. The committee recommends an increase of $24.0 million in WTCV for M1 Abrams tank modifications. Additional funding was included in the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list. The committee directs the Army to use the additional funds to reduce risk in the armored vehicle industrial base.

Carbine

The budget request included $29.4 million in Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV), for the M4A1 carbine, $4.6 million for M240 medium machine gun modifications, and $2.0 million for M16 rifle modifications. At the Army's request, the committee recommends decreases of $8.8 million for M4A1 carbine, $2.0 million for M240 medium machine gun modifications, and $2.0 million for M16 rifle modifications.

Also at the Army's request, the committee recommends increases in WTCV of $3.0 million for M4 carbine modifications, and in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army, in PE 63872A of $3.0 million for soldier systems advanced development and in PE 64601A of $6.7 million for infantry support weapons small arms improvement.

Modular handgun reduction

The budget request included $1.0 billion in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), of which $9.6 million was for handgun ammunition, all types, of which $3.1 million was for modular handgun ammunition.

The committee is concerned that the request for modular handgun ammunition is ahead of need and is not approved for service use.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $1.5 million in PAA, handgun ammunition, all types, for modular handgun ammunition.

40mm reduction

The budget request included $1.0 billion in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), of which $40.9 million was for 40mm ammunition, of which $1.9 million was for 40mm day/night/thermal ammunition.

The committee is concerned that the request for 40mm day/night/thermal is ahead of need and is not approved for service use.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $1.9 million in PAA, 40mm, for 40mm day/night/thermal ammunition.

Precision Guidance Kit reduction

The budget request included $1.0 billion in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), of which $94.0 million was for artillery propellants, fuses and primers, of which $61.2 million was for artillery fuse, precision guidance kit (PGK).

The committee notes that PGK failed its first article test and experienced a schedule delay.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $15.0 million in PAA, artillery propellants, fuses, and primers for PGK.

Warfighter Information Network—Tactical, increment 2

The budget request included $763.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Warfighter Information Network—Tactical (WIN–T), increment 2. The committee recommends a decrease of $125.0 million in OPA for WIN–T, increment 2, due to development delays in the Point of Presence and Soldier Network Extension components of the program.

Joint tactical radio system

The budget request included $175.7 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the joint tactical radio system (JTRS). The committee recommends a decrease of $88.0 million in OPA for JTRS due to slow execution of available prior year funds.

Mid-tier Networking Vehicular Radio

The budget request included $9.7 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Mid-tier Networking Vehicular Radio (MNVR). The committee recommends a decrease of $8.0 million in OPA for MNVR due to program delays and slow execution of available prior year funds.

Family of weapon sights

The budget request included $49.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the family of weapon sights. Funds requested are early to need; therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $12.0 million in OPA for family of weapon sights.

Joint Battle Command—Platform

The budget request included $97.9 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Joint Battle Command Platform (JBC–P). The committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million in OPA for JBC–P due to program delays and slow execution of available prior year funds.

Counterfire radars

The budget request included $209.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for counterfire radars. The committee recommends a decrease of $80.4 million in OPA for counterfire radars due to the availability of prior year funds and excessive concurrency through low rate initial production (LRIP).

The committee notes that the Army has been buying and fielding the AN/TPQ–53 counterfire radar using LRIP to meet operational needs even though the system's design, configuration, and performance have matured over time. This has resulted in a retrofit requirement for systems already fielded that will cost $85.0 million. The committee believes that there is no operational urgency to continue to produce and field systems that provide some but not all needed capabilities, and that the Army can manage production rates with funds available from prior years without creating additional requirements and costs for retrofit.

The committee is concerned the Army continues to acquire counterfire radars through LRIP acquiring over 50 percent of its Army Acquisition Objective while the full rate production decision has slipped almost a year as compared to the fiscal year 2014 schedule. The committee also notes the Army's counterfire radar sustainment concept is interim contractor support.

The Secretary of the Army is directed to submit a report that outlines the sustainment concept for counterfire radars including the results of the core depot assessment and type I/II business case analyses to determine the best mix of organic depot and contractor logistics support. The report shall address the Army's plan to compete contract logistics support activities. The report is due to the congressional defense committees not later than April 30, 2015.

Army information technology

The budget request included $155.2 million in Other Procurement, Army Line 106 for automated data processing equipment. The committee recommends a reduction of $15.0 million to this program. The committee recommends that the Army, the Defense Information Systems Agency, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense's Chief Information Officer should coordinate efforts to ensure that Army information technology procurement are not redundant with capabilities available under joint, other Service, or other agency programs. Further, these procurements should be made in a fashion so as to permit the Army to re-compete contracts for indi-

vidual elements of the enterprise as necessary, in order to maximize cost savings due to competition and to enable the Army to have a flexible enterprise services modernization strategy.

Modification of in-service equipment

The budget request included $98.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the modification of in-service equipment. Funds requested for the modification of the Army's watercraft are early to need; therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $18.0 million in OPA for the modification of in-service equipment.

Joint Improvised Explosive Defeat Fund

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

The budget request includes $115.1 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat fund for the Joint IED Defeat Organization's (JIEDDO) staff and infrastructure expenses.

As it has in each fiscal year since JIEDDO's inception, the committee declines to recommend any funding for JIEDDO in the base budget and therefore recommends a reduction of $115.1 million in the Joint IED Defeat fund. The committee understands that the Department of Defense (DOD) intends to request funding for the Joint IED Defeat fund in the overseas contingency operations budget request later this year.

The committee recognizes the important work JIEDDO has done but notes that JIEDDO was created as a temporary wartime organization. The committee believes that the operational tempo in U.S. Central Command provides an opportunity to conduct a review, captured in another title of this Act, that should lead to consolidation and, where appropriate, elimination of organizations, such as JIEDDO, that provide response to emergent warfighter needs.

Navy

EP–3E Airborne Reconnaissance Integrated Electronic System

The budget request included $32.9 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), line 39, for the EP–3E Airborne Reconnaissance Integrated Electronic System (ARIES). The Navy has been pursuing spiral upgrades for the fleet of EP–3 aircraft for a number of years. The budget request did not include funds to install Spiral 3 upgrade kits on the 11th and 12th EP–3E aircraft, or for the installation of electronic intelligence sensor upgrade kits on the last eight EP–3E aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million to install these upgrade kits.

The committee appreciates the progress that the Navy has made in answering the concerns of the committee and the Joint Staff regarding the Navy's plans for shifting EP–3E and Special Projects Aircraft (SPA) capabilities to the multi-intelligence variant of the TRITON unmanned aerial vehicle and a quick reaction capability (QRC) upgrade of the P–8A maritime patrol aircraft.

However, the committee has a number of concerns about the Navy's plan. The Navy's transition plan would still involve eliminating personnel from the existing systems well before replacement

systems are available to maintain that capability. This situation could create significant gaps in the ability to meet the needs of the combatant commands. Secondly, there is a real possibility that the Navy would be tempted to make even greater reductions in current capability if they need to pay for potential schedule delays in the development of the new signals intelligence (SIGINT) payload for TRITON while continuing to add orbits of the current version of TRITON that has only modest SIGINT capability. Finally, the committee notes that there is a mismatch between the operational concept for the P–8A QRC, which would depend on remote operations and wide-band communications, and the plan that would install wide-band communications capability on the P–8A aircraft much later than the fielding of the P–8A QRC capability.

Aircraft spares and repair parts

The budget request included $1.2 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Navy for buying spares and repair parts for all Navy and Marine Corps aircraft. This total included a request for $956.0 million in replenishment spares, an increase of $341.2 million from the fiscal year 2014 amount for replenishments spares. The committee has strongly supported efforts to improve readiness in Navy aviation programs. The committee, however, also believes that the Navy will be able to increase readiness and manage the Department's replenishment spares portfolio with a smaller resource increase in fiscal year 2015. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $35.0 million to the budget request.

Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests

The fiscal year 2015 budget request reduced the number of Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests by two. Given the importance of these tests to the readiness of the strategic submarine force, the committee recommends $11.0 million to procure one additional Strategic Programs Alteration Kit to conduct an additional Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Test.

Tomahawk

The budget request included $194.3 million to procure 100 Tomahawk missiles. The future years defense program envisions shutting down the Tomahawk production line after the fiscal year 2015 procurement.

The Navy has been expending Tomahawk missiles on a fairly regular basis of more than 100 missiles per year. The committee believes that it would be imprudent to ramp down and close Tomahawk missile production at this time.

Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $82.0 million to keep Tomahawk production at the minimum sustaining rate of 196 missiles per year.

The committee is concerned about the Navy's abrupt decision to truncate production. The Tomahawk is combat-proven missile, having been used well over 2,000 times in the last two decades, and has a proven operational track record and capability. The Navy provided some limited information to support its proposal. However, the analysis supporting projected inventories and usage rates to be expected during the remainder of this decade was incomplete.

Prior to making any decision to terminate new production and transition to a mid-life upgrade, the Navy must ensure the implications on production and recertification are fully examined and understood.

The committee directs the Navy to provide, prior to submission of the fiscal year 2016 President's budget, its complete analysis of alternatives, including an assessment of near-term and long-term threat analysis, impact on the industrial base and the needed timing of a mid-life certification/upgrade of the current Tomahawk inventory. This analysis must clearly show annual projected inventory usage, starting and ending inventory levels by fiscal year and what is budgeted for Tomahawk, as well as for all related development and production programs, with specific appropriation and line item/program element detail. The Navy should provide this information in an unclassified report with an accompanying classified annex.

Navy enterprise information technology

The budget request included $87.2 million in Other Procurement, Navy Line 161 for enterprise information technology (IT). The committee notes that much of this funding is supporting procurements related to the legacy Navy IT systems located around the world. The committee is concerned about the continued investment of funds into legacy IT infrastructure, and believes that the Navy should seek to leverage services, networks, and hardware available through the Defense Information Systems Agency, the Next Generation Enterprise Network, and other assets to the maximum extent possible. The committee recommends a reduction of $15.0 million to this program.

Power equipment assorted

The budget request included $8.9 million in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC) for assorted power equipment. The committee recommends an increase of $2.9 million in PMC for advanced power equipment. Additional funding was included in the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list.

Air Force

RQ–4

The budget request included $54.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for the RQ–4 Global Hawk program. These funds are not to buy new air vehicles, but are intended for miscellaneous procurement, to include equipment to support depot activation, initial spares, support to complete delivery of Global Hawk vehicles on contract, sensor operator trainer, and procurement to replace equipment supported by disappearing manufacturing sources.

The committee believes that the sensor operator trainer is being requested ahead of need, and recommends a reduction of $10.0 million to the budget request.

MQ–9

The budget request included $240.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) to buy an additional 12 MQ–9 air vehicles.

The committee understands that the MQ–9 program has $37.8 million in fiscal year 2013 APAF funds that are excess to program needs. These funds will remain available for obligation throughout fiscal year 2015, and can be used to offset other fiscal year 2015 requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends reduction of $37.8 million to the MQ–9 budget request.

C–5 Reliability Enhancement and Re-engining Program

The budget request included $331.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force for the C–5M program, also known as the C–5 Reliability Enhancement and Re-engining Program (RERP). Of that total, the request included $254.2 million for installing RERP kits purchased in prior years.

The committee understands that there have been delays in the RERP kit installation program and recommends a reduction of $50.0 million in the C–5M program.

U–2

The fiscal year 2015 budget request for the U–2 program did not include any procurement funding for supporting the U–2 program but did include $5.5 million in PE 35202F for developing various safety of flight and vanishing vendor modifications.

The budget request for the Global Hawk program included $86.8 million in procurement and $244.5 million in PE 35220F for developing various capabilities for the Global Hawk, including a total of $208.8 million for various Block 30 development efforts. Included in the Block 30 development efforts was $136.0 million specifically for enhancements for Global Hawk Block 30 aircraft to provide the Block 30 aircraft with some level of capability that would be lost by retirement of the U–2 aircraft. The Air Force plans to spend $1.9 billion during the future years defense program (FYDP) for these enhancements to Block 30.

The committee is skeptical of the Air Force's plans to retire the U–2 in the near term and perhaps replace some of the U–2's current capability after the end of the FYDP. First, this plan would reduce capability and leave a deficit in meeting combatant commanders' requirements now. Second, there is no real guarantee that spending $1.9 billion in the FYDP will allow the Air Force to replace the capability of the U–2 fleet with capability from Global Hawk Block 30 fleet. Finally, the FYDP that includes this funding is $115.0 billion more that the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) totals would allow for the Department of Defense (DOD) during that period. If Congress does not enact changes to amend the BCA, enhancement programs like the Block 30 upgrades would be at great risk.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $64.3 million for various modifications and $5.8 million in research and development activities for the U–2 fleet as planned last year. The committee also recommends a reduction of $136.0 million in Global Hawk research and development activities targeted at replacing U–2 capability.

The committee reminds DOD that the restrictions on retiring the U–2 aircraft in section 133 of the John Warner National Defense

Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), as amended, remain in effect.

C–130 aircraft modifications

The fiscal year 2015 budget request did not request funding for the C–130 avionics modernization program (AMP), but included $7.4 million for communication, navigation, surveillance/air traffic management (CNS/ATM) upgrades and $7.2 million for upgrading cockpit voice and digital data recorders (CVR/DVR) for legacy C–130 aircraft in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF). The program of record for modernizing the legacy C–130 aircraft until the fiscal year 2013 budget request was the C–130 AMP. When the Air Force announced a decision to cancel AMP, the program was already in low rate initial production and had delivered five aircraft, four additional kits, and training devices.

Section 143 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) prevented the Secretary of the Air Force from canceling or modifying the AMP effort for C–130 aircraft until 90 days after submission of a cost-benefit analysis comparing the original C–130 AMP with a program that would upgrade and modernize the legacy C–130 airlift fleet using a reduced scope program for avionics and mission planning systems. The Air Force submitted that report, but there were questions about the assumptions and conclusions of the report. For example, the original Air Force study also assumed life cycle costs covering only 25 years.

Section 133 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) prevented the Air Force from cancelling the AMP effort in fiscal year 2014 and directed the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the congressional defense committees a sufficiency review of the cost benefit analysis in the Air Force study. The committee received the Comptroller General's report which pointed out that changes of fundamental assumptions in the report could change the outcome of the analysis, including the assumed length of time used for calculating life cycle costs savings.

The Air Force will be operating approximately 150 C–130H aircraft for the foreseeable future, probably longer than the 25 years assumed in the Air Force study. The committee strongly supports modernization of this legacy C–130 fleet, and recommends an increase of $25.0 for procurement and installation of C–130 AMP kits. In addition, the committee directs the Air Force to obligate the fiscal year 2014 funds authorized and appropriated for this program to conduct such activities as are necessary to complete testing and transition the program to production and installation of modernization kits.

C–130 engines

The fiscal year 2015 budget request did not request funding for making upgrades to C–130 engines.

The Air Force has flight tested a contractor-developed upgrade to the current engine and determined that this upgrade would result in fuel savings of 7.9 percent compared to operating current engines. The Air Mobility Command (AMC) performed a business

case analysis of a potential upgrade program for the C–130H fleet. AMC found that an investment of $657.0 million would result in reduced maintenance and fuel expenditures that would save $2.0 billion over the lives of those aircraft.

The committee recommends an increase of $22.6 million to procure and install engine upgrade kits for the C–130H fleet.

Lynx synthetic aperture radar

The budget request includes $30.0 million in PE 25219F, line 66, in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for procurement of upgrades to the Lynx synthetic aperture radar (SAR) carried on the REAPER unmanned aerial system. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (P.L. 113–66) eliminated funding for Lynx SAR retrofits on the grounds that the rare use of this radar does not justify substantial new investment. The committee is not aware of any change in the utilization of the Lynx SAR in the field, and therefore recommends a reduction of $30.0 million.

Small diameter bomb

The budget request included $70.6 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force (MPAF) to buy 246 units of the Small Diameter Bomb Increment II (SDB II).

The committee understands that there have been delays in the Milestone C decision, and a resulting delay in awarding the contract for fiscal year 2014 production. As it stands now, the Air Force is likely to award the contract for the fiscal year 2014 production sometime during fiscal year 2015, and expects that the contract will include provisions for awarding options to the contract that would include for awarding the next option on the contract during fiscal year 2016. This means that the Air Force will not need additional production funds in fiscal year 2015.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $52.5 million in this program.

General purpose bombs

The budget request included $177.2 million in Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (PAAF) for general purpose bombs. The committee recommends an increase of $8.8 million in PAAF for general purpose bombs. The need for additional funding was identified in the Commander of the United States Pacific Command's unfunded priorities list.

Base information transportation infrastructure transfer

The budget request included $81.3 million in Other Procurement, Air Force for information transport systems, and $122.2 million in Other Procurement, Air Force for Air Force Network (AFNET). To correct an error in the budget materials, and at the request of the Air Force, the committee recommends a transfer of $31.3 million from the AFNET account to the information transport systems account for the purposes of supporting base information transportation infrastructure.

Procurement of additional ICBM training equipment

The fiscal year 2015 budget request contained no funds for the procurement of additional intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) trainers at the 381st Training Group (TRG). This lack of training equipment limits the availability of qualified ICBM officers, which are in high demand. The committee recommends $23.6 million to Other Procurement Air Force, Line 60, Base Procured Equipment for expansion of the 381st TRG Missile Procedures Training Capability for Combat Mission Readiness and to procure Computer Based Training/Rapid Execution and Combat Targeting standalone trainers.

Defense-wide

MC–12 aircraft

The budget request includes $40.5 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for the modification of 24 MC–12 aircraft being transferred from the Air Force to U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to support the manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) requirements of U.S. Special Operations Forces. Elsewhere in this bill, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the transfer of these MC–12 aircraft from the Air Force to SOCOM until the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, in coordination with the Commander of SOCOM, provides the congressional defense committees an analysis and justification for such actions.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funding in PDW for modification of MC–12 aircraft. As noted elsewhere in this report, the recommended reduction does not apply to procurement in support of SOCOM aviation foreign internal defense missions, which are funded in a different budget line. Chemical, biol.

MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle

The budget request included $15.6 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), for the acquisition and support of special operations-unique mission kits for the MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV). U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is responsible for the rapid development and acquisition of special operations capabilities to, among other things, effectively carry out operations against terrorist networks while avoiding collateral damage.

The committee understands that the budget request only partially addresses technology gaps identified by SOCOM on its fleet of MQ–9 UAVs. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $5.7 million in PDW for the MQ–9 UAV.

The committee strongly supports SOCOM's efforts to accelerate fielding of advanced weapons, sensors, and emerging technologies on its fleet of MQ–9 UAVs through the MQ–9 Medium Altitude Long Endurance Tactical program of record utilizing the Lead-Off Hitter rapid acquisition process. The committee understands this process has successfully fielded MQ–9 UAV capabilities at greatly reduced timelines when compared to traditional acquisition processes and such capabilities have significantly improved the accuracy and lethality of MQ–9 UAVs in "find, fix, and finish" operations. The committee encourages SOCOM to continue to look for

other opportunities to accelerate combat capability development through the Lead-Off Hitter approach.

Items of Special Interest

Air Force KC–46A Pegasus procurement

The committee notes that the KC–46A Pegasus remains one of the Department of Defense's most successful and important acquisition programs. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force described aerial refueling tankers as the lifeblood of the Joint Force's ability to respond to crises and contingencies around the world. The KC–46A will replace the Air Force's 1960s era KC–135s and will significantly enhance our current capability. The Chief of Staff of the Air Force has consistently stated that the KC–46 is the Air Force's highest acquisition priority, and essential to the future of the Joint Force.

The committee also notes that the development of the KC–46As continues to meet its technical performance goals on time and under budget. In April 2014, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the KC–46's development cost has changed less than 1 percent since 2011, despite funding reductions in fiscal year 2013 associated with the Budget Control Act. Moreover, the aircraft's fixed price incentive contract shifts liability for any future cost growth to the contractor. This structure not only incentivizes the contractor to cut costs in order to generate additional profits, it also ensures maximum value for the government and the taxpayer. To date, the Air Force reports it has saved $900.0 million in the KC–46 Aircrew Training System and other program risk adjustments compared to previous estimates.

The committee notes that disrupting this well-performing program would negatively affect the ongoing development of the KC–46s and our national security. The Air Force estimates that reducing procurement from seven aircraft to six in fiscal year 2015 would yield near-term savings of $139.6 million. However, the Air Force projects that this reduction in quantity would adversely affect contractual cost factors over the life of the program, ultimately increasing the cost to the taxpayer by more than $640.0 million. A reduction would also impose severe risk on the contractor's ability to meet its contractual requirement to deliver 18 aircraft by August 2017. Also, the government could risk losing the very favorable production pricing under the KC–46 contract by not living up to the government's responsibilities under the contract to provide resources matched to contractor progress. In order to ensure the KC–46 program continues to meet is cost, schedule, and performance objectives, and ultimately meet our national defense requirements, the committee recommends fully funding the President's request for procurement of seven KC–46 aircraft in fiscal year 2015, and keeping the program on a stable funding path.

Armored vehicle transmission industrial base

Over the last several years the committee has expressed its concern for the management of strategic risk in the armored vehicle industrial base. Strategic risk is that associated with the permanent or temporary loss of either public depot or private commercial

industrial capability or capacity to repair and upgrade the Nation's current fleets or develop and produce the next generation of armored vehicles.

The committee notes that this risk is apparent in the portion of the armored vehicle industrial base that designs, develops, and produces transmissions. The committee is aware of actions on the part of the Army to manage this risk through the procurement of some armored vehicle transmissions in excess of its usual repair parts supply and production requirements. Buying extra transmissions, however, may not be a sustainable risk management approach because of declining and uncertain budgets.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or designee, in coordination with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy, to conduct a business case analysis of the costs, benefits, risks, feasibility, and advisability of strategies to manage risk in the armored vehicle transmission industrial base including, but not limited to, increased competition, consolidation, or other industrial approaches across public depot, private commercial, and public-private partnership entities and facilities.

The results of this analysis shall be briefed to the congressional defense committees by the Secretary, or designee, not later April 30, 2015.

Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Defense

The budget request included $17.5 million in Other Procurement, Army for chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) defense but included no funding for personal dosimeter systems.

The committee understands the Army has 10,000 personal dosimeters in its inventory consisting of 2,000 dosimeters purchased in 2013 and 8,000 dosimeters based on 1960s technology and are no longer in production. Additionally, these 8,000 systems are unable to be repaired due to a lack of spare parts. The committee is concerned that the Army may not have kept pace with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction including nuclear weapons and material to state and non-state actors.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report or briefing no later than March 15, 2015, on the requirements and, if necessary, the plan to upgrade and/or acquire personal dosimeter systems.

Combatant command intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance requirements

Demand for intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) remains the number one shortfall identified by combatant commanders. The Department of Defense (DOD) is pursuing a number of initiatives to respond to these demands.

One of these approaches is applying open systems architectures principles to current and new software systems. As discussed elsewhere in this report, DOD is pursuing a number of programs to provide new ISR capabilities through an open systems architecture approach. This should provide DOD more flexibility to adapt new payloads or capabilities to varying environments and operational needs.

DOD is also modernizing and expanding ISR capabilities for systems with longer ranges and endurance. Combatant commanders frequently ask for systems with additional range and loiter times to simplify their scheduling and administrative efforts in providing on-station capability.

The committee believes that it is important that DOD remain focused on its efforts to help simplify and reduce the costs of meeting combatant commanders' ISR requirements.

Commercial aircraft used by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The U.S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) uses commercial aircraft performing survey and mapping services. In the case of some of these aircraft, the USACE contracts directly with the private sector for use of the aircraft. In other cases, the USACE uses the services of commercial aircraft that are on retainer with the Air Force or the Navy. The committee is concerned about recent Army blanket requirements for the USACE. The committee is concerned about the issuance of new blanket requirements for Army-contracted aircraft that do not apply to those aircraft on retainer with the Air Force or the Navy. These new requirements apparently include a requirement that all commercial aircraft under Army contract be subject to oversight by the Army's Program Executive Office for Aviation (PEO–AVN) and require an Air Worthiness Release (AWR). The committee has been made aware that the Army may not be applying these new requirements to such aircraft on loan from the Air Force or the Navy.

Such aircraft on contract to the USACE for survey and mapping purposes were previously certified by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), since such aircraft are used for inherently non-defense purposes. The committee believes that the Army's requirement for a blanket AWR for aircraft already certified by the FAA may not have a material impact on aircraft air worthiness unless the Army were to make major modifications to the aircraft or to make changes to the mission parameters. Such specific changes would dictate a more stringent air worthiness certification for these aircraft, but a blanket requirement that all aircraft require an AWR could result in unnecessary expenses for the taxpayer.

Therefore, the committee directs the Army and USACE to provide the congressional defense committees a briefing on contract aircraft operated by or for the USACE modifications required to meet USACE missions, certification requirements for such aircraft, and what value the Army receives from insisting on an AWR for commercial aircraft performing for civil survey and mapping functions.

Comptroller General of the United States review relating to remotely piloted aircraft

Remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) are a critical capability the Air Force provides to combatant commanders and in response to growing mission demands, the Air Force has significantly increased the number of RPA and associated personnel since 2008. However, the committee is concerned that the Air Force has not adjusted policies to fully account for the high operations tempo and unique operating

environment that drive the RPA enterprise requirements. A recent review by the Comptroller General of the United States, "Air Force: Actions Needed to Strengthen Management of Unmanned Aerial Systems Pilots; GAO–14–316," details some of these challenges. The committee directs the Air Force to report to the committee no later than September 30, 2014, on its efforts to implement the first three Government Accountability Office recommendations concerning its crew ratio, recruiting, and retention strategy.

Similar to units deploying to combat operations in Afghanistan and the Middle East, Air Force RPA pilots operate at a high operational tempo which constrains the time they have to train for the entire spectrum of missions in which they are required to maintain proficiency. Exacerbating this challenge, available simulators do not adequately replicate the environment of a RPA ground control station. Across the Department of Defense (DOD), as much as 90 percent of training for RPA-related personnel occurs as part of a combat operations mission.

As combat operations wind down in Afghanistan, the DOD will need to identify training opportunities to keep RPA personnel proficient. Two of the biggest challenges will be RPA access to military training airspace due to competition with other military aviation requirements, and access to civilian controlled airspace due to safety concerns. As RPA technology advances and RPA mission areas expand, the committee is concerned about DOD's ability to keep pace with these changes.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to review DOD's RPA training. The review should include, at a minimum: (1) Challenges DOD faces in training RPA personnel; (2) The extent to which DOD has planned for and taken steps to mitigate those challenges; (3) The extent to which RPA units are able to perform required missions; (4) The extent to which DOD has access to the national airspace structure for RPA training operations; and (5) Any other matters the Comptroller General determines are appropriate during the review.

The Comptroller General shall submit the preliminary results of the review to the congressional defense committees no later than January 31, 2015, with a report to follow.

Distributed mission operations

The Air Force is providing its warfighters the ability to train and operate in a realistic virtual environment using the real-world operational systems they would use in an actual combat situation under its distributed mission operations (DMO) program. DMO training enables warfighters to simulate real operations in a safe training environment at multiple levels of classification and complexity without the concerns of range and airspace restrictions. By using this DMO training, the Air Force reduces flying hour costs, travel costs and other operations and support costs.

The committee is concerned that the ability of Air Force to field and connect DMO simulators broadly across the total Air Force, as Air Force leadership would prefer, is being hampered in this fiscally constrained environment. The committee needs to understand the extent of these fielding problems.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a plan that identifies current and planned fielding of the DMO program across the total Air Force, including locations and schedules for installation of DMO simulators and associated equipment, current and future network distribution and connectivity, and a funding plan that would achieve full operational capability for DMO. The Secretary of the Air Force should provide this plan to the congressional defense committees not later than April 30, 2015.

Ejection seats

Section 146 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) directed the Secretary of the Air Force to submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the risks to the health and safety of the members of the Armed Forces of the ejection seats currently in operational use by the Air Force. The report is due to the congressional committees no later than June 2014.

The committee looks forward to receiving that report. When the report is completed, the committee believes that the Secretary should develop a strategy to implement recommendations from the study to improve the safety and reliability of existing ejection seats in fighter and bomber aircraft as soon as possible, to include requesting any funding that may be needed in the fiscal year 2016 budget request.

Enhanced position location reporting system

The committee notes that the Army is modernizing its tactical communications architecture, including divestment of the Enhanced Position Location Reporting System (EPLRS) between fiscal years 2014 and 2017. The committee supports the Army's plan to modernize its digital communications architecture and understands that replacement of the EPLRS system with the currently fielded more capable Blue Force Tracking System will provide units with an improved interim capability. The committee is aware that EPLRS will continue to be used in some units outside of the Army and by some allies. Given this potential mix of communications systems, the committee would be interested to learn how the Army plans to mitigate any operational impacts as it implements EPLRS divestment.

Accordingly, the Secretary of the Army shall provide the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate with a briefing that outlines the potential interoperability risks, if any, for units still equipped with EPLRS and its plans to mitigate those risks.

Family of medium tactical vehicles

The budget request includes no funding in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the family of medium tactical vehicles (FMTV). However, the committee notes that the Army justification material for OPA included funding planned for fiscal years 2017 and 2018. The committee urges the Army to consider funding FMTV in the Oversea Contingency Operations request in order to help bridge the fiscal year 2014 to fiscal year 2017 funding gap.

Joint Light Tactical Vehicle

The budget request included $45.7 million in PE 65812A, $11.5 million in PE 65812M, $164.6 million in Other Procurement, Army, and $7.5 million in Procurement, Marine Corps for research, development, and low rate initial production (LRIP) of the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV). The committee notes that, according to the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General John Campbell, JLTV is the centerpiece of the Army's tactical wheeled vehicle modernization strategy. The committee further notes that fiscal year 2015 is a critically important year for this program. Over the last 3 years, the joint program office has been managing the development and testing of prototype vehicles provided by three competing tactical vehicle vendor teams. This competitive prototyping acquisition strategy is consistent with the requirements of the Weapons System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) and in 2015 will result in the selection of a single vendor for award of a LRIP contract for up to 183 Army and Marine Corps vehicles. The committee recommends full funding as requested for JLTV and expects the program to remain on schedule for its Milestone C decision in June 2015.

Joint Strike Fighter software development

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a rigorous assessment of the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter's software development program and report to the congressional defense committees on the specific capabilities, to include combat capabilities, to be delivered and those that will not likely be delivered to each of the military Services by the date at which the Service plans to declare initial operational capability. The Secretary shall submit this report not later than May 1, 2015.

Light weight cartridge case and ammunition development

The committee remains encouraged by the Department of Defense's efforts and multiple ongoing projects to decrease the weight of cartridge cases and ammunition. The committee understands that polymers have the potential to act as better heat insulators, enabling the firing of more ammunition, and an added benefit of cost savings and decreased weight compared to conventional metal cartridge cases. The committee is also encouraged by the ongoing research and potential for cased telescoped ammunition which could decrease logistical weight by at least 50 percent and bulk storage volume by at least 40 percent.

Accordingly, the committee urges the Department to conduct the necessary logistical impact assessments to explore additional efficiencies for light weight cartridge cases and ammunition.

Lightweight robots

The committee is aware that the Army has developed and fielded a variety of lightweight robots to conduct reconnaissance, to counter improvised explosive devices, and for other tactical uses by units deployed supporting overseas contingency operations.

Over the years, the Army has rapidly acquired these lightweight robots in response to theater operational needs statements. The committee supports the continued research, development, and ac-

quisition (RDA) of lightweight robots to support the Army's various tactical requirements.

The committee is interested to learn, however, how the Army plans to transition lightweight robot RDA to a formal program of record. A program of record appears necessary to sustain momentum in the development of next generation lightweight robots as well as identify and field technical improvements to existing capabilities.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or designee, not later than September 30, 2014, to provide the Senate Committee on Armed Services a briefing on the Army's plans, if any, for creation of a RDA program of record for lightweight tactical robots. The briefing should include discussion of the development and schedule for the review and approval of requirements documents necessary to establish a RDA program of record. Also, the briefing should include technology development and procurement schedules and related funding profiles through the future years defense program.

MH–60R helicopters

The budget request included $933.9 million to buy 29 MH–60R helicopters and $106.7 million in advance procurement. The last future years defense program (FYDP) indicated that the Navy intended to buy 29 MH–60R helicopters in fiscal year 2016 to fulfill the Navy's part of the last year of the Army's H–60 multiyear procurement contract. The latest FYDP projects that the Navy will not buy any MH–60R helicopters in fiscal year 2016. Absent action to revise the fiscal year 2016 plan for the Navy, or to apply additional resources to the Army procurement effort, this action by the Navy would cause a government default on the multiyear contract.

The Navy has planned to budget $250.0 million in fiscal year 2016 to cover termination charges. However, the Navy cannot assure the committee that this amount will cover all of the Navy's early termination charges, nor have Navy officials been able to specify what additional costs will fall on the Army if the Navy were to fail to buy the 29 helicopters as planned. At a minimum, the Army would be forced to renegotiate the contract, which will probably delay deliveries and most certainly increase unit costs.

The committee urges the Navy to reconsider this plan during the development of the fiscal year 2016 budget. If the Navy decides to opt out of the multiyear contract next year, the committee expects the Secretary of the Navy to explain how this aircraft reduction is related to the Navy's ship force structure and whether the Navy will be able to meet its requirements with a smaller number of MH–60R helicopters in the future. In the meantime, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy, to develop a better estimate of the likely effects if the Navy were to withdraw from the Army's H–60 multiyear procurement contract in fiscal year 2016. The Secretary of Defense should provide that analysis to the congressional defense committees within 90 days.

Modular handgun

The committee is aware that the Army is in the process of an open competition for a commercial off-the-shelf non-developmental modular handgun that could result in the replacement of its existing M9 pistol. The committee notes that the Army has not replaced any of its current mix of small arms in several years and is interested to know how the Army will ensure the stability of the modular handgun program.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or designee, to provide the congressional defense committees a briefing no later than March 1, 2015, that describes the modernization strategy for its handgun replacement program. The required briefing shall include a description of requirements for the replacement modular handgun and how the program's critical performance requirements are linked to capabilities demonstrated in the small arms marketplace. The briefing should also include relevant schedule and funding profile information through the future years defense program.

Report on the Navy's shipbuilding industrial base

In testimony before the Seapower Subcommittee of this committee, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition expressed concern about the fragility of the Navy's shipbuilding industrial base. Other Navy officials, including the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations have expressed similar concerns. The committee shares these concerns and requests the Secretary of the Navy, in conjunction with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisitions, Technology, and Logistics, provide a report on the state of the Navy's shipbuilding industrial base not later than February 1, 2015. The report should contain the following:

(1) A comparison of shipyard capacities and capabilities with projected shipbuilding workloads, and challenges this may produce in coming years in terms of capacity utilization and preservation of key design and construction skills.

(2) Investments the shipyards have made in recent years to modernize their production facilities and to recruit, train, and retain their workers, and any challenges the shipyards may face in doing this in coming years.

(3) Investments the shipyards could make to achieve cost reductions on Navy programs or to position the yards to survive a number of years on reduced Navy orders.

(4) The shipyards' construction processes and methods, and how these compare to best practices in shipyards around the world.

(5) The prospects, by ship type, for using competition in the design and construction of Navy ships in coming years.

(6) A comparison of supplier capacities and capabilities with projected shipbuilding workloads, and challenges this may produce in coming years in terms of capacity utilization and preservation of key suppliers.

(7) A comparison of shipbuilding research and development investments with projected shipbuilding workloads, and any challenges that deficiencies in investment may produce in future years

in utilizing capacity, preserving of key skills, and continuing innovation.

(8) An analysis of the risks to the shipbuilding industrial base in the Navy's shipbuilding plan in the 2015 future years defense program, and the risks to the industrial base if Congress does not amend the Budget Control Act to increase budget levels for the Department of Defense before fiscal year 2016.

(9) A comprehensive funding section that includes:

(a) An itemized listing of funds budgeted for support of the shipbuilding industrial base. This is to include all applicable Navy and Defense-wide appropriations. Detail must be by fiscal year at the Appropriation, line item/program element-project level with a description of the effort. Detail should be provided over the future years defense program and include up to 10 years of prior fiscal year actuals. This detailed listing is to specifically include funding contained in current shipbuilding programs (detail design/plans), as well as the research and development funding for preliminary and contract design program elements, and any applicable science and technology funding, as well as applicable funding from the Industrial Preparedness and Manufacturing Technology programs.

(b) Any recommendations in the report for additional funding should be identified at the same level of detail as described in the subsection above.

(c) The report funding summary should also provide information on applicable efforts from other related agencies, such as the Department of Transportation, the Maritime Administration, and the Coast Guard.

RQ–21 unmanned aerial systems

The budget request included $70.6 million to procure three RQ–21A Blackjack unmanned aerial systems and to buy ancillary support equipment and provide interim contractor logistics support.

The committee recognizes that this is not a very economical rate at which to buy the RQ–1A system and understands that the Marine Corps may be seeking to move funds within the account to add to the RQ–21A end item procurement plan.

If the Marine Corps can identify additional resources to such a purpose, the committee would support buying more systems under a buy-to-budget approach.

Solid state radar upgrades

The committee is aware that most current Navy radars use 1910s vacuum electronic devices technology and designs, such as traveling wave tubes and cross-field amplifiers.

The committee also understands that corrective radar system maintenance typically occurs only after a component or system failure, or that components are proactively replaced to avoid suffering lower operational readiness due to low mean time between critical failure of the cross-field amplifier tube technology. These failures can undercut readiness and reduce the operational availability of naval vessels.

The committee notes that upgrading existing radars with solid-state technology, such as components using gallium nitride (GaN),

may significantly improve performance and reliability, as well as result in significant potential cost savings over the life of the radar. The committee needs to understand the potential of technology improvements to result directly in increases in operational readiness.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chief of Naval Research to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees, no later than September 30, 2014, that includes the following:

(1) An inventory of current Navy radars, the technology Navy radars utilize, and the reliability of those radars;

(2) An assessment of the feasibility, advisability, estimated costs, and potential performance benefits of upgrading radars on current Navy vessels with solid-state emitters that use solid state technology, such as GaN;

(3) An assessment of ongoing efforts to prototype a generic solid state emitter as a potential upgrade for radars across Navy vessels.

Technical study and business case analysis of body armor plates

The Secretary of the Army shall conduct a technical study and business case analysis on the requirements, cost, benefit, feasibility, and advisability of the replacement and refurbishment of the various body armor plates used in personal protective equipment. The technical study will include an identification and evaluation of environmental or other conditions under which body armor plates will or could lose their required protective performance or properties and an identification and evaluation of the handling and storage for body armor plates to ensure the most cost-effective shelf life to retain the required protective performance properties. In addition to the technical study, the business case analysis will evaluate the full range of options for body armor modernization and sustainment. An interim report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2015, and a final report submitted not later than March 1, 2016.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201)

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

Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations

Modification of authority for prizes for advanced technology achievements (sec. 211)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authority of the Secretary of Defense to hold prize and challenge competitions to spur advanced technology achievements. The provision would give the Department of Defense (DOD) more flexibility in selecting prize award sizes to better match the awards to the technical challenge being addressed.

Additionally, the provision would permit DOD to combine funding with other federal, state, or local government funding in order to leverage other resources to achieve goals of interest to defense missions and priorities. Finally, the provision would reduce the reporting requirement for the use of the authority.

The March 2014 report to Congress on the prize authority indicated that prizes "have demonstrated the ability to stimulate and incentivize a broad spectrum of individuals to offer solutions to problems of significant interest to our Nation's Warfighters." The Army, Navy, Air Force, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and Defense Threat Reduction Agency have all successfully used prize competitions to develop innovative approaches to address technology challenges.

Modification of Manufacturing Technology Program (sec. 212)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel which coordinates manufacturing technology and research programs for the Department of Defense should receive oversight from the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics or his designees. Further, the provision reduces the frequency of mandated updates to the Manufacturing Technology program's strategic plan, to better synchronize this effort with the Quadrennial Defense Review process.

Limitation on retirement of Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar Systems aircraft (sec. 213)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Air Force from retiring or preparing to retire operational Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft until the Secretary of the Air Force submits a report to the congressional defense committees including an update of the results of the analysis of alternatives (AoA) for recapitalizing the current JSTARS capability; an analysis of life cycle supports costs of maintaining the current fleet of JSTARS aircraft versus replacing the current fleet JSTARS aircraft with a new aircraft and radar system employing mature technology; and an assessment of the cost and schedule of developing and fielding a new aircraft and radar system employing mature technology to replace the current JSTARS aircraft.

The budget request included $73.1 million in PE 37581F for developing a next generation system to replace the current JSTARS aircraft. The Air Force conducted an AoA 3 years ago to review options for modernizing the current E–8C JSTARS capability. That AoA concluded that a combination of Global Hawk Block 40 remotely piloted aircraft and a business class intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) platform was the least cost, highest performing alternative. The AoA reported that a modern business jet outfitted with fourth generation radar based on existing technology would be the desired capability.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force also informed the committee 2 years ago that the Air Force could not afford to pursue the business jet alternative when he said, "We simply don't have the resources."

This year, the budget request proposes to retire six of the current E–8C JSTARS aircraft in fiscal years 2015 and 2016, and pursue a standard acquisition program and expend nearly $2.0 billion on a research and development program to develop and integrate new capability onto existing business jet airframes. This new radar and aircraft would not achieve initial operational capability until fiscal year 2022.

The committee supports a rapid recapitalization program to replace the Air Force's current JSTARS aircraft fleet.

However, the committee has concerns regarding the Air Force's ability to complete that new program due to future budget uncertainties. Given the importance of restoring the capability lost by retiring E–8C aircraft in the near term, the committee believes the Air Force should pursue an effort to integrate existing technology onto an airframe, rather than starting a new research effort to develop a new capability. The committee believes the Air Force should be innovative in its recapitalization approach by using modern, but existing, components and technologies and that this should be an integration effort rather than a research and development effort.

Therefore, the committee denies the Air Force request to initiate a a new major research and development program to recapitalize the JSTARS fleet and instead recommends the Air Force pursue a program that pursues integration of existing systems and components onto commercially available airframes. The committee rec-

ommends a total of $10.0 million to begin that more modest integration and fielding effort.

Limitation on significant modifications of Army test and evaluation capabilities (sec. 214)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to report on significant reductions or consolidations of major test facilities.

Subtitle C—Reports

Study and reports on the technological superiority of the United States military (sec. 221)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to task the Defense Science Board or other independent group to examine the potential specific challenges to U.S. military technological superiority within the next 10 years, and the specific planned responses by the Department of Defense (DOD) to meet these challenges. The provision also requires DOD to provide an interim report to the committee on current acquisition and development programs, and policy changes that are being undertaken in response to these challenges.

The committee notes that Secretary of Defense Hagel has indicated that "the development and proliferation of more advanced military technology by other nations means we are entering an era where American dominance of the seas, in the sky, and in space can no longer be taken for granted." Similarly, Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Frank Kendall has indicated in public statements that in terms of "technological superiority, the Department of Defense is being challenged in ways that I have not seen for decades, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region."

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a classified briefing and a series of staff-level briefings in order to better understand these developments and the DOD responses to them. As a result of these briefings, the committee is concerned that DOD has not adequately placed a priority on providing resources to programs that can address situations in which U.S. military capabilities will not be technically superior to those which may be potentially fielded by global peer adversaries. Further, the committee is concerned that only minimal efforts have been made to redirect military service and defense agency programs from legacy efforts into new programs better aligned to meet these near term emerging threats.

Reduction in frequency of reporting by Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Systems Engineering (sec. 222)

The committee recommends a provision that would reduce the reporting requirement related to the systems engineering activities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The committee believes this reduction will save resources for use in technical systems engineering work which can lead to system performance enhancements and acquisition cost savings. The committee notes the critical importance of effective systems engineering capabilities and activities in

the development and deployment of complex technical systems. The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will continue to keep Congress informed of systems engineering activities of interest upon request.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Pilot program on assignment to Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency of private sector personnel with critical research and development expertise (sec. 231)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to carry out a pilot program to employ up to five individuals employed by the private sector on rotational assignments to lead research or development projects of the Agency. The committee believes that this authority will allow DARPA to leverage the considerable talent that resides in industry in key technical areas, including cybersecurity, robotics, cloud computing, and biotechnology, where technological leadership often is resident outside the government. The committee notes that this pilot program is modeled on the successful Intergovernmental Personnel Act (IPA) Mobility Program which has been used successfully by federal agencies to exchange specialized personnel with state and local governments, academia, national labs, and other not-for-profit organizations. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has established procedures for monitoring and controlling salaries and expenses for the IPA program, including a limitation on salaries that may be paid or reimbursed for IPAs, and expects that such constraints will be applied to the pilot authorized by this provision.

Pilot program on enhancement of preparation of dependents of members of Armed Forces for careers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (sec. 232)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pilot program to enhance the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) educational opportunities for children of servicemembers. The committee believes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has a unique responsibility for the well-being of military children. These children are faced with a unique set of pressures and challenges relative to their peers, including the stresses of parental deployments and frequent relocations due to changes of duty station. Any successful effort to improve the quality of STEM education for military children would benefit both the children and their servicemember parents, but also help strengthen the pipeline of future personnel into civilian and military positions into DOD.

The committee notes that (DOD) has a set of educational outreach programs and assets, largely managed by the DOD Educational Activity (DODEA) and science and technology organizations, which could be leveraged to create effective engagements with military children and help improve their STEM educational experiences. The committee recommends that the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the Under Secretary

for Personnel and Readiness work in partnership to develop activities under this program. Activities could include internships at defense laboratories, teacher training, curriculum enhancements, or other programs designed to address the challenges facing military children. The committee notes that the Department could also leverage research and development funding, including through the Small Business Innovation Research program, to develop new technologies and practices supportive of the goals of the pilot program.

The committee directs that any educational activities undertaken through this pilot program only be established with metrics that can be used to evaluate the merits and benefits of such activities. The activities should also be closely coordinated with STEM educational activities in the private sector, state and local organizations, and other federal agencies to ensure use of best educational practices, and to limit duplication of efforts.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends an additional authorization of funding to support some of the activities authorized by this provision.

Modification to requirement for contractor cost-sharing in pilot program to include technology protection features during research and development of certain defense systems (sec. 233)

The committee recommends a provision, requested by the Department of Defense, that would modify the cost-sharing provision of section 243 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). The underlying provision requires industry to bear a fixed portion of the cost for the development of features which could enable the exportability of systems, including measures to prevent tampering with export versions of major defense equipment. The recommended provision would allow the Department of Defense to adjust the cost-share requirement for industry partners to levels appropriate for the particular project.

Budget Items

University research initiatives

The budget request included $69.8 million in PE 61103A, $113.9 million in PE 61103N, and $127.1 million in PE 61103F for university research initiatives. The committee notes that the overall basic research program in the budget request has been reduced by roughly $150 million, or 7 percent, relative to the fiscal year 2014 requested level. In testimony to the Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering testified that this would lead to a reduction of between 1,500 to 2,000 grants to university faculty and students.

The committee notes that basic research activities focused in technical areas of interest to Department of Defense missions lay the foundation upon which other technology development and new defense systems are built. These programs fund efforts at universities, small businesses, and government laboratories. These investments also serve to help train the next generation of scientists and

engineers who may work on defense technology problems in government, industry, and academia.

To help address the significant reduction in basic research funding in the request, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 61103A, $20.0 million in PE 61103N, and $20.0 million in PE 61103F. The committee directs that these funds be awarded through the well-established and competitive Multidisciplinary University Research Initiative process. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the plan to spend these additional resources no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

Indirect fire protection capability

The budget request included $96.2 million in PE 64319A for indirect fire protection capability. Due to program delays some of the funds requested are early to need, therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of $30.0 million in PE 64319A for the indirect fire capability.

Infantry support weapons

The budget request included $27.9 million in PE 64601A for infantry support weapons of which $7.8 million would be for the XM25 counter defilade target engagement weapon system. The XM25 is a grenade launcher firing a 25mm projectile selectively programmed to detonate in the air at a designated range.

The committee notes that the Army has invested $183.2 million in development, procurement, and assessment of the XM25 between December 2010 and August 2013. Prototypes of this weapon were acquired, initially tested for safety, and deployed to Afghanistan for a forward operational assessment. Malfunctions during this assessment, and during subsequent testing, have raised questions about the system's safety, reliability, and effectiveness. A March 2014 report by the Department of Defense Inspector General (DOD IG) identified cost, performance, and schedule issues with the system. According to the DOD IG, reliability issues discovered during and after operational assessment have resulted in a program delay of over 2 years, cost growth for technical development and corrections, and Army program evaluators question the weapon's lethality. The program is delayed pending resolution of weapon function and munition effectiveness testing.

Due to the availability of unobligated prior year funds, the committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million in PE 64601A only for the XM25 counter defilade target engagement weapon system. Furthermore, given the reliability and effectiveness issues discovered in development and testing of the weapon and munition, the committee designates as a congressional interest item the XM25 counter defilade target engagement weapon system, or any of its derivative weapons or ammunition development or procurement programs, projects, or activities.

Kwajalein Atoll Reagan Test Site space situational awareness operations support

The budget included $176.0 million for PE 0605301A for Army Kwajalein Atoll. The committee recommends an increase by $11.0

million to meet a U.S. Strategic Command unfunded requirement for space situational awareness operations support.

Marine Corps assault vehicles

The budget request included $105.7 million in PE 63611M for Marine Corps assault vehicles. At the request of the Marine Corps, the committee recommends a decrease of $52.0 million in PE 63611M for the new amphibious vehicle project.

Also, at the request of the Marine Corps, the committee recommends the following increases:

(1) $45.0 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for Landing Craft, Air Cushion (LCAC) service life extension; and

(2) $7.0 million in PE 24413N for surface connector research and LCAC stern ramp testing.

Offensive anti-surface warfare weapon development

The budget request included $202.9 million in PE 64786N for developing an offensive anti-surface warfare (OASuW) weapon. This follows on an enacted funding level of $91.0 million in fiscal year 2013. The Navy hopes to use these funds to mature the development of a science and technology development effort of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) that is seeking to demonstrate a variant of the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile (JASSM) in an anti-ship mission set. DARPA has called this variant the Long Range Anti-ship Missile, or LRASM.

In fiscal year 2013, the Navy had planned to release a request for proposal, award one or more competitive prototyping contracts, and establish a government program office team.

In fiscal year 2014, it became clear that the Navy planned to adopt the DARPA LRASM program without competition and to continue development of that missile, leading to fielding of an air-launched version (increment 1) and surface-launched version (increment 2) of LRASM missiles to be delivered initially by B–1 bombers or F/A–18 strike fighters. The Senate report accompanying S. 1197 (S. Rept. 113–44) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 directed the Navy to present a plan that would pursue a more competitive approach, yield a program proceeding to a technology readiness level 6 before deciding on a particular technical solution.

For fiscal year 2015, the Navy plan would continue that same non-competitive approach, but would field only a limited number of the air-launched version of the missile. The budget request and the future years defense program (FYDP) envision spending roughly $1.5 billion to acquire roughly 110 missiles.

The committee is concerned that this program was created to respond to an urgent combatant commander need, but was done so with insufficient analyses of other available alternatives, and with insufficient regard for the costs of locking in a long-term commitment under a non-competitive program.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $202.9 million for the OASuW program in fiscal year 2015, and directs the Navy to use available funds to conduct more thorough analyses of alternatives for meeting combatant commander needs.

Integrated Personnel and Pay System

The budget request included $90.2 million in PE 65018F for the Air Force integrated personnel and pay system. The committee notes that a planned contract award for development of an integrated pay system largely based on commercial software has been delayed by two fiscal quarters, relative to the program schedule and associated funding plan proposed in the budget request. As a result, the committee recommends a reduction of $30.0 million to this program.

F–15 Eagle Passive/Active Warning and Survivability System

The budget request included $68.9 million in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force for the F–15 Eagle Passive/Active Warning and Survivability System (EPAWSS). EPAWSS is expected to significantly improve the F–15's capability to autonomously and automatically detect, identify and locate radio frequency threats, as well as provide the ability to defeat radio frequency, electro-optical, and infrared threat systems.

The Air Force plans for fiscal year 2015 to award a pre-engineering and manufacturing development (pre-EMD) contract and prepare for awarding a full EMD contract in late fiscal year 2016. This program plan includes a schedule slip of roughly 15 months since last year's plan. This was due in part to a delay of a year in the analysis of alternatives for EPAWSS.

The committee understands that there have been additional delays in the schedule since the Air Force submitted the budget request, and recommends a reduction of $19.5 million to reflect that delay.

Airborne Signals Intelligence Payload

The budget request includes $30.7 million in PE 34260F for development of the Airborne Signals Intelligence Payload 2C (ASIP–2C) for the REAPER unmanned aerial system. The Air Force has decided to sustain other signals intelligence capabilities on the REAPER in lieu of the ASIP–2C and does not require these funds. The committee recommends a reduction of $30.7 million.

Network Centric Collaborative Targeting

The budget request included $8.8 million in PE 35221F for Research and Development (R&D) for the Network-Centric Collaborative Targeting (NCCT) program. The budget request also included $3.0 million in line 14 of Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF) for NCCT procurement. The committee has long supported the goal of building a capability to create a tracking and targeting network across all of the major airborne intelligence collection platforms, and all sensor types (visible imagery, infrared/spectral imagery, synthetic aperture radar, moving target indicator radar, and all forms of signals intelligence (SIGINT) sensors), utilizing machine-to-machine tipping and cueing. However, the intelligence components supporting our military forces have never been willing to organize around this concept.

The NCCT technology, architecture, and concept of operations were developed a long time ago, but the relevant program offices have not been willing to implement them. The committee reluc-

tantly concludes that it is time to try different approaches to this worthy goal.

The intelligence community is now pursuing the concept known as activity-based intelligence (ABI), which involves inter alia layering or integrating geo-referenced data and metadata from any and all sources about places, events, and activity. It is anticipated that ABI will enable target discovery, correlation, patterns of activity, and cues or tips for further collection.

The National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) is investigating technology and processes for automated, machine-based tipping and cueing across programs and sensor types that it hopes to persuade its mission partners to adopt to support the ABI concept. The Joint Staff is conducting studies of methods and means to use integrated sensor collection operations to track mobile, strategically important targets.

The Air Force Rapid Capabilities Office (RCO) is developing advanced technology for machine-to-machine networking that can support tipping and cueing and other coordinated operations for unmanned aerial systems (UAS) and manned platforms alike under the UAS Command and Control Initiative, Common Mission Control Center, and Open Mission Systems programs.

The Navy is developing advanced machine-to-machine tipping and cueing capabilities under the Minotaur initiative. Minotaur's goals are to detect, locate, and track targets either on the ground, at sea, or in the air. Minotaur is now or soon will be in operation on airborne platforms of the Navy, Coast Guard, SOCOM, and Customs and Border Patrol.

These initiatives appear to be more promising than NCCT in ultimately achieving the original goals of the NCCT program. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $8.8 million from the R&D request, and $3.0 million from the procurement request. The committee strongly encourages the Air Force RCO and the Navy Minotaur programs to collaborate with each other and the NRO.

Cross-program, cross-agency, cross-service, cross-sensor networking, and cooperative operations are essential to modern military operations in large-scale conventional warfare and in irregular warfare and man-hunting operations. However, this goal will require cultural and organizational changes, as well as technological innovation. Just as the military learned how to conduct joint operations after Goldwater-Nichols, the intelligence community at the national and tactical levels must begin to practice jointness in the tasking of collection and the exploitation and analyses of collected data.

The committee directs the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and requests the Deputy Director of National Intelligence for Intelligence Integration, to jointly conduct an assessment of the utility of fully integrating the operations of the tasking organizations for imagery collection and signals intelligence at the national level and within the service Distributed Common Ground Systems and Command Joint Intelligence Operations Centers. This assessment shall be briefed to the congressional defense and intelligence committees by June 1, 2015.

Logistics information technology

The budget request included $109.7 million in PE 78610F for the Air Force Logistics Information Technology (LOGIT) program. The committee recommends a reduction of $12.5 million to this program. The committee notes that LOGIT is intended to partially replace the planned Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS) program, which was terminated. The committee notes that two Department of Defense (DOD) analyses of the failure of the ECSS program, the "ECSS Acquisition Incident Team Final Report" and the "Root Cause Analysis of the ECSS Program Report," both highlighted a number of issues that led to the program's failure. These included: an unclear process for coupling business process changes to planned technology changes; poor program management by government and industry personnel; unrealistic program timelines and expectations; and a lack of senior management attention to program challenges.

The committee is concerned that these and other issues that plagued the ECSS program have not been adequately remedied in the LOGIT program. Therefore, the committee directs the DOD Chief Information Officer, jointly with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the Secretary of the Air Force, to provide for an independent assessment of the current acquisition and test strategy, funding plan, goals, and schedule of the LOGIT program. The study's focus should be to determine if the lessons of the ECSS program have been adequately incorporated into the LOGIT program. The study should clearly identify specific activities and processes that represent changes in the planning and execution of the LOGIT program as compared to the ECSS program, and are based on an understanding and analysis of that program's deficiencies. Further, the report should make recommendations on improvements to the LOGIT program strategy and execution, or on specific actions the program should take, to improve acquisition program outcomes. The committee directs that the independent study team be provided access to all records, data, and other relevant information as needed to develop the required study. The committee directs that the study be provided to the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2015.

Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency programs

The budget request included $2.91 billion for the research and management activities of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA). The committee commends DARPA on its efforts to support high risk, high payoff research programs that often can introduce revolutionary capabilities into the technology development programs of Services and agencies. When well-coordinated with Service efforts, DARPA programs often result in significantly enhanced operational capabilities. To support these efforts, the committee recommends two provisions elsewhere in this report which attempt to enhance the quality of DARPA's technical personnel.

The committee notes that funding for DARPA was increased in the fiscal year 2015 budget request, at a time when the overall science and technology program was decreased relative to fiscal year 2014 levels. Further, the request included a decrease of over

$150 million in basic research programs at universities, small businesses, and government laboratories.

Therefore, the committee recommends that DARPA shift its investments to support increased efforts in basic research that engage universities and other research communities in the unique programs managed by DARPA and recommends an increase of $20.0 million in PE 61101E for this purpose. The committee recommends that DARPA consider funding efforts that engage a broader set of researchers, including those from non-traditional defense contractors, universities, Department of Defense (DOD) laboratories, and small businesses, in partnership with other funded DARPA initiatives. For example, the committee believes that DARPA-managed basic research activities in cybersecurity, robotics, development of systems engineering and software development tools, advanced learning and training technologies, and modeling and simulation would be of great benefit to supporting the achievement of DOD research and development goals. The committee also believes that DARPA is best enabled to engage the basic research community in addressing fundamental science challenges underlying efforts to develop new systems to address anti-access/area denial capabilities of potential adversaries. The committee directs DARPA to provide the congressional defense committees with a plan for execution of these funds no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act. The committee reaffirms the requirement by law that all such funding be allocated on the basis of a merit-based selection, pursuant to a broad agency announcement or similar competitive process.

The committee further recommends a reduction of $20.0 million in PE 63766E. The committee recommends reducing funding for the High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System, which has been funded at DARPA for over 10 years, with over $200 million expended to date. This program history is inconsistent with the traditional DARPA model of successfully proving the technical feasibility and military value of disruptive, innovative technologies in shorter periods of time. The program still has no identified commitments for a transition pathway to a Service program for further development, and seems to have a low probability of transition, even if current technical challenges are overcome.

Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education for military children

The budget request included $45.5 million in PE 61120D8Z for the National Defense Education Program (NDEP), but no funding for pre-kindergarten through 12th grade (PK–12) Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) education activities, which have been traditionally funded at approximately $10.0 million per year. In support of a provision described elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends an additional $10.0 million for support of activities that enhance the STEM educational opportunities for military children. The committee reaffirms the requirement by law that all such funding be allocated on the basis of a merit-based selection, pursuant to a broad agency announcement or similar competitive process.

The committee notes that the NDEP has historically funded three activities related to STEM education: (1) The Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) scholarship program, established in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 108–375); (2) the National Security Science and Engineering Faculty Fellowship (NSSEFF); and (3) PK–12 STEM education activities. In the fiscal years 2014 and 2015 President's budget requests, in response to an administration initiative to consolidate STEM educational activities, the NDEP's PK–12 STEM education program was terminated, with much of the funding transferred to the NSSEFF. The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has a unique responsibility for the well-being of military children and responsibility to their servicemember parents, and believes that DOD is well-positioned to help enhance their STEM educational opportunities.

The budget request included $44.6 million in PE 61110D8Z for Basic Research Initiatives. The committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million for the NSSEFF program to return the program back to historical funding levels.

Historically black colleges and universities and minority serving institutions

The budget request included $24.4 million in PE 61228D8Z to support basic research at Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Serving Institutions (HBCU/MI). The committee recommends an additional $10.0 million to support activities that enhance efforts to increase the numbers of HBCU/MI students and graduates working in defense laboratories and defense industry; increase the number of research partnerships established between HBCU/MI research staff and faculty and their counterparts in government laboratories, industry, and academia; support the development of advanced research infrastructure at HBCU/MI schools, especially facilities that can be leveraged by other research universities; and increase the number of undergraduates funded who graduated with degrees in STEM fields and who will continue to pursue graduate degrees in STEM fields. The committee reaffirms the requirement by law that all such funding be allocated on the basis of a merit-based selection, pursuant to a broad agency announcement or similar competitive process.

The committee notes that this program had been historically funded at a level of approximately $35.0 million per year, but was reduced without sufficient justification. In testimony to the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, witnesses highlighted the value of this program in performing valuable basic research, as well as in training the next generation of scientists and engineers who may work in defense laboratories or defense industry.

Applied research for the advancement of science and technology

The budget request included $42.0 million in PE 62251D8Z for applied research for the advancement of science and technology priorities. The committee recommends a decrease of $10.0 million.

Office of the Secretary of Defense Cyber Security Research

The budget request included $15.0 million in PE 62668D8Z for Cyber Security Research. The committee is concerned that the proliferation of cyber security research programs in the Department of Defense (DOD), intelligence community, and other federal agencies, both in classified and unclassified programs, has created inefficient redundancy and duplication of efforts. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $7.5 million in PE 62668D8Z. Further, the committee directs that this program prioritize investment in activities that support research by university centers, small businesses, and non-traditional defense contractors, so as to help promote a diversity of innovative concepts and ideas into the set of programs striving to address DOD and national cyber security challenges.

Foreign technology testing

The budget request included $30.0 million in PE 63133D8Z for comparative testing of foreign technologies. The committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million in this program to reduce growth. The committee directs that efforts under this program reflect testing of technologies in the advanced technology development stage, given the realignment of this account into the defense science and technology budget. Further, the committee notes that the Department of Defense should invest similar resources in programs that ensure that domestically-produced technologies which may provide superior capabilities to existing or developmental systems are comparatively evaluated and develop policies to ensure that if appropriate, these technologies are adopted.

Science and technology analytic assessments

The budget request included $12.0 million in PE 63288D8Z for science and technology analytic assessments, $60.0 million in PE 63289D8Z for advanced innovative analysis and concepts, and $4.9 million in PE 65798D8Z for defense technology analyses. The committee recommends a reduction of $7.5 million in PE 63288D8Z, a reduction of $15.0 million in PE 63289D8Z, and a reduction of $4.75 million in PE 65798D8Z for these efforts. The committee supports analyses that can better inform research and technology efforts that will address Department of Defense concerns related to a reduction in military technological superiority of global peers, but notes that robust funding in program offices, military services and defense agencies, and in federally funded research and development centers can be used for these purposes.

Concept and technology demonstrations

The budget request included $132.0 million in PE 63648D8Z for the Joint Capability Technology Demonstration (JCTD) program. The committee is concerned over the limited transition success rate of past JCTD programs and recommends that the Department of Defense focus efforts on a smaller number of programs which represent revolutionary and disruptive technology capabilities and operational concepts that would otherwise not be funded in service development and acquisition programs. Therefore, the committee

recommends a reduction of $20.0 million in this program to reduce the number of new-start efforts.

Advanced sensor applications program

The budget request included $15.5 million in PE 63714D8Z for the Advanced Sensor Applications Program (ASAP). This represents a reduction from the level funded in fiscal year 2014 of $19.2 million.

The committee believes that this reduction will cause the program to postpone important testing and experiments. The committee believes that these efforts are too important to postpone or cancel, and therefore, recommends an increase of $4.0 million for ASAP.

Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system

The budget request included $299.6 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide, PE 63881C, for continued development of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system, including for development of the THAAD 2.0 concept. The committee believes the concept for the THAAD 2.0 is not sufficiently defined to warrant the level of funding requested. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $15.0 million in PE 63881C for development of THAAD 2.0 as early to need.

Ground-based Midcourse Defense reliability and maintenance funding

The budget included $1.0 billion in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, PE 63882C, for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system that provides homeland ballistic missile defense. However, the committee is aware that a recent independent assessment of the GMD system indicated that a number of important reliability and maintenance functions are not included in the current GMD program of record. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million in PE 63882C for the following activities: (1) Failure mitigation actions and upgrades for the Capability Enhancement II Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle; (2) Upgrades to the Command Launch Equipment and the GMD Fire Control System; and (3) Improvements to the GMD Stockpile Reliability Program, including rocket motor life assessments.

The committee believes these are necessary functions for the GMD program to work effectively and be sustainable for the planned life of the system. Therefore, the committee directs the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to develop a plan for executing these funds, and for completing the remainder of the work required to accomplish these functions within the GMD program of record. The committee further directs the Director of MDA to report to the congressional defense committees on this plan by no later than November 15, 2014. As part of this planning process, the committee expects MDA to consider the full range of funding options, including re-prioritization of funds, reprogramming actions, and adjustments to budget plans for fiscal year 2016.

Funding for Iron Dome and U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs

The budget request included $96.8 million in PE 63913C for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) for U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, including $10.7 million to improve the existing Arrow Weapon System; $54.4 million for continued development of the Arrow-3 upper tier interceptor missile; and $31.7 million for continued co-development of the David's Sling short-range ballistic missile defense system. These systems are part of Israel's layered defenses against missiles and rockets of varying ranges, from longer-range missiles from Iran or Syria, to short-range missiles and large-caliber rockets such as those fired from Lebanese territory, to the very short-range rockets and artillery fired from Gaza. The United States is jointly developing and co-managing these systems to ensure they are compatible and interoperable with U.S. missile defense systems.

The budget request also included $175.9 million in Procurement, Defense-wide for the MDA, for Israel to procure additional Iron Dome short-range rocket defense systems, including co-production of Iron Dome parts and components in the United States by U.S. industry in accordance with the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome production agreement signed on March 15, 2014. The Iron Dome system, which was developed by Israel, proved highly effective at defending against hundreds of short-range rockets launched from Gaza in 2012, and has been provided Israel with an alternative to launching large-scale military offensives to counter such rocket attacks.

The Government of Israel has requested an additional $175.0 million for Iron Dome in fiscal year 2015. The committee is supportive of the Iron Dome program and is aware that short-range rocket attacks are a continuing threat to Israel's security. The committee also supports the three cooperative missile defense programs, and recognizes that Israel may determine that it is a higher national security priority to use additional funding for these programs, given the continuing threat of rockets and missiles that could be launched from Iran, Syria, and from Lebanese territory.

Therefore, as provided in a legislative provision described elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends an increase of $175.0 million in PE 63913C for Israel to produce Iron Dome systems, including co-production of Iron Dome parts and components in the United States by U.S. industry, in accordance with the terms, conditions, and co-production targets for fiscal year 2015 in the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome production agreement. However, if Israel determines that it would be a higher priority for its national security, it may use part or all of the additional $175.0 million for the three U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs: the Arrow System Improvement Program; the Arrow-3 upper tier interceptor missile development program; and the David's Sling short-range ballistic missile defense system.

Corrosion control and prevention funding increase

The budget request included $6.0 billion in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) for Advanced Component Development & Prototypes, of which $2.9 million was for the Department of Defense (DOD) Corrosion Program.

The committee continues to be concerned that DOD has consistently underfunded the Corrosion Program since fiscal year 2011. DOD estimates that the negative effects of corrosion cost approximately $20.8 billion annually to prevent and mitigate corrosion of its assets, including military equipment, weapons, facilities, and other infrastructure.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $5.0 million in RDT&E, line 101, PE 0604016D8Z, for the DOD Corrosion Program.

Defense research and development Rapid Innovation Program

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) Rapid Innovation Program (RIP) has been funded at decreasing levels over the last few fiscal years, dropping from a high of $439.0 million in fiscal year 2011, to $175.0 million in fiscal year 2014. The committee recommends an authorization of $75.0 million in PE 64775D8Z to continue activities under this program. This decrease from previous levels of authorization reflects the need for the DOD and the Government Accountability Office to complete reviews of the program and its effectiveness, while balancing the need to maintain the program continuity and maintaining engagement with industry and acquisition program offices. The committee notes that the DOD has increased the number of organizations participating in the program, while streamlining management processes, enabling earlier solicitation of proposals from small businesses and other potential contractors. The committee further notes that preliminary evaluation of program results have identified a number of RIP-funded technologies which have transitioned into acquisition programs.

The RIP is a competitive, merit-based program established by section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) that is designed to fund innovative technologies, reduce acquisition or life-cycle costs, address technical risks, improve the timeliness of test and evaluation outcomes, and rapidly insert technologies needed to meet critical national security needs. The committee notes that $175.0 million was appropriated for the RIP in the DOD Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–6); however, no funds were requested in the budget request for fiscal year 2015.

In the 3 fiscal years during which the program has been executed, 17 defense components (including U.S. Special Operations Command, the military services, the Missile Defense Agency, U.S. Transportation Command, and others) have used the additional funding through 12 different open calls for industry proposals. The competitions resulted in over 8,600 technology-concept white papers and over 500 full proposals for funding, which were evaluated for their responsiveness to defense technology requirements and their ability to effectively transition technologies to acquisition program offices, depots, logistics, contractors, or other relevant organizations. Investments in the program have prioritized proposals that have the ability to: deliver nearer-term emerging technologies to current military operations in areas such as electronic warfare, cybersecurity tools, robotics, and dismounted force protection; con-

tribute to breakthrough technologies for future military capabilities in areas such as countering weapons of mass destruction, space systems, and hypersonics; or improve the affordability of defense operations through technologies that reduce the cost of energy and other logistical items or increase interoperability across platforms and systems.

Through this rigorous process, in fiscal years 2011 and 2012, 263 awards of less than $3.0 million each were made to innovative companies, over 90 percent of which were made to small businesses, and a majority of which leveraged previous investments made by the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) program. DOD estimates that 90 to 100 projects will be awarded through the fiscal year 2013 competitive process. Successful projects to date include, but are not limited to: enhanced ground vehicle protection, lightweight ground fire detection systems for combat outposts, automated intelligent training systems, low cost missile launchers, advanced body armor, and intrusion detection systems for port security missions.

DOD has reported that the program has increased the effectiveness of technology development activities in a number of ways, including: allowing acquisition program managers to have the flexibility to develop, test, and possibly incorporate higher performance and lower cost capabilities into programs that traditionally are unable to fund or evaluate disruptive and novel technologies; creating competitive pressures on existing defense contractors through the potential introduction of new technologies; enhancing the return on investment on the roughly $1.0 billion DOD SBIR program; and providing a new avenue for commercial industry, small businesses, and other non-traditional contractors to develop solutions to defense technology challenges.

The committee reaffirms the requirement by law that all such funding be allocated on the basis of a merit-based selection, pursuant to a broad agency announcement or similar competitive process. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to continue to refine and enhance program management and industry engagement practices to maximize the ability of the RIP to deliver new technologies to acquisition programs and operational units that would otherwise not be funded or evaluated, given resource constraints and traditional program management processes.

Chemical and Biological Defense Program under-execution

The budget request included $345.9 million in PE 64384BP for the Chemical and Biological Defense Program engineering and manufacturing development. The committee notes that this program funding line received an increase of $158.0 million—nearly 60 percent—from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2014, and with this substantial increase the program execution rate for the fiscal year 2014 funds is slower than expected.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $10.0 million for PE 64384BP for prior year under-execution delays.

Combatant Command exercise engagement and training transformation funding decrease

The budget request included $887.8 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) for RDT&E Management Support, of which $44.0 million was for Combatant Command Exercise Engagement and Training Transformation (CE2T2).

The committee is concerned that historical under-execution has occurred in the CE2T2 program with respect to the percentage of validated combatant command joint exercise transportation requirements executed in support of the joint exercise training program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.0 million in RDT&E, line 174, Program Element 0804767D8Z, for CE2T2.

Sharkseer zero-day cybersecurity program

The budget request included $125.9 million for research and development (R&D) for the National Security Agency's (NSA) Information Systems Security Program (ISSP) in PE 33140G, conducted by the Information Assurance Directorate (IAD).

The budget request includes no funds in fiscal year 2015 for the Sharkseer program. Sharkseer has been funded in previous years at the direction of the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) and has been identified by the CIO as among the highest priority cybersecurity initiatives under its purview. The committee is informed that the CIO intends in future budget submissions to transition this initiative to a permanent program of record. Sharkseer is the first concerted attempt by the Department of Defense (DOD) to buy advanced commercial technology to defend DOD networks against cyber attacks that have not been seen before—for which no signatures are available to block against. These attacks, popularly called zero-day attacks, are increasingly prevalent as adversaries employ simple morphing techniques to mask the appearance of malware that is already well-known.

The first generation of commercial products for enterprise-level zero-day detection and response capabilities that the Sharkseer program office has assembled has been deployed to a DOD Internet Access Point (IAP) for demonstration and testing. By all accounts, it has performed very well. Funds on hand, authorized and appropriated in prior years, are sufficient to deploy these capabilities operationally to three IAPs. Neither NSA nor the Defense Information Systems Agency has followed through to make funding available to deploy this capability to all the other IAPs, or for beginning work with other vendors on next-generation capabilities, or to extend capabilities to hosts.

The committee recommends an additional $30.0 million for Sharkseer to extend deployments to additional IAPs and further develop a closed-cycle concept of operations and technical capabilities to quickly translate detections at network boundaries into blockable signatures, rapidly disseminate them, and directly interact in near real-time with endpoints/hosts. The committee expects the newly forming Cyber Protection Teams to rely heavily on Sharkseer tools and capabilities.

The committee encourages the CIO to establish Sharkseer as a sustained activity to procure innovative commercial cybersecurity products and to refresh them with new products and capabilities in the same way that the DOD routinely programs funds for technology refresh on network equipment like routers, switches, and load balancers.

Defense Information Systems Agency cybersecurity research and development

The budget request included $3.2 million in PE 35103K for research and development (R&D) of cybersecurity solutions by the Mission Assurance Directorate of the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA). The DISA Information Systems Security Program PE 33140K has no R&D funds requested at all.

A strategy of procuring only mature commercial or government cybersecurity solutions is sound, but DISA has multiple, high-priority unfunded needs, and needs some R&D funding to work with industry to identify, test, and integrate commercial security solutions. In past years, the committee provided funds for the Chief Information Officer (CIO) through DISA to conduct pilot programs with advanced technology cybersecurity companies, which were very productive and valued by the CIO. This funding, too, has not been sustained.

The committee urges the DISA Director, the CIO, and the Principal Cyber Advisor to assess the lack of R&D funding for cybersecurity at DISA, and include appropriate amounts in future budget submissions. The committee recommends an authorization of $9.4 million in PE 33140K for one of DISA's highest priorities, building out the analytic platform for cyber situational awareness at the community data center. This analytic platform, analyzing a diversity of big data sources, such as full packet capture, netflow, and log data, will be a critical tool for the Cyber Protection Teams coming on line at U.S. Cyber Command. In addition, the committee recommends transferring the $3.2 million R&D request from PE 35103K to PE 33140K.

MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle

The budget request included $9.7 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide (RDTEDW), for the development, integration, and testing of special operations-unique mission kits for the MQ–9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV). U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is responsible for the rapid development and acquisition of special operations capabilities to, among other things, effectively carry out operations against terrorist networks while avoiding collateral damage.

The committee understands that the budget request only partially addresses technology gaps identified by SOCOM on its fleet of MQ–9 UAVs. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $5.2 million in RDTEDW for the MQ–9 UAV.

The committee strongly supports SOCOM's efforts to accelerate fielding of advanced weapons, sensors, and emerging technologies on its fleet of MQ–9 UAVs through the MQ–9 Medium Altitude Long Endurance Tactical program of record utilizing the Lead-Off Hitter rapid acquisition process. The committee understands this

process has successfully fielded MQ–9 UAV capabilities at greatly reduced timelines when compared to traditional acquisition processes and such capabilities have significantly improved the accuracy and lethality of MQ–9 UAVs in "find, fix, and finish" operations. The committee encourages SOCOM to continue to look for other opportunities to accelerate combat capability development through the Lead-Off Hitter approach.

Items of Special Interest

Advanced training technologies

The committee believes that the appropriate application of advanced technologies can help improve the effectiveness of training, while reducing overall costs. The committee notes that the Department of Defense has made significant progress in the development of augmented reality and augmented virtuality technologies to enhance training experiences through the use of advanced computer simulation techniques. These technologies are used to mix virtual and real-world experiences, so as to improve training outcomes. Continuing work in these areas holds the promise of developing increased virtual training capability, with resulting enhanced force readiness at reduced cost. The committee is unaware of any independent study comparing the benefits of live, virtual, augmented, and mixed reality training systems.

To help determine the value and possible need for increased emphasis on these technical areas, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide for an independent review to assess the effectiveness, in terms of cost and performance, of augmented reality and augmented virtuality training methods and tools. In particular, the study should examine the ability of these deployed or developing systems and methods to enhance the acquisition and retention of skills needed to complete critical missions, as compared with exclusively live or virtual training exercises. The report should be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

Air Force Office of Scientific Research

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Air Force announced the decision to not relocate the Air Force Office of Scientific Research (AFOSR) in testimony. The committee commends the Secretary on the decision. AFOSR plays a vital role in the development of new Air Force capabilities, by funding basic research programs at universities, small businesses, and government laboratories in areas including advanced materials, cybersecurity, hypersonics, robotics, and computer science. AFOSR investments in the past have led to a range of deployed and commercial systems ranging from the computer mouse to lasers to stealth materials used on tactical aircraft. The committee notes that AFOSR has funded research by 73 scientists and engineers who have earned Nobel Prizes in physics, chemistry, medicine, or economics. Further, AFOSR plays a leading role in Air Force engagement with the global scientific community, and in supporting the training of the next generation of scientists, engineers, and technology entre-

preneurs through science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education and graduate fellowship programs.

The research community collaborates with AFOSR at its present location, and has expressed concern to the committee about the potential adverse impact of relocation on both the mission of AFOSR and on its current federal and non-federal partners. The committee notes that AFOSR moved to its present location in the late 1990s, specifically to be physically close to other key federal research offices, including the National Science Foundation (NSF), Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), and Office of Naval Research (ONR). This co-location was endorsed as a Center of Excellence by the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission. The Commission further cautioned that placing AFOSR onto a military installation could restrict access by key partners.

The committee is concerned that any relocation could risk the Air Force losing the advantages of AFOSR's current location, which likely enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization in the performance of its Air Force-designated missions. Finally, the committee has yet to receive any detailed budget information justifying a potential move on the basis of cost savings. Accordingly, the committee directs the Air Force to put on hold any further plans for the relocation during fiscal year 2015.

Further, the committee directs the Air Force to report to the committee on AFOSR programs and activities, no later than 180 day after the enactment of this Act. The report should include information on planned activities to maintain and strengthen AFOSR's basic research function, policies, and activities being developed to ensure AFOSR can shape a workforce best-qualified to manage the Air Force basic research portfolio, activities intended to continue and expand AFOSR outreach to universities and the U.S. and global scientific community to support Air Force missions, and specific examples of coordinated research and other activities with peer federal research agencies.

Airborne signals intelligence enterprise

Due to the importance of the mission, the Air Force continues to invest heavily in signals intelligence (SIGINT) collection capabilities for multiple platforms. SIGINT is a key component of airborne collection systems that exploit multiple phenomenologies in contested and denied environments. As the Air Force moves forward with system modifications and upgrades of its SIGINT assets and capabilities, the Air Force needs to be able to leverage investments made by programs across the Department of Defense (DOD) to reduce life cycle costs of these systems.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, DOD is pursuing a number of efforts to apply open systems architecture principles for modernization and sustaining existing systems, as well as for new developments. Implementation of open systems architecture standards should enable just such sharing and help achieve the best value to the warfighter through ensuring competition throughout the lifecycle of defense acquisition programs, as directed by the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23).

The committee encourages the Air Force to continue its efforts to move to open systems architectures that will facilitate open competition at all levels for future system modifications and upgrades.

Anti-submarine warfare research and development

The committee notes that continued advancements in submarine technology present significant challenges for the United States and the international community. The Navy's Maritime Strategy lists the proliferation of submarines, both advanced diesel-electric and nuclear-propelled submarines, as potentially the principal threat to future maritime security.

Modern diesel-electric submarines are increasingly capable and lethal. Advanced air independent propulsion (AIP) systems have exponentially increased diesel submarines' underwater endurance, which provides greater survivability and freedom of movement. Additionally, diesel-electric submarines allow for smaller submarine designs, which permit greater access to littoral areas than their larger nuclear-powered counterparts. Finally, many of these submarines are capable of carrying advanced torpedoes and cruise missiles, which could threaten maritime commerce and civilian shore installations. These advanced capabilities, coupled with diesel submarines' relatively low-cost, have resulted in rapid expansion of submarine programs in nearly every region around the world.

The committee commends the Navy's proactive approach to this growing challenge, including specific training exercises designed to address modern diesel-electric submarines' unique capabilities. However, the committee also encourages the Navy to continue to pursue new technologies that could provide the next generation of undersea warfare advantages, including detection of sea-floor scarring and other non-acoustic signature.

Cargo unmanned aerial system

The committee is aware of ongoing efforts to demonstrate the military utility of a cargo unmanned aerial system (UAS) to support intra-theater operational logistics where the use of manned aircraft or ground convoys to resupply troops is uneconomical or dangerous. The committee understands that since December 2011, the Marine Corps has been conducting a Military User Assessment (MUA) of cargo UAS helicopters for supply missions in Afghanistan. The committee believes that sufficient information should be available to support the analysis associated with a formal requirements development process and decision on whether or not to transition cargo UAS helicopters to a program of record.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than April 1, 2015, on the results of the MUA and the Department's plans, if any, for establishing a program of record for the development, procurement, fielding, and sustainment of cargo UAS helicopters.

Clear technical communications

The committee is concerned with the limited ability of the Department of Defense (DOD) in communicating the values, goals, successes, and impacts of its science and technology programs to

external audiences, including Congress, the public, and government policy and decision makers. Communication of these science and technology (S&T) developments is vital to an external understanding of innovations within the DOD. Clear descriptions of support for military missions and measurable reductions in operational and acquisition costs should be key goals of communication.

The committee commends the DOD for its efforts in its "Armed With Science" blog. The web site highlights S&T developments within the DOD and is dedicated to making these developments relevant to internal and external audiences alike. "Armed With Science" operates under the mission of making science matter to everyone, and the committee believes that the DOD needs to dedicate more resources to this goal.

Combat rescue helicopter

The Air Force has announced an intention to move forward with the combat rescue helicopter (CRH) program to replace existing HH–60 helicopters that fulfill the combat search and rescue function in the Air Force. The Air Force also has informed the committee that the future years defense program (FYDP) plan for the CRH program includes a shortfall of $436.0 million needed to execute the CRH program.

The committee recognizes the importance of replacing the aging HH–60 airframe, a heavily used helicopter whose readiness rates are persistently low. The committee commends the Air Force on moving forward with the CRH program, but remains concerned that the Air Force properly budget for the program in the outyears. The committee directs the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not less than 90 days after enactment of this Act on how it will correct that funding shortfall for the CRH program in the FYDP.

EC–130H Compass Call aircraft

The committee is concerned about the plans of the Air Force to retire almost one half of the EC–130H Compass Call fleet starting in fiscal year 2016. The EC–130H Compass Call is an airborne electronic attack (AEA) platform which has proven its value in every major combat operation since Operation Just Cause in 1989 through today's conflict in Afghanistan.

The EC–130H Compass Call provides an unparalleled capability for our combatant commanders to disrupt enemy command and control communications and limit adversary coordination essential for enemy force management. As a manned platform, Compass Call is able to operate independently in a communications degraded environment. The Compass Call is also flexible since the crew includes electronic warfare officers and linguists who can make real-time decisions in the execution of electronic warfare.

To ensure support for combatant commander needs, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a plan, including milestones and resource requirements, to replace, modernize, or rehost the current Compass Call capabilities. The Secretary's plan will include a detailed assessment of what the new objective system or systems should be, what upgrades or enhancements of existing Compass Call aircraft systems will be pursued for

those aircraft remaining in the force, and how the Air Force will meet combatant commander requirements until a new objective system achieves full operational capability. The Secretary should deliver this plan to the congressional defense committees not later than September 30, 2014.

Electronic warfare threat emitters

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has initiated development and fielding of new electronic warfare testing and operational training capabilities to ensure that weapon systems and aircrews, including the F–35, are able to be appropriately tested and trained against emerging threats. The committee notes that both the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (OT&E) and the Director of the Test Resource Management Center (TRMC) are funding efforts to develop and field realistic electronic warfare threat simulators for use in developmental and operational testing. The committee also understands that the Air Force is currently fielding the Joint Threat Emitter that can simulate the multiple threat scenarios of modern integrated air defense systems to support operational training missions. The committee supports the appropriate and realistic testing and operational training of weapon systems and aircrews to meet current operational requirements, as well as emerging threats. The committee is concerned however that these well-intentioned efforts may be duplicative, not well coordinated, and not aligned with the schedule, testing, and operational training requirements of currently fielded weapons systems and the F–35.

Therefore, the committee directs that the Deputy Secretary of Defense develop a coordinated plan, among the OT&E, TRMC, Air Force, Navy, and relevant program offices and organizations, for the development and fielding of a usable set of electronic warfare threat simulation capabilities that meet current and future operational training and testing requirements and program schedule needs that sufficiently simulate all realistic threat scenarios. The plan should identify actions that promote the rapid development, fielding, and leveraging of test and operational training assets to support the most efficient deployment of capabilities on current and future weapon systems to defeat existing threats and mitigate impact of emerging threats. Further, the plan should also identify a lead agency for this coordinated effort. The committee directs that this plan be submitted to the congressional defense committees before fiscal year 2015 funds are expended on further development of these test capabilities. This restriction does not prohibit funding of threat emitters being fielded to meet current weapon system operational training requirements.

Improved turbine engine program

Over the last 3 years the committee has consistently expressed its support for the Army's Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP). The committee recognizes that ITEP faces the same challenges and fiscal risks impacting all Army research, development, and acquisition programs under the Budget Control Act of 2011. The committee understands that the Army would prefer to take ITEP competitive prototyping beyond the technology development

phase and into engineering and manufacturing development, however, future resources may not be available to do so. Nonetheless, providing adequate and stable funding for ITEP sufficient to carry at least two engine developers over the next few years and through completion of the technology development phase is important to reduce risk, achieve appropriate technology maturity, and set the conditions for ultimate program success. The committee supports the current program funding profile and schedule and encourages the Army to maintain stability and therefore momentum in the program as resources and technical progress allow.

Inter-agency coordination on medical countermeasures development

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) has a robust research and development (R&D) program to provide bio-defense medical countermeasures for military and civilian personnel to protect them against biological threats. The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) also conducts significant R&D of bio-defense medical countermeasures for public health. The committee understands that the two departments have established an interagency process for coordination and collaboration on bio-defense medical countermeasure development, to ensure that the bio-defense needs of both military and civilian populations are met while avoiding duplication of effort and maximizing the benefits of limited resource allocation.

The committee believes such coordination and collaboration are essential, and believes it is important to understand the mechanism and process by which the two departments manage this process with other interagency partners. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense committees an unclassified report, not later than November 1, 2015, describing the process and mechanisms by which the DOD coordinates its bio-defense medical countermeasures development with those of the DHHS. The report should describe the roles of the various interagency partners in deciding R&D priorities and responsibilities, and how the process avoids duplication of effort.

National Security Agency cybersecurity research and development

The budget request included $125.9 million for research and development (R&D) for the National Security Agency's (NSA) Information Systems Security Program (ISSP) in PE 33140G, conducted by the Information Assurance Directorate (IAD), a reduction of one-third from the $181.6 million appropriated in fiscal year 2014.

This steep R&D reduction resulted in part because of the NSA IAD's insistence, despite the recommendation of the Office of the Chief Information Officer (CIO) and the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, on maintaining the level of funding in its operations and maintenance budget to protect its government workforce.

The committee urges the Principal Cyber Advisor and the CIO to review the IAD cybersecurity R&D budget and to augment that budget, as appropriate, through reprogramming actions. The committee also urges the CIO and NSA's leadership to determine IAD's

sustainable government workforce levels in connection with future budget submissions.

Supporting commercialization of defense laboratory technologies

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) executes a number of activities to promote the transfer of technology from DOD laboratories or agencies to commercial entities, for potential further technology development or commercialization. These activities can support the development of new military capabilities that can be incorporated into acquisition programs, and also enhance the return on taxpayers' investments in defense research programs, while creating jobs and stimulating the economy. The committee notes that the administration has established a major technology transfer initiative, "Lab-to-Market," with a goal of establishing policies and programs that streamline the ability for the private sector to leverage the inventions and innovation that occur inside federal laboratories to support national missions. Further, the committee notes that the recent Institute for Defense Analyses study, "Exemplar Practices for Department of Defense Technology Transfer," identified a number of best practices that enhance the efficiency of technology transfer processes, including the establishment of partnerships between labs, universities, and industry, marketing laboratory technologies and capabilities to industry, and using existing technology transfer mechanisms and authorities to full potential. Finally, the committee notes that DOD recently established a "Technology Transfer Center of Excellence," which will help DOD transfer technologies developed at its defense laboratories to the commercial marketplace. Consistent with these efforts and findings, the committee recommends that DOD continue to expand its technology transfer activities, including through the use of expertise in university centers, industry associations, and government organizations to identify and proliferate best technology transfer practices.

Technology transition of successful research initiatives

Since its inception more than 55 years ago, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has invested in a number of groundbreaking new technology advances, some of which have resulted in significantly enhanced military capabilities as well as commercial products that benefit the nation. DARPA has a unique role within the Department of Defense (DOD) and is intended to be a specialized technological engine for pursuing radical innovations and high-payoff research projects that can transform military capabilities beyond near-term needs and requirements.

The committee fully supports the important role that DARPA fills in pursuing cutting edge concepts and technologies that improve military capabilities. The committee believes that continued investment in high-risk, high-payoff research and development projects is critical, given the broad and complex range of current and emerging security threats facing our nation. In addition, with current fiscal constraints driving reductions in force structure, readiness, and modernization in DOD, it is essential that we sustain a robust science and technology enterprise to support military

readiness and to deliver advanced technologies and capabilities to operational forces.

Based on the nature of research endeavors, it is expected that some technology projects may not achieve their intended goals and objectives or are just the first steps towards proof of concept and development. However, the committee is concerned that some technology projects may be successfully completed, but fail to transition into acquisition programs of record or directly into operational use. This may be because of administrative, funding, cultural, and/or programmatic barriers that make it difficult to bridge the gap from science and technology programs to acquisition programs, as well to the expected users of the technology. As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and others have previously reported, transitioning technologies from defense science and technology organizations to military users has been a long-standing challenge for DOD. These reports have found that sometimes technologies are not ready to transition when needed because they may still be too risky or too costly to adopt or have not been adequately demonstrated. In other cases, promising technologies are not taken advantage of because of insufficient processes and mechanisms to expedite their transition to users. These transition barriers and failures reduce the return on investment for science and technology funding, and create severe funding challenges for research performers in industry and government, who must strive to sustain a skilled workforce, and specialized equipment and facilities, during periods of funding discontinuities.

The committee further notes that the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and defense agencies manage over $2.0 billion in science and technology programs aside from those in the DARPA budget. The committee is concerned that these programs are facing the same technology transition challenges that DARPA faces.

The committee directs the GAO to review DARPA, OSD, and the defense agencies technology transition processes, practices, and results. In conducting this review, GAO should assess: (1) The policies, processes, and mechanisms that have been established to plan for and facilitate the transition of technologies to users; (2) The extent to which organizations use existing DOD and military department technology transition programs and initiatives such as the Rapid Innovation program, Joint Capability Technology Demonstrations, and the Small Business Innovation Research program; (3) DARPA projects considered technically successful that were not transitioned, directly or indirectly, into operational use or service acquisition programs and the underlying reasons for those transition failures; (4) How organizations track and measure technology transition; and (5) The factors that hinder the transition of promising technologies.

The committee further directs that the GAO submit a report on this review to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act.

Unmanned underwater vehicles and the public shipyards

In the House report accompanying H.R. 1960 (H. Rpt. 113–102) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives ex-

pressed its belief that in order "to maintain undersea dominance in maritime regions of significant economic and military importance to the United States, the Navy requires disruptive technologies that can be rapidly developed, demonstrated, evaluated, and fielded to counter expanding undersea capabilities by peer and near-peer maritime nations and to extend the Navy's reach and persistence." The committee expressed its concern that, under the Navy's acquisition plan, the Navy would not have the new technologies it needs to meet these requirements until after 2020.

The Committee on Armed Services of the Senate agrees with the views expressed by the House. Unmanned underwater vehicles (UUV) will be critical to the protection of U.S. economic and national security interests. Integrating them and other autonomous undersea technologies and payloads into the undersea warfare mission area will expand the technology base and more rapidly provide warfighting options that are not currently achievable.

The committee remains concerned that the Navy may not be able to develop the necessary capabilities to achieve its goal of deploying large displacement UUV (LDUUV) from an operational UUV squadron on independent missions by 2020. Further, the committee believes that budget constraints may further hamper the development of these critical capabilities. For these reasons, with respect to the development of UUVs, the committee believes that the Navy should look for opportunities to capitalize on existing resources and assets within the Navy enterprise to expedite the development of these vehicles and their technology at the lowest possible cost.

Particularly with respect to the LDUUV project, the committee encourages the Navy to take full advantage of existing expertise and infrastructure at the public shipyards. The committee believes that the public shipyards may be able to assist the LDUUV project with engineering, configuration management, acquisition support, technical problem solving, and operations and logistics support, including life-cycle maintenance and mission package support.

Therefore, no later than September 30, 2014, the committee directs the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees detailing how the Navy is currently utilizing, and plans to utilize, the public shipyard infrastructure and expertise for UUV research, development, engineering, configuration management, acquisition support, technical problem solving, and operations and logistics support, including life-cycle maintenance and mission package support. In addition, the report should identify all funding by fiscal year, appropriation, and line item/program element budgeted in support of this effort.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations

Authorization of appropriations (sec. 301)

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

Subtitle B—Energy and the Environment

Method of funding for cooperative agreements under the Sikes Act (sec. 311)

The Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670a–670o) provides the secretary of a military department the authority to enter into cooperative agreements with the states, local governments, Indian tribes, nongovernmental organizations, and the heads of other federal departments and agencies to maintain and improve the natural resources on or off military and National Guard installations.

The committee recommends a provision that would amend this section of the Sikes Act (16 U.S.C. 670c–1) to allow the funds for such a cooperative agreement to be paid in a lump sum that includes an amount to cover future costs of the activities provided for under the agreement. The provision would also allow the funds be placed in an interest-bearing account provided that the interest or income is applied for the same purpose as the principal.

Environmental Restoration at former Naval Air Station, Chincoteague, Virginia (sec. 312)

The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has the administrative jurisdiction over the Wallops Flight Facility, Virginia. The site includes the area formerly known as the Naval Air Station Chincoteague, Virginia, including the Naval Aviation Ordnance Test Station, Virginia.

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to undertake an environmental restoration project in the area with regard to pollutants or contaminants that are solely attributable to Department of Defense activities while the property was under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Navy. The project may be entered into either jointly or in conjunction with an environmental restoration project of the Administrator.

The provision also provides that the Secretary and the Administrator may enter into an agreement to provide for the effective and efficient performance of environmental restoration projects in the area. The Secretary may use funds available in the Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites account for these environmental restoration projects.

Limitation on availability of funds for procurement of drop-in fuels (sec. 313)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit Department of Defense funds to be used for bulk purchases of drop-in fuel for operational purposes during fiscal year 2015, unless the cost of that drop-in fuel is cost competitive with traditional fuel, subject to a national security waiver. The committee notes that the phrase "cost competitive" in this section generally refers to prices that are equal to or lower than prices offered by competitors for similar goods or services. However, the committee notes that terms and conditions for particular purchases may vary; in particular, long-term energy purchases are likely to have different pricing structures from short-term or spot-market purchases. Accordingly, the committee believes some flexibility in the application of this phrase is anticipated, where necessary to address such differences. The committee understands that average prices over the period of a long-term contract would be cost competitive.

Study on implementation of requirements for consideration of fuel logistics support requirements in planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes (sec. 314)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, on the implementation of section 332 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The report shall describe the implementzation to date of the requirements for consideration of fuel logistics support requirements in the planning, requirements development, and acquisition processes for: (1) Acquisition solicitations that incorporate analysis established and developed pursuant to section 332; (2) The fully burdened cost of energy and energy key performance parameters in relation to other metrics; (3) The total fuel costs avoided as a result of inclusion of the fully burdened cost of energy and energy key performance parameters, including an estimate of monetary savings and fuel volume savings; and (4) The extent to which the energy security requirements of the Department of Defense are enhanced.

Comptroller General study of Department of Defense research and development projects and investments to increase energy security and meet energy goals requirements (sec. 315)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Comptroller General to conduct a review of Department of Defense projects, strategy, resourcing, research, development, and investment in pursuit of increasing energy security, decreasing energy consumption and logistical burdens, reducing tactical and strategic vulnerabilities, and meeting renewable energy goals set forth in section 2911(e) of title 10, United States Code.

Decontamination of a portion of former bombardment area on island of Culebra, Puerto Rico (sec. 316)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that certain limited portions of the former bombardment area on the Island of Culebra should be available for safe public recreational use while the remainder of the area is most advantageously reserved as habitat for endangered and threatened species.

The provision would also change a legislative restriction in section 204(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act, 1974 (Public Law 93–166) which provides that section shall not apply to the beaches, the campgrounds, and the Carlos Rosario Trail, as defined in the provision.

The provision would also allow, notwithstanding the quitclaim deed, the Secretary of the Army to expend funds available in the Environmental Restoration Account, Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS), established pursuant to section 2703(a)(5) of title 10, United States Code, to decontaminate the beaches, the campgrounds, and the Carlos Rosario Trail of unexploded ordnance.

The committee notes that the purpose of this provision is to lift the statutory restriction that is barring the Secretary of the Army from decontaminating this part of Culebra Island. This decontamination project should be prioritized within the regular process with all other FUDS.

Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment

Modification of annual reporting requirement related to prepositioning of materiel and equipment (sec. 321)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2229(c) of title 10, United States Code to sunset after 3 years, the Comptroller General's annual review of the Department of Defense's progress in implementing its strategic policy and plan for its prepositioned stocks.

Modification of quarterly readiness reporting requirement (sec. 322)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 482 of title 10, United States Code, to update and streamline the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress (QRRC). The committee also strongly urges the Department of Defense (DOD) to remove Supplement One from future QRRCs as the information therein is readily available in the public domain. The committee notes that the recommended provision would include a separate assessment for the United States Cyber Command.

The committee also notes that while the recommended provision strikes the reporting requirement on major exercise assessments, the committee directs DOD to report on an after-action assessment of any major exercise related to nuclear command, control, and communications for 3 years after enactment of this Act, beginning with the first QRRC of fiscal year 2015. The report may be in classified format, as appropriate.

The committee strongly urges DOD to move the information captured in Supplement Two of the QRRC to Annex B in order to avoid duplication and maximize efficiency.

Elimination of authority to abolish arsenals (sec. 323)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4532 of Title 10, United States Code, the Arsenal Act, and eliminate the ability of the Secretary of the Army to abolish any U.S. arsenal considered to be unnecessary.The provision would also make it the objective of the Secretary of the Army, in managing the workload of the arsenals, to maintain the critical capabilities identified in the Army Organic Industrial Base Strategy Report, and to ensure cost efficiency and technical competence in peacetime, while preserving the ability to provide an effective and timely response to mobilizations, national defense contingency situations, and other emergent requirements.

Subtitle D—Reports

Repeal of annual report on Department of Defense operation and financial support for military museums (sec. 331)

The committee recommends a provision, as requested by the Department of Defense (DOD), that would repeal section 489 of title 10, United States Code, which requires the Secretary of Defense to submit annually to Congress a report on DOD operation and financial support for military museums. The committee notes that preparation of this report requires extensive data collection, but the DOD components do not use the information in the report to manage their programs. Repeal of the report will save the DOD $39,000 per year.

Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority

Limitation on MC–12 aircraft transfer to United States Special Operations Command (sec. 341)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the transfer of 24 MC–12 aircraft from the Air Force to U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) for manned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) until the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, in coordination with the Commander of SOCOM, provides the congressional defense committees with an analysis and justification for such a transfer.

The committee notes that since 2005, SOCOM has spent more than $524.0 million to field 33 U–28 ISR aircraft to support near-term ISR requirements in Afghanistan and Iraq as well as longer-term ISR requirements in Asia-Pacific, Africa, and elsewhere. The committee is concerned that SOCOM now plans to divest most of these aircraft in favor of MC–12 aircraft without sufficient analysis and justification. For example, the July 2005 Aircraft Selection Report supporting SOCOM's decision to acquire single engine U–28 aircraft as opposed to other available multi-engine aircraft indicated that "engine failures in multi-engine aircraft are much more

likely to cause an accident according to the Federal Aviation Administration." The committee is concerned appropriate safety analysis has not been conducted to support the change to a multi-engine ISR aircraft and has included additional information on this matter in the classified annex accompanying this bill. Furthermore, the committee understands that MC–12 aircraft may require significant investment to support integration of sensor capabilities similar to those provided by the U–28 without meeting its long-term manned ISR requirements.

The committee believes that until further analysis is completed and presented to the congressional defense committees, SOCOM should continue to use available operation and maintenance funding to resource flying hours for its existing inventory of U–28 and MC–12 JAVAMAN I/II aircraft. Elsewhere in this bill, the committee recommends no funding for MC–12 modifications in fiscal year 2015.

The committee notes that the budget request included $41.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, and $10.5 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, to support aircraft to be flown by the Air National Guard in support of SOCOM aviation foreign internal defense (AvFID) missions. The committee supports this effort and notes that the limitation included in this provision and the reduction in funding for MC–12 modifications contained elsewhere in the bill do not apply to the AvFID program.

Limitation on establishment of regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers (sec. 342)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized for fiscal year 2015 to establish Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers (RSCC) by U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM).

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) included a similar prohibition and required the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to submit a report on the purpose, cost, and the authorities necessary for the establishment of RSCCs. While the required report was submitted on April 16, 2014, it left a number of questions unanswered related to the long-term funding required to support RSCCs in each geographic combatant command (GCC); the relative funding that would be provided by SOCOM, the GCCs, and the host nation or other participating nations; and coordination with other engagement activities conducted by the GCCs and the Department of State. Additionally, the report states that "Providing confirmed and sustained out-year support is critical to realizing the full potential of an RSCC." However, the report also identifies additional legislative authorities that would need to be addressed for such "confirmed and sustained" support to occur while indicating "there are currently no plans to seek these additional authorities."

The committee believes issues related to funding and authorities need to be resolved before RSCCs are established. The committee also believes that SOCOM should focus its efforts and resources on supporting regional special operations engagement activities that are hosted in and led by partner nations. For example, the com-

mittee understands that Colombia is working to establish the "Centro Regional de Estudios Avanzados de Seguridad" or CREAS, that will, among other things, bring together regional special operations forces for educational, training, and other events. The committee notes that the recommended provision would not prohibit the provision of support to regional special operations coordination activities, like CREAS, led by and established in partner nations, provided they are consistent with broader military-to-military objectives and coordinated with the Department of State and relevant country teams.

Further, the committee believes that SOCOM has not fully explored the viability of expanded cooperation with the regional security studies centers and believes that expanded cooperation with the existing centers should be prioritized. As such, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD(P)) to conduct a review of the existing regional centers and establish a process through which the SOCOM Commander's priorities are more effectively incorporated in their activities. Once this review is complete, the committee directs the USD(P) to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees.

Elsewhere in this bill, the committee recommends a reduction of $1.8 million from the requested amount in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for RSCC concept development, study, and planning in fiscal year 2015.

Subtitle F—Other Matters

Repeal of authority relating to use of military installations by Civil Reserve Air Fleet contractors (sec. 351)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 9513 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the use of military installations by commercial air carriers doing business with the Department of Defense. Under this program, the Secretary of the Air Force has been authorized to enter into contracts with air carriers authorizing the use of designated installations as: (1) Weather-related landing alternatives; (2) Technical stops not involving the enplaning or deplaning of passengers or cargo; or (3) In the case of an installation within the United States, for other commercial purposes. While the legislation envisioned such agreements as a potential incentive for obtaining air carrier commitment to the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program, the Secretary's authority has not resulted in a single contract in its almost 20 years of existence.

Revised policy on ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms (sec. 352)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 352 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (P.L. 113–66) that established a policy that the Secretary of Defense shall eliminate the development and fielding of Armed Forces-specific combat and camouflage utility uniforms and families-of-uniforms for specific combat environments to be used by all members of the Armed Forces.

The committee notes that the guidance for the military services and combatant commands required to implement this policy has

not yet been delivered to the committee. The committee also notes that based on demand and price differentials, the average contract price for the current Marine Corps desert blouse is $33.70, compared to the Navy's blouse contract unit price of $36.04. The average contract price for the current Marine Corps woodland and desert trousers is $35.82, compared to the Navy's trousers unit price of $44.45. The committee notes that based on current annual demand, the Navy could save approximately $724,000 by simply fielding the Marine Corps combat uniform to sailors. Additional savings may be found by combining Navy and Marine Corps combat uniform planning, item production, warehousing, and follow-on sustainment efforts.

The committee believes that an implementation plan is necessary to ensure that the Department of Defense develops a schedule and identifies the actions necessary to fulfill the Department's policy on ground combat and camouflage utility uniforms.

Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas (sec. 353)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide that the Secretary of the Navy will establish areas, to be known as the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas, for national defense purposes. The areas are defined by coordinate boundaries in the provision. Sections 4 and 9 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533, 1538) and Sections 101 and 102 of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1371, 1372) would not apply with respect to the incidental takings of any southern sea otter in the Southern Sea Otter Military Readiness Areas in the course of conducting a military readiness activity. For purposes of military readiness activities, the otters within the readiness areas would be treated, for purposes of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1536), as a member of a species that is proposed to be listed as an endangered species or threatened species under section 4 of that Act.

The Secretary of Interior would be able to revise or terminate the exceptions to the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act if the Secretary were to determine, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy and the Marine Mammal Commission, that the military activities occurring in the readiness areas were impeding southern sea otter conservation or the return of the sea otters to optimum sustainable population levels.

The provision would also repeal Section 1 of Public Law 99–625 (16 U.S.C. 1536 note).

Budget Items

Army and Army Reserve readiness unfunded priorities increases

The budget request included $33.2 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), of which $1.0 billion was for land forces depot maintenance and $2.0 billion was for facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization (SRM). The budget request also included $2.4 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR), of which $58.8 million was for land forces depot maintenance.

The Army has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could help offset the negative impacts from sequestration and accelerate readiness recovery. The committee notes that these recommended increases will restore some critical depot maintenance requirements for the Army and the Army Reserve.

The committee also notes that these recommended increases will satisfy the Army's 6 percent capital investment program, as required by law.

Accordingly, the committee recommends increases in OMA of $185.6 million for land forces depot maintenance and $94.3 million in SRM. The committee also recommends an increase of $15.0 million in OMAR for land forces depot maintenance.

Facilities Sustainment

The committee recognizes that facilities sustainment funding is often deferred in difficult budget times in favor of other priorities. However, underfunding of facilities sustainment accepts greater risk that facilities will fail prematurely and, in the longer term, result in higher restoration and replacement costs. The committee notes that requested funding for facilities sustainment has fallen from $8.5 billion in fiscal year 2013 to $6.4 billion for fiscal year 2015, a decrease of 25 percent in only 3 years.

On April 2, 2014, the Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment testified before the committee that, "Sustainment represents the Department's single most important investment in the condition of its facilities . . . While the Department's goal is to fund sustainment at 90 percent of modeled requirements, the funding level noted above supports an average DOD-wide sustainment funding level of 65 percent of the Facilities Sustainment Model requirement."

The committee believes that the dramatic decrease in facilities sustainment funding represents an unacceptable risk to the readiness of Department of Defense facilities. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $105.0 million in Operation and Maintenance for facilities sustainment across the active, guard, and reserve components.

Foreign currency fluctuation reductions

The budget request included $33.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), $39.0 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), $5.9 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), $35.3 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), and $31.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW).

The committee believes that when foreign currency fluctuation (FCF) rates are determined by the Department of Defense, the balance of the FCF funds should be considered, particularly if the balance is close to the cap of $970.0 million. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has informed the committee that as of March 2014, the Department has not transferred in any prior year unobligated balances to replenish the account for fiscal year 2014 from a beginning balance of $970.0 million. A GAO analysis projects that the Department will experience a net gain of $351.9 million due to

favorable foreign exchange rates and will lose $248.1 million in fiscal year 2015 in FCF.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $48.9 million to OMA, $74.2 million to OMN, $28.4 million to OMMC, $51.9 million to OMAF, and $17.5 million to OMDW for FCF.

Projected overstatement for Army civilian personnel

The budget request included $33.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA). Army officials have informed the committee that they expect an average civilian personnel end strength for fiscal year 2015 that is 2,600 (1 percent) lower than planned in the budget, due to reductions in the workforce since the time that budget estimates were made last year.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $250.0 million in OMA for overstatement of civilian personnel.

Undistributed travel reductions

The budget request included $33.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), of which $829.3 million was for travel of persons. The budget request included $39.0 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), of which $569.4 million was for travel of persons. The budget request included $5.9 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), of which $183.2 million was for travel of persons. The budget request included $35.3 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which $673.8 million was for travel of persons. The budget request included $31.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) of which $678.1 million was for travel of persons.

The committee believes that a portion of the planned Department of Defense travel budget should be realigned to support higher priority readiness requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an undistributed decrease of $21.1 million to OMA, $14.5 million to OMN, $4.8 million to OMMC, $17.3 million to OMAF, and $17.3 million to OMDW for travel.

Army National Guard readiness funding increase

The budget request included $6.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), of which $198.3 million was for maneuver units. The budget request also included $128.9 billion in Military Personnel Appropriations (MPA).

The committee recommends an increase of $23.0 million in OMARNG for maneuver units and $45.0 million in MPA.

The committee notes that these recommended increases will ensure that two brigade combat teams will be able to attend combat training center (CTC) rotations in fiscal year 2015, which is the top request on the Army National Guard's unfunded requirements list. These funding increases will also provide additional enabler support during CTC rotations for the active component which does not require personnel growth.

Army National Guard advertising reduction

The budget request included $274.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG). The committee

believes some of the advertising funding should be realigned to support higher priority readiness requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $13.8 million in OMARNG for advertising.

Navy readiness unfunded priorities increases

The budget request included $39.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), of which $814.7 million was for aircraft depot maintenance and $1.4 billion was for sustainment, restoration, and modernization (SRM).

The Navy has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could help offset the negative impacts from sequestration and accelerate readiness recovery. The committee notes that these recommended increases will fund some of the Navy's fiscal year 2015 unfunded requirements for aircraft depot maintenance.

The committee further notes that the recommended funding increase for SRM will enable the Navy to meet the minimum capital investment threshold of 6 percent across all shipyards and depots, as required by law.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase in OMN of $108.9 million in aircraft depot maintenance and $85.2 million in SRM.

Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests

The fiscal year 2015 budget request reduced the number of Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests by two. Given the importance of these tests to the readiness of the strategic submarine force, the committee recommends $1.3 million to conduct an additional Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Test.

Aircraft carrier defueling planning funds

The budget request included $46.0 million in the Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) account for advance planning funding for defueling of the USS George Washington (CVN–73) in fiscal year 2017.

It is the committee's intent that the Navy proceed with the refueling and complex overhaul of the USS George Washington (CVN–73) should additional funds be made available in fiscal year 2015 for that purpose.

Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of $46.0 million in OMN, and an increase of $46.0 million for CVN Refueling Overhauls in the Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy account.

Marine Corps unfunded priorities increase

The budget request included $5.9 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), of which $905.7 million was for operational forces.

The Marine Corps has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could help offset some negative impacts from sequestration and accelerate readiness recovery. The committee notes that this recommended increase will improve the Marine Corps ability to resource new Special-Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Forces in U.S. Central and U.S. Southern Combatant Commands areas of responsibility.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $33.8 million in OMMC for operational forces.

The committee further notes that in a separate budget item, the recommended funding increase for facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization will enable the Marine Corps to meet the minimum capital investment threshold of 6 percent across all depots, as required by law.

Marine Corps tuition assistance

The budget request included $19.1 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for off duty and voluntary education programs. At the request of the Marine Corps, the committee recommends an increase of $15.7 million in OMMC for tuition assistance.

The budget request also included $105.7 million in PE 63611M for Marine Corps assault vehicles. At the request of the Marine Corps, the committee recommends a decrease of $15.7 million in PE 63611M or the new amphibious vehicle project.

Museum reduction

The budget request included $362.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC) for Administration, of which $9.1 million was for an expansion of the National Museum of the Marine Corps (NMMC).

The committee believes that the funding should be realigned to support higher priority readiness requirements given the funding increase of $9.1 million is comparable to the entire cost of the Marine Corps Prepositioning Program Norway in fiscal year 2015, and the baseline request for the NMMC is already $49.5 million.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $9.1 million in OMMC for the NMMC.

RC–135 Rivet Joint

The budget request included classified amounts in Air Force Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), PE 35207F, for the RC–135 Rivet Joint signals intelligence collection program. This request exceeds the amount requested in fiscal year 2014, when operational tempos and budgets were higher. The committee recommends a reduction of $8.0 million, which represents an increase over the fiscal year 2014 appropriated amount.

Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support reduction

The budget request included $35.3 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which $871.8 million was for Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support.

The committee recommends a decrease of $11.0 million in OMAF for a classified program. Additional information is provided in the classified annex.

Joint Enabling Capabilities Command

The budget request included $237.3 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for Combatant Commanders Core Operations, of which $40.7 million was for Joint Enabling Capabilities Command (JECC).

The committee believes this funding should be realigned to support high priority readiness requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $20.0 million in OMAF for JECC.

United States Pacific Command unfunded priorities increases

The budget request included $35.3 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which $1.0 billion was in logistics operations.

The United States Pacific Command (PACOM) has identified specific amounts in readiness accounts that could help offset the negative impacts of sequestration and accelerate readiness recovery. The committee notes that this recommended increase will mitigate a critical munitions shortfall program for PACOM.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $10.3 million in OMAF for logistics operations.

In the procurement of ammunition budget tables, the committee recommends a related funding increase to mitigate a critical munitions shortfall program for PACOM.

U.S. Special Operations Command-National Capital Region

The budget request includes $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the U.S. Special Operations Command-National Capital Region (SOCOM–NCR) initiative. The committee received notification on March 19, 2014, from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict that SOCOM has discontinued efforts to develop and implement its concept for a SOCOM–NCR office.

Therefore, the committee recommends no funding in OMDW for the SOCOM–NCR.

Regional Special Operations Forces Coordination Centers

The budget request includes $3.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Regional Special Operations Coordination Centers (RSCC). The committee believes that the requested funding is excessive for the purposes of concept development, study, & planning as outlined in the budget justification materials. Elsewhere in the bill, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit establishment of RSCCs.

Therefore, the committee recommends $1.8 million in OMDW for RSCC concept development, study, and planning.

U.S. Special Operations Command unfunded readiness requirements

The budget request included $4.76 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM). The committee notes that the Commander of SOCOM has identified $344.2 million in unfunded readiness requirements for U.S. Special Operations Forces. The committee is concerned that current fiscal pressures have forced SOCOM to assume unacceptable risk in its training programs.

Therefore, the committee recommends an additional $36.4 million to support aircrew training hours, the SOCOM Commander's

top unfunded readiness requirement, and $20.0 million for high priority unit readiness training, which was also identified by the SOCOM Commander as an unfunded readiness requirement.

Department of Defense STARBASE program

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

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

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $25.0 million for the DOD STARBASE program.

Procurement technical assistance program

The budget request included $381.4 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Defense Logistics Agency, of which, $23.0 million was for the procurement technical assistance program (PTAP).

The committee notes that the purpose of the PTAP is to enhance the industrial base, improve local economies, and generate employment by assisting small businesses with help from the Department of Defense, federal agencies, and state and local governments.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of $12.7 million in OMDW for the PTAP.

Defense Security Cooperation Agency

The budget request includes $544.8 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, of which $34.4 million is for the Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP). While the committee remains supportive of this program, the committee is concerned about the expanding activities and increased operating costs of the CTFP at a time of fiscal challenges. The committee encourages the CTFP to focus its activities on its core counterterrorism training and education and a limited number of regions where the threat posed by terrorism is the most significant. As such, the committee recommends an undistributed decrease of $7.0 million for the CTFP.

The budget request also includes $12.2 million for the Defense Institute Reform Initiative (DIRI) and $2.6 million for the Defense Institute for International Legal Studies (DIILS). While the committee recommends no funding reduction to the DIRI and the DIILS programs, the committee directs the Director of the Defense

Security Cooperation Agency to adjust, as appropriate, the budget documentation in the next fiscal year to redirect the funding from DIRI and DIILS to the human rights training initiative authorized in this Act.

Funding for impact aid

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

[Changes in millions of dollars]

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

Defense-wide funding decrease for ahead of need request

The budget request included $186.9 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), of which $80.6 million was for water and wastewater infrastructure improvements. The committee remains concerned that the funds requested for the OEA are ahead of need. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $80.6 million in OMDW for the OEA.

Defense-wide funding decrease for 2015 base realignment and closure support

The budget request included $1.8 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, of which $4.8 million was support for a 2015 round of base realignment and closure (BRAC).

The bill recommended by the committee would prohibit the expenditure of funds for a new BRAC round. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.8 million in OMDW for the 2015 BRAC round.

Department of Defense rewards program reduction

The budget request included $1.8 billion in the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, of which $7.9 million was for the Department of Defense (DOD) rewards program.

The committee is concerned that the DOD rewards program has been hampered by historical under-execution for several years now. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.0 million in OMDW for the DOD rewards program.

Additional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to United States Africa Command

The budget request includes $31.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW). Within that amount for classified programs, the budget justification material identifies no specific funding to sustain intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) support to any of U.S. Africa Command's (AFRICOM) ongoing operations.

The fiscal year 2015 request includes no funding for contract ISR, which will mean that, absent congressional action, Operation Observant Compass ISR support will depend on the Global Force Management Allocation Process (GFMAP). The GFMAP has not resulted in adequate ISR support to AFRICOM in the past. Therefore, the committee recommends $60.0 million in OMDW to sustain ISR support to AFRICOM and further directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure the GFMAP is used to provide appropriate ISR support to AFRICOM operations.

Defense Clandestine Service

The budget request included classified amounts in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), for the Human Intelligence Enabling project for the Defense Clandestine Service (DCS) initiative in the Defense Intelligence Agency. The request represents an increase of $13.3 million for fiscal year 2014. The Department of Defense (DOD) has consistently maintained that the DCS initiative would be executed within existing planned resources, and the committee notes that DOD's original plans for DCS have been scaled back. The committee does not support growth in this area and recommends a decrease of $13.3 million.

Operational support to the Defense Clandestine Service

The budget request includes classified amounts in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Operational Human Intelligence project in the Military Intelligence Program budget of the Defense Intelligence Agency. The budget request for this project includes an increase of $5.1 million in support for the Defense Clandestine Service. The Department of Defense (DOD) has consistently maintained that the DCS initiative would be executed within existing planned resources, and the committee notes that DOD's original plans for DCS have been scaled back. The committee does not support growth in this area and recommends a decrease of $5.1 million.

Review of operation of certain ships during Vietnam era

The budget request included $31.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW). In a legislative provision located in title X of this committee report, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to review within 1 year of the date of enactment of this Act the logs of each Navy ship known to have operated in the waters near Vietnam between January 9, 1962, and May 7, 1975, to determine whether the ship operated in the territorial waters of the Republic of Vietnam during that period, and if so, when.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase in OMDW of $5.0 million to reflect this provision.

Support for international sporting competitions

The budget request included $1.8 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Miscellaneous Appropriations (OMMA), of which $10.0 million was for Support for International Sporting Competitions (SISC), Defense account.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense expects to allocate approximately $1.0 million to $3.0 million in SISC resources in support of the 2015 Special Olympics World Summer Games.

The committee is concerned that as of March 2014, the SISC account still has $3.8 million from fiscal year 2013 in unallocated carryover, in addition to $4.3 million in allocated but unobligated funds for sporting events that have since concluded from the 1990s and the early 2000s.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $4.3 million in OMMA to the SISC Defense account.

Items of Special Interest

Acoustic mixing

The committee understands that the Army currently uses low-frequency, high-intensity sound waves, in a technology called "acoustic mixing" during the manufacturing of some munitions. Acoustic mixing makes it possible to efficiently mix a wide variety of materials, including highly viscous substances. The committee further understands that this process could have the potential to improve industrial efficiency and productivity. The committee encourages the Army to continue to evaluate acoustic mixing capabilities that could increase industrial productivity, decrease adverse environmental impacts, and enhance safety.

Active and Reserve funding efficiencies for training

The committee understands that the pace of recent combat and contingency operations, the needs of the total force, and fiscal constraints have determined the Army's use for brigade-level combat training at each of its three Combat Training Centers (CTC). Active duty brigade combat teams (BCT) conduct training at one of the CTC every 2 to 3 years on average, while Army National Guard BCT conduct collective CTC training every 7 years on average.

The committee believes that there may be cost effective and efficient options for active component training using reserve component training facilities. For active component units not assigned to combat brigades, at echelons above or below brigade-level, and for those units not routinely participating in a CTC rotation, the committee is interested to learn if reserve component regional training institutes and centers may provide a cost effective means to provide access to enhanced training resources and improve or sustain readiness.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to review current unit training funding mechanisms that do or could allow for possible integration and use of active component units at reserve component training facilities. The review should consider existing policies and processes for active and reserve component training and resources, and recommendations that may improve training effectiveness and cost efficiency. The review should also include an outline of all existing reserve component training facilities at which active component training might improve readiness. The Secretary shall submit a report on the results of this review to this

committee no later than 1 year from the date of enactment of this Act.

Additive manufacturing

The committee notes that Senate Report 113–44 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 required the Secretary of Defense to prepare a briefing or report to the congressional defense committees on the potential benefits and constraints of additive manufacturing, how the process could or could not contribute to Department of Defense (DOD) missions, and what technologies being developed at the National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute (NAMII) are being transitioned for DOD use.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to: (1) Analyze and report to the congressional defense committees on the sufficiency of the DOD's report in addressing the requirements; (2) Review the extent to which DOD has a process in place to ensure that additive manufacturing initiatives are coordinated across the DOD; and (3) Examine DOD's methods for determining whether these initiatives will improve combat capability, achieve performance improvements, and/or cost efficiencies over conventional manufacturing techniques. The Comptroller General review shall be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than March 30, 2015.

Afghanistan retrograde costs

The committee recognizes that the retrograde of equipment and personnel from Afghanistan is a significant logistical challenge for the Department of Defense (DOD). According to Department officials, there are three primary options for the retrograde and reduction of equipment in Afghanistan: removing the equipment from Afghanistan, transferring the equipment to another agency or government, or destroying the equipment in theater.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has reported in the past on the need for DOD officials to conduct and document analyses that compare the costs of and benefits of equipment retrograde, and that cost-benefit analyses should be a key factor in decision-making. Additionally, the committee notes that the GAO has also reported that one of the primary costs the Department should consider is the cost of equipment transportation, and that it is particularly important when considering what to do with equipment that exceed a Service's approved acquisition objective (AAO). The committee believes that retrograde internal controls could be more efficient and cost-effective. Consequently, the committee is concerned about the potential accrual of unnecessary transportation costs resulting from the return of equipment from Afghanistan.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing or a report to the committee no later than February 1, 2015, demonstrating what actions the Department has taken to ensure that justifications for returning equipment from Afghanistan that exceeds their AAO are documented and receive management review, and that transportation and all other relevant costs are included in disposition decision-making for equipment returning from Afghanistan.

Air tactical training

The committee understands that the Active and Reserve Air Force and Navy components have successfully used contracted fighter aircraft to augment some aspects of air tactical training to replicate adversaries with electronic warfare capabilities and joint terminal attack controller training. The committee notes that outsourced air tactical training brings potential benefits of prolonging aircraft service life and decreased costs in flying hour programs, especially with respect to fifth generation fighters. Given the current climate of fiscal constraints coupled with the potential to preserve valuable readiness resources, the committee encourages the military services to consider expanding the use of contracted air tactical training to additional units for appropriate missions.

Army and Marine Corps equipment reset

The committee notes that billions of dollars' worth of equipment has and continues to be retrograded from Afghanistan and the Army and Marine Corps continue to face a multi-year and multi-billion dollar effort to reset this equipment to a combat-ready condition. Both the Secretary and Chief of Staff of the Army have testified to this committee that during fiscal years 2013 and 2014, the Army had reset approximately 87,000 pieces of equipment at the depot level and about 300,000 pieces of equipment at the unit level. But as a result of sequestration, the Army had deferred approximately $729.0 million of equipment reset, postponing the repair of nearly 700 vehicles, 28 aircraft, and over 2,000 weapons and prepositioned stock. The Army leadership further projects that its reset requirement of equipment will extend at least 3 years after redeployment and will cost approximately $9.6 billion.

Conversely, the Marine Corps leadership has testified to this committee that while its equipment reset liability cost was approximately $3.2 billion last year, it had made significant progress to date and now estimates that its remaining reset liability will cost about $1.1 billion. The Marine Corps leadership has also testified to this committee that its reset requirements will continue at least 2 to 3 years after its equipment has redeployed.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has reported in the past on the need for more accurate cost estimates and reporting of the Army and Marine Corps projected equipment reset liability requirements. Additionally, the GAO has reported on the need for a standard Department of Defense-wide definition of reset for use in the overseas contingency operations budgeting process. Consequently, the committee is interested in verifiable financial reset requirements reported by the Army and Marine Corps.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide the committee with an assessment of the Army and Marine Corps extended equipment reset liability costs and requirements. This assessment shall include, but not be limited to: the extent to which the Army and Marine Corps are using a consistent definition of reset in estimating their reset liability costs, the types of costs included in the Army and Marine Corps reset liability estimates, an analysis of any assumptions used in developing the Army and Marine Corps estimates, to in-

clude the planned funding resources, and any other issue the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to the Army and Marine Corps reset cost estimates.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing or deliver a report to the committee no later than March 15, 2015.

Army Emergency Management Program

The 2009 Army Emergency Management Program sought to integrate planning, execution, and response management to all-hazard incidents affecting Army installations and activities.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to brief the congressional defense committees on the status of and plans for Army emergency management training no later than August 1, 2015.

Availability of funds for readiness

Over the course of the last year, senior Department of Defense (DOD) leaders, both military and civilian, have urged the committee to help DOD restore military readiness. The bill recommended by the committee seeks to achieve this objective by preserving the full amount of funding for operation and maintenance (O&M) requested by DOD, while shifting funds within O&M accounts to meet high priority readiness needs. The committee urges DOD, in executing the fiscal year 2015 defense program, to avoid any funding transfers that would reduce O&M funding. To the extent additional funds become available for reprogramming during the course of the fiscal year, for example, as unobligated funds become available from fact-of-life delays and under execution, then, the committee urges DOD to consider transfers that would help address high priority readiness needs.

Budget execution for Kwajalein Atoll

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit with the fiscal year 2016 President's budget submission a report for the Kwajalein Garrison on the type and level of funding over the future years defense program. The report should identify the performing Army agency for each category of funding and should also include a 10-year profile of planned facilities recapitalization.

Category I ammunition items

The committee notes that Category I ammunition items, including certain man-portable missiles and rockets, are highly explosive, extremely lethal, and a potential threat if they were to be used by unauthorized individuals or groups. To help protect these items and minimize the risk of loss or theft, it is critical that the Department of Defense (DOD), among other security measures, have sound inventory controls and accountability. The committee notes that recent Government Accountability Office reports on inventory management have found that DOD information systems used to facilitate inventory management have some limitations that prevent DODs ability to have Department-wide visibility of its inventory, including Category I ammunition items.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the extent to which the military

Services, in accordance with policies and procedures, have: (1) Established and maintained serial number registration and reporting of these assets; (2) Conducted physical inventories as a check against the accountability record, including recording adjustments to inventory and the rationale for such adjustments; and (3) Established procedures for maintaining proper accountability for shipped assets (i.e. when custody for the asset is transferred to another entity).

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide such a report to this committee no later than March 15, 2015.

Coal-to-liquid report

The Senate Report 113–44 accompanying S. 1197, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to submit a report to the committee on the feasibility of potential technologies that could enable coal-to-liquid (CTL) fuels to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD) consistent with section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) by February 1, 2014.

The committee remains concerned that DOD has yet to provide that required report to the committee. The committee did receive an interim response delaying the report because DOD is working in consultation with the Department of Energy to ensure the most thorough examination occurs.

Accordingly, the committee expects the Secretary of Defense to deliver the required CTL report no later than July 31, 2014, in accordance with the commitment made in the interim response.

Combatant Command Support Agent accounting

The committee reported in Senate Report 113–44 accompanying Senate bill S. 1197, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) on page 85 that: The committee notes the Operation and Maintenance budget justification material within the Air Force's Combatant Commander Direct Mission Support and Combatant Commanders Core Operations (Lines 130 and 140) accounts are a consolidation of multiple combatant commands under the purview of the Air Force as Combatant Commander Support Agent. The committee is concerned that due to this consolidation, the justification material lacks the level of detail necessary for this committee to make informed budget decisions. Accordingly, the committee directs the services to annually deliver independent, detailed budget justification for each combatant command they are assigned Combatant Command Support Agent responsibility.

The consolidated manner in which combatant command material is presented provides an incomplete depiction of combatant command budgets, fails to provide the necessary detail required to justify the budget request, and introduces confusion into congressional processes. This lack of detail related to specific budget items was directly attributable to past misperceptions about unjustified increases. These perceived increases led to reductions to combatant command accounts in the fiscal year 2013 NDAA which neces-

sitated reprogramming actions at considerable expense in time and effort.

Language was explicitly inserted into the fiscal year 2014 NDAA to correct these shortfalls, but examination of the fiscal year 2015 congressional justification material incorporated in the fiscal year 2015 Budget Estimates, Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, Volume 1, clearly demonstrates the Air Force failed to make the corrective action as directed.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to brief the congressional defense committees on actions they will take to ensure that the level of detail is provided in the budget exhibits to ensure the needs of the combatant commanders are met. This briefing is to occur no later than October 1, 2014.

Comptroller General of the United States report on the Department of the Army actions to determine the appropriate structure of the Army

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on a comprehensive review of the Department of the Army's data, analysis, decisionmaking processes, and plans for structuring, readying, and managing the forces of the Army, including the regular Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve. The required report will include a description and assessment of the manner in which the Department of the Army determines the size and force mixtures of the components of the Army in order to fulfill the national security missions of the Army, including any data on cost, readiness, effectiveness, and other factors available and used by the Department in making that determination. The Comptroller General shall provide an interim briefing not later than March 1, 2015, and a final report on March 1, 2016.

Comptroller General review of readiness

The committee recognizes that for many years the Department of Defense (DOD) has used C-ratings to measure unit readiness of its forces. The Global Status of Resources and Training System (GSORTS) was created to measure unit readiness in terms of resources with respect to authorized and assigned or on-hand personnel and equipment, the operating status of equipment, and the level of training achieved. GSORTS was then able to capture "ready with what." Later, Defense Readiness Reporting System was intended to take readiness reporting a step further to capture and incorporate, "ready for what." More recently, in support of combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, some units have repeatedly been deployed and task organized to execute missions that have differed from their core functions or the types of military operations for which the unit is designed. Accordingly, the DOD added assigned mission and capability ratings to its traditional C-ratings. The Services and combatant commands also began reporting readiness assessment levels (RA-levels) to capture their strategic readiness.

The committee is concerned that these metrics do not fully capture or articulate the time component of readiness. For example, the C-ratings and assigned mission ratings tend to emphasize read-

iness at a particular point in time, or the day the rating is achieved. Meanwhile, capability and RA-ratings have an implied time component as they measure readiness against timelines required to support operation and contingency plans. However, the committee is concerned that none of these metrics clearly answer the question of when forces, if not fully manned, trained, equipped, and ready, will be ready for sourcing decisions or risk assessment. Throughout the last decade of combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, too often the appropriate level of readiness for deploying active and reserve component units was achieved "just in time" prior to deployment. In some cases, training shortfalls or changes in mission required additional training in theater prior to operational employment of a unit.

In an era of fiscal uncertainty and significant risk to resources, the committee believes "just in time" does not adequately inform strategic and operational risk assessments nor distinguish which units can provide ready forces to meet combatant commander requirements.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General to report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2015, analyzing the extent to which time is or has been incorporated as a quantitative or qualitative component of current and past readiness metrics. The analysis shall describe any efforts the Services, combatant commands, Joint Staff, or the Office of the Secretary of Defense have made to modify their readiness metrics or add any additional metrics to better address the question of when units or commands will be ready.

Continued Defense-wide and interagency collaboration in the military working dog program

The committee recognizes the value of military working dogs (MWD) in support of the mission of the U.S. Armed Forces. MWDs have been important to the Department of Defense (DOD) in support of military training and combat operations. The MWD program covers a broad range of military missions, including security and patrol, explosives detection, search and rescue, and guard duties. Furthermore, MWDs are expected to operate in the harshest of climates and support our troops in combat. The joint nature of the MWD program also requires a high level of interoperability. The 341st Training Squadron at Lackland Air Force Base consolidates training for MWDs across DOD and other federal agencies. This consolidation helps to ensure uniformity of training, promotes the valuable exchange of experience and ideas, and enhances interoperability.

The committee believes that the MWD program should continue its current collaboration efforts in the field of training and research. The committee also believes that through a coordinated effort between DOD, federal agencies, the veterinary community, universities, and other research centers, the MWD program will continue to provide useful mission support.

Finally, the committee encourages DOD to continue to develop its training and research to include expanding its interaction with outside entities in order to better serve our Nation's security and combat capabilities.

Depot capital investment program

The committee remains concerned that the Army and the Navy continually fail to appropriately invest in the capital budgets of the covered depots required by law. Section 2476, title 10 of United States Code, requires that at least 6 percent of the average total combined maintenance, repair, and overhaul workload funded at all the depots of a military department be reinvested into depot infrastructure and capital assets.

The committee commends the Air Force for investing 7.6 percent in fiscal year 2013, planning 8.9 percent in fiscal year 2014, and 9.5 percent in fiscal year 2015, despite the negative effects of sequestration. Conversely, the committee notes that the Navy plans to only invest 3.4 percent and the Army only 3.6 percent in fiscal year 2015.

The committee strongly urges the Army and the Navy to adhere to their statutory requirements with respect to the minimum capital investment program. Furthermore, with the drawdown of combat operations and likely prospect of declining depot workload, the Department of Defense should engage with the committee if the previous 3-year average workload calculation is no longer an appropriate benchmark for capital depot investment.

Lastly, the committee notes that in the operation and maintenance budget tables, the committee recommends funding increases which will meet the minimum capital investment threshold of 6 percent across all the military services, as required by law.

Enhanced visibility for credentialing and installation access programs and systems

The committee is concerned that there is a lack of coordination among the efforts of the military services and defense agencies to support credentialing at defense installations, which is a key component of addressing the insider threat problem. No single office in the Department of Defense (DOD) is responsible for this effort or even tracks all of the programs and systems used for credentialing throughout DOD. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees concurrent with the budget submission for fiscal year 2016 that identifies all DOD credentialing and physical access control programs and systems, including commercially contracted services and other commercially provided services.

The report should cover all programs and systems intended to provide credentials and/or manage installation access of uniformed members, civilian employees, military dependents, military retirees, vendors, contractors, suppliers, service providers, and visitors. The report should also include all programs and systems the services and DOD have operationally deployed in research and development and in pilot or prototype demonstration.

The report shall also include an estimate of the total cost to DOD for such credentialing, including both direct and indirect costs. This report shall be submitted in an unclassified form.

Humanitarian Demining Training Center

The committee recognizes and expresses its support of the Department of Defense (DOD) Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) pro-

gram and the Defense Security Cooperation Agency's Humanitarian Demining Training Center (HDTC) and its mission to train and prepare U.S. military forces and U.S. Government HMA stakeholders, who in turn train U.S. foreign partners to conduct HMA missions in the detection and clearance of landmines and other explosive remnants of war, as well as the disposal, demilitarization, physical security, and stockpile management of potentially dangerous stockpiles of explosive ordnance. This training delivers direct benefits to host nations while giving U.S. teams valuable field experience, given that U.S. forces might not otherwise deploy to these nations. HDTC works with many U.S. Government agencies, the United Nations, and non-governmental mine action organizations, as appropriate, serving as a clearinghouse and collector of mine action information for the U.S. Government. The HDTC also helps develop new demining methods and technology appropriate for lesser developed countries.

The committee, therefore, encourages the HDTC and DOD HMA program to continue engaging with international partners and allies, when practical, including allies from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to ensure a coordinated and holistic approach to achieve geographic combatant commander security needs.

Improving energy efficiency and performance of military platforms

The committee notes the critical role that fundamental understanding of aerodynamics, physics, and fluid dynamics play in support of Department of Defense (DOD) goals to enhance the energy efficiency of military platforms. For example, the design and development of systems that reduce the drag caused by turbulent air flow can often enhance the performance of military platforms and munitions, including reducing fuel consumption and enhancing flight performance.

The committee notes that there exists only limited domestic laboratory experimentation and computer simulation capability to study these technical issues. The committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense coordinate, and to the extent appropriate, collaborate with government laboratories, universities, and other research facilities and organizations pursuing military-relevant aerodynamics, physics, fluid dynamics, and other related research to ensure that DOD derives maximum value and combat capability from ongoing advances in these important disciplines.

Incentivizing alternative fuel and fuel cell vehicle refueling stations

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to report to the committee on options to support the development and deployment of alternative fuel vehicle refueling stations, to include electric, fuel cell, and compressed natural gas vehicles on Department of Defense (DOD) property.

The committee is interested in an analysis of possible financing tools including, but not necessarily limited to, competitive federal research awards, contracts, credit assistance, public-private part-

nerships, coordinated government purchase strategies, and membership-based cooperatives.

The committee notes that DOD actions should be consistent with national security priorities and market conditions.

The Secretary shall deliver the report to the committee no later than March 1, 2015.

Jungle training

The committee understands that after more than a decade of combat operations in the Middle East, the Department of Defense (DOD) is rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific region. As a result, the committee is concerned with the potential challenges that the Armed Forces may face if operating in tropical environments which exist in the Asia-Pacific region. Among other challenges, triple canopy covers, dense vegetation, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance difficulties, and limited sources of potable water could make for difficult conditions where training and education will be vital for success in combat operations.

The committee understands that the U.S. Army Jungle Operations Training Center (JOTC) at Fort Sherman, Panama, was closed in 1999. The committee notes that DOD does not currently have an organic ability to train soldiers for jungle operations, and has been sending military servicemembers in small numbers to various countries for jungle training.

The committee also recognizes that the 25th Infantry Division (ID) at Schofield Barracks has recently begun training for jungle operations. The committee recognizes that there is a valid need for this type of training and appreciates the efforts of the 25th ID to prepare soldiers for jungle operations. The committee understands that the Army has not programmed resources specifically for jungle training and is conducting the training out of existing budgetary resources. It appears that sufficient resources may not be aligned and executed in a coordinated effort to provide this important training.

Accordingly, the committee encourages DOD to allocate the appropriate amount of coordinated resources, if DOD determines that there is a valid need to continue to provide jungle training to military personnel.

Management of conventional ammunition inventory

The committee recognizes the efforts of the Department of Defense (DOD) to modernize, transform, and integrate the Services' ammunition logistics database. The committee has reviewed current inefficiencies that resulted in diminished accountability per a recent report by the Government Accountability Office. Accordingly, no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide a report to this committee identifying an authoritative DOD-wide repository of data on conventional ammunition, together with the total cost and timeframe for implementation, that: (1) Uses a standard data exchange format consistent with the Defense Logistics Management Standards Office; (2) Provides a single source of conventional ammunition data as inputs into DOD decision support systems, such as those used for readiness reporting and operational planning; (3) Collects com-

prehensive, accurate data, consistent with federal internal control standards, from other service ammunition systems in order to provide real-time or near-real-time total ammunition asset visibility; (4) Enables quarterly stratified reporting through the Office of the Executive Director for Conventional Ammunition or another authority; and (5) Meets the conventional ammunition data functionality needs of all DOD components that require visibility of these data.

Additionally, the committee directs that all stratified reporting will include complete and detailed accounting for all ammunition that in a previous year was unclaimed by another service and categorize for disposal.

Marine Corps Prepositioning Program—Norway

The committee recognizes that the Marine Corps Prepositioning Program—Norway (MCPP–N) was established as part of the Department of Defense's (DOD) Cold War posture and relationship with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The committee notes that equipment use from MCPP–N has predominantly been for training and joint exercises in Europe rather than to supplement equipment shortfalls for combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The committee is concerned that over the past 35 years, only 11 percent of the total use of MCPP–N has gone to support major combat operations.

In the past, the DOD has stated that the need for prepositioning materiel and equipment should be based on requirements for an approved operation plan, but the Marine Corps has stated that there is no direct operation plan impacts currently associated with MCPP–N. The committee recognizes the current situation in Ukraine could have an effect on future plans for MCPP–N.

The committee also notes that over the next several years, the Marine Corps plans to transition MCPP–N's equipment profile from primarily engineering and transportation equipment to support a capabilities-based Marine Aviation Group Task Force (MAGTF) as soon as the end of fiscal year 2015. The Marine Corps has indicated that the MCPP–N will include additional equipment to support specialized capability sets, security cooperation packages, and retain the ability to augment up to a Marine Expeditionary Brigade-sized force.

The committee is concerned that MCPP–N recently only had 48 percent of its major equipment items on hand. Additionally, the committee is concerned that it is unclear what the full cost of the planned transition and operation to support MAGTF capabilities will be in the years to come. Lastly, the committee notes that the most recent Government Accountability Office review of MCPP–N was in 1989.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General to prepare a briefing or report to the committee no later than March 1, 2015 on: (1) How MCPP–N supports the overall DOD and Marine Corps prepositioning program; (2) The Marine Corps' prepositioning plans for MCPP–N, how they were developed, and the military requirements they address; (3) The unique capabilities, if any, that MCPP–N provides to meet the prepositioning requirements of EUCOM and AFRICOM; and (4) the funding plan to tran-

sition MCPP–N to support MAGTF capabilities and the future projected costs to the United States and Norway.

Measuring Department of Defense use of commercial cloud computing capabilities and services

The committee believes that the use of cloud computing to support Department of Defense (DOD) computing missions can lead to significantly higher performance and reduced costs, while leveraging the innovative capacity of the commercial information technology (IT) sector, and maintaining required security and reliability to meet DOD needs. The committee notes that the President's fiscal year 2015 budget materials indicated that "as a result of the Administration's Cloud First policy, Federal agencies adopting cloud-based IT systems are increasing operational efficiencies, resource utilization, and innovation across the Government." The committee is concerned that DOD is not moving expeditiously in evaluating and adopting market-tested commercial approaches to cloud computing to meet mission needs.

Accordingly, the committee directs the DOD Chief Information Officer to sponsor an independent study to develop metrics to assess DOD's progress in evaluating and adopting commercial cloud capabilities. The committee recommends that metrics could include: cost savings or avoidance to DOD programs through use of commercial cloud services; the technical merit, relevance, and value of additional DOD security requirements on commercial cloud providers relative to the requirements mandated by the government-wide and industry-supported Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program; the trends in new applications or services being hosted on military-unique clouds or computing centers versus commercial clouds; the time required to review, analyze, and accredit commercial cloud capabilities by DOD; and the application of DOD security and other controls to applications, systems, and services being hosted on military-unique clouds or computing centers relative to those being applied to potential commercial cloud systems.

The study also should assess and compare the features, performance, costs, and functionality of the "milcloud" (military cloud) developed by the Defense Information Systems Agency using government contractors to the leading commercial cloud technology.

The study should be delivered to the congressional defense committees no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

Mission-critical electricity infrastructure adoption of National Institute of Standards and Technology Cyber Security Framework

The committee notes that in a report delivered in January 2008, the Defense Science Board Task Force on Department of Defense (DOD) Energy Strategy concluded that, "Military installations are almost completely dependent on a fragile and vulnerable commercial power grid, placing critical military and Homeland defense missions at an unacceptable risk of extended outage." The report cited potential cyber-attack as a key source of risk to utility grids supplying power to mission-critical military facilities, noting that, "U.S. grid control systems are continuously probed electronically, and there have been numerous attempted attacks on the Super-

visory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) systems that operate the grid." Additionally, the task force underscored the overwhelming consequences of electricity grid failures, finding that, "in addition to degrading national military and Homeland defense capabilities, failure of the grid for any extended period could significantly affect national economic and social stability. Pumps that move natural gas and oil through pipelines rely on electricity, as do refineries, communications systems, water and sewage systems, hospitals, traffic systems, first response systems, border crossing detection systems and major transportation hubs such as airports."

The committee remains concerned about DOD's continued dependence on "a fragile and vulnerable commercial power grid," particularly in light of proven cyber-attack capabilities and demonstrated intent of adversaries to use cyber means to target U.S. and foreign electricity infrastructure. While the committee recognizes that military installations that rely on commercial electricity utilities have made some important strides in bolstering cyber defenses, there is no question that electricity grids supplying power to mission-critical DOD facilities remain highly vulnerable to cyber-attacks by nation-states and other sophisticated actors.

The committee notes that in February 2014, pursuant to Executive Order 13636, the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) issued the initial iteration of a voluntary Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity, designed to leverage existing standards, guidelines, and best practices to reduce cyber risk to critical infrastructure. The framework articulates a "framework core," which "presents a set of cybersecurity activities, desired outcomes, and applicable references—including existing industry and governmental standards, guidelines, and best practices—that are common across critical infrastructure sectors."

The committee notes that the Department has begun to take some action to address electric power resilience for military installations, in response to section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2012 (P.L. 112–81).

The committee further notes that in February 2014, the Department of Energy issued the Electricity Subsector Cybersecurity Capability Maturity Model (ES–C2M2), which was designed to be "an easily scalable tool for the subsector's implementation of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Cyber Security Framework."

The committee believes that the issuance of the NIST Framework and the ES–C2M2, as well as the positive embrace of these tools by many entities within the electricity subsector, are welcome signs that commercial electricity utilities are taking active measures to improve cyber defenses. However, the committee is concerned that the DOD may not have adequately assessed the extent to which these measures have, specifically, helped to address vulnerabilities in power grids serving mission-critical military installations.

In order to assess continued vulnerability of mission-critical military installations to power grid cyber-attacks, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to undertake an inventory of mission-critical electricity infrastructure. This inventory shall include: (1) Identification of each mission-critical military facility located

within the United States; (2) Identification of the electricity infrastructure, including the utilities or entities operating such infrastructure, upon which each identified mission-critical military facility is directly dependent for electricity (for the purposes of this inventory, such infrastructure should be limited to infrastructure which, if destroyed or degraded, would directly cause a power outage to a mission-critical military facility); and (3) A survey of whether each identified electricity infrastructure states that it has adopted or is adopting the framework core of the NIST Framework for Improving Critical Infrastructure Cybersecurity.

The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a report to Congress, within 360 days of the date of enactment of this Act, summarizing the results of the inventory. The report shall be unclassified, with a classified annex, as appropriate.

Multi-modal retrograde contracts

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) Inspector General (IG) found that the DOD did not have effective controls over the storing and handling of retrograde equipment at aerial ports of debarkation (APOD) in Afghanistan. The DOD IG also found that U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) contracting officials did not establish effective security and oversight requirements to safeguard cargo staged for shipment at APOD in Afghanistan. The DOD IG stated that this occurred because contracting officials omitted specific security requirements, did not include effective monitoring and surveillance requirements, and did not appoint any oversight officials in Afghanistan. As a result, DOD has no assurance that contractors are properly securing cargo at Bagram and Kandahar APOD. Although existing contract language requires contractors to use commercial best practices for security of cargo, the DOD IG found that TRANSCOM was unaware of the existence and adequacy of each multi-modal contractor's cargo safeguarding procedures. For example, the DOD IG report documented examples of military vehicles determined to be ammunition-free arriving in Dubai and Baku with live ammunition and trash inside.

The committee notes that without stronger contract oversight, there is increased risk that equipment could be lost, damaged, or vandalized in transit.

Accordingly, the committee directs TRANSCOM to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee no later than January 1, 2015, on the contract modifications made to multi-modal contracts to better define security and handling requirements and a determination of the number and location of contractor officer representatives necessary to provide adequate contract oversight in Afghanistan. The briefing or report shall also include the steps taken to create and implement standard operating procedures and updates to the appropriate quality assurance surveillance plans to ensure proper securing and handling of equipment by military personnel, contractors, and their subcontractors.

Navy fire control radar and replacement

The committee encourages initiatives that increase operational availability rates and reduce the maintenance cost of warfighting

equipment, especially in the face of tightening resources from implementation of the Budget Control Act (Public Law 112–25). The committee understands that public-private partnerships can allow government entities and private industry to collaborate and develop unique efficiencies that may reduce costs to the taxpayers when appropriately implemented.

No later than 45 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a review and submit a report to this committee examining the Air Force public-partnership program for the repair of the dual mode transmitter in the F–16 fire control radar. The review shall determine the cost savings to date and the future estimated annual cost savings that this program may have achieved and to determine the feasibility and advisability of other services adopting similar programs.

The committee notes that the Navy may benefit from pursuing a similar public-private initiative for Navy aircraft, including the F/A–18. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to examine the feasibility and advisability of establishing a public-private partnership for F/A–18 fire control radar module repair and refurbishment and submit a report summarizing the findings to this committee no later than September 30, 2014.

Network upgrades to the Kwajalein Garrison

The Kwajalein Garrison is the Nation's primary long-range missile test support facility. It also hosts a number of critical sensors supporting space situational awareness. It has supported both of these missions for over 60 years and will continue to do so for the foreseeable future given its unique location. This committee has long-recognized the strategic importance of this garrison and the surrounding atoll.

A critical element of the garrison is the permanent workforce that maintains the unique sensor systems throughout the atoll. It has come to the attention of the committee that as late as January 2014, despite the recent availability of broadband internet connectivity to the garrison, the workforce and their families are required to use dial-up modems to communicate with the mainland. This is a morale issue, given many of the families who live on this atoll must arrange for their children to apply online for college, some 5,000 miles away, using a dial-up modem. At the request of the committee, the U.S. Army's Network Command has undertaken an assessment of the actions needed to upgrade the garrison's network and has begun an implementation of these upgrades.

The committee believes that the most pressing item is to ensure that the families who support this unique national security resource have the ability to communicate over the Internet comparable to that of their counterparts on the mainland. On March 6, 2014, the Army reported to the committee that initial efforts are now underway to permit the families on the atoll to use high-speed capabilities resident with other facilities of the garrison.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to report no later than September 30, 2014, on whether the families on the garrison have high speed Internet support and, if not, the reason why and what actions will be taken to remedy the situation.

The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army, based on the briefing given on March 6, 2014, to update the committee in the form of a briefing no later than March 31, 2015, on what actions have been taken and are to be taken over the future years defense program to upgrade the communications infrastructure of the garrison.

Operational assessment of the Defense Readiness Reporting System

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2013 annual report conducted by the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) found that the Defense Readiness Reporting System—Strategic (DRRS–S) is not ready to proceed to initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E) based upon the system deficiencies and lack of functionality demonstrated during an operational assessment.

The committee remains concerned that despite congressional direction for the Department of Defense (DOD) to first establish DRRS–S to eventually replace the Global Status of Resources and Training System (GSORTS) in the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), the DOD has failed to progress to IOT&E.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee on the timeline and funding plan to provide DRRS–S with all the capabilities required for GSORTS retirement. Additionally, the briefing or report shall include a plan to have a certified red team to conduct penetration and exploitation testing to verify correction of the DOT&E's information assurance findings and evaluate the ability of the DRRS–S to protect, detect, react, and restore against an operationally relevant cyber-security threat.

Operational energy benefits

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's fiscal year 2015 commitment to improving military capability, reduce costs, and decrease tactical risk through efforts to improve energy security and to better manage both operational and installation energy.

For example, the committee understands that the Army's planned Abrams tank auxiliary power unit will use 92 percent less fuel idling and 9 percent less fuel during maneuvers. Similarly, the improved turbine engine program for Blackhawk and Apache helicopters is expected to reduce fuel use by 22 percent, reduce maintenance costs by 35 percent, and increase engine life by 20 percent compared to current engines, saving almost 14.0 million gallons of fuel per year. The committee also notes the fleet-wide average fuel savings is 21 percent with the fielding of advanced medium mobile power sources generators.

The committee also recognizes the role operational energy (OE) advisors have played on forward operating bases (FOBs). For example, one OE helped the Department save 2.5 million gallons in annual fuel avoidance, which equates to 1,000 fuel trucks not having to traverse dangerous roads and limits exposure to enemy attacks. Similarly, many FOBs require aerial resupply every 3 days with fuel and water making up 70 percent of the cargo. The investments

made to date in new and emerging OE technologies decrease resupply convoys to every 10 days, again reducing risk and vulnerability of attacks to troops. Additionally, the return on investment captured by energy savings with more efficient shelter and tent liners can pay for the upfront cost in less than 1 year.

The committee is encouraged by the Navy's focus on enhancing combat capability, increasing endurance and range, and using energy investments to increase readiness. Planned technologies such as improved ship hull coatings, more efficient stern flaps, and bow bulbs will create almost 1 week of additional steaming days on the same amount of fuel. Hybrid electric drives, currently installed in amphibious assault ships, can add 10 steaming days which would allow the Navy and Marine Corps more presence on station and to spend less time refueling and replenishing at sea. Additionally, the committee is encouraged by the Navy's efforts to program for energy sustainment, restoration, and modernization projects which factor in an energy return on investment and a yearly cost avoidance of $15.1 million.

Consequently, the committee strongly encourages the Department to continue the progress made towards improving the military services' capabilities through appropriate investments in operational and installation energy.

Soldier equipment modernization program

The committee notes that in the fiscal year 2015 budget request the Army increased its soldier equipment modernization program by $33.3 million, in addition to a baseline funding request of $94.9 million. The committee understands that fiscal year 2015 is the first year of a planned multi-year program to provide next-generation organizational clothing and individual equipment and personal protective equipment to soldiers. The goal of the program is to provide life-saving and mission-enhancing gear to soldiers with a lighter, scalable, and adaptable protective capability that allows a greater range of motion and more effective performance.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2015 budget request will fund the next increment of brigade combat teams with updated deployment equipment bundles containing enhanced combat helmets, load-bearing equipment, cold weather clothing, and flame resistant clothing.

The committee recognizes that for several years the Army's rapid fielding initiative program, using overseas contingency operations funding, has provided flame resistant clothing to all deploying soldiers to minimize the risk of burn injuries from improvised explosive devices. The committee notes that the Army's flame resistant uniforms are approximately double the cost of non-flame resistant uniforms. However, the committee is encouraged that non-deployed soldiers who are the most at risk to fire hazards, such as aviators, armor vehicle crewmen, and fuel handlers, currently receive and will continue to receive flame resistant uniforms specifically designed for their military occupational specialty.

The committee is also encouraged by the Navy's recent decision to field flame resistant coveralls to sailors aboard ships that face an increased risk to fires in tight quarters.

Strategic military infrastructure to support operation plans

The committee remains concerned about the structural condition and readiness status of the Military Ocean Terminal, Concord (MOTCO) and the Lualualei (LLL) annex Oahu to support the operational requirements of U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM).

A recent report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found that while the Department of Defense (DOD) has considered alternatives for mitigating a capability gap at MOTCO, alternatives have not been coordinated among the appropriate stakeholders, and DOD has not developed a coordinated and detailed plan laying out alternatives. The GAO also found that DOD has not agreed upon which set of alternatives should be pursued.

The committee notes that given the potential for delays to infrastructure repair work, the DOD could be accepting additional risk to executing its war plans by waiting to develop a plan to mitigate any potential capability gaps at MOTCO and other strategic military infrastructure within PACOM. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing or report to the committee no later than February 1, 2015, on MOTCO and the LLL annex, including: (1) The funding strategy and mitigation plan to address any structural and readiness concerns; (2) Any impacts to operation plans; (3) Alternatives to mitigate any shortfalls that may occur during a potential capability gap; (4) The status of intra-service collaboration; and (5) The status of any relevant environmental impacts statements. If appropriate, the briefing or report may be submitted in a classified format.

Stryker sustainment

The committee notes that the Department of the Army currently sustains the Stryker family of vehicles under a sole source requirement and task order contract for "manufacturing, fielding, sustaining, improving, reset, retrofit, recapitalization (recap) and overhaul of the Stryker Family of Vehicles." The total estimated value of this contract is $5.1 billion. On January 30, 2012, the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology determined that only one source was qualified and capable of performing the work at a reasonable price to the government.

In the justification for other than full and open competition, the Army delineated the $5.1 billion, 3-year contract into three broad categories: vehicles ($2.0 billion), engineering support ($0.6 billion), and logistical support ($2.5 billion). This contract is up for renewal in October 2015. The committee understands that the Army currently intends to award another contract for other than full and open competition. Of the three broad categories cited in the Army's justification document, it appears that logistical support offers the Army an opportunity to compete this contract, especially given the fact that eventually Stryker sustainment is planned to be transitioned to an organic industrial base capability.

Accordingly, the committee strongly encourages the Army to compete the logistical support aspect of the next Stryker requirement and task order contract in order to maximize efficiencies and cost savings.

Training for the Air Force weather program

The Air Force Weather Agency makes a significant contribution to improving combat effectiveness of our warfighters. The Air Force needs to modernize its weather training programs to be able to continue that contribution. The Air Force may be able to take advantage of different training regimes as it modernizes its training programs, including reliance on organic training, entering into or expanding cooperative programs with other government agencies, such as the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and entering into or expanding cooperative programs with colleges and universities that have meteorological training programs. The committee believes that the Air Force needs to investigate whether the service could improve the effectiveness and efficiency of its weather training programs by placing greater reliance on cooperative training programs. If this investigation shows promise for such programs, the committee encourages the Air Force to explore the options further.

Use of power purchase agreements to meet requirements for Military installations

The committee notes that on April 16, 2014, the Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense signed out Department of Defense (DOD) Directive 4180.01, "DOD Energy Policy," to provide a common energy framework to guide the full range of defense energy activities, including operational energy, facilities energy, and energy-related elements of mission assurance. The Directive established the DOD policy to enhance military capability, improve energy security, and mitigate costs in its use and management of energy.

The committee notes that in support of this policy, the DOD has increased the use of Power Purchase Agreements (PPA), in conjunction with the authority provided by section 2922a of Title 10, United States Code, to enter into long-term contracts of up to 30 years in order to generate or provide power for a military installation. These contracts have the potential to achieve cost savings while improving energy security by ensuring a reliable power supply to a military facility or installation.

The committee believes that PPAs, like authorities provided for military housing and other utilities, offer a substantial benefit to DOD by addressing the need for a reliable energy source with no upfront capital costs. The private sector finances and installs an energy generating system on land owned by DOD or on private land. A private entity owns, operates, and maintains the system and DOD agrees to purchase the power generated by the system over the life of the contract. A PPA generally shifts performance risk of the project from the government to the contractor. DOD is able to establish a known long-term electricity price for a portion of site load. A PPA provides a reliable power supply at a predictable cost for budget stability.

The committee notes that DOD guidance on the use of section 2922a recognizes the authority to enter into a contract for energy generating projects without the capital costs of construction either on a military installation or on private property. The committee also notes that, like housing privatization, regional or portfolio approaches in a contract that will provide energy to more than one

military installation may offer the potential for greater savings and best value. DOD also has the flexibility to enter into contracts that consider the availability of regional resources and use more than one energy source to achieve greater efficiencies and lower costs. In addition, section 2922a does not direct that a dedicated transmission line or other additional infrastructure be required for projects on private property if the availability and use of existing power distribution infrastructure will result in a lower cost over time. The committee encourages DOD to use the flexibility contained within the authority to maximize the efficiency and effectiveness of each contract.

The committee recognizes that Part 41.201 of the Federal Acquisition Regulations requires DOD to obtain required utility services from sources of supply which are most advantageous to the Government in terms of economy, efficiency, reliability, or service. While electricity prices are subject to market pressures, locking in a reasonable rate over a longer period of time will protect DOD from rate volatility. To that end, DOD guidance for the approval by the Secretary of Defense of the use of section 2922a requires the military service or defense agency to provide an economic/business case analysis summary to include the energy project cash flow display for each fiscal year included within the contract. The committee believes this analysis is critical to ensure that the projects enhance military capability, improve energy security, and mitigate costs.

The committee encourages DOD to continue to use PPAs and the flexible authorities contained in section 2922a to take full advantage of private sector financing for projects that offer economy and reliability of service over time and ensure rates equal to or lesser than projected energy rates over the life of the contract.

War reserve stocks

The committee believes that a primary element of military readiness is the sound management of adequate war reserves and that an efficient and effective war reserve supply chain is critical to support the warfighter in any theater of operations and to serve our military personnel stationed around the world. Accordingly, each military service establishes and maintains a continuing war reserve program that reflects the policies and guidance of the Secretary of Defense regarding enemy threats and capabilities, along with the Nation's current military strategy.

The committee is concerned that as military force structure and combat operations decline over the next few years, coupled with sequestration effects, the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) will need to carefully balance the necessity of accurately planning for contingency requirements and maintaining sufficient war reserves to meet military requirements, along with the appropriate stewardship of taxpayer dollars to avoid excess procurement, storage, and transportation of war reserve stocks.

Accordingly, the committee expects the DLA and the Services to maximize fiscal year 2015 resources with the utmost priority placed on maximizing cost-effectiveness in the planning, procurement, and management of war reserve stocks. The committee also directs the DLA and the Services to revisit and reevaluate their policies regarding the management of war reserve stocks in order

to meet warfighter needs while avoiding unnecessary excess, and to provide a report or briefing with recommendations to the committee no later than March 1, 2015. This reevaluation should focus on those elements of war reserve stocks that the DLA and Services determine are most likely to yield cost savings and efficiencies.

Additionally, the Comptroller General is directed to review, report, and provide recommendations to the congressional defense committees no later than March 30, 2015, on the DLA's and the Services' efficiency and effectiveness of their war reserve supply chain, and whether those war reserve stocks accurately reflect revised end strength and force structure requirements and achieve cost efficiencies in the storage and transportation of such stocks.

Warrior power executive agent

The committee continues to be encouraged by the Department of Defense's (DOD) efforts to pursue increased combat capability, effectiveness, and efficiency to better support the warfighter. For example, the committee recognizes that significant progress has been made to date with respect to individual warrior power systems and programs which provide expeditionary power solutions designed for combat operations in the most austere environments by increasing mobility, range, and endurance.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees no later than March 1, 2015, of the direction to designate a DOD executive agent for warrior power to align and advance various ongoing efforts across the Department, who is assigned specific responsibilities, functions, and authorities to support designated activities that involve two or more of the military services.

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Active Forces

End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active-duty end strengths for fiscal year 2015, as shown below:

Service	FY 2014 authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 request	FY 2014 authorized
Army	520,000	490,000	490,000	0	−30,000
Navy	323,600	323,600	323,600	0	0
Marine Corps	190,200	184,100	184,100	0	−6,100
Air Force	327,600	310,900	310,900	0	−16,700
DOD Total	1,361,400	1,308,600	1,308,600	0	−52,800

Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2015, as shown below:

Service	FY 2014 authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 request	FY 2014 authorized
Army National Guard	354,200	350,200	350,200	0	−4,000
Army Reserve	205,000	202,000	202,000	0	−3,000
Navy Reserve	59,100	57,300	57,300	0	−1,800
Marine Corps Reserve	39,600	39,200	39,200	0	−400
Air National Guard	105,400	105,000	105,000	0	−400
Air Force Reserve	70,400	67,100	67,100	0	−3,300
DOD Total	833,700	820,800	820,800	0	−12,900
Coast Guard Reserve	9,000	9,000	9,000	0	0

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

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2015, as shown below:

Service	FY 2014 authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 request	FY 2014 authorized
Army National Guard	32,060	31,385	31,385	0	−675
Army Reserve	16,261	16,261	16,261	0	0
Navy Reserve	10,159	9,973	9,973	0	−186

Service	FY 2014 authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 request	FY 2014 authorized
Marine Corps Reserve	2,261	2,261	2,261	0	0
Air National Guard	14,734	14,704	14,704	0	−30
Air Force Reserve	2,911	2,830	2,830	0	−81
DOD Total	78,386	77,414	77,414	0	−972

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

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the minimum number of military technicians (dual status) for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force as of the last day of fiscal year 2015, as shown below:

Service	FY 2014 authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 request	FY 2014 authorized
Army National Guard	27,210	27,210	27,210	0	0
Army Reserve	8,395	7,895	7,895	0	−500
Air National Guard	21,875	21,792	21,792	0	−83
Air Force Reserve	10,429	9,789	9,789	0	−640
DOD Total	67,909	66,686	66,686	0	−1,223

Fiscal year 2015 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2015, as shown below:

Service	FY 2014 authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 request	FY 2014 authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

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

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, as shown below:

Service	FY 2014 authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 request	FY 2014 authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0

Service	FY 2014 authorized	FY 2015		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2015 request	FY 2014 authorized
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations

Military personnel (sec. 421)

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

Budget Item

Military personnel funding changes

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

[Changes in millions of dollars]

Military Personnel Underexecution	−761.7
Reduction in meals-ready-to-eat	−20.0
Restore lost savings from COLA change repeal	500.0
Restore anticipated savings for TRICARE consolidation	78.0
Increase CTC rotations for Army National Guard	45.0
Additional ESGR State support specialists	4.0
Limit A–10 retirement	82.8
Limit AWACS retirement	24.9
Total	−47.0

The committee recommends a total reduction in the Military Personnel (MILPERS) appropriation of $47.0 million. This includes: (1) A reduction of $761.7 million to reflect the Government Accountability Office's most recent assessment of the average annual MILPERS underexecution; (2) A reduction of $20.0 million to reflect the Defense Logistics Agency's overstatement of meals-ready-to-eat inventory; (3) An increase of $500.0 million to restore retirement accrual savings that resulted from the revision in the cost-of-living adjustment to military retired pay contained in section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (H.J. Res. 59), and which were lost when Congress grandfathered the current force from the effects of that provision in section 2 of Public Law 113–82; (4) An increase of $78.0 million to restore MILPERS savings anticipated by the Department of Defense relative to its proposal to consolidate the TRICARE program, which the committee did not adopt; (5) An increase of $45.0 million to support additional Combat Training Center rotations for the Army National Guard; (6) An increase of $4.0 million for the Office of Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve to increase the number of State support specialists; (7) An increase of $82.8 million to fund additional personnel required relative to a limitation on retiring A–10s contained elsewhere in this Act; and (8) An increase of $24.9 million to fund additional personnel relative to a limitation on retiring AWACS contained elsewhere in this Act.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy

Authority for three-month deferral of retirement for officers selected for selective early retirement (sec. 501)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 581 and 638 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify the date by which warrant officers and regular officers on the active-duty list who have been selected for selective early retirement must retire.

Repeal of limits on percentage of officers who may be recommended for discharge during a fiscal year under enhanced selective discharge authority (sec. 502)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 638a of title 10, United States Code, by deleting the limitation on the total number of officers that a selection board may recommend for early discharge under enhanced selective discharge authority.

Elimination of requirement that a qualified aviator or naval flight officer be in command of an inactivated nuclear-powered aircraft carrier before decommissioning (sec. 503)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5942(a) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement that a qualified aviator or naval flight officer serve as commanding officer of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier that has been inactivated during the limited period between the inactivation and permanent decommissioning prior to disposal.

Authority to limit consideration for early retirement by selective retirement boards to particular warrant officer year groups and specialties (sec. 504)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 581(d) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to establish selection objectives, by year group or specialty, or any combination thereof, for selection boards considering warrant officers for selective retirement.

Repeal of requirement for submittal to Congress of annual reports on joint officer management and promotion policy objectives for joint officers (sec. 505)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 662 and 667 of title 10, United States Code, removing the requirement that the Secretary of Defense submit annual reports to

Congress on joint officer management and promotion policy objectives for joint officers.

The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense would continue to oversee the success of the military departments in meeting joint officer management program requirements.

Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management

Retention on reserve active-status list following nonselection for promotion of certain health professions officers and first lieutenants and lieutenants (junior grade) pursuing baccalaureate degrees (sec. 511)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 14701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize consideration for continuation on the reserve active-status list of first lieutenant and lieutenant (junior grade) health professions officers who have twice failed of selection for promotion to the next higher grade. The provision would also require service secretaries to retain on the reserve active-status list health professions officers who would otherwise be required to be removed from the reserve active-status list until the officer has completed his or her service obligation.

Database on military technician positions (sec. 512)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain a centralized database of military technician positions within the Department of Defense (DOD).

The committee notes that the September 30, 2013, Center for Naval Analyses report titled, "Report on the Termination of Military Technician as a Distinct Personnel Management Category," criticized DOD for lacking data that clearly identifies military technicians as a "fundamental problem" inhibiting oversight of a complex personnel program. The committee directs the Secretary to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by no later than January 1, 2015, on the numbers of military technicians within DOD, dual status and non-dual status, where they are assigned, and a short description of their assigned duties, as of September 30, 2014.

Improved consistency in suicide prevention and resilience program for the reserve components of the Armed Forces (sec. 513)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe a policy for the development of a standard method for collecting, reporting, and assessing suicide data and suicide attempt data involving members of the National Guard and Reserves, and to submit this policy to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Office of Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve (sec. 514)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Office of Employer Support for the Guard and Reserve to take appropriate actions to increase the number of program support specialists in the States.

To support this requirement, the committee recommends moving $4.0 million from funds available for research, development, test, and evaluation, Air Force, for the F–15 Eagle Passive/Active Warning Survivability System, to the military personnel appropriation.

Subtitle C—General Service Authorities

Enhancement of participation of mental health professionals in boards for correction of military records and boards for review of discharge or dismissal of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 521)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1552 of title 10, United States Code, to require that any medical advisory opinion issued to a board for correction of military records regarding a servicemember who was diagnosed while serving in the military as experiencing a mental health disorder include the opinion of a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist if the individual's request for correction of records relates to a mental health disorder.

The provision would also amend section 1553 of title 10, United States Code, to require boards for review of discharge or dismissal: (1) To include a member who is a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with additional training and experience to provide advice on specialized medical or psychological matters relating to post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injuries, when the board considers a request for review of a discharge or dismissal by a former servicemember who was diagnosed as experiencing post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as a consequence of a deployment in support of a contingency operation; and (2) To include a member who is a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with additional training and experience to provide advice on specialized medical or psychological matters relating to mental health disorders, when the board considers a request for review of a discharge or dismissal by a former servicemember who was diagnosed while serving in the military as experiencing a mental health disorder.

The committee expects that boards for review of discharge or dismissal would consider a new application for relief by a former servicemember when the member's prior application was denied by a board whose membership did not include a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with additional training and experience as required by this provision.

Extension of authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 522)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act

for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as amended by section 531 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), by extending the authority to conduct programs on career flexibility to December 31, 2018, with a deadline to return all participants to active duty by no later than December 31, 2021, adjusting interim and final report due dates to reflect the extended authority and deadline, and by requiring certain additional elements of information in the final reports.

Sense of Senate on validated gender-neutral occupational standards for all military occupations (sec. 523)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate concerning the development of validated gender-neutral occupational standards pursuant to the ongoing process of reviewing and opening positions and occupations to women that are currently closed.

Comptroller General of the United States report on impact of certain mental and physical trauma on discharges from military service for misconduct (sec. 524)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on the impact of mental and physical trauma relating to post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), traumatic brain injury, behavioral health matters not related to PTSD, and other neurological combat traumas on the discharge of servicemembers for misconduct.

Sense of Senate on upgrade of characterization of discharge of certain Vietnam era members of the Armed Forces (sec. 525)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that Boards for Correction of Military Records, when considering a request for correction of a less-than-honorable discharge issued to a servicemember who served during the Vietnam era, should take into account whether the veteran was diagnosed with Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) as a result of such service.

Furthermore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report within 180 days on the plans of the military departments to address requests for upgrades of discharges of Vietnam era members of the Armed Forces who may have suffered from service-related PTSD. The report shall include the following elements:

(1) Guidance to Boards for Correction of Military Records and Discharge Review Boards regarding the application of medically appropriate standards to evaluate discharge upgrade applications based in whole or in part on PTSD or other mental health conditions;

(2) Guidance to Boards for Correction of Military Records and Discharge Review Boards on use of information in military service records and consideration of post-discharge diagnoses of PTSD that are related to their military service that the boards may consider when evaluating a request for an upgrade of a discharge, and consideration of waiving any statute of limita-

tions for either new applicants or those previously denied for upgrade applications covered by this section;

(3) The feasibility of use of video conference capabilities by Boards for Correction of Military Records and Discharge Review Boards, and other initiatives to increase the number of in-person hearings granted;

(4) A resourcing plan for the timely consideration of applications from all eligible individuals;

(5) Outreach initiatives to those eligible to seek a discharge upgrade and available pro bono legal services to assist them;

(6) Information provided concerning the right to judicial review and the availability of free legal services, such as those established in collaboration with the Department of Justice's Access to Justice Initiative, in letters from the Boards advising applicants of adverse decisions; and

(7) Compliance with the requirement for inclusion in membership of the Boards for Correction of Military Records and Discharge Review Boards of a physician, clinical psychologist, or psychiatrist when adjudicating applications based in whole or in part on PTSD or other medical condition.

Subtitle D—Member Education and Training

Enhancement of authority for members of the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials (sec. 531)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service of the Navy, to carry out a program to enable members of the Armed Forces to obtain professional credentials while they are serving that relate to training and skills acquired during military service.

Authority for Joint Special Operations University to award degrees (sec. 532)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 108 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the President of the Joint Special Operations University to confer appropriate degrees upon graduates who meet degree requirements. A degree could not be conferred unless the Secretary of Education has recommended approval of the degree in accordance with the Federal Policy Governing Granting of Academic Degrees by Federal Agencies, and the Joint Special Operations University is accredited by the appropriate civilian academic accrediting agency or organization to award the degree.

Enhancement of information provided to members of the Armed Forces and veterans regarding use of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance and Federal financial aid through Transition Assistance Program (sec. 533)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, by no later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, to provide additional information to servicemembers in the transition assistance program concerning

certain education benefits available to them, and to ensure that the higher education component of the transition assistance program is available to members of the Armed Forces on an Internet web site of the Department of Defense.

Duration of foreign and cultural exchange activities at military service academies (sec. 534)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 4345a, 6957b, and 9345a of title 10, United States Code, to extend the period that foreign exchange personnel are authorized to attend the U.S. Military Academy, the Naval Academy, or the Air Force Academy when the service secretary determines that the attendance of such persons contributes significantly to the development of foreign language, cross-cultural interactions and understanding, and cultural immersion of cadets or midshipmen, from 2 weeks to 4 weeks.

Subtitle E—Military Justice and Legal Matters

Ordering of depositions under the Uniform Code of Military Justice (sec. 541)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Article 49 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) (10 U.S.C. 849) to authorize the court-martial convening authority or the military judge to order a deposition only if the party requesting the deposition demonstrates that, due to exceptional circumstances, it is in the interest of justice that the testimony of the prospective witness be taken and preserved for use at an Article 32, UCMJ, preliminary hearing or a court-martial.

Modification of Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence, relating to the privilege against disclosure of communications between psychotherapists and patients (sec. 542)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, Rule 513 of the Military Rules of Evidence be modified to: (1) Include communications with "other licensed mental health professionals" within communications covered by this privilege; (2) Clarify or eliminate the current exception to the privilege when the admission or disclosure of a communication is constitutionally required; (3) Require a party seeking production or admission of records protected by the privilege to show a specific factual basis demonstrating a reasonable likelihood that the records or communications would yield evidence admissible under an exception to the privilege, demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the requested information meets one of the enumerated exceptions to the privilege, show that the information sought is not cumulative of other available information, and show that the party made reasonable efforts to obtain the same or similar information through non-privileged sources; (4) Authorize the military judge to conduct an *in camera* review only when the moving party has satisfied these requirements and an examination of the information is nec-

essary to rule on the production or admissibility of the records; and (5) Require that any admission or disclosure be narrowly tailored.

Enhancement of victims' rights to be heard through counsel in connection with prosecution of certain sex-related offenses (sec. 543)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1044e of title 10, United States Code, to authorize Special Victims' Counsel to represent the victim of a sex-related offense at any proceedings in connection with the reporting, military investigation, and military prosecution of the alleged sex-related offense. The provision would also require that the Manual for Courts-Martial be modified not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act to provide that when a victim of a sex-related offense has a right to be heard in connection with the prosecution of such offense, the victim may exercise that right through counsel, and would also require service secretaries to establish policies and procedures to ensure that counsel for the victim of an alleged sex-related offense is provided prompt and adequate notice of the scheduling of any hearing, trial, or other proceeding in connection with the prosecution of that offense to afford victim's counsel the opportunity to prepare for the proceeding.

Eligibility of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for assistance of Special Victims' Counsel (sec. 544)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1044e of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the assistance of Special Victims' Counsel for a member of a reserve component who is the victim of an alleged sex-related offense and who is not otherwise eligible for military legal assistance under section 1044 of this title.

Additional enhancements of military department actions on sexual assault prevention and response (sec. 545)

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) Require Special Victim's Counsel to provide advice to victims of sexual assault on the advantages and disadvantages of prosecution by court-martial or a civilian court with jurisdiction over the offense and would require that the victim's preference be considered in the determination of whether to prosecute the offense by court-martial or by a civilian court; (2) Require service secretaries to ensure that all written performance appraisals of servicemembers include an assessment of the extent to which the servicemember being evaluated supports the sexual assault prevention and response program of the military service, and the performance appraisals of commanding officers indicate the extent to which the commanding officer has or has not established a command climate in which allegations of sexual assault would be properly managed and fairly evaluated and in which a victim can report criminal activity, including sexual assault, without fear of retaliation, including ostracism and group pressure; (3) Amend section 1743(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) to require that the 8-day incident report of an unrestricted report

of sexual assault include a review of the most recent climate assessment for the command or unit of the suspect and the command or unit of the victim, and an assessment of whether another climate assessment should be conducted; (4) Require the service secretaries to establish a confidential process, through boards for correction of military records, by which an individual who was the victim of a sexual offense while in the military can challenge, on the basis of being a victim of the offense, the terms or characterization of the individual's discharge or separation; and (5) Require that the Military Rules of Evidence be amended, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to provide that the general military character of an accused is not admissible for the purpose of showing the probability of innocence of the accused for specified offenses.

Review of decisions not to refer charges of certain sex-related offenses for trial by court-martial if requested by chief prosecutor (sec. 546)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1744 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) to require that in any case where a convening authority decides not to refer a charge of a sex-related offense to trial by court-martial and the chief prosecutor of the service concerned requests review of the decision, the service secretary must review the decision as a superior authority authorized to exercise general court-martial convening authority.

Modification of Department of Defense policy on retention of evidence in a sexual assault case to permit return of personal property upon completion of related proceedings (sec. 547)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 586 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to authorize the return to the rightful owner of personal property retained as evidence in connection with an incident of sexual assault involving a service member after the conclusion of all legal, adverse action, and administrative proceedings related to the sexual assault.

Inclusion of information on assaults in the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database (sec. 548)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to issue policies and procedures for the inclusion of certain information obtained from restricted and unrestricted reports of sexual assault, including known information about the alleged assailant, in a sexual assault database.

The committee expects that the policies and procedures to implement this provision would ensure that information obtained from restricted reports of sexual assault is made available only to appropriate personnel for the limited purpose of identifying alleged suspects in multiple restricted reports of sexual assault. The committee expects that information in this database will assist law enforcement personnel to identify and investigate serial offenders. The committee also expects that victims who may later learn the

alleged suspect in their report may have assaulted another person may be encouraged to change restricted reports to unrestricted reports of sexual assault to facilitate increased prosecutions of such serial offenders. The committee is mindful that failure to properly safeguard the privacy of the victim could risk the unintended and adverse consequence of undermining the confidence of victims in the use of the restricted report as a viable option for reporting sexual assault. Therefore, the policies and procedures developed to implement this provision should provide for including in the database only information freely volunteered by sexual assault victims who file restricted reports and to ensure that victims are not coerced into providing this information.

The committee is also mindful that the failure to properly safeguard the identity of an alleged suspect resulting in disclosure could risk unintended and adverse consequences for the alleged suspects to include potential damage to their personal and professional reputations without the due process protections of the military justice system. Therefore, the committee directs that policies and procedures developed to implement this provision must also preserve the presumption of innocence for alleged suspects.

The committee specifically directs that the information concerning the identity of an alleged suspect may not be used for any purpose related to assignment, training, or advancement.

Technical revisions and clarifications of certain provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 relating to the military justice system (sec. 549)

The committee recommends a provision would make technical and clarifying corrections to various provisions of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) relating to the military justice system.

Applicability of sexual assault prevention and response and related military justice enhancements to military service academies (sec. 550)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Service secretaries and the Secretary of Homeland Security to ensure that the sexual assault prevention and response provisions in title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) and the sexual assault prevention and response provisions in this Act apply to the military service academies.

Analysis and assessment of disposition of most serious offenses identified in unrestricted reports on sexual assaults in annual reports on sexual assaults in the Armed Forces (sec. 551)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1631 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to require that the Department of Defense Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military include an analysis and assessment of the disposition of the most serious offenses identified in unrestricted reports of sexual assault.

Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces (sec. 552)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to establish and maintain a Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces to advise the Secretary on the investigation, prosecution, and defense of rape, forcible sodomy, sexual assault, and other sexual misconduct in the Armed Forces and to submit a report on an annual basis to the Secretary and to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Collaboration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice in efforts to prevent and respond to sexual assault (sec. 553)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General to jointly develop, not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a strategic framework for ongoing collaboration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice in their efforts to prevent and respond to sexual assault.

Modification of term of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces (sec. 554)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Section 942 of title 10, United States Code, to modify the statutory termination date of the term of office of judges of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces to align the termination date with the starting date of the Court's annual term.

Report on review of Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity role in sexual harassment cases (sec. 555)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1735 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) to require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report on the Secretary's review of the Office of Diversity Management and Equal Opportunity's role in sexual harassment cases.

Repeal of obsolete requirement to develop comprehensive management plan to address deficiencies in data captured in the Defense Incident-Based Reporting System (sec. 556)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 543(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to remove the requirement that data concerning domestic violence incidents be recorded in the Defense Incident Based Reporting System (DIBRS). DIBRS is a criminal incident uniform crime reporting system that does not lend itself to recording domestic violence incidents because domes-

tic violence is not an enumerated offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The Department of Defense has developed an alternative method to accurately count domestic violence incidents and resulting disciplinary actions.

Subtitle F—Decorations and Award

Medals for members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who were killed or wounded in an attack by a foreign terrorist organization (sec. 561)

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 1129a to title 10, United States Code, to require that the Secretary concerned treat attacks by a foreign terrorist organization as an attack by an international terrorist organization for the purposes of awarding the Purple Heart in certain circumstances.

Subtitle G—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters

Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 571)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $25.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for continuation of the Department of Defense (DOD) assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by enrollment of dependent children of military members and DOD civilian employees.

Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 572)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), using the formula set forth in section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), for continuation of Department of Defense assistance to local educational agencies that benefit eligible dependents with severe disabilities.

Amendments to the Impact Aid Improvement Act of 2012 (sec. 573)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 563 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to extend the program modifications contained in that section by an additional 3 years.

Authority to employ non-United States citizens as teachers in Department of Defense Overseas Dependents' School system (sec. 574)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2(2)(A) of the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act (20 U.S.C. 901(2)(A)) to authorize employ-

ment of local nationals who are not United States citizens to teach host nation language courses in the Defense Dependents' Overseas Education System.

Inclusion of domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools among functions of Advisory Council on Dependents' Education (sec. 575)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1411 of the Defense Dependents' Education Act of 1978 (20 U.S.C. 929) to include in the functions of the Advisory Council on Dependents' Education the responsibility to provide advice and information on the Department of Defense's domestic dependent elementary and secondary school system. Currently this council provides advice and information on the Department of Defense Education Activity's overseas school system, and does not provide advice and information on the Department's domestic dependent schools.

Department of Defense suicide prevention programs for military dependents (sec. 576)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to direct the service secretaries to develop and implement a program to track, retain, and analyze information on deaths that are reported as suicides involving dependents of members of the regular and reserve components of each respective military service and to submit a report on the programs developed to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

Enhancement of authority to accept support for Air Force Academy athletic programs (sec. 581)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 9362 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to: (1) Accept from third parties funds, supplies, equipment, and services for the support of the athletic programs of the Air Force Academy (Academy); (2) Enter into leases or licenses for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy; and (3) Enter into contracts and cooperative agreements for the purpose of supporting the athletic programs of the Academy. The provision would also authorize the corporation established to support the athletic programs of the Academy to enter into licensing, marketing, and sponsorship agreements relating to trademarks and service marks identifying the Academy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force.

Items of Special Interest

Comptroller General of the United States report on the sexual assault prevention activities of the Department of Defense and the Armed Forces

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States, not later than February 27, 2015, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, a report on the sexual assault prevention activities of the Department of Defense (DOD), containing: (1) An assessment of the sexual assault prevention strategy of the DOD; (2) A description and assessment of the actions taken by each military service to implement the sexual assault prevention strategy of DOD and of that service; (3) A comprehensive description of the sexual assault prevention activities of each military service as of submittal of the report and of those planned for the 12 months thereafter; (4) A comprehensive description of the sexual assault prevention activities at joint installations, and an assessment of the collaborative efforts of the military services involved, as of submittal of the report and of those planned for the 12 months thereafter; (5) A comprehensive assessment of the sexual assault prevention activities of each military service, including an assessment of the extent to which any differences among such activities arise from unique qualities of a particular service or the efforts of a service, to pursue an innovative approach to sexual assault prevention; (6) A description and assessment of the procedures and mechanisms used by each military service to ensure that the sexual assault prevention strategy of each service, and the training provided pursuant to such strategy, are effective in achieving the intended objectives; (7) An assessment of the report of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the President on efforts of the DOD and the Armed Forces to improve the prevention of and response to sexual assault in the Armed Forces, as required by the President, to be submitted not later than December 1, 2014; and (8) Such other recommendations on the sexual assault prevention activities of the DOD as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

Comptroller General report on access to on-base services by junior enlisted personnel

According to the Department of Defense, roughly 83 percent of the active-duty force is comprised of enlisted personnel. Of these, about 95,000 are in grades below E–5. Service policies require most junior enlisted personnel below the grade of E–5 to live on post. The committee recognizes the unique military value of requiring junior enlisted personnel to live on post, including improved unit cohesion, discipline, professional development, and esprit de corps. Many of these members, owing either to service policies, post restrictions, or financial reality, do not have a means of personal transportation other than public transportation. Accordingly, these members may be isolated from commercial amenities and services. The military services provide a wide array of services and programs on post to meet the needs of these members and others who choose to live on post, including dining facilities, health care clinics

and treatment facilities, commissaries and exchanges, legal assistance, recreation and leisure opportunities, physical fitness and other morale, welfare, and recreation facilities, and libraries.

The committee is concerned that some junior enlisted personnel living on post are experiencing difficulties in accessing these services due to various factors such as inconsistent or inadequate hours of operation or lack of transportation. As a result, some members may be forced to forego meals or miss medical appointments simply because the dining facility closed early or transportation was not available to the health clinic on the other side of post. This is a leadership issue that the committee expects commanders to address.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the provision of services provided on military installations, and the policies and procedures for ensuring that junior enlisted personnel have ready access to those benefits. The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a report on the results of this review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by no later than April 1, 2015.

Comptroller General report on feasibility and advisability of longer tour lengths

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by no later than January 1, 2015, assessing the feasibility and advisability of lengthening tour rotational goals within each military department.

The report shall include:

(1) A description of current spending on permanent change of station (PCS) moves and associated support costs;

(2) A review of past changes to PCS policy and costs or savings associated with such changes for each military service;

(3) A description of the extent to which each service is meeting existing rotational goals and, if not, the causes of major shortfalls; and

(4) An assessment of the impact lengthened tour rotations could have on unit readiness, stability for servicemembers and their families, career progression, and potential cost savings in military service budgets.

Comptroller General review of Department of Defense progress in expanding service opportunities for women

Women have served in the military services for over a half a century but have been mostly excluded from direct combat positions. Over time, women have been assigned to select positions in ground combat units at certain levels or under certain conditions. Despite these restrictions, women have served in combat environments while deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan. During the wars over the past 13 years, more than 800 women have been wounded and more than 130 have died. Many women have received awards for their performance in combat environments.

On January 24, 2013, the Secretary of Defense rescinded the 1994 direct ground combat exclusion rule for women, which opened

certain positions and units to women following service reviews and congressional notification procedures. The Secretary of Defense directed the military departments to submit detailed plans by May 15, 2013, for the implementation of this change and to move ahead expeditiously, with the process to be completed by January 1, 2016. As a result, according to the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review, since 2012 the military services have opened approximately 57,000 positions to women, and service efforts to validate gender-neutral occupational performance standards continue.

The committee is concerned about what steps the Department of Defense (DOD) and the military services are taking to ensure the effective and successful integration of women into previously closed positions and units, as well as the methodology being used to validate occupational standards. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the progress of the services in opening closed positions and occupations to women, and their progress in developing and validating gender-neutral occupational standards. The report should include: (1) The status of service efforts to open previously closed positions and units to women; (2) The integrity and effectiveness of the services' evaluation processes and testing in validating gender-neutral occupational standards; (3) The extent to which these processes consider the overall operational capability and combat effectiveness of units required to meet national defense objectives; (4) The extent to which the DOD is tracking and monitoring military service plans to complete the integration of women in direct combat positions by January 2016; and (5) Any steps DOD or the services have taken to mitigate potential challenges associated with integrating women into combat roles. The Comptroller General shall report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the results of this review by no later than February 1, 2015.

Continuation of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program

The committee notes that since 2008, more than 1.3 million National Guard and reserve servicemembers and their families have benefited from the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program (YRRP). Information and counseling provided during Yellow Ribbon events help returning guard and reserve members and their families manage the unique challenges associated with transitions between military and civilian life. YRRP is designed to ensure guardsmen and reservists returning home, often to rural areas or locations far removed from military installations and traditional military support networks, have access to similar services as their active-duty counterparts. The program provides training sessions and information regarding family assistance programs, veterans' benefits, resilience and suicide prevention, mental health outreach, and other medical information, for servicemembers and their families pre-deployment, during deployment, and up to 90 days post-deployment. YRRP also supports additional state-outreach programs that coordinate state and local resources to create a comprehensive network of support throughout the deployment cycle. These extended programs are particularly valuable given that servicemembers may continue to face reintegration challenges, including symptoms associated with

post-traumatic stress disorder, up to and exceeding 180 days after deployment.

The committee believes the YRRP has enduring value, and encourages the Department of Defense to continue its support beyond the current conflict. The committee also directs the Office for Reintegration Programs Center for Excellence to evaluate the feasibility and advisability of adding additional Yellow Ribbon programming 180 days after deployment and throughout the deployment cycle. The evaluation should include an assessment of possible means to provide more efficient delivery of services, to include leveraging the value of State-based outreach programs.

Cyber career field

The committee is encouraged by the efforts of the Services to recruit and retain military personnel with the skills and aptitude for our Nation's cyber mission. However, the committee is concerned that military personnel in the cyber field have no clear, defined career path to success. To retain the very best officers and enlisted members with cyber skills, the Services need to provide a career track that includes progressive training, education, and assignments to prepare these servicemembers for positions of increased responsibility, including command and leadership positions.

The committee directs the service secretaries to assess whether the cyber mission warrants new officer and enlisted specialty designators that are distinct from communications, signal, and intelligence specialties, and whether recruiting, retention, and assignment of servicemembers with cyber skills requires bonuses or special and incentive pays. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report the results of this assessment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than January 31, 2015.

Department of Defense policy and plan for prevention and response to sexual harassment in the Armed Forces

The committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense has not complied with section 579 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) that required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, no later than January 2, 2013, a report setting forth a comprehensive policy to prevent and respond to sexual harassment in the Armed Forces. The committee has not yet received this report.

This legislative provision also required the Secretary to develop a plan to collect information and data regarding substantiated incidents of sexual harassment involving servicemembers, including the need to identify cases in which a servicemember is accused of multiple incidents of sexual harassment. The Secretary was required to submit this plan to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 1, 2013. The committee has not yet received this plan.

The committee is aware that there is a correlation between sexual harassment and sexual assaults and believes that it is imperative to address incidents of sexual harassment before the perpetrator progresses to commit more serious sexual offenses.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than July 31, 2014, on the status of both of these requirements.

Funding for the United States Naval Sea Cadet Corps

The committee recognizes that the United States Naval Sea Cadet Corps (USNSCC) makes significant contributions in the development of our Nation's youth, the recruitment efforts of the United States Navy, and the awareness of the Navy and its mission. Since its inception in 1958, the USNSCC has trained over 170,000 young Americans. Today, it continues to prepare America's youth to become productive and patriotic citizens. Furthermore, the USNSCC contributes directly to the recruiting mission of the United States Navy. Over 11 percent of the most recent class at the United States Naval Academy were former cadets, and a total of 626 cadets accessed into military service in 2013.

The USNSCC plays a significant role in both the development of this Nation's youth and the mission of the United States Navy. This committee supports its mission and encourages the Secretary of the Navy to continue funding the USNSCC at current programmed funding levels, to be augmented with additional funds, should they become available.

Military chaplains

The committee recognizes the historical and present-day significance of military chaplains. Since the Nation's founding, military chaplains have provided spiritual leadership and guidance to servicemembers. Chaplains have served in every war in which America has fought, and many have been decorated, including numerous valor awards, and even the Medal of Honor. The committee acknowledges that the Chaplaincies of the Military Departments "are established to advise and assist commanders in the discharge of their responsibilities to provide for the free exercise of religion in the context of military service as guaranteed by the Constitution, to assist commanders in managing Religious Affairs, and to serve as the principal advisors to commanders for all issues regarding the impact of religion on military operations." Further, today's force comprises a religiously diverse population, and chaplains serve everyone to the best of their abilities, attending to the spiritual needs of servicemembers, even in circumstances where the chaplain's religion differs from the members they serve.

The committee expresses its strong and continuing support of chaplains and their mission.

Online employment search-tool consolidation

The committee recognizes the importance of Department of Defense (DOD) investment in Internet-based job search programs to assist servicemembers who are transitioning from Active Duty into the civilian workforce. However, the committee is concerned that efforts to help servicemember transition have resulted in the creation of duplicative and overlapping online tools. The committee strongly believes that the Office of the Secretary of Defense should

identify ways to consolidate multiple existing online transitional tools into a single, concerted effort.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by no later than October 1, 2014, that describes all current and projected DOD-supported Internet-based transitioning servicemember, reserve component and veterans job assistance tools, programs, and processes.

The report should include the cost of sustaining the current array of Internet-based job assistance tools, programs, and processes, and the Secretary's recommendations for standardizing, simplifying, and consolidating such programs. It is the intent of the committee that DOD maintain an efficient and effective online employment search-tool while avoiding duplication and redundancy.

Sexual Assault Bystander Prevention

The committee remains concerned by reports of pervasive sexual violence within military communities. To that end, the committee notes that non-governmental collaborations between practitioners and researchers have identified a growing need for expanded bystander education in sexual violence prevention as a means to enhance deterrence, and timely reporting and adjudication of sexual violence. The committee believes that the Department of Defense sexual violence prevention programs should utilize evidence-based methods that evaluate the impact of bystander prevention curricula on participant attitudes and behaviors in order to inform and strengthen ongoing prevention and response activities.

Standardized survivor experience surveys

The committee supports the Department of Defense's (DOD) development of standardized survivor experience surveys for survivors of sexual assault. Survivor responses may provide valuable insight to ensure that DOD policies and relevant legislation achieve expected results. The committee encourages DOD to promote broad survivor participation in the survey process to include participation by survivors in cases where sexual assault was alleged in the initial complaint regardless of whether the sexual assault allegations were disposed of through a military justice process, civilian criminal process, or through administrative disposition.

The committee directs DOD to ensure that the annual report on sexual assault in the military required by section 1602 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (P.L. 111–383) includes an update on DOD's progress towards developing and implementing such survivor experience surveys and a report on responses received and associated lessons learned.

Use and adequacy of military leave for federal employees who are members of reserve components

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the use and adequacy of annual military leave used under section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, to meet reserve component readiness objectives, and to report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the results of this review by no later than February 1, 2015. The review shall include:

(1) A description of the average number of hours per fiscal year that Department of Defense (DOD) employees who are also members of reserve components spend in any leave status (including leave without pay) to cover periods of active duty for training or inactive duty for training; (2) A description of the average number of hours of military leave used per year by military technicians (dual status) in the fulfillment of their technician duties; (3) An assessment of whether the leave provided under section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, is adequate to meet the needs of employees, including military technicians (dual status), in light of the operational tempo of the reserve components; (4) An assessment of whether members of reserve components should continue to accrue and carry over military leave under section 6323 of title 5, United States Code, during periods of active duty or full-time national guard duty for which they volunteered; and (5) Any other matter relating to the use of military leave considered appropriate by the Secretary.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances

Fiscal year 2015 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pay raise of 1 percent for all members of the uniformed services in pay grades O–6 and below effective January 1, 2015.

Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau and Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau among senior members of the Armed Forces for the purposes of pay and allowances (sec. 602)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide pay parity for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The provision would also provide pay parity for the senior enlisted advisor to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau with the senior enlisted advisors of the Armed Forces. The changes made by this provision would be prospective to the date of enactment of this Act.

Modification of computation of basic allowance for housing inside the United States (sec. 603)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, to revise the method by which the monthly amount of the basic allowance for housing (BAH) is determined by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to reduce the monthly amount by up to 5 percent of the national average for housing for a given pay grade and dependency status. Servicemembers will not see any reduction in their BAH until they undergo a permanent change of duty station.

Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing under certain circumstances (sec. 604)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the rate of basic allowance for housing in areas impacted by natural disasters or experiencing a sudden influx of personnel.

Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus,

the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen enrolled in the Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps, travel expenses for certain inactive-duty training, and income replacement for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for active duty service.

One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus, education loan repayment for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers, and special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions. The provision would also extend for 1 year the authority to pay hazardous duty pay, assignment or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, the assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus, the foreign language proficiency incentive pay, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to

ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between Armed Forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates.

Subtitle C—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits

Inapplicability of reduced annual adjustment of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces under the age of 62 under the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 who first become members prior to January 1, 2016 (sec. 621)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend subparagraph (G) of section 1401a(b)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to exempt those who first join military service prior to January 1, 2016, from the reduced cost of living adjustment (COLA) applicable to military retired pay made by section 403 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113–67), as amended by section 2 of Public Law 113–82. Under current law, this reduced COLA is inapplicable to members who first join prior to January 1, 2014.

This change better aligns the impact of the reduced COLA with Congress's consideration of the report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, due February 2015.

Modification of determination of retired pay base for officers retired in general and flag officer grades (sec. 622)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1407a of title 10, United States Code, to reinstate the cap on retired pay of general and flag officers at the monthly equivalent of level II of the Executive Schedule, as provided for in section 203(a)(2) of title 37, United States Code. The provision would ensure the equitable treatment of the service of general and flag officers serving on or after the date of enactment of this Act. The retired pay base for final pay retirees would be the greater of: (1) Their retired pay as determined by function of the pay tables existing on December 31, 2014, in the officer's grade and years of service as of that date; or (2) Their retired pay as determined by applicable law at the time of their retirement (but subject to the cap in section 203 of title 37, United States Code). The retired pay base for high-36-month retirees would be based on applicable law at the time of their retirement, but would continue to account for uncapped months accumulated between October 1, 2006, and the date of enactment of this Act.

Modification of per-fiscal year calculation of days of certain active duty or active service to reduce eligibility age for retirement for non-regular service (sec. 623)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12731(f)(2)(A) of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that qualifying days of service under that section to reduce the age at which a servicemember may receive reserve retired pay may be accumulated between 2 consecutive fiscal years, effective after the date of enactment of this Act.

Earlier determination of dependent status with respect to transitional compensation for dependents of certain members separated for dependent abuse (sec. 624)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1059 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the date on which a dependent child's status is determined for the purposes of transitional compensation under that section, in the case of a member being administratively separated, is the date on which the separation action is commenced. This aligns the dependent status determination with the date on which transitional compensation payments begin under this section in these cases.

Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for special needs trusts established for the benefit of dependent children incapable of self-support (sec. 625)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1448, 1450, and 1455 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the payment of the Survivor Benefit Plan annuity to a special needs trust created under subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 1396p(d)(4) of title 42, United States Code, for the sole benefit of a disabled dependent child incapable of self-support because of mental or physical incapacity.

Subtitle D—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations

Procurement of brand-name and other commercial items for resale by commissary stores (sec. 631)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2484 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to purchase any commercial item, including brand-name and generic items, for resale in, at, or by commissary stores without using full and open competition procurement procedures.

Items of Special Interest

Department of Defense pay and benefit proposals

The Department of Defense (DOD) proposes several measures intended to slow the growth of personnel costs within the DOD budget. These proposals include:

(1) A 1.0 percent pay raise for most military personnel, lower than the 1.8 percent that would take effect under current law;

(2) Limiting increases in the housing allowance below the rate of inflation, such that servicemembers will eventually pay 5 percent of housing costs out of pocket, as measured by average national rental costs for a given pay grade and dependency status;

(3) A phased reduction by $1.0 billion of the annual direct subsidy provided to military commissaries, starting with $200.0 million in fiscal year 2015, down from the current annual subsidy of $1.4 billion, a change that could significantly impact commissary savings that servicemembers and their families depend on;

(4) A restructuring and consolidation of the TRICARE Prime, Standard, and Extra programs into a single TRICARE plan;

(5) Establishment of enrollment fees for TRICARE for Life beneficiaries; and

(6) Increased pharmacy co-pays for prescriptions filled outside of military treatment facilities.

The committee reluctantly supports DOD's proposals concerning the pay raise, the basic allowance for housing (BAH), and pharmacy co-pays. The committee does not support the proposals affecting the commissary benefit, TRICARE for Life, or the TRICARE reorganization. The committee views these latter proposals as structural in nature; as such, they are better left for consideration until after the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission submits its report in February 2015. The pay raise, BAH, and pharmacy proposals, while undesirable, are necessary to produce a DOD budget that provides sufficient funding to address readiness and modernization deficits, authorizes a sufficiently sized and trained force to meet national defense objectives, and adheres to congressionally-mandated budget levels.

Department of Defense proposal to modify commissary benefit

Commissaries have a major positive impact on the quality of life of all servicemembers—active, reserve, and retired—and their families. Commissaries, on average, afford savings of more than 30 percent on items purchased. Additionally, commissary patrons frequently use base exchanges when they come on post to shop at the commissary. Increased usage of the base exchanges results in additional dividends that are returned to the military community for morale, welfare, and recreation activities. The cumulative effect of all of these benefits from commissary patronage is particularly important to junior enlisted servicemembers.

The committee is concerned that consequences of the Department of Defense proposal to increase costs to patrons of the commissary benefit in order to reduce appropriated fund support for the Defense Commissary Agency have not been fully evaluated, and that other business models that may not have the same detrimental impact were not considered.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission and to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than December 1, 2014, that describes: (1) How changes to the financial structure and funding of commissaries would impact the purchasing power of military families, especially young enlisted members and their families; (2) The impact on commissary sales volumes if prices for groceries and other goods rise significantly under a new financial and funding structure; (3) The collateral impact of the Department's proposal on sales volumes in the military exchange system; (4) The impact of lower sales volumes in military exchanges on monetary dividends provided to support the morale, welfare, and recreation programs of the military services; (5) An assessment of adoption by the commissary system of a business model similar to that of the military exchange system; and (6) Other options for consolidation

of commissary and exchange system functions. The committee expects the Commission to consider this report as it addresses the commissary benefit in the report that it submits to Congress and to the President.

Secretary of Defense review of pay table

The committee recognizes the service of those who choose to serve beyond 30 years in the military. Many of these servicemembers, the most experienced in the ranks, forego the opportunity of a second career in order to continue serving their nation. As a way to incentivize and reward such service, especially among senior enlisted and officers with prior enlisted service, Congress extended the pay tables to 40 years in section 601 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). As the military draws down, however, and fewer servicemembers serve beyond 30 years, the committee believes it is time to reevaluate the usefulness of the 40-year pay table, and whether it is necessary to continue to achieve certain retention goals.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the utility of the pay tables currently in law with respect to retaining experienced military personnel who would otherwise be difficult to retain, and whether such pay tables are necessary or if retention of such personnel would be equally achievable under a 30-year pay table, and to submit a report on this review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by no later than February 1, 2015. The report shall include a description of how many personnel remained on Active Duty past 30 years of service, annually, since 2007; a breakdown by pay grade of such personnel; and the additional costs to the Department of Defense (DOD) since 2007 of operating under the 40-year pay table rather than a 30-year pay table (adjusted for inflation). The report shall include the Secretary's recommendation whether to retain the 40-year pay table, the reasons why, and an assessment of how DOD believes longevity pay increases beyond 30 years impacts retention in the armed services.

Survey of preferences of members of the Armed Forces regarding military pay and benefits

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense has not adequately considered the views and preferences of servicemembers in making proposals designed to slow the growth of personnel costs, and that other proposals may yield similar savings with less impact on those benefits servicemembers value the most.

The committee strongly encourages the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission to conduct a survey of active-duty servicemembers, reserve component members, and retirees on their preferences with respect to pay, allowances, health care, retirement, and quality-of-life benefits; how those benefits effect decisions to join or remain in the military; how they differ by grade, dependency status, and duty location; and to consider the results of this survey in the Commission's report due next February.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—TRICARE Program

Annual mental health assessments for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 701)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a person-to-person mental health assessment for active duty and selected reserve members each year. The Secretary may provide such assessments in conjunction with annual periodic health assessments or pre- or post-deployment health assessments. In addition, the provision would require the Secretary to submit an annual report on the tools and processes used to provide the assessments.

Modifications of cost-sharing and other requirements for the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program (sec. 702)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1074g of title 10, United States Code, to modify the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program by specifying that non-formulary prescriptions would be available through the national mail-order pharmacy program, establishing prescription copayments from 2015 through 2024, and requiring that non-generic prescription maintenance medications must be refilled through military treatment facility pharmacies or the national mail-order pharmacy program.

Parity in provision of inpatient mental health services with other inpatient medical services (sec. 703)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, to remove limits on inpatient mental health services, removing a potential barrier to receipt of mental health care that does not exist for other medical and surgical care.

Availability of breastfeeding support, supplies, and counseling under the TRICARE program (sec. 704)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1079 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize breastfeeding support, supplies, and counseling during pregnancy and the postpartum period as a covered benefit for TRICARE beneficiaries.

Authority for provisional TRICARE coverage for emerging health care products and services (sec. 705)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1073 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide provisional coverage or authorization for coverage for certain health care products and services that do not

meet the hierarchy of reliable evidence as prescribed in federal regulations for the TRICARE program. This would authorize TRICARE coverage for a drug, device, medical treatment, or procedure considered unproven if the drug or device cannot be lawfully marketed without Food and Drug Administration clearance or approval, that are commonly utilized in medical practice, and are, in many cases, considered standards of practice by medical practitioners.

Report on status of reductions in TRICARE Prime service areas (sec. 706)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the status of the reduction of TRICARE Prime services areas conducted by the Department of Defense.

Repeal of requirement for ongoing Comptroller General of the United States reviews of viability of TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra (sec. 707)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement for ongoing Comptroller General review of the processes, procedures, and analysis used by the Department of Defense to determine health care and mental health care provider acceptance of the TRICARE Standard and TRICARE Extra benefit.

The committee notes that the Comptroller General has already issued five reports under this mandate, and additional reviews and reports are unlikely to develop significantly new findings and recommendations for improvement.

Subtitle B—Health Care Administration

Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund matters (sec. 721)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1111, 1113, 1115, and 1116 of title 10, United States Code, to modify the method by which the Federal Government makes accrual payments into the Department of Defense Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (Fund). The provision would require the Secretary of Defense and other administering secretaries of the uniformed services to make payments into the Fund at the end of each month on the basis of an actuarial determination of the single level dollar cost per uniformed member multiplied by that uniformed services' total monthly end strength. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to change the actuarial determination required by section 1115 of title 10, United States Code, after the start of the fiscal year in the event Congress enacts significant changes in benefits after the fiscal year begins. This would allow the Secretary to modify the monthly payments into the Fund during that fiscal year to account for the change in law, and to realize attendant discretionary savings earlier. The provision would become effective immediately and would apply to payments into the Fund beginning in fiscal year 2016.

Extension of authority for Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (sec. 722)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1704(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) to extend the termination date of the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund from September 30, 2015, to September 30, 2016. Extension of this fund will allow the departments to fully assess the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center demonstration project, develop and submit a final report, and give Congress time to consider and assess the effectiveness of the demonstration project.

Department of Defense-wide strategy for contracting for health care professionals for the Department of Defense (sec. 723)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a Department of Defense (DOD)-wide strategy for contracting for health care professionals for the DOD.

Program on medication management in the Department of Defense (sec. 724)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program of comprehensive, uniform medication management in military medical treatment facilities and to submit a report describing this program to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters

Report on military family planning programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 731)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive study of the access of servicemembers and certain military dependents to methods of contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration, contraception counseling, and related education, and to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report of the findings of this study no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Interagency working group on the provision of mental health services to members of the National Guard and the Reserves (sec. 732)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to convene an interagency working group to review and recommend collaborative approaches to improving the provision of mental health services to members of the National Guard and Reserves and to submit a report on the findings and recommendations of the interagency working group to the appro-

priate congressional committees not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Report on improvements in the identification and treatment of mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury among members of the Armed Forces (sec. 733)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, a report evaluating the 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.

Report on implementation of recommendations of Institute of Medicine on improvements to certain resilience and prevention programs of the Department of Defense (sec. 734)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of implementing the recommendations of the Institute of Medicine regarding improvements to programs of the Department of Defense intended to strengthen mental, emotional, and behavioral abilities associated with managing adversity, adapting to change, recovering, and learning in connection with service in the military.

Report on Department of Defense support of members of the Armed Forces who experience traumatic injury as a result of vaccinations required by the Department (sec. 735)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the secretaries of the military departments, to report on the adequacy and effectiveness of the policies, procedures, and systems of the Department of Defense in providing support to servicemembers who experience traumatic injury as a result of a vaccination required by the Department of Defense.

Comptroller General of the United States report on Military Health System Modernization Study of the Department of Defense (sec. 736)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report assessing the Military Health System Modernization Study of the Department of Defense to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Items of Special Interest

Autism spectrum disorder services

The committee is aware that researchers are making progress in diagnosing autism in infants and young children years before what was previously thought possible. It is recognized that with early intervention, a child may make significant progress—potentially increasing language and social skills as well as circumventing the development of problematic behaviors. In keeping with trends in ongoing research, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to assist military families with autistic children to make sure they can receive the full and expanding range of early evidence-based risk assessments and diagnostics, early interventions, and appropriate treatment approaches. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that sufficient priority is given to efforts to provide timely services for autistic children of military families living in rural or underserved communities.

Behavioral health treatment of developmental disabilities under TRICARE

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to either: (1) Include in the defense budget for fiscal year 2016 the funding required to provide health care, including behavioral health treatment and applied behavior analysis when prescribed by a physician or psychologist, under section 1077 of title 10, United States Code, for treatment of developmental disabilities (as defined by section 102(8) of the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 U.S.C. 15002(8))), including autism spectrum disorder; or (2) Submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives explaining why such funding is not included in the budget for fiscal year 2016.

The health care described above should be provided by licensed or board-certified professionals. However, applied behavioral analysis or other behavioral health treatment may be provided by authorized employees, contractors, or trainees under the supervision of the licensed or board-certified professionals when the employee, contractor, or trainee meets minimum qualifications, training, or supervision requirements established by State law, an accredited national certification board, or by the Secretary.

Consolidated TRICARE health plan

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's proposal to consolidate the current TRICARE Prime, Standard, and Extra health plans into a single, consolidated plan designed to improve the benefit for authorized beneficiaries. However, the committee is concerned that this proposal would make significant structural changes to TRICARE that may be premature in light of the upcoming report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission established by Congress in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). This Commission is required to submit its report no later than February 2015. The committee is aware that this Commission is considering potential changes to the TRICARE benefit as part of its charter.

The committee remains committed to a military health care system that provides high quality, cost-effective health care to servicemembers, military retirees, and military dependents, and looks forward to the Commission's recommendations to maintain and improve the TRICARE health care benefit.

Department of Defense collaboration with the Department of Veterans Affairs on the disability claims processing backlog

The committee recognizes the vitally important ongoing collaboration between the Department of Defense (DOD) and the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) as they seek resolution on the over half a million pending disability claims, of which more than 50 percent are over 125 days old. Therefore, the committee encourages further coordination between the departments, specifically through: ongoing assignment of DOD subject matter experts to the Veterans Benefits Administration to review the disability claims backlog and identify cases where DOD involvement can assist the VA in processing claims; timely implementation of an interoperable electronic health record with integrated display of data or a single electronic health record; and the deployment of the Health Artifact and Image Management Solution. Additionally, the committee urges the DOD/VA Health Executive Committee to ensure expanded access to the Janus Joint Legacy Viewer to VA regional offices in all Veterans Integrated Service Networks regions and major DOD medical facilities in order to provide more efficient health care services to all veterans.

Prosthetics for servicemembers

The committee believes that injured servicemembers should have access to the best and most clinically appropriate prosthetics available. The committee notes that section 724 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) directed the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on plans to ensure that the most clinically appropriate prosthetics and orthotics are made available to injured servicemembers and veterans using technological advances as appropriate. The committee looks forward to reviewing that report, which is due on June 24, 2014.

As part of the existing reporting requirements associated with section 724, the committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to include in the report the following elements:

(1) A description of the quality and capability of prosthetics currently available to servicemembers, and an assessment of how the quality and capability of those prosthetics compare to the best prosthetics currently available in the commercial market;

(2) A description of prosthetics that have been developed with the support of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and an assessment of how those prosthetics compare to those currently available to servicemembers;

(3) An assessment of whether any gaps exist between the prosthetics currently provided to servicemembers and what is available in the commercial market; and

(4) If any such gaps exist, a description of the steps the Secretary of Defense plans to take in order to eliminate those gaps.

Treatment for obesity

The committee believes that maintaining a healthy weight supports overall health by reducing weight-related chronic disease risks. By encouraging TRICARE beneficiaries to maintain a healthy weight, the Department of Defense (DOD) can limit the direct and indirect medical costs associated with obesity. The committee notes that section 1079(a)(11) of title 10, United States Code, states that treatment of obesity may not be provided if obesity is the sole or major condition treated. The committee understands that DOD interprets this subsection to prohibit coverage for any treatment for obesity other than bariatric surgery, including FDA-approved drugs, even in cases where co-morbid conditions exist. The committee encourages DOD to broaden its interpretation to include coverage for clinically appropriate treatments for obesity where other major underlying medical conditions exist.

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management

Open systems approach to acquisition of systems containing information technology (sec. 801)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to adopt an open systems approach to Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAP) and Major Automated Information Systems (MAIS), and to other programs the primary purpose of which is the acquisition of an information technology (IT) system, entering the acquisition process after January 1, 2016. The committee believes that a comprehensive open systems approach is an important component of IT acquisition reform.

The provision would provide exceptions to this requirement for the procurement of commercial end-items and systems, and for so-called Quick Reaction Capabilities acquired or developed in response to Joint Urgent Operational Needs Statements or Joint Emergent Operational Needs Statements. The provision also would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) to identify all the legacy systems as of January 1, 2016, that were or are MDAP or MAIS that are not open systems, develop a process, including business case analyses, for ranking the priority of such legacy systems for migration to open systems, and develop a plan to migrate the top half of that prioritized list to open systems within 10 years of the date of enactment.

To support this open systems approach to IT acquisition reform, the provision requires the Secretary to: (1) Identify the distinct computing environments and mission domains in DOD; (2) Form or use existing voluntary and consensus based standards bodies to create technical reference architectures (TRA) and domain-specific services (DSS) for those computing and mission domains; and (3) Ensure that the DOD components are using the same TRA and DSS to avoid duplication, competing approaches, and lack of interoperability.

The provision defines an open system approach as an integrated technical and business strategy that: (1) Employs a modular design and uses widely supported and consensus-based standards for interfaces between layers, segments, services, and applications; (2) Is subjected to verification testing to prove the openness of its interfaces; and (3) Allows components to be added, modified, replaced, removed, and supported by different vendors over the lifecycle of the system, enabling competition and innovation. By computing environments, the committee means the computing infra-

structure that support missions and functions, ranging from embedded, real-time, safety-critical systems, to mobile computing, to large-scale enterprise or cloud-based environments.

Traditional, closed system acquisitions typically result in vendor lock for the life of the system because the design is tightly integrated between system components and between software and hardware, and software and interfaces are proprietary and unique. In such systems, it is very difficult and expensive to modify any component because of the tight coupling; and hardware and software coupling inhibits insertion of new commodity hardware.

In open systems, new hardware can be easily inserted, software can be extensively reused from one project to another, services are common and reused, new capabilities, services, and applications can be quickly developed and inexpensively integrated, and modifications and upgrades can be incrementally executed with low risk. Software is separated or abstracted from hardware, allowing substitution of new hardware or the application of software from one system to another.

The committee has over a period of years encouraged DOD, including through legislation, to develop meaningful IT acquisition reform strategies in recognition of the differences between the IT industry and non-IT hardware development processes. The committee has been disappointed by the inconsistent nature of the DOD's response.

In a few key areas, such as Navy sonars and submarine ship systems, DOD has shown that open systems architecture designs can yield significant benefits.

The Navy is now applying open systems approaches to a large number of programs, both large and small. The Air Force is using this design approach for unmanned aircraft avionics and ground control stations through the Rapid Capabilities Office, and to migrate to an open system on the F–22 and the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS). The Navy and Army jointly are building an open systems architecture approach for aviation systems through the Future Airborne Capability Environment. The Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) Task Force in USD (AT&L) is applying an open systems approach to the UAS Control Segment initiative. The Army's Intelligence and Security Command is designing the next-generation version of DCGS to be an open system. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence has for several years been constructing an open systems architecture for the entire Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise.

Nonetheless, DOD's approach to open systems remains spotty and inconsistent, and very few open systems have actually been built.

Accordingly, the committee concludes that DOD would benefit from a policy which establishes a presumption in favor of open systems architectures and requires program managers to focus on this issue early in the acquisition cycle.

Recharacterization of changes to Major Automated Information System programs (sec. 802)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify requirements applicable to a Major Automated Information System

program that fails to achieve a full deployment decision within 5 years after the Milestone A decision or selection of the preferred alternative for the program.

In lieu of a critical change report, failure to achieve a full deployment decision within 5 years would be determined to be a significant change with the attendant notification to the congressional defense committees required for all significant changes.

Process map requirement for milestone approval of defense business system programs (sec. 803)

The committee recommends a provision that would require business process reengineering before milestone decisions for Major Automated Information System programs.

Governance of Joint Information Environment (sec. 804)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to install a stronger management element and set of controls on the Joint Information Environment (JIE) initiative. Department of Defense (DOD) officials describe JIE as the most significant and far-reaching transformation of the Department's information networks ever attempted, and yet the Department is not managing the effort as an acquisition program. The committee is prepared to accept, for the time being, the Department's arguments for not designating JIE formally as an acquisition program. However, the committee is not satisfied with the level of rigor in DOD's planning and oversight of this initiative. In addition, the committee is concerned that the management elements in existence for JIE are imbalanced, with insufficient representation of those who must execute warfighting missions through the JIE networks and those who must operate and defend those networks against cyber attacks.

To address these concerns, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to assign a senior military or civilian official to serve as an assistant to the Chief Information Officer (CIO) as the JIE Coordinator. The JIE Coordinator shall have expertise in information technology planning and program management, command and control at the Joint Force level, and U.S. Cyber Command's (CYBERCOM) concept of operation for operating and defending DOD information systems and networks.

The provision would require that the CIO assign to the JIE Coordinator responsibility for balancing the priorities and risks between efficient network acquisition and operation, effective execution of military missions, and effective network defense. The JIE Coordinator would also:

(1) Define the features of the existing network architecture that are critical for the transition to the objective JIE architecture (the as is condition);

(2) Develop the desired architecture for JIE (the to be state);

(3) Develop and update an integrated master schedule for the migration from the as is to the to be JIE;

(4) With the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, develop and update cost estimates and performance measures for the migration to JIE;

(5) Track conformance and deviation from schedules, costs, and performance metrics;

(6) Identify gaps in the budgets and plans of the DOD components that collectively make up the resources for the JIE to determine requirements for development or procurement actions to address those gaps; and

(7) Oversee the development of open system architectures for the joint warfighting missions of the Department to complement the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise open architecture for JIE being developed under the direction of the JIE Executive Committee (EXCOM) by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence for the intelligence mission of the Department.

The provision would require the CIO, the commanders of the combatant commands, and the heads of the cyber components of the military services to assist the Coordinator by making available to the Coordinator experts from across the Department with experience in joint planning and operations at a combatant command, serving in the Office of the CIO or an office of the CIO of a military service, and on the staff of CYBERCOM or the cyber component of a military service. In addition, the team would include experts in information technology and cloud computing acquisition.

The JIE EXCOM currently is tri-chaired by the DOD CIO, the Joint Staff J6, and the Commander of CYBERCOM. The provision would require the addition of the J3s from the Joint Staff and CYBERCOM, and the addition of representatives from the operational communities on the working groups staffing the JIE EXCOM to ensure representation of warfighter interests and perspectives.

The provision would require the CIO to select from among competing open source candidates a standard language for representing cyber threat information, such as the Structured Threat Information Expression (STIX), Open Indicators of Compromise (Open IOC), Cyber Observable Expression (CYBOX), and Trusted Automated Exchange of Indicator Information (TAXII).

Finally, the provision would require the CIO to identify and prioritize the applications in use in the Department that the CIO assesses are candidates for migration to a cloud computing environment, and to determine which applications can and cannot, without modification or replacement, be shifted to a cloud computing environment, along with a time-phased plan to either modify or replace those applications that are not cloud-compatible. The committee notes that a significant percentage of DOD computing applications cannot be virtualized or otherwise are not cloud-compatible, and that the cost and time required to modify such applications are substantial. Without an understanding of what applications can be readily migrated, and a plan to modify or replace those that cannot, neither the Department nor potential commercial cloud providers will be able to plan effectively.

Report on implementation of acquisition process for information technology systems (sec. 805)

In the last several decades, the commercial marketplace has developed a process of rapid innovation and technology refresh for in-

formation technologies that the Department of Defense (DOD) has tried to leverage but often failed due to a cumbersome acquisition process.

In response, DOD has received new authorities from Congress and developed on its own significant policies and guidance for the development, acquisition, and integration of information technologies.

Legislation that supports a new approach includes, but is not limited to:

(1) The Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (P.L. 103–355), which encouraged executive agencies to seek and acquire commercial items or nondevelopmental items other than commercial items to address requirements;

(2) The Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–106; formerly the Information Technology Management Reform Act of 1996), which instituted a number of changes to acquisition practices emphasizing performance- and results-based management to enforce accountability for information resources; authorized the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy to conduct a pilot program to test alternative approaches for information technology acquisition by executive agencies; and directed the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that information technology acquisition processes were simple, clear, and understandable and that such processes addressed risk management, incremental acquisitions, and timely incorporation of commercial information technology; and

(3) Section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (P.L. 111–84), which directed the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a new acquisition process for information technology systems. The process was to take a modular, open-systems approach and include early and continual involvement of the user, multiple, rapidly executed increments or releases of capability, and early, successive prototyping to support an evolutionary approach.

The committee notes that the Department has issued guidance and policies to support and implement these authorities including, but not limited to:

(1) The interim DOD Instruction 5000.02, on Operation of the Defense Acquisition System (dated November 25, 2013). This instruction specifically highlights the importance of compliance with the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–106); and

(2) The Department's ongoing Better Buying Power initiative, which since 2010 has focused on providing greater efficiencies toward an affordable, value-added military capability to the warfighter. Among other areas, this initiative has concentrated on affordability, cost control throughout the product lifecycle, and incentivized productivity and innovation.

From the nonexhaustive list of laws, policies, and guidance listed above, it is clear that both the legislative and the executive branches have recognized the benefits of agile, incremental acquisition of information technology.

However, from the record of successful Major Automated Information Systems, it is less clear that the DOD has realized the ben-

efits from these laws, policies, and guidance. The committee notes approvingly that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) has initiated a review of information technology acquisition policy as part of his broader effort to reform and streamline defense acquisition.

As part of that process, the committee recommends a provision that requires the USD (AT&L) to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by July 31, 2014 on the implementation of the acquisition process for information technology detailing the applicable implementing regulations, instructions, or policies. The report shall also explain any legislative criteria not yet implemented and a schedule for implementing such criteria along with any proposed deviations.

Revision of requirement for acquisition programs to maintain defense research facility records (sec. 806)

The committee recommends a provision that would revise the requirement for Department of Defense programs to maintain defense research facility records, as established by section 2364 of title 10, United States Code.

Rapid acquisition and deployment procedures for United States Special Operations Command (sec. 807)

The committee recommends a provision that would require procedures for the rapid acquisition and deployment of items for the United States Special Operations Command that are currently under development by the Department of Defense or available from the commercial sector and are urgently needed to avoid significant risk of loss of life or mission failure, or needed to avoid collateral damage where no collateral damage is necessary for mission success.

Consideration of corrosion control in preliminary design review (sec. 808)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to ensure that Department of Defense Instruction 5000.02 and other applicable guidance require full consideration during preliminary design review of metals, materials, and technologies that effectively prevent or control corrosion over the life cycle of the product.

Repeal of extension of Comptroller General report on inventory (sec. 809)

The committee recommends a provision that would sunset the reporting requirements of section 803(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations

Restatement and revision of requirements applicable to multiyear defense acquisitions to be specifically authorized by law (sec. 821)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify and reorganize the reporting and certification requirements of the Department of Defense when requesting specific authorization for multiyear contract authority.

Section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretary of Defense, in the case of a contract equal to or greater than $500.0 million, to certify that certain requirements will be met by the proposed contract no later than March 1st of the year in which the legislative authority to enter into such contract is requested. The Secretary must send a notification of the findings regarding the same requirements 30 days before award of the contract.

The committee finds value in both the certification and the notification, but believes that the timing is reversed. The recommended provision would reorganize the timeline so the Secretary provides the initial findings of the enumerated requirements when requesting multiyear contract authority and then certifies the completed findings prior to contract award.

The committee believes this will provide more reasonable and complete information.

Extension and modification of contract authority for advanced component development and prototype units and modification of authority (sec. 822)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend a pilot program that provides a bridge between the science and technology (S&T) portion of a contract awarded under the Federal Acquisition Regulation's Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) authority, and the award of a contract under a new acquisition for advanced component development or prototyping. The provision also expands the authority, to include a bridge to the production of technologies resulting from the successful research and development programs.

The committee believes that by allowing the BAA-based contract to include a contract line item or an option for potential work that bridges the gap between S&T and advanced component development or procurement, contracts can be issued on BAAs that carry the most promising work through to integrated component evaluation, demonstration, validation, and production without having to restart the acquisition process.

It is the committee's expectations that extending the authority under this section will speed the transition of S&T into fielded systems pursuant to the goals of Department of Defense Instruction 5000.2, "Operation of the Defense Acquisition System".

Conditional temporary extension of comprehensive subcontracting plans (sec. 823)

The committee recommends a provision that extends the comprehensive subcontracting plan test program to September 30, 2015, if the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisitions, Tech-

nology and Logistics cannot transition all active participants to individual small business subcontracting plans that meet all relevant requirements contained in the Federal Acquisition Regulation before December 31, 2014.

Participants transitioned shall also enhance subcontracting opportunities for small business concerns.

Sourcing requirements related to avoiding counterfeit electronic parts (sec. 824)

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify sourcing requirements related to avoiding counterfeit electronic parts.

Authority for Defense Contract Audit Agency to interview contractor employees in connection with examination of contractor records (sec. 825)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend subsection (a)(1) of section 2313 of title 10, United States Code, to grant the Defense Contract Audit Agency specific authority to interview contractor employees similar to the authority granted to the Comptroller General in subsection (c)(1) of that same section.

Enhancement of whistleblower protection for employees of grantees (sec. 826)

The committee recommends a provision that would enhance the whistleblower protections for employees of grantees.

Prohibition on reimbursement of contractors for congressional investigations and inquiries (sec. 827)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit reimbursement of costs incurred by a contractor in connection with a congressional investigation or inquiry into an issue that is the subject matter of a proceeding resulting in a disposition.

Enhanced authority to acquire certain products and services produced in Africa (sec. 828)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide Department of Defense missions in the United States Africa Command (AFRICOM) area of responsibility (AOR) with a limited procurement authority giving a preference to products and services produced in the AFRICOM AOR.

Requirement to provide photovoltaic devices from United States sources (sec. 829)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide additional acquisition opportunities for the Department of Defense with respect to photovoltaic devices.

Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs

Program manager development strategy (sec. 841)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a comprehensive strategy for en-

hancing the role of Department of Defense program managers in developing and carrying out defense acquisition programs.

Tenure and accountability of program managers for program development periods (sec. 842)

The committee recommends a provision that requires the Secretary of Defense to revise Department of Defense guidance for defense acquisition programs to address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program development period of defense acquisition programs.

Tenure and accountability of program managers for program execution periods (sec. 843)

The committee recommends a provision that would address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program execution period.

The provision would require each such program manager to enter into a performance agreement with the milestone decision authority (MDA) that establishes the expected parameters of performance, including the commitment of the MDA that adequate funding and resources are available and will be provided, and assurance of the program manager that the parameters are achievable.

The provision would also require that program managers be given authority comparable to the authority given to private sector program managers and that they be assigned to a program until the delivery of the first production units, with a narrow waiver authority.

Removal of requirements related to waiver of preliminary design review and post-preliminary design review before Milestone B (sec. 844)

The committee recommends a provision that would add an alternative to one of the certification requirements established by section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, for major defense acquisition programs entering the acquisition system at Milestone B.

Comptroller General of the United States report on operational testing programs for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 845)

The committee notes the valuable role that the Director of Operational Testing and Evaluation (DOT&E) plays in providing oversight and independent reviews to Congress to ensure weapon systems are suitable and effective in combat.

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the extent, if any, to which major weapon systems have been required to conduct operational testing in excess of levels necessary to demonstrate compliance with program requirements validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and effectiveness and suitability for combat, as required by section 2399 of title 10, United States Code.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Extension to United States Transportation Command of authorities relating to prohibition on contracting with the enemy (sec. 861)

The committee recommends a provision that would include United States Transportation Command in the expanded authorities granted by section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–066).

Reimbursement of Department of Defense for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers (sec. 862)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the reimbursement to the Department of Defense for assistance provided to nongovernmental entertainment-oriented media producers.

Three-year extension of authority for Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund (sec. 863)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 3 years the Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund, which is available to the Secretary of Defense for providing equipment, supplies, services, training, and facilities to resolve urgent operational needs.

Items of Special Interest

Army Financial Management Optimization Initiative

The General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS) is the Army's web-based enterprise resource planning (ERP) solution. GFEBS leverages commercial off-the-shelf business enterprise software (SAP) to enable the Army to compile and share accurate, up-to-date financial and accounting data across the entire active Army, Army Reserves, and Army National Guard. GFEBS replaces or absorbs more than 80 legacy accounting and asset management systems to standardize business processes and transactional input across the Army.

Seeking to optimize GFEBS utilization, the Secretary of the Army signed a memorandum on September 11, 2012, directing the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller (ASA(FM&C)) to conduct a doctrine, organization, training, material, leadership, personnel, facilities (DOTMLPF) review of all financial management processes, policies, organization, and workforce composition.

This review, known as the Army Financial Management Optimization (AFMO) initiative is intended to examine and ultimately adjust the roles, missions, and functions of Army financial management (FM) units to optimize the capabilities of the Army's enterprise-wide FM system, maximize efficiency, eliminate or mitigate capability gaps, and meet DOD-wide auditability requirements. The AFMO Task Force made numerous recommendations, including a plan to "consolidate selected financial management activities" into "Command-Aligned Hubs" (CAH). A pilot program to test this CAH approach will begin October 1, 2014.

The committee applauds the Army's efforts. But as the Army works to reduce costs and achieve auditable financial statements, it is important that the evaluation of the CAH pilot program be analyzed not just from an Army perspective but also from a DOD-wide perspective.

The committee therefore directs the Deputy Chief Management Officer to conduct a review of the CAH pilot program for any DOD-wide impacts and report findings of the review to the congressional defense committees within 120 days of completion of the pilot program.

Business systems modernization

The Department of Defense (DOD) business systems environment supports critical functions such as human resources management, logistics, and acquisition that directly impact the lives of our fighting men and women.

Nevertheless, this environment, which includes over 2,000 systems, is overly complex and error-prone, and is characterized by little standardization, multiple systems that perform the same tasks, the same data being stored in multiple systems, and the need for data to be entered manually into multiple systems. The President's budget requests over $6.0 billion in fiscal year 2015 funds to support its business systems.

10 U.S. Code 2222 requires all business systems to comply with the DOD Business Enterprise Architecture (BEA) and complete sufficient Business Process Reengineering before the systems can be certified and approved to obligate available funds.

However, the ability to meet the intent of this statute is limited by the quality and utility of DOD's BEA and business process reengineering efforts. Without a meaningful architecture and effective means for conducting business process reengineering assessments, DOD will not be able to cost-effectively achieve its business systems modernization goals in a timely manner.

Accordingly, the committee requests the Government Accountability Office to report on (1) How useful the current BEA is in guiding and constraining DOD's business transformation initiatives and whether more cost-effective alternative approaches exist to meet DOD's needs; and (2) Evaluate the effectiveness of DOD's approach to conducting business process reengineering assessments.

The report should consider including business system investments covering a range of sizes (costs) and risk levels, among other selection factors, as part of its study. The committee directs the Comptroller General to issue this report by February 1, 2015.

Clarification on the use of energy savings performance contracts

The committee notes that section 8287 of title 42, United States Code, provides authority for energy savings performance contracts (ESPC). The committee believes that ESPC are a tool that has proven effective in reducing both cost and energy use by leveraging third-party private financing.

The committee has attempted to clarify when it is appropriate to use such contracts in both section 828 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–

383) and section 2825 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239).

While ESPC are not available for constructing new buildings or facilities, the committee notes that in some cases, the installation of equipment meeting the standard of section 8287 requires the modification or repair of existing facilities, or the construction of facilities or infrastructure that provide necessary support to the primary function of the operating equipment. In such cases, ESPC may be used.

The committee applauds the Army for their aggressive use of ESPC. According to testimony by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy, and Environment on April 2, 2014, "The Army has the most robust ESPC program in the Federal Government. The ESPC program has more than 180 Task Orders at over 75 installations, representing $1.32 billion in private sector investment. . . . We have additional ESPC projects in development, totaling over $400.0 million in private investment."

The committee understands that the Army's use of ESPC has resulted in energy savings of almost 9 percent of their fiscal year 2013 facilities energy consumption and an annual utility cost avoidance of more than $168.0 million.

The committee notes that while the Navy and the Air Force have also made use of ESPC, they have done so on a much smaller scale. The committee urges the Navy and the Air Force to adopt the Army's best practices wherever possible to similarly increase their use of ESPC.

Comptroller General of the United States report on counterfeit or suspect counterfeit electronic parts

The committee remains concerned about the counterfeit electronic parts in the Department of Defense (DOD) supply chain. While efforts have been made to secure the supply chain, vulnerabilities still exist.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide the congressional defense committees a report within 270 days of enactment of this Act.

The required report should contain an analysis of reports relating to counterfeit or suspect counterfeit electronic parts submitted to the Government Industry Data Exchange Program (GIDEP) from January 2011 to present, including: (a) The number of reports filed by original component manufacturers, authorized distributors, independent distributors, and original equipment manufacturers; and (b) The source of supply, i.e., original component manufacturers, authorized distributors, and independent distributors, for parts identified in reports as counterfeit or suspect counterfeit.

The required report should also contain a description of DOD efforts to work with the defense industrial base to improve contractor systems for the detection and avoidance of counterfeit parts. Further, the report should describe government or industry practices that detect counterfeit or suspect counterfeit parts prior to their entry into the DOD supply chain but do not fall under the GIDEP reporting requirement, and make recommendations on how to best ensure such cases are reported in the future.

Comptroller General review of the Department of Defense audit readiness efforts for property, plant, and equipment

The committee notes that successful execution of Department of Defense (DOD) military missions depends on a properly equipped and supplied force. Maintaining accurate, reliable, and accountable systems of record for mission critical assets, including equipment, real property, inventory, and supplies, is imperative.

The availability and accuracy of cost information for use by Congress and DOD executives is critical in making decisions about allocating scarce resources, authorizing and modifying programs, and evaluating program performance.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the DOD's plans to achieve audit readiness with respect to its property, plant, and equipment, and to submit a report on the findings to the congressional defense committees within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The required report shall, at a minimum, include an assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of requiring asset valuations to be conducted as part of the statutory requirement for audit readiness by September 30, 2017.

Government Accountability Office review of Nunn-McCurdy reporting requirements applicable to major automated information systems experiencing cost or schedule overruns

The committee notes that Chapter 144A of title 10, United States Code, enacted as section 816 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, establishes a tiered system for reporting cost and schedule overruns for Major Automated Information Systems (MAIS) programs, similar to the system established for reporting cost and schedule overruns on Major Defense Acquisition Programs (MDAPs) under Chapter 144 of title 10—commonly referred to as the Nunn-McCurdy reporting requirements.

Under Chapter 144A, as under Chapter 144, programs experiencing a critical change to program requirements are subject not only to congressional notification but also to a program evaluation assessing: the projected cost and schedule for completing the program if current requirements are not modified, the projected cost and schedule for completing the program based on reasonable modification of such requirements, and the rough order of magnitude of the cost and schedule for any reasonable alternative system or capability.

No funds may be obligated for a MAIS program experiencing a critical change unless and until the program manager for the program provides a written certification to Congress that: the program is essential to the national security or to the efficient management of the Department of Defense (DOD), there is no alternative to the program that will provide equal or greater capability at less cost, the new estimates of the costs, schedule, and performance parameters have been determined, with the concurrence of the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, to be reasonable, and

the management structure for the program is adequate to manage and control program costs.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to review DOD implementation of the requirements of Chapter 144A and report to the congressional defense committees on any findings and recommendations from that review.

Joint Information Environment

The Department of Defense (DOD) is undertaking an ambitious effort to realign and restructure how its many information technology (IT) networks are constructed, operated, and defended with the goal of providing better information access to the user, improving the security of its networks and data, and being more responsive to constantly changing technological and operational factors.

This IT network alignment initiative is referred to as the Joint Information Environment (JIE) and is led by the DOD Chief Information Officer (CIO). According to the CIO, DOD plans on utilizing the Services' existing programs, initiatives, and technical refresh to deploy or migrate to JIE standards using specific implementation guidance.

While a shared IT infrastructure across the DOD would improve mission effectiveness, providing our military commanders and civilian leaders with the most timely and accurate data and information, DOD does not have a strong track record implementing large-scale IT initiatives.

In particular, after 10 years and at least $379.0 million, the DOD has still yet to develop a meaningful IT enterprise architecture—the blueprint for defense system interoperability—that has been fully federated (extended) to the components.

In light of this, the committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to evaluate the JIE initiative. At a minimum, the GAO shall (1) ascertain the scope, costs, and implementation plans for JIE, and (2) assess the extent to which DOD is executing effective executive oversight and governance of JIE.

The committee expects GAO to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by October 1, 2014.

Next Generation Enterprise Network

The committee notes that the Navy is investing considerable resources in the planning, development, and implementation of the Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN), which will serve to replace the current Navy Marine Corps Intranet in supplying information technology (IT) and data service to the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The committee conceptually supports the Navy's planned transition and acquisition strategy that is intended to procure IT enterprise services, including network operating centers, desktop applications, service desks, and computer server farms, in a series of individually competed short-term contracts. If realized, such an acquisition strategy would allow for frequent recompetition allowing the Navy to acquire higher performance capabilities at reduced costs.

The committee is concerned, however, that the integrated nature of IT systems, and the tendency for bureaucratic and cost barriers

to prevent displacement of incumbent technologies and contractors, will prevent the Navy from achieving this desired competitive and flexible acquisition environment.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2014 on the methods and strategies it will use to ensure it can continually re-compete contracts for hardware, network services, enterprise services, and other capabilities under the NGEN program individually, and without undue advantage to incumbent technologies and contractors.

Performance Based Logistics

In 2001, the Department of Defense (DOD) identified performance-based logistics (PBL) as a preferred weapon system support strategy. Within DOD, PBL is the purchase of performance outcomes, such as system availability and readiness, rather than the purchase of individual elements of logistics support—such as parts, repairs, and engineering support.

DOD guidance recommends that business case analysis be used to guide decisionmaking regarding the implementation of PBL.

The committee supports the use of a business case analysis and believes that the Services should have effective internal controls to ensure that the analyses are prepared and that they provide a consistent and comprehensive assessment of costs and improvements to readiness.

The committee is aware of a number of PBL, including the Navy's use for aviation tires and the Air Force's use for the sustainment of the C–17, as well as discussions to expand PBL to sustainment of the F117 engine fleet.

Reportedly, since the award of the PBL in 2000, the Navy has achieved approximately $46.0 million in savings in inventory reductions while producing on-time delivery requirements of 99 percent and a reduction in delivery time from 60 days to 36 hours inside the United States and to 66 hours outside the United States.

The C–17 PBL reduced cost-per-flight hour, reduced engine overhaul turn-around time, and increased the sustained mission capable rate, saving the Air Force hundreds of millions of dollars.

To better understand the effectiveness and efficiency of PBL, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide the congressional defense committees with a plan for the future use of PBL reflecting how the use of PBL can improve execution, efficiency, cost, and readiness of applicable programs.

Report on Statement of Budgetary Activity to assess progress toward auditability

The committee believes that a valuable means of demonstrating Department of Defense (DOD) progress towards auditability is for the Secretary of Defense to report on the aggregate funding included in a Schedule of Budgetary Activity by service branch and defense agency and appropriation, and also the aggregate funding not included in such Schedules of Budgetary Activity.

As the Schedules of Budgetary Activity are an interim step toward a complete Statement of Budgetary Resources that complies

with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, it is valuable for the committee to have available a means of assessing DOD progress toward the statutory requirement to produce auditable financial statements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report annually, 120 days after the end of the fiscal year, on the aggregate DOD funding included in Schedules of Budgetary Activity.

The report should include the aggregate level of funding and also the percentage of total funding that is included in DOD's Treasury certified Statement of Budgetary Resources Financial Statement that is not included in a Schedule of Budgetary Activities.

Small businesses and the health of the U.S. defense industrial base

The committee believes that a healthy defense industrial base must include a large number of vibrant, growing, and technologically-advanced small defense companies. Small defense companies can provide a source of competition that drives down costs and increases performance.

The committee is concerned that sequestration and the lack of fiscal certainty have created a difficult business environment, particularly for small companies that contract with the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee believes that DOD should continue its efforts to improve the health of the defense industrial base, including small businesses. DOD should continue to proactively seek to contract with small defense companies, when appropriate, and the committee expects DOD to strive to meet its small business contracting goals as set forth in 15(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(g)) annex.

Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the following:

(1) The impact of defense sequestration on small business concerns of the defense industrial base and any associated national security consequences; and

(2) A determination if the effects of defense sequestration have made DOD more reliant on sole source procurements or reduced the pool of small business offerors for critical weapon systems components.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management

Reorganization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and related matters (sec. 901)

The committee recommends a provision that would combine the Deputy Chief Management Officer position and the Chief Information Officer position into the Chief Management Officer position, redesignate the Deputy Secretary of Defense as the Chief Operating Officer, eliminate the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense title except for Principal Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense established by law, and redesignate the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations, Energy, and Environment.

Additionally, this proposal seeks to make changes to Chapter 4 of Title 10, United States Code, in order to streamline the establishment provisions for certain officials and ensure that policy-making requirements are provided for separately from establishment provisions and to make other clerical and conforming changes.

Section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) designated the Deputy Secretary of Defense as the Department of Defense (DOD) Chief Management Officer, established an Under Secretary of Defense-level Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO) to assist the Deputy Secretary, and named the under secretaries of the military departments as their organizations' chief management officers.

This legislation was intended to strengthen the management of DOD's business operations and was the result of a series of recommendations from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and several think tanks that argued the need for a senior official at DOD with significant authority and experience to focus attention on enterprise-wide business transformation and sustain progress at the highest levels of DOD.

The framework enacted into law was a compromise between those such as then-Comptroller General David Walker who advocated the creation of a second Deputy Secretary of Defense focused solely on management, and those who asserted that no reorganization was necessary to address DOD's persistent business challenges.

Following enactment of the legislation, DOD moved quickly to implement the new office of the DCMO with the mission of integrating, synchronizing, and coordinating DOD's business operations. On July 1, 2010, the first DCMO was confirmed by the Senate and sworn in. At that time, DOD believed that the new man-

agement structure put in place by the Fiscal Year 2008 NDAA was properly scoped and defined to enable DOD to make significant progress in breaking down its functional stovepipes.

The committee believes that while significant progress has been made, it has become increasingly clear that additional changes to the structure of the DCMO position are needed to position DOD for success in its business mission.

Specifically, change is required to make the DCMO a co-equal of the other Under Secretaries of Defense with the independent statutory authorities necessary to introduce and drive implementation of transformational change and improvement in the Department's business operations.

The provision would therefore combine the DCMO position with the Department's Chief Information Officer (CIO) position and designate that individual as the Department's Chief Management Officer (CMO). The CMO would be subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense. The Deputy Secretary of Defense, previously designated as the CMO, would now be designated as the Chief Operating Officer (COO) of the Department.

The new CMO position would be directly after the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics and service secretaries in the order precedence and before the remaining Under Secretaries of Defense. The position would be assigned two Principal Deputy Under Secretaries of Defense (PDUSD) to assist in the execution of their duties, a PDUSD for Management and a PDUSD for Information.

The proposed CMO position would unify roles and functions traditionally performed by the CIO and strengthen the office by making it a Senate-confirmed position again. The CMO would exercise authority, direction, and control over the Information Assurance Directorate (IAD) of the National Security Agency (NSA). The bifurcation of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence into the ASD(NII) and the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) led to the USD(I) supervising the NSA IAD, despite the fact that the CIO, not the USD(I), is responsible for information systems security, which is the mission of the IAD.

A strengthened CIO will provide better management and oversight of information technology, systems, and operations within DOD, including over the U.S. Cyber Command.

Combining these offices also should produce some savings in overhead.

The committee recognizes and is encouraged by the significant progress that has been made to date on the use of energy by the Department since the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy Plans and Programs was first established.

The committee is also encouraged by the DOD Energy Policy (4180.01) published on April 16, 2014, and strongly intends for the new position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment to: (1) Establish DOD energy policy, goals, initiatives, oversight, and budgetary matters for operational energy, installation energy, and environmental matters including climate change, contingency basing, and energy security; (2) Establish

DOD energy boards and councils as necessary to support DOD energy policies, plans, and programs; (3) Oversee DOD energy planning, use, management, and implementation; (4) Develop policy, guidelines, and provide oversight for development, certification, qualification, field demonstration, and ongoing purchases of alternative fuels for operational platforms and demonstration of energy technologies; (5) Support the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) in the requirements process regarding energy in accordance with the Operation of the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System Manual; (6) Promote energy-related issues, programs, and accounts as an advisor to the Defense Acquisition Board and other key acquisition bodies; (7) Advise the CJCS and the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy regarding the role of energy in the DOD planning process across the full range of military operations; (8) Oversee identification and mitigation of energy-related risks and commercial grid challenges for DOD infrastructure and missions in conjunction with other DOD risk management and readiness programs; (9) Ensure investments are made in facility infrastructure to reduce energy demand, increase on-site distribution (including renewables), and enhance the power resiliency on installations; (10) Oversee facility energy technology programs and identify and support the demonstration of energy technologies to address installation needs; and (11) Collaborate with other governmental organizations and the private sector on energy-related matters.

Additionally, the committee maintains that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment may communicate views directly to the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense without obtaining the approval or concurrence of any other official within the DOD.

Additionally, the new position of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment will serve as the Department's designated Senior Real Property Officer and be responsible for providing budgetary, policy, and management oversight of the DOD's real property portfolio; managing the Base Realignment and Closure activities for domestic installations and facility consolidation and realignment efforts overseas; and managing environmental compliance, conservation, and clean-up programs.

Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (sec. 902)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 138 of title 10, United States Code, to redesignate the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, whose principal duty would be the overall supervision of manpower and reserve affairs of the Department of Defense.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Modifications to requirements for accounting for members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense civilian employees listed as missing (sec. 911)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 76 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a defense agency within the Department of Defense, headed by a Director, to have responsibility over the Prisoner of War/Missing in Action accounting community. The provision would create a new section 1501a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into public-private partnerships for the purposes of facilitating the accounting of missing persons. The provision would require the Secretary to assign or detail to the defense agency a full-time senior medical examiner to provide medical oversight of the identification process, to establish identification and laboratory policy, and to advise the Director on forensic scientific disciplines. Finally, the provision would require the Secretary to establish and maintain a single centralized database and case management system containing information on all missing persons for whom a file has been established.

Items of Special Interest

Headquarters Reductions of the Department of Defense

The Secretary of Defense has announced plans to reduce management headquarters in the Department of Defense (DOD) by 20 percent. These reductions are intended to reverse the growth in such headquarters and garner efficiencies that can be used to decrease overhead in favor of mission needs.

The fiscal year 2015 budget materials submitted by the President projects that DOD will save $5.3 billion through 2019 by such reductions. While a significant sum, this is a tiny fraction of DOD's overall spending and the committee is increasingly convinced that DOD's planned efforts will not result in as much of a reduction as they should be able to achieve.

Moreover, in May 2013, the Comptroller General reported that the geographic combatant commands, excluding U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) which led U.S. efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan, had grown by 50 percent over the past decade. Ongoing work by the Comptroller General being conducted for this committee has found even larger growth at CENTCOM, as well as the functional combatant commands, the service secretariats and service staffs, the Joint Staff, defense-wide combat support agencies, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

In general, the Comptroller General has found a lack of discipline in setting and validating requirements for individual headquarters, as well as poor visibility into the total resources being devoted across organizations to similar functions and missions. As a result, the committee lacks confidence that DOD has a clear grasp of the personnel it needs to conduct its missions or that current plans will reverse the extensive growth of the past decade.

To achieve significant savings, the Secretary of Defense must focus on consolidating and eliminating organizations and personnel that perform similar functions and missions.

In March 2012, the Comptroller General reported longstanding problems in the way that DOD tracks its headquarters spending and found that DOD could likely achieve additional savings by consolidating or eliminating organizations that are geographically close or managed by the same executive agent nearby and by expanding the span of control or by centralizing functions and services, such as administrative and support.

In January 2014, the Defense Business Board (DBB) reported that such de-layering will be critical to achieving real savings and would improve efficiency by reducing layers of review and coordination.

The DBB concluded that DOD's current efforts might generate savings near term but would not be the most efficient approach in the longer term for a number of reasons. The DBB estimated that DOD could save up to $8.0 billion annually if they took a more systematic approach.

The committee is concerned about DOD's efforts to stem the apparent growth in support functions such as, among others, budget, policy, legal, and personnel management across the organizations.

Of particular note is that much of the growth in headquarters appears to be driven by the need to support the growing bureaucracy itself; for instance, the personal staff of some combatant commanders exceeds one-fifth of their entire organization while others have a much lower proportion of their personnel in the front office. In addition, some mission-related functions, such as intelligence and planning, also appear to have grown dramatically.

To assist in ongoing congressional oversight and ensure that the Secretary of Defense achieves meaningful and durable savings in its headquarters overhead, the committee directs the Comptroller General to identify: (1) Trends in specific budget lines reflecting the growth in personnel, mission and other resources at headquarters units; (2) Trends in personnel, mission, and resource growth across functional areas across related organizations; (3) The extent DOD and the military services have taken steps to eliminate or consolidate overlapping, fragmented, or duplicative functions; (4) The extent to which DOD and the military services have eliminated both the civilian billets or contractor positions and the associated funding with those positions; (5) Whether efforts to date constitute a systematic and comprehensive approach; (6) Actual savings to date from announced reductions in personnel, mission, or other resources since fiscal year 2012; (7) any additional steps DOD should take to realize substantial additional savings; (8) Whether captured, planned, or recommended reductions warrant an evaluation of the rank of the individual heading each relevant organization; and (9) Other matters the Comptroller General determines are appropriate as this review is conducted.

The organizations that shall be considered in this cross-cutting review are the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the service secretariats and staff, the geographic and functional combatant commands and their service component commands, and the defense-wide combat support agencies.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to brief the preliminary results of the study no later than October 2014 and may report the results of the study in one or more reports as deemed appropriate to the Comptroller General as agreed to by the committee.

Plan on satisfying emergent warfighter needs

The committee encourages the Department of Defense (DOD) to capture and institutionalize the lessons learned from more than a decade of wartime rapid acquisition and to streamline and consolidate the organizations, capabilities, and resources devoted to fulfilling urgent and emergent operational needs.

The committee supports the efforts by the former Deputy Secretary of Defense, Ashton Carter, to organize DOD organizations and capabilities to respond quickly to emerging warfighter requirements as outlined in his September 6, 2013, memorandum.

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) required the Secretary of Defense to provide a study and report on the effectiveness of the processes used by DOD to generate and satisfy urgent operational needs. The resulting Defense Science Board (DSB) report offered a number of improvements to this process.

This DSB report predicted that as the push of wartime needs subsides, the ability to rapidly field critical equipment and weapons systems will decline. The committee believes that DOD should maintain this important capability.

While it is true that unanticipated and vital warfighter requirements, including Joint Urgent Operational Needs (JUON) and Joint Emergent Operational Needs (JEON), will continue to arise that must be addressed quickly, the committee believes that further consolidation of the organizations and processes are warranted.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD (AT&L)) in coordination with the secretaries of the military departments, the Under Secretary of Defense (Policy), the Under Secretary of Defense (Intelligence), the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command, and the Director of the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation Office, to present the congressional defense committees with a plan to consolidate any enduring functions of the organizations, capabilities, and funding associated with the following organizations: the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization; the Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell; the Warfighter Senior Integration Group; the Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Task Force; the Afghanistan Resources Oversight Council; and along with any other defense-wide or military department-specific organizations, capabilities, and funding associated with comparable JUON or JEON efforts.

The plan shall also include the organization, or organizations, under which the aforementioned organizations will be consolidated. The objective of this consolidation should be to eliminate headquarters organizations to the maximum extent practicable while maintaining the critical ability to meet emergent warfighter re-

quirements in a rapid and effective manner with a sense of urgency commensurate with identified needs and risks.

The committee expects the required plan to include any lessons learned by the rapid acquisition organizations since 2001, and how these lessons learned are incorporated into current policy and processes for satisfying JUON and JEON.

The committee directs the USD (AT&L) to provide an interim report to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2014, and a final report no later than February 2, 2015.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Financial Matters

General transfer authority (sec. 1001)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to $5.0 billion of funds authorized in division A of this Act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. Transfers of funds between military personnel authorizations would not be counted toward the dollar limitation in this provision.

National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund (sec. 1002)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund. This fund would be responsible for obligation and expenditure of funds for construction (including design of vessels), purchase, alteration, and conversion of strategic missile submarines.

The committee recognizes that there will be challenges to affordability as the Department of the Navy and the Department of Defense seek to replace the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarines as they approach the end of their useful service lives. In testimony before the committee, the Chief of Naval Operations stated, "I am increasingly concerned about our ability to fund the Ohio Replacement ballistic missile submarine (SSBN) program—our highest priority program—within our current and projected resources."

The committee believes that establishing a separate fund for pursuing construction of the Ohio-class replacement submarines is a first important step to ensuring that the program has the appropriate visibility within the administration and within Congress to ensure that the Ohio Replacement Program moves forward with the appropriate level of visibility and management attention.

The committee recommends an authorization of $100.0 million for the fund.

Sense of Senate on sequestration (sec. 1003)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate on the devastating impact that the statutory budget caps are having on the Department of Defense and our national security and the need for legislation to adjust those caps.

Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities

Extension of authority to support unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1011)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 3 fiscal years the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to support the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism

campaign of the Government of Colombia (section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as most recently amended by section 1011 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66)), as well as extend the expanded congressional notification requirement.

The committee notes that the Government of Colombia has made and continues to make progress against transnational narcotics trafficking organizations and designated foreign terrorist organizations. This type of flexible authority is still required to assist the Government of Colombia to consolidate its gains, but the committee expects to see continued reductions in the level of assistance provided to Colombia, as has been agreed to in our bilateral engagements with the Government of Colombia.

Extension and modification of authority for joint task forces supporting law enforcement agencies conducting activities to counter transnational organized crime to support law enforcement agencies conducting counter-terrorism activities (sec. 1012)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1022 of the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2004 (Public Law 108–136), as most recently amended by section 1012 of the the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), to: (1) Extend the underlying authority through fiscal year 2020; (2) Expand the scope of the Department of Defense (DOD) authority to provide support to U.S. law enforcement agencies for counterterrorism purposes when a nexus exists between drug trafficking or transnational organized crime (TOC) and a foreign terrorist organization; (3) Make a series of technical modifications; and (4) Expand the authority of DOD to support counter illicit trafficking activities in certain circumstances.

As the committee notes elsewhere in this report, the Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime, released by the President on July 19, 2011, sought to increase DOD's support to U.S. law enforcement efforts to combat TOC. As such, the committee believes this modification to DOD's longstanding counterdrug authority is necessary to ensure DOD is able to fully support both U.S. law enforcement and foreign partners.

Further, the committee expects DOD to leverage this modification to increase its counter threat finance intelligence activities. "Cash is king" for illicit organizations that operate in narcotics, transnational crime, and terrorism, and—as DOD has learned through its threat finance cell operations in Afghanistan and Iraq over the past decade—understanding the financing activities of illicit networks is critical to minimizing the threat posed to U.S. national security interests and enabling the use of law enforcement, financial, or other tools to disrupt such activities. The committee expects that DOD will focus on any expansion of its activities pursuant to this authority on the Haqqani network and al Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb.

Extension of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments (sec. 1013)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 1013 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). Specifically, the provision would extend the Department of Defense's (DOD) authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments through fiscal year 2020, as well as increase the cap on the limitation on obligations from $100.0 million to $125.0 million per fiscal year.

The committee notes that DOD has increased its utilization of this authority in recent years and in fiscal year 2014, according to the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Counter-narcotics and Global Threats, DOD has received validated requests for more than $100.0 million from the combatant commanders. The committee further notes that under the current funding limitation, DOD will reject validated requests from the combatant commanders for countries that are prepared to increase their capacity to combat the flow of narcotics and to assist the U.S. Government in its counter-narcotics operations.

The committee also notes that the number of countries eligible to receive so-called section 1033 assistance has increased in recent years as a result of the growing presence of transnational criminal organizations operating across many parts of Africa a region the committee continues to believe DOD should expand its current programming. As such, the committee expects that DOD will look to initiate programs in the AFRICOM area of responsibility with this increase in the availability of funds.

Extension and modification of authority of Department of Defense to provide additional support for counterdrug activities of other governmental agencies (sec. 1014)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1004 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510), as most recently amended by section 1005 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), to authorize the Department of Defense (DOD) to provide additional support for activities of other governmental agencies to counter transnational organized crime (TOC) in addition to its counterdrug activities. The provision would also extend the underlying authority through the end of fiscal year 2020 and reduce the dollar threshold for a notification on facilities projects to the congressional defense committees.

The committee notes that the Commander of U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) and the Commander of U.S. Northern Command have testified before the committee about the corrosive effect of TOC on every institution in the partner nations in their respective areas of responsibility. Furthermore, the committee is aware of research indicating the increasing convergence of threats to U.S. national security—including narcotics trafficking and terrorism—with TOC networks. The committee notes that the Strategy to

Combat Transnational Organized Crime, released by the President on July 19, 2011, sought to enhance DOD's support to U.S. law enforcement. As such, the committee believes this modification to DOD's longstanding counterdrug authority is necessary to ensure DOD is able to fully support U.S. law enforcement and foreign partners.

For purposes of implementation guidance, the committee believes the National Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime provides a good definition of TOC. It states that TOC "refers to those self-perpetuating associations of individuals who operate transnationally for the purpose of obtaining power, influence, monetary, and/or commercial gains, wholly or in part by illegal means, while protecting their activities through a pattern of corruption and/or violence, or while protecting their illegal activities through a transnational organizational structure and the exploitation of transnational commerce or communication mechanisms."

Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards

Limitation on use of funds for inactivation of U.S.S. George Washington (sec. 1021)

The committee recommends a provision that would prevent the Navy from obligating or expending any funds in fiscal year 2015 on inactivating the U.S.S. *George Washington* (CVN–73) unless such obligation or expenditure is to support tasks that are identical to tasks that would be necessary to conduct a refueling complex overhaul (RCOH) of the ship.

The Navy had planned to conduct an RCOH on CVN–73, beginning in fiscal year 2016. The fiscal year 2015 budget request altered that plan to drop the RCOH and inactivate CVN–73. Congress has already authorized and appropriated $329.7 million for the CVN–73 RCOH. The plan for fiscal year 2015 submitted with the fiscal year 2014 budget for the Navy was to request another $491.1 million for advance procurement of the CVN–73 RCOH.

In lieu of the plan, the fiscal year 2015 budget request and the future years defense program (FYDP) supports inactivation of CVN–73. Department of Defense (DOD) officials have stated DOD will defer the decision until 2016 on whether to refuel and maintain CVN–73 or inactivate the ship.

The committee is concerned that DOD submitted a fiscal year 2015 budget request and FYDP that are inconsistent with DOD's stated intent to defer a decision on the refueling, and with the requirement of section 5062(b) of title 10, United States Code, that the Navy maintain 11 operational aircraft carriers.

In testimony, Secretary of Defense Charles Hagel confirmed that 11 carriers are a statutory requirement saying, "We follow the authorization and appropriations direction of Congress. We follow the law." Secretary Hagel explained the dichotomy between an avowed plan to maintain 11 operational aircraft carriers and the FYDP by saying he was waiting for a sign from someone, presumably Congress, that DOD would get the partial relief from the effects of sequestration reflected in the FYDP.

The committee has seen no evidence that the requirement for maintaining 11 operational carriers has diminished. In fact, senior

Navy leaders have repeatedly stated the need for 11 carriers as the minimum number required to execute the President's National Military Strategy. Senior military officers have testified that global requirements argue for an even larger number of aircraft carriers. The Commander of U.S. Pacific Command noted that, "Based on the world as it is, about 11 aircraft carriers is just—is just barely making it today."

The aircraft carrier remains the most visible projection of military force abroad and is an effective instrument for shaping the perception of allies and potential foes alike. The committee is concerned that inactivating an aircraft carrier with 20 to 30 years of useful service life remaining is a very inefficient use of defense resources and would be inconsistent with implementing the administration's strategic shift toward the Asia-Pacific region, and such an action would send the wrong signals about our determination to support that shift.

Complying with the letter of this section requires that the administration either submit a budget that supports a fleet with 11 operational aircraft carriers or submit a legislative proposal to amend title 10 to readjust the requirement. The administration has done neither. This provision would ensure that the Navy maintains a path of obligations and expenditures consistent with the statutory requirement to maintain 11 operational aircraft carriers.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report on the effect on capabilities for power projection and global engagement, as it affects the Navy's ability to meet the Defense Strategic Guidance, moving to a permanent force structure of fewer than 11 operational carriers. This report should include a classified annex that describes the Navy's ability to meet the combatant commanders' requirements, both at the current force level and the impact of a force level with fewer than the required 11 operational carriers. This report should also specify what the effects of such action would be on operational deployments, overall readiness, and on sailors and their families. The report should identify potential effects on the shipbuilding industrial base, on the remainder of the RCOH program, on other shipbuilding programs, and on other acquisition programs. The Secretary of the Navy should submit that report with the fiscal year 2016 budget request.

Availability of funds for retirement or inactivation of Ticonderoga class cruisers or dock landing ships (sec. 1022)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish rules under which the Navy could use resources in the Ship, Modernization, Operations, and Sustainment Fund (SMOSF) to implement a plan to: (1) Retain 11 *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers and 9 *Whidbey Island*-class and *Harpers Ferry*-class dock landing ships in active service; (2) Temporarily inactivate 11 *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers and 3 *Whidbey Island*-class dock landing ships; (3) Modernize the inactivated ships during the period of their inactivation; and (4) Reactivate those ships to replace cruisers and dock landing ships retiring at the end of their expected service lives.

The provision would require that the Secretary of the Navy retain the cruisers and dock landing ships until the end of their ex-

pected service lives, and use SMOSF only to sustain and modernize the vessels.

The provision would also require the Secretary of the Navy to submit an annual report with the budget request. The report would describe the status of the SMOSF, including specific financial information, such as starting and ending fiscal year corpus balances, providing a detailed obligation and expenditure plan by vessel, and including information detailing all transfers into and out of the SMOSF by appropriation account.

The committee further directs the Secretary to ensure that the annual budget justification material for the SMOSF include detailed information at the vessel level. In addition, the committee directs the Defense Finance and Accounting Service to provide execution reports for the SMOSF that treats each vessel like a line item within the SMOSF.

Operational readiness of Littoral Combat Ships on extended deployments (sec. 1023)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide additional flexibility for the Secretary of the Navy to maintain Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) by allowing government personnel or U.S. contractor personnel to conduct corrective and preventive maintenance on an LCS vessel regardless of the ship's location.

Because an LCS vessel has a smaller crew than other Navy vessels, much of the corrective and preventative maintenance must be performed by personnel not in the ship's force. The Secretary of Navy needs added flexibility in conducting this maintenance to ensure that the Navy can sustain readiness, particularly on forward-deployed LCS vessels.

Authority for limited coastwise trade for certain vessels providing transportation services under a shipbuilding or ship repair contract with the Secretary of the Navy (sec. 1024)

The committee recommends a provision that would enable the Secretary of the Navy to authorize shipbuilding or ship repair contractors owning U.S.-built dry docks, tugboats, and towing vessels to engage in limited coastwise trade for purposes of performing a shipbuilding or ship repair contract entered into with the Department of the Navy.

Currently a contractor under foreign ownership, control, or influence can only utilize its own vessel to perform Navy shipbuilding and ship repair contracts within the continental United States if a limited waiver for that vessel to engage in coastwise trade is granted. Such waivers are only granted on a case-by-case basis through a very burdensome administrative process involving three different agencies of the Federal Government. This is because foreign ownership precludes such a vessel from meeting the definition of a "U.S.-flagged vessel," even if the vessel was built in the United States and was manned by crew composed of U.S. citizens.

Subtitle D—Counterterrorism

Limitation on the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1031)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit, for fiscal year 2015, the transfer or release of detainees held at Guantanamo (GTMO) to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions, until the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed plan to close the GTMO detention facility and Congress has voted on a joint resolution of disapproval under expedited procedures. If a joint resolution of disapproval is not enacted, then the Secretary would be authorized to transfer GTMO detainees to the United States for detention, trial, and incarceration. Other conditions that must be met before a transfer under this section can take place are a determination by the Secretary that doing so is in the national security interest of the United States, that steps have been taken to address any risk to public safety, and the appropriate congressional committees are notified not later than 30 days in advance of any such transfer. The provision would ensure that the legal rights applicable to detainees held at GTMO remain unchanged as a result of their transfer under this authority.

Report on facilitation of transfer overseas of certain individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1032)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a detailed report to the appropriate committees of Congress on impediments to the transfer overseas of Guantanamo detainees and the actions that have been or are planned to be taken to overcome such impediments and facilitate overseas transfers.

Section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) provides the Secretary of Defense a more flexible authority to transfer Guantanamo detainees overseas. The committee notes that to date, a very limited number of Guantanamo detainees have been transferred overseas under this new authority. The committee urges the Secretary of Defense to address diplomatic, security, and other impediments to overseas transfers of Guantanamo detainees and use the full extent of the authority provided by section 1035 to complete such transfers, as appropriate and consistent with U.S. national security interests.

Authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment (sec. 1033)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the temporary transfer of Guantanamo (GTMO) detainees to a military medical facility in the United States for the sole purpose of providing emergency or critical medical treatment that is not available at GTMO and is necessary to prevent the death or imminent significant injury or harm to the individual's health. The detainee

would not be admitted into the United States during the period of medical treatment and must be returned to GTMO as soon as medically feasible. The Secretary of Defense would be required to notify the appropriate committees of Congress of any transfer under this authority not later than 30 days in advance of the transfer or, if the need for emergency medical treatment is immediate, not later than 5 days after the transfer.

The committee makes note of the U.S. obligations under domestic law and Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions to provide for the humane treatment of detainees in its custody. The authority granted under this section would address concerns raised by the Commander, U.S. Southern Command, and others regarding the level of medical care available to GTMO detainees and the challenges, taking into account the aging of that detainee population, of ensuring humane treatment.

Prohibition on transfer or release to Yemen of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1034)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of Department of Defense funds to transfer, release, or otherwise assist in the transfer or release, of any Guantanamo detainee to Yemen during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2015.

Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations

Reduction in Department of Defense civilian personnel and review of certain headquarters spending (sec. 1041)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, on Department of Defense (DOD) civilian positions, including the number of civilian positions created between September 11, 2001, and December 31, 2013, as a result of military to civilian conversions, the number of positions created as temporary positions that are being converted back to military positions, and the number of civilian positions that have been or are being eliminated.

The provision would also express the sense of Congress that the number of civilian positions should be reduced simultaneously with, and by the same percentages, as the corresponding reductions in military end strengths.

The provision would also require the Secretary to review spending on headquarters in commands below major command with the objective of reducing such spending by not less than 10 percent.

The provision would also require the updating of various DOD instructions and regulations to improve tracking and reporting headquarters personnel and resources.

Protection of Department of Defense installations (sec. 1042)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to protect the buildings, grounds, and property that are under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the De-

partment of Defense (DOD) and persons on that property. The provision provides that the Secretary may designate personnel to: (1) Enforce federal laws and regulations for the protection of persons and property; (2) Carry firearms; (3) Make arrests; and (4) Conduct investigations of offenses against the property of the DOD.

This new authority would not apply in those locations currently under the protection of the Federal Protective Service, for example, office buildings provided by the General Services Administration in which DOD organizations are tenants.

Authority to accept certain voluntary legal support services (sec. 1043)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1588(a) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to accept voluntary legal support services provided by law students through internship and externship programs approved by the secretary concerned.

Inclusion of Chief of the National Guard Bureau among leadership of the Department of Defense provided physical protection and personal security (sec. 1044)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1074 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to include the Chief of the National Guard Bureau as one of the specified persons in the Department of Defense who, by nature of their positions, require continuous security and protection.

Inclusion of regional organizations in authority for assignment of civilian employees of the Department of Defense as advisors to foreign ministries of defense (sec. 1045)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–84), as most recently amended by section 1094 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), to expand the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide Department of Defense advisors to regional organizations.

The committee notes that regional conflicts and other security challenges continue in the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and Africa, and that an expanded authority that allows the Secretary of Defense to provide advisors to regional organizations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), or other comparable regional organization, would better enable the Secretary to advance U.S. national security and mutual security objectives in specific regions.

The committee notes that the United States is working with its GCC partner nations to improve regional air and missile defense capabilities, including data sharing and multilateral cooperation. The committee believes that such multilateral cooperation would enhance regional security and would provide significant improvements beyond national and bi-national capabilities. The expansion of the so-called Minister of Defense Advisor program to regional organizations is a prudent step that could assist in advancing the re-

gional security objectives stated by the Secretary of Defense at the 2013 Manama Dialogue.

Extension of authority to waive reimbursement of costs of activities for nongovernmental personnel at Department of Defense regional centers for security studies (sec. 1046)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of the Secretary of Defense to waive the requirement for the Department of Defense (DOD) to seek reimbursement for the costs associated with the attendance of personnel from nongovernmental DOD regional centers for security studies, as most recently amended by section 1094(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

Subtitle F—Studies and Reports

Reports on recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force (sec. 1061)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit annual reports for each fiscal year from 2016 through 2019 on how the Air Force is implementing the recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force. In the first such report, the Secretary would be required to establish milestones for the Air Force's review of the Commission recommendations, and a preliminary implementation plan for such recommendations that do not require further review. Subsequent reports would identify progress in achieving milestones established in previous reports and establish milestones for implementing those recommendations for which analysis of the recommendation had been completed since the previous report.

The Air Force staff indicates that the Air Force: (1) Agrees with 10 recommendations now; (2) Agrees in principle with 26 other recommendations, but requires some further clarification on those; (3) Has no position on 5 recommendations that will require further analysis; and (4) Disagrees with one recommendation. The recommendation with which the Air Force disagrees is one to disestablish the Air Force Reserve Command, which would require a change in legislation. The Air Force staff further indicates that they will have completed roughly four-fifths of their reviews of the other 41 recommendations by the end of calendar year 2014. Therefore, the committee expects that the Secretary's first report will establish milestones for most, if not all, 41 Commission recommendations.

Review of operation of certain ships during the Vietnam era (sec. 1062)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to review, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the logs of each Navy ship known to have operated in the waters near Vietnam between January 9, 1962, and May 7, 1975, to determine whether the ship operated in the territorial waters of the Republic of Vietnam during that period, and, for each ship that operated in these waters during that

time, the date or dates that the ship so operated and the distance from the shore of the location where the ship operated. The Secretary would be required to provide this determination and information to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Assessment of the operations research tools, processes, and capabilities in support of requirements analysis for major defense acquisition programs and allocation of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets (sec. 1063)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (VCJCS), in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD (AT&L)), and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE), to conduct an assessment of the operations research tools, processes, and capabilities used to support the analysis of requirements for new systems acquisitions and the analysis, validation, and prioritization of requirements for the allocation of existing intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) assets to the combatant commands. The provision would require the VCJCS, the USD (AT&L), and the Director of CAPE to brief Congress on the results of this assessment within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

The provision would also require the VCJCS to provide to the congressional defense and intelligence committees, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the data collected and the operations research analysis of that data used to validate the requirements submitted by the combatant commands for ISR asset allocation under the Global Force Management Process (GFMAP) for fiscal year 2015 and to determine ISR asset allocation.

The committee has long been concerned about the standardization and quality of the analysis conducted of requirements for systems acquisition programs in the Department of Defense (DOD), and of the GFMAP to validate and prioritize resources in a manner that does not over-allocate resources to one combatant commander. Senior officials in the Joint Staff J–8 Directorate (Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment) informed the committee 2 years ago that substantial improvements were needed in the analysis of requirements for new acquisition programs in order to adequately balance cost, performance, schedule, and risk. The committee was also informed that the J–8 lacked sufficient operations research expertise and planned to add personnel to the Directorate's staff, and to work with CAPE to access CAPE's analytic expertise and resources for front-end requirements analysis. These initiatives were not implemented.

The Defense Science Board Advisory Group (DSB AG) on Defense Intelligence issued a report in January 2009, titled, "Operations Research Applications for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance." This study included a broad review of the use of operations research methods across DOD and the commitment of decisionmakers to base their decisions on the outcome of this rigorous type of analysis. The AG concluded that operations research is a "powerful tool to help improve the quality of investment decision making . . . in which significant consequences and resources are at

stake." The AG noted that operations research cannot be institutionalized "without strong commitment, support, and advocacy from senior leadership." The AG concluded that "save for a few 'points of light,' operations research is in decline and not universally valued in decision making, especially at the strategic level, and with respect to investment decisions and systems acquisition."

With respect to the GFMAP for ISR asset allocation, the level of analysis supporting geographic combatant command requirements is inconsistent, with some commands struggling to define and defend their requirements. There is also insufficient analysis and standardization of data collected for the validation and prioritization of submitted requirements at the Joint Staff level, and inadequate processes to inform allocation decisions with a comprehensive awareness of, and deconfliction with, collection assets and activities that are not included in the GFMAP. One consequence of these shortcomings has been that a few commands garner almost all of the ISR assets committed to the GFMAP.

The committee fully understands that the needs of one or more combatant commands can be dominant, as has been the case for U.S. Central Command since September 11, 2001, but the committee doubts that a rigorous analysis would consistently rank the lowest priorities of one or more combatant commands higher than the highest priorities of other combatant commands. The committee notes that at least two geographic combatant commands have less than 10 percent of their total requirements being met. In the case of one of those combatant commands, U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM), the threat from terrorism and the inability of the GFMAP to prioritize and allocate additional ISR resources gives the committee pause. Over the last 3 years, AFRICOM has seen the emergence of numerous conflicts including major conflagrations in Mali, South Sudan, Central African Republic, and Libya. The inability of the GFMAP to prioritize and allocate ISR resources have resulted in skewed allocations of ISR resources, leaving the DOD unable to predict or respond to emerging crises.

A decade ago, DOD established the Joint Functional Component Command for ISR (JFCC–ISR) under United States Strategic Command. An independent assessment group was created in the JFCC–ISR to analyze requirements and the performance of deployed ISR assets. This group has some operations research expertise and capacity, and has endeavored to collect data and analyze needs for and the performance of ISR assets. However, the committee is concerned that these analyses have not led to any improvement in requirements generation and validation, or greater efficiency in the use of ISR assets.

The committee believes DOD must improve its ability to analyze, validate, and prioritize both new systems acquisitions and the allocation of ISR assets to the combatant commands. If the Joint Staff is unable to present convincing analyses or arbitrate effectively between the combatant commands, changes need to be made.

Review of United States military strategy and the force posture of allies and partners in the United States Pacific Command area of responsibility (sec. 1064)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to commission an independent review of the U.S. Asia-Pacific re-balance, with a focus on policy issues that will be critical for the next 10 years, following the enactment of this Act.

The organization shall submit to the Secretary of Defense an unclassified report along with a classified annex not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act.

Not later than 90 days after receipt of the report, the Secretary of Defense shall submit the report and its annex to the congressional defense committees, along with any comments the Secretary deems appropriate.

Department of Defense policies on community involvement in Department community outreach events (sec. 1065)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, a report on the policies of the Department of Defense (DOD) on the involvement of non-Federal entities in DOD community outreach events (including, but not limited to, air shows, parades, and open houses) that feature any unit, aircraft, vessel, equipment, or members of the Armed Forces.

Comptroller General of the United States briefing and report on management of the conventional ammunition demilitarization stockpile of the Department of Defense (sec. 1066)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the management of the conventional ammunition demilitarization stockpile of the Department of Defense no later than April 30, 2015. The briefing shall be followed by a report no later than June 1, 2015.

Repeal and modification of reporting requirements (sec. 1067)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal or modify a number of reporting requirements that have been included in law in past years. The requirements recommended for repeal or modification in this provision are requirements identified by the committee as being no longer relevant or necessary and that can be repealed or modified without adversely affecting the committee's oversight responsibilities.

Repeal of requirement for Comptroller General of the United States annual reviews and report on pilot program on commercial fee-for-service air refueling support for the Air Force (sec. 1068)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal the requirement for a Comptroller General review of a pilot program on

commercial fee-for-service air refueling support for the Air Force. Since enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–81), the pilot program has yet to be used.

Subtitle G—Uniformed Services Voting

PART I—PROVISION OF VOTER ASSISTANCE TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Provision of annual voter assistance (sec. 1071)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 80 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to develop an online system to provide annual voting assistance to active duty servicemembers.

Designation of voter assistance offices (sec. 1072)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1566a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize, but not require, service secretaries to designate offices on military installations to provide absent uniformed services voters and their family members with voting information and assistance.

PART II—ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEMS

Repeal of electronic voting demonstration project (sec. 1076)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 1604 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107) that requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct an electronic voting demonstration project for absent military voters.

Subtitle H—Other Matters

Biennial surveys of Department of Defense civilian employees on workplace and gender relations matters (sec. 1081)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 23 of title 10, United States Code, to require biennial surveys of civilian employees of the Department of Defense (DOD) to solicit information on gender issues, including issues relating to gender-based assault, harassment, and discrimination, and the climate in the DOD for forming professional relationships between male and female employees of the DOD. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the feasibility of conducting similar surveys of military dependents and DOD contractors.

Transfer of administration of Ocean Research Advisory Panel from Department of the Navy to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (sec. 1082)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Department of Defense (DOD) more flexibility in engaging with the National Ocean Partnership Program and the Ocean Research Ad-

visory Panel (ORAP). The committee believes that this flexibility will allow DOD and the Navy to balance the application of resources for this activity with other potential activities and is consistent with the Secretary of Defense's Efficiency Initiatives. The committee notes that much of the work of ORAP has been more related to civilian ocean research issues, rather than defense-related matters. The committee further notes that this provision was recommended by the Administration and DOD.

Authority to require employees of the Department of Defense and members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to occupy quarters on a rental basis while performing official travel (sec. 1083)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5911 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish a government lodging program and to require its use by servicemembers and Department of Defense (DOD) civilians performing official travel. The provision would also require the Secretary to report to the appropriate congressional committees within 18 months on DOD's implementation of this program and savings achieved.

Expansion of authority for Secretary of Defense to use the Department of Defense reimbursement rates for transportation services provided to certain non-Department of Defense entities (sec. 1084)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2642 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the authority to provide transportation services beyond other Federal agencies to include: (1) State, local, and tribal agencies (including any organizations composed of State, local, and tribal agencies); and (2) Defense contractors, when those contractors are transporting supplies for, or destined for, a Department of Defense entity.

Pilot program to rehabilitate and modify homes of disabled and low-income veterans (sec. 1085)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a pilot program to award grants to qualified organizations to rehabilitate and modify the primary residence of eligible veterans.

Technical and clerical amendments (sec. 1086)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical and clerical corrections to title 10, United States Code, and various National Defense Authorization Acts.

Items of Special Interest

Army force structure and installation alignment

The committee is aware of the Army's end strength and force structure reductions and changes made last year in accordance with the January 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance (DSG). The DSG directed the reduction of Army active end strength to 490,000 soldiers and the inactivation of eight combat brigades.

In this regard, the Subcommittee on Airland, in a March 2013 letter, requested a Government Accountability Office (GAO) assessment of the Army's analysis and decisionmaking processes associated with planned force structure reductions and their alignment with installations. The GAO's assessment, reported in December 2013, noted that the Army used a variety of analyses to inform its decisionmaking processes, including "obtaining input through open meetings with communities around installations being considered for stationing changes." The GAO recommended that the Army needed to update and document its rules for future analysis of force structure realignments and stationing decisions.

The committee notes that, in order to meet Budget Control Act caps, the Army plans the additional active Army end strength reductions to 450,000 soldiers by fiscal year 2017. This will result in additional unit inactivations at Army posts around the country. The committee is interested to learn how the Army has updated its analysis and decisionmaking processes and how it will incorporate its 2013 decisions for force realignments into another round of reductions. Accordingly, the Secretary of the Army, or designee, shall provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than April 30, 2015, that:

(1) Identifies the analytical methodology and decisionmaking processes that will be used for force structure reductions related to active end strength of 450,000 soldiers or less by 2017 or beyond;

(2) Identifies the changes to the methodology or process, as recommended by the GAO;

(3) Details the schedule for conducting its analysis, including completion of environmental assessments and planned public meetings or information sessions with installations' communities;

(4) Details how implementation of force realignment decisions made in 2013 are being or will be executed, and how uninitiated, incomplete, and planned force realignments will be incorporated into the assessment of installations; and

(5) Certifies that the Army will comply with the requirements of chapter 55, title 42, United States Code, (National Environmental Policy Act), and with the requirements of section 993, title 10, United States Code, for prompt congressional notification of additional force structure modifications, reductions, and additions.

Comptroller General of the United States review of burden-sharing agreements and posture costs

The committee notes that as part of its three strategic objectives listed in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review, the Department of Defense (DOD) will continue to rebalance and sustain its global posture. This will include continuing to invest resources in the Asia-Pacific region in order to preserve critical political, economic, and security interests. At the forefront of this rebalancing will be the partnerships with two of our most important allies, Japan and the Republic of Korea (ROK). In addition, given DOD's deep and abiding interests in maintaining and expanding European security and prosperity and particularly in light of recent events in eastern

Europe, DOD will also continue to work with our long-standing European allies to promote regional stability, as well as to improve capacity, interoperability, and strategic access for coalition operations. Most of these partnerships date back over 50 years, allowing U.S. forces access to land and facilities in host countries.

Host nation support, through burden-sharing agreements, has been critical to helping offset the costs of stationing U.S. forces in many countries. Burden-sharing arrangements, such as Special Measures Agreements with Japan and the ROK, have contributed billions of dollars to mitigate the costs associated with a forward-based U.S. military presence, including such costs as labor, utilities, and construction. Due to rising costs associated with stationing forces overseas and the security benefits that accrue to both the host nation and the United States, these agreements play a pivotal role in DOD's current and future strategic planning.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has completed several studies on U.S. defense posture in the Asia-Pacific region as well as in Europe. While these reports highlighted areas for improvement in planning and data collection, DOD's process and parameters for negotiating and monitoring burden-sharing agreements with host nations, or similar host nation support and payment agreements, are not clear to the committee. As a result of the challenges faced by DOD associated with Global Force Management and current fiscal uncertainties, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze and report on the following:

(1) How does DOD estimate the costs of its overseas presence and use this information to develop burden-sharing agreements or similar host nation support and payments;

(2) Does DOD calculate the percentage of current and future costs host nation support is covering and how does it determine what to include in that calculation;

(3) What is DOD's process for determining what is to be included in burden-sharing agreements or similar host nation support and payments; and

(4) To what extent is DOD monitoring the execution of host nation support, including the support provided under burden-sharing agreements?

(5) How does DOD account for and inform Congress of host nation contributions?

(6) Any other matters the Comptroller General deems appropriate to include as a result of its review.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the above questions by April 30, 2015, with a report to follow by June 1, 2015.

Comptroller General of the United States review of the National Guard Counterdrug Program

Since 1989, the National Guard has worked with law enforcement agencies and community-based organizations to perform interdiction and anti-drug activities. The National Guard Counterdrug Program operates in 54 U.S. States and territories with approximately 2,500 soldiers and airmen supporting more

than 5,000 agencies at the local, state, and federal levels to prevent illicit drugs from being imported, manufactured, and distributed. In fiscal year 2012, the National Guard Counterdrug Program began implementing a threat-based resource model to allocate funding to States and territories based on performance metrics and the severity of the narcotics threat. According to the National Guard Bureau, the model aligns with Department of Defense priorities as outlined by the National Security Strategy and Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Counternarcotics and Global Threats.

The committee is concerned that it has an incomplete picture of the goals and activities of the National Guard Counterdrug Program as well as how resources are being expended. It is imperative that the National Guard Bureau have data, metrics, and analyses to manage the program that are reliable, clearly articulated, transparent, and reflect the changing nature of narcotics trafficking activities. Moreover, given the inter-agency nature of U.S. counterdrug activities, it is critical that the National Guard Bureau cooperate and share information associated with its planned activities with relevant interagency partners, particularly the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the Drug Enforcement Agency.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General to provide an independent assessment of the program including: (1) The activities and resources associated with the National Guard Counterdrug Program and the trends, if any, over time; (2) The process used to identify, prioritize, and select activities for funding and implementation; (3) The framework used to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of activities; and (4) Whether the plans and activities of the National Guard program support the efforts of interagency partners and align with broader U.S. goals. The Comptroller General may include other areas in the assessment as deemed appropriate if such inclusion would assist in oversight of the program. The Comptroller General should brief the committee by November 15, 2014, on the preliminary results of the study, with a report to follow as agreed to with the committee.

Detention of Third Country Nationals in Afghanistan

The Government of Afghanistan ordered the extra-judicial release of 65 Afghan detainees on February 13, 2014, despite extensive information and evidence from U.S. Forces–Afghanistan (USFOR–A) that the detainees posed a continuing threat if released. According to USFOR–A, the released detainees were linked to wounding or killing 32 U.S. or coalition personnel and 23 Afghan National Security Forces or civilians. The Commander, USFOR–A, objected to these releases, on the basis that they were in contradiction to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by the Afghan Minister of Defense and the Commander, USFOR–A, on March 25, 2013, regarding the transfer of Afghan detainees in U.S. law-of-armed-conflict custody to the custody of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GIRoA). The agreed-upon process was violated when the Afghan Review Board did not consider the evidence submitted by USFOR–A or engage in an information exchange prior to the detainees' release as set forth in the MOU. The committee remains concerned that the GIRoA will seek to release the 23 remaining dangerous Afghan detainees the

USFOR–A has contested, and calls on the GIRoA to adhere to the procedures agreed to in the existing MOU.

The committee also notes that the detainees that the GIRoA continues to hold have been determined to be Enduring Security Threats (EST). The committee supports the continued detention of ESTs, in accordance with the provisions of the existing MOU, and believes that any change to the status of ESTs other than as provided in the MOU should only occur as mutually agreed between the GIRoA and USFOR–A.

The committee remains concerned about the disposition of the detainees that remain under the control of USFOR–A, and therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the committee, by not later than June 30, 2014, and thereafter as requested by the committee, on the disposition plan for third-country nationals (TCN) currently being held by USFOR–A. The briefing should include the U.S. Government's plan for the continued detention, transfer, or release of TCNs under U.S. control currently held in Afghanistan, the process for reviewing the status of TCNs, and any plans for the prosecution of TCNs.

National Guard Counterdrug Program

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) requests funding annually to support the National Guard Counterdrug Program (CDP). The committee believes that the CDP plays an important role in providing military-specific capabilities and expertise resident within the National Guard to support the counterdrug activities of federal, state, and local authorities. This support includes the provision of linguists, intelligence, transportation, logistics, reconnaissance, training, education, and prevention outreach. The committee notes that budgetary pressures have led DOD to decrease the annual budget request for the CDP in recent years.

Further, the committee understands that these cuts have caused a disruption or curtailment of CDP operations, including the planned closure of the five regional counterdrug training centers in fiscal year 2015. The committee encourages DOD to continue its support for the CDP and to provide adequate funding to ensure the sustainability of the program.

Additionally, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to examine the CDP on an ongoing basis to ensure it keeps pace with the evolving nature of illicit trafficking enterprise.

Preparing for increased Arctic operations

The committee notes that the Arctic is an area of increasing strategic and economic importance to the United States. The opening of new maritime shipping lanes and increased access to abundant deposits of natural resources, such as oil and natural gas, will provide opportunities and challenges to U.S. national interests. The committee commends the Department of Defense (DOD) for increasing its focus on this region and encourages DOD to continue to plan for operating in what will likely become a more crowded and potentially more contested region. The committee is also interested in ensuring that DOD, in coordination with the Department

of Homeland Security, focuses on developing and acquiring capabilities that will enable the United States to operate effectively in the Arctic in the coming years. The United States is an Arctic nation that stands to benefit from increased access to that region, and it is critical that our national security strategies and capabilities keep pace with our growing interests, especially as other nations increase their activity in the Arctic.

Transfer of aircraft to other departments for wildfire suppression and other purposes

Section 1098 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) directed transfers of Department of Defense (DOD) and U.S. Coast Guard aircraft to other departments of the Federal Government for wildfire suppression and other purposes.

The committee understands that discussions among the agencies on implementing that direction have been collaborative and productive. The committee knows that such transactions are complex.

However, the committee has been informed that the Air Force General Counsel has decided that the specific word "transfer" in Section 1098(a) requires the Coast Guard to convey title, engineering services, and technical authority of the HC–130H to the Air Force. The committee understands this would be a cumbersome and paperwork-intensive process for the short period of time that the Air Force would possess the aircraft for modifications and depot-level maintenance prescribed in section 1098(a) before relinquishing the aircraft. Such an interpretation was not the intention of the committee nor was it the committee's intention to complicate the process of implementing section 1098(a) that deals with HC–130H transfers.

The Air Force routinely conducts depot-level maintenance and modifications of HC–130H aircraft on behalf of the Coast Guard without having to convey title from the Coast Guard to the Air Force. The interpretation of the Air Force General Counsel could significantly delay implementation of depot-level maintenance and firefighting modifications required by section 1098(a), and thus delay providing much needed firefighting capacity improvements to the U.S. Forest Service.

The Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the U.S. Forest Service briefed the committee on an execution plan in February 2014. That plan included having the Air Force modify Coast Guard HC–130H aircraft and provide firefighting-capable aircraft to the Forest Service in the most expeditious manner. This plan did not involve a transfer as interpreted by the Air Force General Counsel. The committee supports that execution plan. To that end, the committee directs the DOD General Counsel to review the interpretation of the Air Force General Counsel and ensure that the word "transfer" as used in section 1098(a) is used consistent with the congressional intent not to require title of HC–130H aircraft from the Coast Guard to the Air Force while the Air Force executes this modification.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

Extension and modification of experimental program for scientific and technical personnel (sec. 1101)

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical modifications to a special hiring authority used by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and other agencies to hire world-class technical experts to serve as research and development program managers.

Modifications of biennial strategic workforce plan relating to senior management, functional, and technical workforces of the Department of Defense (sec. 1102)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 115b of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to prepare a biennial strategic workforce plan that addresses the shaping and improvement of the senior management workforce of the Department of Defense and includes an assessment of the senior functional and technical workforce of the Department within the appropriate functional community. The provision would also add a requirement that the strategic workforce plan include an assessment of the workforce of the Department comprised of highly qualified experts.

One-year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on premium pay and aggregate limitation on pay for Federal civilian employees working overseas (sec. 1103)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1101 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as most recently amended by section 1101 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), to extend through 2015 the authority of heads of executive agencies to waive limitations on the aggregate of basic and premium pay of employees who perform work in an overseas location that is in the area of responsibility of the Commander, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), or a location that was formerly in CENTCOM but has been moved to an area of responsibility of the Commander, U.S. Africa Command, in support of a military operation or an operation in response to a declared emergency.

Personnel authorities for civilian personnel for the United States Cyber Command (sec. 1104)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that enhanced personnel authorities are needed for hiring, compensating, and promoting civilian personnel supporting U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM), perhaps modeled on

the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) established in title 10 sections 1601 through 1607. The provision also would require the Principal Cyber Advisor, within 180 days of enactment, to provide recommendations to the Secretary of Defense to improve the support provided by CYBERCOM's executive agent, the Department of the Air Force, in the area of civilian personnel, both through administrative actions and legislation.

The committee notes that the DCIPS authorities available to defense intelligence agencies and components provide special hiring, compensation, and promotion authorities that enable these agencies and components to compete effectively to recruit and retain civilian employees with critical skills and experience. Congress has also provided enhanced authorities to manage specialized civilian personnel at the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the research laboratories of the military services. CYBERCOM must compete directly with the National Security Agency and the private sector for personnel with technical cyber skills and is currently at a significant disadvantage in terms of desirable positions, rates of pay, and career advancement opportunities. The committee believes that providing enhanced personnel management authorities for CYBERCOM civilians is important and justified to ensure that CYBERCOM can fulfill its missions.

Item of Special Interest

Assignment of Department of Defense civilian employees with cyber skills

The committee recognizes the growth in the number of Department of Defense (DOD) civilian employees supporting critical and evolving cyber missions of the DOD. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess whether a program that involves predictable assignments or details of DOD civilian personnel with cyber skills to other military departments or DOD civilian positions in U.S. Cyber Command and Cyber Mission Forces units would enhance the professional development and career progression of the civilian employees. The committee directs the Secretary to report the results of this assessment to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than January 31, 2015.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

Subtitle A—Assistance and Training

Modification of Department of Defense authority for humanitarian stockpiled conventional munitions assistance programs (sec. 1201)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the definitions contained in section 407 of title 10, United States Code, regarding humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance.

Codification of recurring limitations on the use of funds for assistance for units of foreign security forces that have committed a gross violation of human rights (sec. 1202)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 134 of title 10, United States Code, to include a limitation on the use of funds for training, equipment, or other assistance for the members of a unit of a foreign security force if the Secretary of Defense has credible information that such unit has committed a gross violation of human rights. In addition to a waiver for extraordinary circumstances, the provision would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide training, equipment, or other assistance for disaster relief, humanitarian assistance, or national security emergencies, as well as to conduct human rights training. Should an exception or waiver be exercised by the Secretary, the provision requires the Secretary to submit a notification to the congressional defense committees within 15 days. In carrying out this provision, the Secretary of Defense is required to consult regularly with the Secretary of State.

The committee notes that since fiscal year 1999, the annual Department of Defense appropriations bills have included a provision with a similar limitation and that in the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–86), this provision was expanded beyond training to include the provision of equipment and other assistance. The committee supports the intent of this annual appropriation limitation and, as such, is incorporating it into title 10, United States Code, to ensure that action on this matter is not needed annually in the future.

Codification and enhancement of authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces (sec. 1203)

The committee recommends a provision that would codify in title 10, United States Code, the authority currently under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) as amended (the "section 1206 authority"),

for the Secretary of Defense to conduct a program to train-and-equip foreign security forces to build their capacity to conduct counterterrorism operations. The provision would also modify the authority to provide for training and equipping foreign military forces to participate in or support allied or coalition military or stability operations that benefit U.S. national security interests, and raise the limitation on the amount that can be used for such purposes from $100.0 million to $150.0 million of the total amount of funds authorized for the train-and-equip program under this section. The provision would include a limitation on the amount of funds authorized for the train-and-equip program of $350.0 million. An additional $150.0 million may be used to fund activities under the train-and-equip program authority if such additional funds are transferred for these purposes by the Department of Defense (DOD) under established reprogramming procedures. The total amount authorized, if the reprogramming option were to be fully executed, would be $500.0 million.

In addition, the provision would codify the authority for the Secretary of Defense to use funds under the section 1206 authority to conduct assessments of the effectiveness of the program in building the operational capability and performance of recipient units. The provision would require annual reports through 2025 summarizing the findings of such assessments. The committee supports the DOD's efforts to develop an assessment methodology for evaluating train-and-equip programs, which the committee understands is currently set out in the Section 1206 Assessment Handbook.

The provision would also require the Comptroller General to conduct, through 2025, annual audits of train-and-equip programs, as selected by the Comptroller General in consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, to provide an outside assessment of the effectiveness of these programs in meeting their objectives.

The committee believes that, since its inception in fiscal year 2006, the global train-and-equip program has developed into a critical tool for DOD leaders and military commanders to build the capacity of partner nations' forces to address emerging and urgent threats, including to counter the threat of terrorism as this threat has proliferated and diversified. The maturity and proven track record of this program, closely coordinated between the DOD and the Department of State, is a primary motivation for codifying the section 1206 authority. The committee emphasizes that the focus of the section 1206 authority on addressing emerging and urgent threats has been fundamental to its successful implementation and urges the DOD to continue to prioritize programs on this basis, including to counter the threat posed by terrorist groups in North Africa, the Arabian peninsula, and the Levant.

The committee notes that during the last several years of coalition operations in Afghanistan, section 1206 authority has served as a valuable force multiplier by building the capacity of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members and other coalition partners to participate in stability operations and special operations in Afghanistan—directly contributing to the furtherance of U.S. national security objectives. Even as combat operations in Afghanistan are coming to an end, there remains a significant requirement for interoperability with allied and coalition military

forces, including special operations forces. The committee encourages the DOD to continue capacity-building efforts under section 1206 authority with NATO members and coalition partners in light of the security concerns in Eastern Europe and Ukraine.

Training of security forces and associated ministries of foreign countries to promote respect for the rule of law and human rights (sec. 1204)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct human rights training of security forces and associated ministries of foreign countries. The provision would require that the activities conducted pursuant to this section have the concurrence of the Secretary of State and the provision would define the activities considered to be human rights training.

Modification and extension of Global Security Contingency Fund authority (sec. 1205)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 2017 the authority under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as amended, for the Global Security Contingency Fund (GSCF). The provision would also clarify the types of assistance that could be provided under the fund and the sources of Department of Defense funding that could be transferred to support the GSCF.

The committee is deeply concerned about the ongoing crisis in Ukraine and the urgent security assistance needs of Ukraine and other countries at risk in Eastern Europe. The committee notes that at the time the GSCF was presented to the committee as a legislative proposal, the fund was intended in large part to address the challenges the U.S. Government faced in identifying readily-available sources of security assistance funding following the Georgian-Russian conflict in August 2008. The committee encourages the administration to consider making full use of the GSCF as part of a security assistance program for Ukraine and Eastern European countries.

At the same time, the committee has concerns about the poor track record with regard to the timely implementation of GSCF projects to date. While intended to provide a flexible authority, GSCF execution has suffered due to significant delays in developing the interagency procedures for selecting and implementing projects under the program. As a result, only recently have a number of GSCF projects begun to be implemented. In addition, the committee is concerned that certain GSCF projects, such as the effort to build the capacity of border security forces in Libya, are already at risk of being suspended, partially due to planning shortcomings. The committee strongly urges the Departments of State and Defense to quickly take the steps necessary to address these shortcomings and to ensure that these mistakes are not repeated.

Use of acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend certain military equipment to certain foreign forces for personnel protection and survivability (sec. 1206)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority under section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), as amended, to use the procedures under acquisition and cross-servicing agreements to lend certain personnel protection equipment to foreign military forces participating in coalition operations in Afghanistan. The provision would also authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive, on a case-by-case basis, the requirement that the United States be reimbursed for the cost of such equipment if the equipment is lost in combat during coalition operations.

Cross servicing agreements for loan of personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment in coalition operations (sec. 1207)

The committee recommends a provision that would codify in title 10, United States Code, an authority for the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to enter into arrangements under acquisition and cross-servicing agreements (ACSA) to loan personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment to foreign military forces for their use in coalition operations with the United States as part of a contingency operation or a peacekeeping operation under the United Nations Charter or another international agreement. The provision would include a waiver of the requirement to reimburse the United States for the loss of such equipment if the loss occurred in combat during operations for which the equipment was loaned.

The committee recognizes the importance to coalition operations in Afghanistan of the ability of the United States to loan personnel protection and personnel survivability equipment to coalition partners under the temporary authority of section 1202 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The Department of Defense (DOD) has interpreted this authority narrowly, consistent with the memorandum titled, "Approval and Delegation of Authority to Transfer Personnel Protection Equipment and Other Personnel Survivability Significant Military Equipment (SME) to Certain Foreign Forces Under Existing Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements (ACSAs)," issued by then Deputy Secretary of Defense Ashton B. Carter on November 25, 2011. The committee encourages DOD to take a similar approach to implementing any program to loan equipment under ACSA under the authority of this section.

Extension and modification of authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism (sec. 1208)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority for support of special operations to combat terrorism contained in section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as amended, through fiscal year 2016, and increase the annual cap on the authority from $50.0 million to $60.0 million.

The Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) testified on March 11, 2014, that "Section 1208 authority has been absolutely critical to our current and future efforts against al-Qa'ida and organizations of their ilk. It provides us the ability to apply a modest portion of our annual budget to deliver critical enablers to select irregular forces, groups or individuals, directly involved in the terrorism fight. This authority uniquely provides SOCOM with access and skill sets in locations where we may not otherwise be able to operate, subject to the Secretary of Defense granting specific operational authority. The strategic value of enabling and leveraging such forces to carry out tactical operations alongside, or even in lieu of, U.S. forces cannot be overstated."

The committee supports the use of section 1208 authority by U.S. Special Operations Forces to enhance operations in support of U.S. counterterrorism objectives. The committee also encourages continued vigilance by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict and SOCOM in ensuring that the authority is used to support operational requirements vice long-term capacity-building efforts with partner-nation security forces.

Assistance to foster a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Syria (sec. 1209)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide equipment, supplies, training, and defense services to assist the vetted elements of the Syrian opposition for the purposes of: (1) Defending the Syrian people from the attacks of the Syrian regime; (2) Protecting the United States, our friends and allies, and the Syrian people from terrorist elements; and (3) Promoting the conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in Syria. The provision would also establish requirements for an element of the Syrian opposition to be deemed vetted, permit the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to third countries for purposes of the provision of training and equipment, and the authority to accept contributions from other nations. The Secretary of State's concurrence would be required to conduct activities under this authority.

The committee notes that the authority granted in this provision does not authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Syria for the purpose of combat operations.

Further, should a determination be made to use this authority, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the congressional defense committees on the Department's execution plan, including but not limited to: (1) the process established to vet prospective Syrian opposition participants; (2) the role the United States Armed Forces will play in the execution of the plan; and (3) methods for ensuring the accountability of lethal equipment intended to be transferred to the Syrian opposition. Such briefing should be provided no less than 30 days before plan execution.

Given the importance and breadth of issues associated with U.S. activities involving the situation in Syria, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to make available to the intelligence committees information related to the support provided under this authority.

Limitations on security assistance for the Government of Burma (sec. 1210)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit security assistance funding for the Government of Burma unless the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, certifies that the Government of Burma is taking steps toward implementing human rights reform, terminating military relations with North Korea, and implementing other steps toward broader military reform. The certification would also require that the Burma military is adhering to ceasefire agreements and demonstrating increased transparency and accountability. The provision would provide an exception to the above limitation to allow for security assistance funding for the Government of Burma for human rights and disaster relief training, including on issues such as the law of armed conflict, English-language training, regional norms of security assistance, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR), as well as observation of HADR military exercises.

The provision would also require an annual report on, among other issues, the Burma Government's strategy for security sector reform, U.S. strategy and objectives for the military-to-military relationship between the United States and Burma, and a description and assessment of the record of the Burma military with respect to the implementation of human rights reforms. It would also include reporting on the military-to-military activities between the United States and Burma that have already occurred and that are planned to occur in the future.

The committee expects the Department of Defense (DOD) will begin human rights, humanitarian, and disaster relief training and education for the Burma military, as laid out in section (a)(2) of the provision, in fiscal year 2015, under a DOD program, such as the Defense Institute of International Legal Studies or the Defense Institute Reform Initiative.

Biennial report on programs carried out by the Department of Defense to provide training, equipment, or other assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces (sec. 1211)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a biennial report to Congress in fiscal years 2016, 2018, and 2020 describing the programs conducted by the Department of Defense (DOD) during the previous 2 fiscal years to provide training, equipment, or other security assistance or reimbursement to foreign security forces. The information would be provided on a country-by-country basis. The provision would supersede the reporting requirement under section 1209 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which would be repealed under this section.

Sense of the Senate on multilateral humanitarian assistance and disaster relief exercises (sec. 1212)

The committee recommends a provision that expresses the sense of the Senate that:

(1) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR) multilateral exercises provide nations in the Asia-Pacific region

with the training, capacity building, and coordination expertise necessary to respond to natural disasters; and

(2) Both the People's Republic of China and Taiwan should be afforded the opportunity to attend future multilateral (HADR) exercises to increase their capacity to effectively respond to these types of disasters.

Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq

Commanders' Emergency Response Program in Afghanistan (sec. 1221)

The committee recommends a provision that would make up to $20.0 million available during fiscal year 2015 for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) in Afghanistan under section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) as amended. The provision would also reduce the aggregate amount of CERP funds that could be spent on any one project to $2.0 million.

The committee notes that a primary purpose of CERP has been to enhance force protection by winning the support of local communities in areas where U.S. combat forces are deployed. With the drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan and the end of major combat operations after December 2014, the committee believes that reductions in CERP funding should continue to the minimum level commensurate with the train, advise, and assist mission anticipated for U.S. forces in 2015 and beyond.

Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan (sec. 1222)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through December 31, 2015, the authority under section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to transfer defense articles being drawn down in Afghanistan, and to provide defense services in connection with such transfers, to the military and security forces of Afghanistan. The provision would also extend through fiscal year 2015 the exemption for excess defense articles (EDA) transferred from Department of Defense (DOD) stocks in Afghanistan from counting toward the annual limitation on the aggregate value of EDA transferred under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act (Public Law 87–195).

The committee understands that DOD has determined that several hundred Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles in Afghanistan have been determined to be excess to U.S. defense needs and therefore will either be transferred as excess defense articles to foreign security forces or destroyed. The committee believes that these MRAP vehicles could provide the Afghan National Security Forces with valuable mobility and personnel protection and urges the Secretary of Defense to consider transferring these excess MRAP vehicles under the authority provided in this section.

One-year extension of authority to use funds for reintegration activities in Afghanistan (sec. 1223)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2015 the authority under section 1216 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) as amended, to use Department of Defense funds to support the reintegration of former insurgent fighters into Afghanistan society. The provision would authorize the use of up to $15.0 million in fiscal year 2015 for these purposes.

Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1224)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2015 the authority to make Coalition Support Funds (CSF) payments under section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended. Under this section, the Secretary of Defense may use CSF to reimburse key nations for support provided to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Afghanistan or to use such funds to provide specialized training or loan specialized equipment to key nations participating in coalition operations in Afghanistan. The provision would limit the total amount of CSF that could be provided in fiscal year 2015 to $1.2 billion. Of this amount, the amount of CSF that could be provided to Pakistan would be limited to $900.0 million. The provision would also extend for 1 year certain notification and certification requirements relating to CSF payments to Pakistan. The provision would also restrict the Secretary of Defense from waiving the certification requirements relating to $300.0 million of the $900.0 million in CSF authorized for Pakistan unless the Secretary certifies that Pakistan has undertaken military operations in North Waziristan that have significantly disrupted the safe haven and freedom of movement of the Haqqani network in Pakistan.

The committee notes that CSF payments are directly tied to support provided to U.S. military operations in Afghanistan and should not be considered to be foreign assistance by another name. With the drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan and the end of major combat operations there, the committee expects that CSF payments by the Department of Defense will decline accordingly.

One-year extension of logistical support for coalition forces supporting certain United States military operations (sec. 1225)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2015 the authority to provide logistical support to coalition forces under section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended.

Prohibition on use of funds for certain programs and projects of the Department of Defense in Afghanistan that cannot be safely accessed by United States Government personnel (sec. 1226)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2015 Department of Defense (DOD) funds for DOD reconstruction or other infrastructure projects in Afghanistan if those projects are not safely accessible by U.S. Government personnel with authority to conduct oversight. The provision would include a waiver if certain specified conditions can be met.

Semiannual report on enhancing the strategic partnership between the United States and Afghanistan (sec. 1227)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a semiannual report on building and sustaining the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF) through October 2017. The provision would also repeal the reporting requirement under section 1230 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Report on bilateral security cooperation with Pakistan (sec. 1228)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit semi-annually a detailed report to the appropriate committees of Congress on the nature and extent of bilateral security cooperation between the United States and Pakistan. The report would include information on the cooperation of the Government of Pakistan in the search for Army Sergeant Bowe Bergdahl, who was captured in Afghanistan in June 2009. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to make available to the intelligence committees a copy of the report required under this section.

Surface clearance of unexploded ordnance on former United States training ranges in Afghanistan (sec. 1229)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to $125.0 million of Department of Defense funds in each of fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to conduct surface clearance of unexploded ordnance at closed training ranges used by the U.S. Armed Forces in Afghanistan.

The committee notes that as U.S. Forces have drawn down in Afghanistan, dozens of firing ranges operated and managed by U.S. Forces have been closed. While strongly supportive of efforts to clear unexploded ordnance from these ranges, the committee notes that the inclusion of this authority does not create a U.S. legal obligation regarding the disposition of unexploded ordnance at these ranges or ranges transferred to Government of Afghanistan control and is not intended to serve as a precedent with respect to ranges in other countries or ranges transferred to Government of Afghanistan control.

Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program (sec. 1230)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, for 1 fiscal year, and modify the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program.

Extension and modification of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1231)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 2015 the authority under section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as amended, for the Secretary of Defense to support on a transitional basis the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC–I). The provision would authorize the use of up to $30.0 million in fiscal year 2015 to support OSC–I operations and activities.

The provision would also extend for 1 year the additional authority for the OSC–I to conduct non-operational training of Iraqi Ministry of Defense (MOD) and Counter Terrorism Service (CTS) personnel in an institutional environment to address capability gaps and integrate certain processes within the Iraqi security forces. In this regard, the committee understands the term "non-operational" to mean training that is conducted while not engaged in combat operations, and is not intended to preclude training of Iraqi security forces on operational tactics, techniques, or procedures within an institutional setting such as a MOD or a CTS training facility. In addition, the committee believes that nothing in this provision restricts the training of MOD or CTS personnel from being conducted only at those facilities owned or controlled by their respective ministry or service, and therefore nothing in this provision would preclude CTS personnel from training at MOD training facilities, and vice versa.

Subtitle C—Reports

Report on impact of end of major combat operations in Afghanistan on authority to use military force (sec. 1241)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, to submit a report to the appropriate committees of Congress assessing the impact, if any, of the end of major combat operations in Afghanistan on the authority of U.S. Armed Forces to use military force against al Qaeda, the Taliban, and other associated forces under the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force or any other available legal authority.

United States strategy for enhancing security and stability in Europe (sec. 1242)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a strategy for enhancing security and stability in Europe. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the contingency plans and force posture, readiness, and responsiveness

of U.S. and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) forces in Europe to ensure that such forces are appropriate to meet obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty, particularly the collective defense commitment of Article V. In addition, the provision would require the Department of Defense (DOD) to develop plans for reassuring our NATO allies and for enhancing U.S. security cooperation with appropriate countries participating in the NATO Partnership for Peace program, specifically those countries that are at risk or may become at risk of intimidation or threats to their sovereignty or territorial integrity from neighboring countries. Further, the provision would prohibit the use of DOD funds authorized by this Act to conduct bilateral security cooperation activities between the United States and Russia until Russia has ended its aggressive activities threatening the security of Ukraine and allied nations. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to waive the applicability of this prohibition, if necessary, for critical U.S. national security needs.

Report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation (sec. 1243)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a detailed report on Russia's security and military strategy. The report would include all the elements of the report on Russia required under section 1254 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) and add certain specified reporting requirements. The committee remains concerned about Russia's annexation and occupation of Crimea and the effect of Russian actions on the security and stability of Europe and Eurasia. In reporting on the force structure of the Russian military, the committee expects the report to include a description of Russian military forces stationed outside of Russia, Russian bases outside of Russia, and a breakout of forces stationed in Kaliningrad.

The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives an interim briefing by December 31, 2014, to update the information provided in the report required by June 1, 2014, under section 1254 of Public Law 113–66, as well as progress on assessments of the additional items required in the expanded and modified report under this section.

Modification of matters for discussion in annual reports of United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission (sec. 1244)

The committee recommends a provision that would revise and update the mandate of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission. The Commission's mandate has not been updated since the Commission was created in 2001. The updated mandate would include additional areas of concern for the committee including the People's Republic of China's (PRC) military plans, strategy and doctrine, strategic economic and security implications of its cyber operations, as well as the effects of energy and natural resource needs of the country on the foreign and military policies of the PRC.

The committee emphasizes that the Commission and its members should adhere to the guidance in the Commission's charter. In particular, the expertise of members of the Commission on matters relevant to the Commission's mandate is essential to their ability to appropriately advise Congress. Members of the Commission must possess a working knowledge of national security matters and U.S.-China relations. The committee urges members of the Commission to cultivate and maintain expertise in such matters on an annual basis during their terms in order to fully and effectively comply with the charter.

Further, the Commission is required to include a full discussion of issues listed in its mandate in each annual report. The committee urges the Commission to address all areas outlined as priorities in the Commission's revised mandate, including matters on which members of the Commission have diverse or divided viewpoints.

Report on maritime security strategy and annual briefing on military to military engagement with the People's Republic of China (sec. 1245)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to provide the congressional defense committees a report with a classified annex, if necessary, that would outline the Department of Defense (DOD) strategy with regard to maritime security in the South China and East China seas, including: (1) A description of planned bilateral or regional maritime capacity building initiatives; (2) An assessment of anti-access/area denial capabilities of the People's Republic of China (PRC); (3) An assessment of how the PRC has changed the status quo with regard to competing maritime claims in those seas; (4) An analysis and assessment of the benefits of the military-to-military engagement between the United States and the PRC and potential impact on tensions in the East and South China Seas; and (5) A description of the naval modernization efforts of the PRC and the implications of those efforts for U.S. strategy for maritime security in the region.

The provision would also require that the DOD provide the congressional defense committees a yearly briefing on the military-to-military engagements between the United States and the PRC, including an assessment of the success of such engagements in meeting the objectives of the Commander of United States Pacific Command for such engagements.

Report on military assistance to Ukraine (sec. 1246)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit semi-annually to the congressional defense committees a report on U.S. military assistance to Ukraine. The requirement to submit this report would terminate on January 31, 2017.

Subtitle D—Other Matters

Treatment of Kurdistan Democratic Party and Patriotic Union of Kurdistan under the Immigration and Nationality Act (sec. 1261)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Secretary of Homeland Security in consultation with the Secretary of State to exclude the Kurdistan Democratic Party and the Patriotic Union of Kurdistan from the definition of a Tier III terrorist organization under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

Notification on potentially significant arms control noncompliance (sec. 1262)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to notify the President if the Secretary has substantial reason to believe that there is a potentially significant case of foreign noncompliance with an arms control treaty to which the United States is a party. It would also require the Secretary to submit notice to the Senate committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Intelligence not later than 30 days after such notification to the President.

Enhanced authority for provision of support to foreign military liaison officers of foreign countries while assigned to the Department of Defense (sec. 1263)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1051a of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Department of Defense the authority to continue to benefit from the contributions of liaison officers from other countries beyond the conclusion of current named military operations in Afghanistan.

The committee believes that this authority will enable the Secretary of Defense to better facilitate partner nation participation to assist the United States in a wider range of partnerships, cooperative ventures, and burden-sharing efforts. It would also allow like-minded countries to better plan and utilize resources when addressing common threats and it would enhance interoperability and working relationships between the United States and foreign militaries.

One-year extension of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1264)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of the Department of Defense to establish, develop, and maintain non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities for 1 additional year.

Inter-European Air Forces Academy (sec. 1265)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to operate the Inter-European Air Forces Academy for the purpose of military education and training to military personnel of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) members and countries participating in the NATO Partnership for

Peace program. The provision would also authorize the use of funds available for Air Force operations and maintenance to pay certain costs associated with the program. The authority would expire on September 30, 2017.

The committee understands that the intention of the Department of Defense in establishing the program and curriculum of the Inter-European Air Forces Academy is to train non-commissioned officers and company grade officers of allied and partnered air forces, primarily from Eastern Europe, to help them overcome the legacy of overly centralized command and control structures of these air forces instilled during the Cold War. The program would be intended to train these personnel to delegate effectively within a decentralized organization and to improve the interoperability and effectiveness for future coalition operations.

Extension of limitations on providing certain missile defense information to the Russian Federation (sec. 1266)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 1 year the limitations in section 1246(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) on providing certain missile defense information to the Russian Federation.

Prohibition on direct or indirect use of funds to enter into contracts or agreements with Rosoboronexport (sec. 1267)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense (DOD) from contracting with the Russian state corporation Rosoboronexport or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates. The provision would also require DOD to immediately terminate all contracts with Rosoboronexport. In addition, the provision requires a report submitted to the congressional defense committees on the activities of Rosoboronexport.

Items of Special Interest

Annual report on the military power of Iran

The committee remains concerned about the regional and international threat posed by Iran's nuclear and ballistic missile development programs. As Admiral Cecil Haney, Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, stated in testimony to the committee on February 27, 2014, "[i]f Iran were to make progress toward developing an ICBM [intercontinental ballistic missile] capable of delivering a nuclear or conventional warhead and with sufficient range to reach CONUS [continental United States], I would consider that a threat to the United States." The committee agrees strongly with Admiral Haney and the committee remains interested in an update from the Secretary of Defense on Iran's military development activities in this regard.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Defense is required to submit, on an annual basis, a report on the military power of Iran (section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010, as amended (Public Law 110–84)). The committee notes that previous versions of this report have provided useful informa-

tion on Iran's military power, including its ballistic missile capabilities and developments. The report is due on January 30 of each year. However, the committee notes that, as of May 2014, the report covering 2013 has not been provided to Congress. The committee expects the prompt delivery of this report each year.

Given this delay, upon the delivery of the report covering 2013, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to Congress a briefing on the report which—in addition to covering information from 2013—should also provide an update from the report's information cut-off date to the present on any developments within Iran's ballistic missile program that would, at a minimum, contain the information required in section 1245(b)(4).

Comptroller General of the United States review of Department of Defense security assistance to the Republic of Yemen

The committee notes that Yemen continues to be threatened by terrorist and regional insurgent violence and racked by systemic socio-economic and environmental problems. Further, the Yemen-based al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) remains a serious national security threat to the United States. The U.S. Government has invested more than $1 billion in assistance since 2007 in support of U.S. strategic goals for Yemen.

While the Government Accountability Office reported in March 2013 that some progress has been made toward supporting the Government of Yemen in addressing these difficulties, significant challenges remain regarding Yemen's future, underscoring the possibility that Yemen will need further U.S. assistance as it navigates a demanding transition process.

The committee remains concerned about U.S. security assistance programs (primarily so-called sections 1203, 1206, and 1207(n) assistance programs) and the long-term viability of the U.S. security strategy for Yemen that these programs seek to support. As such, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to update the March 2013 report on U.S. Assistance to Yemen (GAO–13–310). The committee is particularly interested in: (1) Receiving an update on the status of Department of Defense efforts to deliver security-related equipment on a timely basis and conduct the associated training within the time period permitted in the underlying provision of public law; (2) An analysis of the maintenance support programs for the Yemeni security forces on the U.S. provided equipment, including—but not limited to—field service representatives or direct training of the Yemeni security force; (3) An assessment of the cohesiveness and synergy of the collective programs and equipment provided under security assistance programs since 2008; and (4) Other matters the Comptroller General determines appropriate in the conduct of the review. The committee directs that the Comptroller General brief the congressional defense committees on its initial findings no later than the end of this calendar year, and that a final report be issued no later than March 31, 2015.

Maritime security in West Africa

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD/P), in consultation with the Commander of United States Africa Command, to develop a framework for U.S. maritime security assistance and cooperation in the Gulf of Guinea. Such framework shall include the following for each of the principal maritime nations in the Gulf of Guinea and for the region as a whole:

(1) An assessment of where there are shortfalls within national and regional capabilities to reduce and prevent current threats and illegal activities including piracy, maritime oil theft, illegal fishing, illegal trafficking of humans, narcotics, weapons and commodities, and such other destabilizing activities that may disrupt peaceful maritime governance;

(2) An assessment of the current and expected contributions of partner nations, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and interagency efforts to reduce the shortfalls identified in paragraph (1) and shall include how these efforts can be synchronized to avoid duplication of effort;

(3) Development and evaluation of Department of Defense (DOD) alternatives to enhance the maritime security capabilities of the Gulf of Guinea states and region through prioritization of targeted security assistance efforts; and

(4) Development and evaluation of options for the DOD, in partnership with the Gulf of Guinea states, to combat official corruption facilitating piracy and other illegal activity and to enable host nation law enforcement actions against piracy and transnational criminal networks and their support infrastructure.

The USD/P shall submit the report to the congressional defense committees and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act. Further, the committee directs that the report include recommendations for action by the Department of the Navy to enhance maritime security in the Gulf of Guinea.

Nigeria and the threat posed by Boko Haram

The committee has watched with great concern as Boko Haram, which the Department of State designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization in 2013 following a review of available intelligence directed by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), has grown in strength, size, capability, lethal capacity, and geographic reach over the last few years, and as the Nigerian Government has struggled to develop effective policies to combat Boko Haram.

Boko Haram's brutal tactics have included dozens of violent terrorist attacks against both the Nigerian Government and civilian targets such as civil society leaders, moderate religious leaders, journalists, health workers involved in vaccination campaigns, teachers, and students attending secular schools, including the nearly 300 young girls abducted in north-eastern Nigeria earlier this year. Boko Haram has achieved success by advancing a violent extremist ideology while tapping into grievances regarding governance, corruption, and underdevelopment in northern Nigeria.

Boko Haram increasingly presents a direct threat to the Government of Nigeria and to stability in northern Nigeria. Moreover, its growth has a direct bearing on U.S. national security interests in the region, given its commitment to terrorist methods, ties with transnational terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM), and reported involvement in transnational organized crime activities such as illicit trafficking in narcotics, arms, and wildlife.

In response to Boko Haram's growing threat, the Government of Nigeria declared a state of emergency in several northern states in May 2013 and has since increased its military and police operations against Boko Haram. However, these operations have often been heavy-handed, raising human rights concerns as well as fears that the Government of Nigeria may be driving more local residents to support Boko Haram or deterring them from cooperating with law enforcement.

Moreover, the Government of Nigeria has missed opportunities to partner with the international community to improve the effectiveness of its response, and has failed to address underlying grievances that enhance Boko Haram's appeal in the region. As a recent International Crisis Group Report noted, "Unless the federal and state governments, and the region, develop and implement comprehensive plans to tackle not only insecurity but also the injustices that drive much of the troubles, Boko Haram, or groups like it, will continue to destabilise large parts of the country."

The committee recognizes Nigeria as an important partner to the United States but is concerned that deficiencies in the Government of Nigeria's current approach to confronting Boko Haram is undermining its ability to ensure the security of the Nigerian people. While the Department of Defense should continue bilateral counterterrorism efforts and its participation in the inter-agency efforts relating to the captured young girls, the committee believes broader cooperation with the Nigerian Government should be considered carefully in the context of the Nigerian Government's progress in addressing underlying grievances, discontinuing heavy-handed security tactics, and expanding political and economic opportunity in northern Nigeria.

Northeast Asian intelligence threats

The committee understands that U.S. military facilities, U.S. military technology, and Department of Defense (DOD) personnel in Japan are strategic targets for the intelligence and military intelligence agencies of regional adversaries and competitors in Northeast Asia. The committee notes that the Japanese National Diet's approval of the Secrets Protection Act of 2013 provides a legal framework to help protect the Government of Japan (GOJ) and U.S. classified national security data. The committee encourages DOD and the GOJ to continue their collaborative efforts to thwart intelligence threats from regional adversaries and competitors.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency to provide a classified briefing to the congressional defense and intelligence committees, no later than October 1, 2014, on the intelligence threat to U.S. military facilities and

personnel in Japan. This briefing shall include discussion of U.S. cooperation with the GOJ to counter regional intelligence threats, as well as an update on the GOJ's implementation of the Secrets Protection Act of 2013.

Plans for bases in Afghanistan

The committee notes that the administration is still in negotiations with the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan on a Bilateral Security Agreement, which would establish missions and set the number of U.S. military forces to remain in Afghanistan beyond December 2014. As such, the administration has not yet provided a budget request or justification to the committee on supplemental funding required to support overseas contingency operations.

If the administration decides to station U.S. military forces in Afghanistan, those forces will need facilities and supporting infrastructure that is safe and secure and enables efficient mission accomplishment. The committee expects the Department of Defense to include in future budget requests the plans and investments required to ensure adequate facilities and infrastructure for the expected duration of the post-2014 mission.

Support of foreign forces participating in operations against the Lord's Resistance Army

The Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) has wreaked havoc upon millions for more than 2 decades throughout central Africa. The LRA's atrocities have included murder, rape, and the abduction of children to serve as child soldiers. In 2009, Congress passed, and the President signed into law, the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act (Public Law 111–172), which outlined U.S. policy objectives focused on eliminating the threat posed by the LRA and its leader, Joseph Kony. In subsequent years, Congress has provided supporting legislative authorities and associated funding for U.S. military assistance, known as Operation Observant Compass, to regional partners combating the LRA, most recently in section 1208 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

The committee remains strongly supportive of Operation Observant Compass and related assistance to the Africa Union Regional Task Force and other regional partners, including the deployment of U.S. military advisors and equipment. This support has enabled notable progress, including the removal of key LRA commanders from the battlefield and has contributed to increased defections, which the Department of State estimates has reduced the number of LRA fighters to approximately 200 from nearly 1,000 6 years ago.

However, the committee believes that continued U.S. support, specifically additional enablers and actionable intelligence, is required to increase the effectiveness of our regional partners in eliminating the threat posed by Joseph Kony and the LRA to civilian populations. As such, the committee urges the Department of Defense to continue its assistance, specifically the provision of key enabling support, such as mobility and targeted intelligence collection and analysis resources.

United States-India Defense Security Cooperation

The committee supports the continued and growing bilateral security relationship between the United States and India, which includes the expansion of defense trade. Defense trade with India supports both countries and highlights the significance of U.S.-India cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region. The objective of the Department of Defense's (DOD) Defense Trade Initiative (DTI) with India is to nurture increased U.S. defense exports to India. The committee notes that DTI has had mixed results, and encourages the DOD to continue its efforts to streamline business processes to make U.S.-India defense trade and collaboration simpler, responsive, and effective.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with other departments and agencies, as appropriate, to provide the congressional defense and foreign affairs committees a classified briefing, no later than October 1, 2014, on the technologies that are currently being considered or may be considered for export to India, including pending or completed reforms of export controls to facilitate DTI.

United States Strategy on the African Union Mission in Somalia

Since 2007, the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) has been the primary point of engagement for U.S. policy in Somalia. The United States has been the single largest bilateral contributor to financing AMISOM and has provided significant logistical, technical, and political support to AMISOM operations. Additionally, the U.S. Government has provided substantial support to AMISOM contributors through various security assistance programs, among other means. AMISOM has proven highly successful in helping the United States achieve its foremost national security objective in Somalia of disrupting and dismantling al Shabaab in order to prevent the planning and execution of international terrorist attacks.

However, as the situation in Somalia has been transformed by the security gains against al Shabaab and the establishment of a permanent national government, the committee is concerned that strategy informing U.S. policy with regard to AMISOM specifically and Somalia more broadly has not kept pace with the evolving security and governance landscape. There appears to be no coherent long-term strategy or timeline for transitioning the AMISOM mission or associated U.S. support; moreover, a stagnant U.S. policy towards Somalia that continues to be centered upon AMISOM carries a number of risks both for the future of Somalia and for broader U.S. national security objectives in the region.

The committee is concerned that an open-ended AMISOM mission without a clearly articulated transition strategy could crystallize the current status quo that while representing progress from past conditions, is not an acceptable end-state. Accepting the status quo as an end state would mean a long-term dependence by the Somali Federal Government (SFG) on AMISOM to fulfill its security needs; a SFG that is unable or unmotivated to extend its reach beyond Mogadishu; an overwhelming dependence by the SFG on foreign assistance; the strengthening or institutionalization of clan-based militias outside of Mogadishu; and lack of progress toward

necessary constitutional and governmental reform. The committee notes that there already appears to be a relative paralysis with regard to achieving identified political milestones, including progressing toward scheduled elections and a constitutional referendum.

An additional concern is that the continued presence of AMISOM soldiers on Somali soil could generate increasingly negative reactions from local populations, particularly given that AMISOM now includes substantial numbers of military personnel from neighboring nations which many Somali citizens have historically regarded with distrust. Reports of abuses committed by AMISOM personnel against local citizens appear to have increased tensions between AMISOM and local populations in recent months; these tensions are further exacerbated by the significant disparity in monthly salaries between AMISOM soldiers and members of the Somali National Army. Such tensions, should they continue to grow, could fuel a resurgence of al Shabaab or other violent groups intent on attacking foreign forces.

The committee is concerned that continued support to AMISOM also risks constraining or undermining the U.S. Government's ability to address broader national security objectives in the region. Continued support for AMISOM will require continued support for, and dependence upon, Uganda, Kenya, and Ethiopia in a way that is potentially counterproductive to U.S. bilateral and regional policies, particularly in the context of increasing human rights concerns.

As a result, the committee believes the Department of Defense should be working in close coordination with the Department of State to plan for a U.S. Government policy toward Somalia in a post-AMISOM context, to include planning for concrete steps to transition AMISOM's mission to the SFG and for addressing U.S. counterterrorism interests in AMISOM's absence. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a report, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, outlining a strategy for U.S. action with regard to the future of AMISOM and U.S. security and political support to Somalia. This strategy should include:

(1) clearly identified, long-term end states and policy objectives for addressing threats to U.S. national security interests emanating from al Shabaab or other actors in Somalia, and a description of what role, if any, AMISOM should have in achieving those objectives;

(2) a plan for assisting in the transition of security responsibilities from AMISOM to the Somali National Army;

(3) a specific strategy and timeline for winding down U.S. financial and logistical support to AMISOM; and

(4) specific benchmarks and milestones by which to measure progress toward achieving the end states, objectives, and plans identified in (1)–(3).

The committee further expects the Secretary to ensure that the aforementioned strategy informs DOD plans with regard to continued security assistance programs in the region.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

Subtitle A—Funding Allocations

Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds (sec. 1301)

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs, define the funds as authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this bill, and authorize CTR funds to be available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Funding allocations (sec. 1302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $365 million, the amount of the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. This provision authorizes specific amounts for each CTR program element, requires notification to Congress 30 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2015 funds for a purpose other than a purpose listed in the provision, and requires notification to Congress 15 days before the Secretary of Defense obligates and expends fiscal year 2015 funds in excess of the specific amount authorized for each CTR program element.

Subtitle B—Consolidation and Modernization of Statutes Relating to the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

Consolidation and modernization of statutes relating to the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (secs. 1311–1352)

The committee recommends a provision that would consolidate and update Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction authorities.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

Subtitle A—Military Programs

Working Capital Funds (sec. 1401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for chemical agents and munitions destruction, defense, at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, defense-wide, at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Defense Inspector General (sec. 1404)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Defense Health Program (sec. 1405)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile and Related Matters

Report on development of secure supply of rare earth materials (sec. 1411)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, on the supply of rare earth materials extracted, processed, and refined from secure sources of supply to develop and produce advanced technologies in support of requirements of the Department of Defense.

Subtitle C—Other Matters

Authority for transfer of funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, Illinois (sec. 1421)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer $146.9 million from the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund to be used for operations of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, Illinois.

Comptroller General of the United States report on Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, North Chicago, Illinois (sec. 1422)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the Committees on Armed Services and on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center, North Chicago, Illinois, demonstration project not later than 120 days after the date that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs submit to the Committees on Armed Services and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives their evaluation report on this demonstration project.

Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1423)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $63.4 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 2015 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

Designation and responsibilities of Senior Medical Advisor for the Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1424)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1513A of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 413a) to make technical corrections regarding the designation of the Senior Medical Advisor for the retirement home to reflect the disestablishment of the TRICARE Management Activity and creation of the new Defense Health Agency. The provision would also replace the reference to the health care standards of the Department of Veterans Affairs with the more appropriate nationally recognized health care standards and requirements.

Budget Items

Meals, ready-to-eat

The committee request included $44.2 million for the working capital fund, Defense-wide, Defense Logistics Agency (DLA).

The committee notes that a level of 5.0 million cases of meals, ready-to-eat (MRE) was initiated in 2005 to support the operational tempo of combat in Iraq and Afghanistan. A July 2013 DLA Oper-

ations Research and Resource Analysis (DORRA) found that MRE inventory levels should be set between 3.4 million and 3.9 million cases per year.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of $5.0 million to the working capital fund, Defense-wide, for the DLA.

Defense Commissary Agency

The budget request included $1.1 billion for the Working Capital Fund, Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA). The budget assumed savings of $200.0 million associated with a legislative proposal to streamline and reform commissary operations. The committee declined to support this proposal.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase in the Working Capital Fund, DeCA of $200.0 million to restore these assumed savings.

Additional intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to United States Southern Command

The budget request includes $719.1 million for drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, of which $7.7 million is for United States Army Intelligence Command counternarcotics surveillance support and $23.9 million is for a transit zone maritime patrol aircraft for intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) support. This funding is intended to assist United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) to fulfill its statutory mission (10 U.S.C. 124) for detection and monitoring of aerial and maritime transit of illegal drugs into the United States. The committee notes that the SOUTHCOM Commander identified shortfalls in the ISR support provided to SOUTHCOM through the Global Force Management Allocation Plan (GFMAP) and, therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $20.0 million for additional ISR support for SOUTHCOM.

The amount authorized by the committee for this purpose is in addition to the amounts already allocated in the President's budget request to support SOUTHCOM's ISR requirements.

The committee notes that on March 13, 2014, General John F. Kelly, the Commander of SOUTHCOM, testified before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, that only about 5 percent of SOUTHCOM's ISR requirements are being met. Gen. Kelly further testified that, "the vast majority of heroin that's consumed in the United States is actually produced in Latin America. The poppies are now grown in places like Guatemala and Colombia."

The committee directs not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Counternarcotics and Global Threats, in coordination with the SOUTHCOM Commander, provide the congressional defense committees a briefing on its plan to use the additional funding to support SOUTHCOM's narcotics and illicit trafficking detection, monitoring, and interdiction operations. The plan should also identify any other shortfalls, particularly in the area of maritime and fixed and rotary wing assets, and describe any plans to mitigate the impact of these shortfalls to operations.

Defense Health Program funding

The amount authorized to be appropriated for the Defense Health Program includes the following changes from the budget request.

[Changes in millions of dollars]

Reduction for anticipated cost of TRICARE consolidation	−88.0
Annual person-to-person mental health assessments	10.0
Total	−78.0

The committee recommends a total reduction in the Defense Health Program of $78.0 million. This includes a reduction of $88.0 million to reflect costs avoided by the Department of Defense relative to its proposal to consolidate the TRICARE program, which the committee did not adopt, and an increase of $10.0 million to fund annual person-to-person mental health assessments for servicemembers.

Items of Special Interest

Defense working capital funds

The committee is concerned that the Department of the Treasury's decision to migrate from monthly to daily cash balances for the defense working capital funds will likely be delayed beyond October 1, 2014. In preparation for such a migration, the committee is concerned that the Services are purposefully building up excess cash as the Department of Defense (DOD) determines the appropriate amount of cash balances or sufficient cash balances in accordance with DOD's financial military regulation policy. It remains unclear to the committee precisely what DOD intends with respect to defining sufficient cash balances.

The committee is also concerned that a projected shortfall of $927.0 million in the fiscal year 2015 transportation working capital fund may have a significant negative impact on readiness, with respect to the airlift readiness account (ARA). The $927.0 million shortfall will also negatively impact the Air Force working capital fund cash balance and could affect the solvency of the fund. The committee notes that in fiscal year 2013, the Air Force failed to fund ARA requirements.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee no later than October 1, 2015, on: (1) DOD's status made on the proposed change to daily cash balances; (2) A specific definition of sufficient cash balances that DOD and each military service will follow; (3) The methodology used to calculate such definition; (4) Recommendations on how to mitigate the need to carry excess cash to avoid Anti-deficiency Act violations; and (5) A mitigation plan to address the projected ARA shortfall, including any initiatives that could result in savings.

Additionally, the committee urges DOD to consider addressing the fiscal year 2015 ARA shortfall in its fiscal year 2014 omnibus reprogramming request.

Department of Defense Inspector General

The committee recognizes that the independent audit and investigative functions of the Department of Defense (DOD) Inspector

General (IG) continues to serve a valuable role in identifying waste, fraud, and abuse in DOD programs and operations. In fiscal year 2013, DOD IG audits and investigations resulted in over a $5.3 billion return on investment, which is an increase of $1.7 billion in returns compared to fiscal year 2012. The committee notes that of the $5.3 billion returned in fiscal year 2013, $3.2 billion was in achieved monetary benefits, $1.3 billion in civil judgments and settlements, $733.0 million in criminal fines, penalties, and restitutions, $81.5 million in administrative recoveries, and $5.2 million in recovered government property. The 147 reports issued in fiscal year 2013 led to 172 arrests, 242 convictions, 138 suspensions, and 161 debarments.

The committee remains encouraged and recognizes the DOD IG's efforts to date and continued progress with respect to audit readiness, the drawdown of military forces, acquisition processes and financial management, sexual assault investigative oversight, suicide prevention, readiness and safety, information and cybersecurity, healthcare, intelligence oversight, senior official accountability, and whistleblower protection.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations

Purpose (sec. 1501)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to overseas contingency operations.

Overseas Contingency Operations (sec. 1502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for overseas contingency operations.

Subtitle—Financial Matters

Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1511)

The committee recommends a provision that would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

Special transfer authority (sec. 1512)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer of up to an additional $4.0 billion of war-related funding authorizations in this title among accounts in this title.

Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters

Plan for transition of funding of United States Special Operations Command from supplemental funding for overseas contingency operations to recurring funding for future-years defense programs (sec. 1521)

The committee notes that approximately one-third, or $2.3 billion, of the enacted budget for U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) for fiscal year 2014 was Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding. Furthermore, the committee understands that at least $783.0 million of this OCO funding has been identified by the Department of Defense and SOCOM as an enduring requirement that will be necessary to sustain special operations capabilities and readiness in future years. For example, on March 11, 2014, the Commander of SOCOM testified that "SOCOM relies heavily on OCO funding today, with the National Mission Force, in particular, funded with 67 percent of OCO."

The committee notes that section 1534 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to fully transition appropriate SOCOM funding from the OCO to base budget over the future years defense program to maintain critical and enduring special operations capabilities. In a June 3, 2013, letter responding to this provision, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict stated "As the Department's topline continues to decrease, finding the resources to transfer SOCOM's OCO requirements to the base budget remains particularly challenging. The Department will assess transitioning future OCO to base requirements during DOD's FY 2015 Program and Budget Review (PBR) decision cycle, which will occur in the Summer and Fall of 2013.

Unfortunately, the Department still has not provided the congressional defense committees with the required plan. The committee remains concerned that the Department has not identified a plan to fully transition funding for enduring special operations requirements from the OCO to base budget in future years, potentially putting sustainment of such capabilities at risk. Therefore, the committee again recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees, as part of the fiscal year 2016 budget request, with a plan to fully transition appropriate SOCOM funding from the OCO to base budget over the future years defense program to maintain critical and enduring special operations capabilities.

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1522)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund and would thereby provide the Director of the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) with the authority to investigate, develop, and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel, and funds to assist United States forces in the defeat of improvised explosive devices for Operation Enduring Freedom or any successor operation to that operation. The provision would also extend JIEDDO's authority with respect to homemade explosives, and would sunset this authority on December 31, 2015. The provision would also direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to present to the congressional defense committees a plan to consolidate any enduring functions of the stated organizations, capabilities, and funding into an appropriate organization identified as part of that review.

Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1523)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that amounts authorized for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) for fiscal year 2015 continue to be subject to the conditions specified in subsections (b) through (g) of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended. The provision would also extend the requirement under subsection (c)(1) of section 1531 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) that not less than $25.0 million of ASFF funding be available

to be used to promote the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the Afghanistan National Security Forces. The provision would also extend the authority under section 1531(d) of Public Law 113–66 for the Department of Defense to dispose of certain equipment in Afghanistan.

The committee understands that for logistical and security reasons Afghan Air Force (AAF) pilots will initially train on A–29 Light Attack Support aircraft in the United States. The committee concurs with this course of action with the understanding that the U.S. Government intends to transfer all 20 A–29 aircraft used in such training to the Government of Afghanistan to support military operations after the initial training of the AAF pilots is complete, regardless of the outcome of Bilateral Security Agreement negotiations.

Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund (sec. 1524)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2015 Department of Defense funds for the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund.

Sense of Congress regarding counter-improvised explosive devices (sec. 1525)

The committee recommends a provision that express the sense of Congress on the importance of retaining, to the extent practicable, a knowledge base relating to counter-improvised explosive device operations.

Budget Item

Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

The budget request includes $115.1 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat fund for the Joint IED Defeat Organization's (JIEDDO) staff and infrastructure expenses.

As it has in each fiscal year since JIEDDO's inception, the committee declines to recommend any funding for JIEDDO in the base budget and therefore recommends a reduction of $115.1 million in the Joint IED Defeat fund. The committee understands that the Department of Defense (DOD) intends to request funding for the Joint IED Defeat fund in the overseas contingency operations budget request later this year.

The committee recognizes the important work JIEDDO has done but notes that JIEDDO was created as a temporary wartime organization. The committee believes that the operational tempo in U.S. Central Command provides an opportunity to conduct a review, captured in another title of this Act, that should lead to consolidation and, where appropriate, elimination of organizations, such as JIEDDO, that provide response to emergent warfighter needs.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

Subtitle A—Nuclear Forces

Procurement authority for certain parts of intercontinental ballistic missile fuses (sec. 1601)

The committee recommends a provision that would give authority to procure commercial parts for intercontinental ballistic missile fuses, notwithstanding 10 U.S.C. 1502(a), for fiscal year 2015.

Form of and cost estimates relating to annual reports on plan for the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons complex, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons command and control system (sec. 1602)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1043 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to include an update by the Congressional Budget Office of the report required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) that would provide a 10-year estimate of costs associated with the fielding and maintaining the current nuclear weapons and delivery systems of the United States.

Reports on installation of nuclear command, control, and communications systems at the United States Strategic Command headquarters (sec. 1603)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) to submit an annual report on the installation of nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) systems as part of the replacement for the STRATCOM headquarters. Such systems are unique, complex, and highly integrated within the overall U.S. NC3 architecture. In addition, many of the systems, such as the Strategic Automated Command and Control System and the Mission Planning and Analysis System, are based on outdated protocols, computer languages, and architectures that will most likely be incompatible with the communications systems in the new headquarters building. Either these outdated systems will have to be replaced or have interfaces built between them and the new headquarters building—a daunting task.

The requirement for an annual report would terminate at such time as when the Commander of STRATCOM certifies to the congressional defense committees that all milestones have been completed, and the headquarters building is a fully functioning node in the overall NC3 architecture.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) shall review the existing milestones and scope of the effort and provide a technical briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2014, as to whether the scope of the current effort is complete, fully integrated, and meets accepted programmatic planning practices.

The GAO shall review the report submitted each year and provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on whether the installation is meeting projected milestones and costs and whether there are outstanding programmatic or technical issues that must be addressed to meet these milestones so that the building can become an operational hub in the overall NC3 network.

Reports on potential reductions to B61 life extension program (sec. 1604)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command to provide it with separate reports in advance of any decision to reduce the scope of the B61 Life Extension Program below the level proposed in the Fiscal Year 2015 Stockpile Stewardship Management Plan. The committee notes that Assistant Secretary of Defense Madelyn Creedon's testimony last year that, "the Nuclear Weapons Council changed the schedule and cumulative production quantity for the W76–1 program. This change reduced the total LEP production quantity and realigned the end of the production period for all operational units from FY 2021 to FY 2019." The committee is not aware of any similar changes being discussed for the B61, but believes Congress should be notified in advance of any such action, since changes to the program could have far reaching consequences for U.S. national security and obligations to U.S. allies, as well as implications for the cost and schedule of the life extension program itself.

Sense of Congress on deterrence and defense posture of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (sec. 1605)

The committee recommends a provision that would express a sense of Congress that reaffirms and remains committed to the policies enumerated in the Deterrence and Defense Posture Review of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, dated May 20, 2012.

Subtitle B—Missile Defense Programs

Homeland ballistic missile defense (sec. 1611)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress on the importance of defending the United States Homeland against the threat of limited ballistic missile attack from North Korea and Iran, and would require a report describing the status of current and planned efforts to improve United States Homeland missile defense capabilities to keep pace with the evolving threat.

The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) is taking, and plans to take, numerous steps to improve homeland missile defense, including near-term, mid-term, and far-term enhancements. These include: (1) Near-term improvements to the reliability and performance of

the currently deployed Ground-based Interceptor (GBI) kill vehicles; (2) Deployment of 14 additional GBIs in Alaska by the end of 2017; (3) Investments in enhanced sensor capabilities, including a new Long-Range Discriminating Radar in Alaska, and discrimination capabilities to improve operational effectiveness and efficiency of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system; (4) A mid-term re-design of the GMD Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle (EKV) to improve its capability, producibility, maintainability, affordability, and testability; and (5) Plans to design a Next-Generation EKV to take full advantage of improvements in sensors, discrimination, kill assessment, battle management, and command and control, including the potential to defeat multiple threats with individual interceptors.

The committee supports these multiple efforts to improve homeland missile defense, particularly the improvements to sensor and discrimination capabilities, and the re-design of the EKV and plans to design a Next Generation EKV.

The improvements to sensor and discrimination capabilities should improve the operational effectiveness, cost-effectiveness, and efficiency of the deployed inventory of GBIs with better targeting information that will allow the interceptors to defeat more targets. The committee expects MDA to pursue cost-effective development and acquisition approaches for these capabilities to ensure they are both affordable and effective, and directs MDA to keep the congressional defense committees fully apprised of progress on the acquisition of these capabilities.

The committee also supports the plans to improve substantially the performance and reliability of future EKVs through the re-design (Phase 1) and the Next Generation EKV (Phase 2) efforts. Although MDA is still developing the requirements and acquisition plan for the re-designed EKV, it expects to flight test the re-designed EKV beginning in 2018, and to introduce it into the next procurement of GBIs starting in 2020, if development and testing prove successful. The committee expects MDA to use a rigorous acquisition approach, including realistic testing, that can achieve a demonstrated capability as soon as practicable using sound acquisition principles and practices. Elsewhere in this report, the committee addresses the need for a rigorous acquisition plan for the re-designed EKV.

The Next Generation EKV is intended to take advantage of common kill vehicle technologies and improvements to the full range of homeland defense capabilities, such as discrimination and hit assessment, to defeat the evolving missile threat from nations such as North Korea and Iran. The MDA anticipates deploying the Next Generation EKV starting early in the next decade. It also could include the ability to defeat multiple threat objects with individual interceptors.

Regional ballistic missile defense (sec. 1612)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress on the importance of effective regional missile defenses to protect U.S. forward deployed forces, allies, and partner countries against the growing threat of regional ballistic missiles, particularly from Iran and North Korea, to Europe, the Middle

East, and the Asia-Pacific region. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on the status and progress of efforts to improve regional missile defense capabilities in these regions, including efforts and cooperation by allies and partner countries.

The Missile Defense Agency reports that the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) to missile defense is on track to deploy the Phase 2 Aegis Ashore site in Romania in 2015 and the Phase 3 Aegis Ashore site in Poland by the end of 2018. These capabilities are intended to increase the defensive coverage of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization area of Europe against increasingly capable and numerous Iranian missiles. The committee supports the continued development, testing, and implementation of Phases 2 and 3 of the EPAA, and believes these capabilities will be important components of regional European security.

The committee notes that the United States is working with its Gulf Cooperation Council partner nations to improve regional air and missile defense capabilities, including data sharing and multilateral cooperation. The committee believes that such multilateral cooperation would enhance regional security and would provide significant improvements beyond national and bi-national capabilities. The committee encourages the Department of Defense (DOD) to make such multilateral air and missile defense cooperation a regional security priority.

The committee notes the significant missile defense cooperation with Japan, including the co-development of the Standard Missile-3 Block IIA interceptor, and believes this cooperation is an important element of the allied response to North Korea's regional missile capabilities. The committee encourages DOD to continue working with other allies and partners in the region, particularly including South Korea and Australia, to enhance protection against North Korean regional missile capabilities.

The committee notes that U.S. regional missile defense capabilities in each of these regions would be enhanced by increased interoperability and coordination among the geographic combatant commands and the capabilities under their control, and encourages DOD to take steps to maximize such interoperability and coordination.

Availability of funds for missile defense programs of Israel (sec. 1613)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $350.9 million for the Department of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel to procure the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system, including for co-production of Iron Dome parts and components in the United States by U.S. industry. The provision would also provide that, if the Government of Israel determines that it is a higher priority for its national security, up to $175.0 million of the amount authorized for Iron Dome may be used for the following U.S.-Israel cooperative missile defense programs: (1) The Arrow System Improvement Program; (2) The Arrow-3 Upper Tier interceptor development program; and (3) The David's Sling short-range ballistic missile defense system.

The provision would also require that the funds authorized for Iron Dome would be available subject to the terms, conditions, and co-production targets specified for fiscal year 2015 in the "Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement," signed on March 5, 2014. If the Government of Israel decides to use part or all of the $175.0 million authorized for the three specified cooperative missile defense programs, the provision would require that such funds be subject to the terms and conditions of the joint U.S.-Israel Project Agreements governing the management and execution of these cooperative programs.

The committee notes that the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome agreement specifies that the funding level for Iron Dome for fiscal year 2015 would be $175.9 million, the amount in the budget request, and the final amount of the $677.0 million the United States agreed in 2012 to seek for Iron Dome from fiscal years 2012 to 2015. However, the Government of Israel has requested an additional $175.0 million for Iron Dome procurement in fiscal year 2015.

The committee notes that Iron Dome has played an important role in protecting Israel's population from short-range rocket and mortar attacks. The United States has supported Israel's procurement of Iron Dome interceptors and batteries by providing Israel more than $700.0 million since fiscal year 2011. The committee continues to be supportive of Iron Dome, and of co-production of Iron Dome in the United States in accordance with the U.S.-Israel Iron Dome agreement. However, the committee also has been supportive of the three cooperative missile defense programs that were jointly developed by the United States and Israel, and recognizes that they may be a higher priority for Israel to receive additional funding. This provision would provide the authority to permit Israel to use part or all of the additional $175.0 million for the missile defense programs that are the higher priority.

Acquisition plan for re-designed Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle (sec. 1614)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a robust acquisition plan for the re-design of the Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle (EKV) of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system. The provision would require the acquisition plan to include rigorous elements for systems engineering, design, integration, development, testing, and evaluation to ensure that the re-designed EKV is operationally effective, reliable, producible, cost-effective, maintainable, and testable. Consistent with the fly-before-you-buy acquisition approach, the provision would also require the re-designed EKV to be tested and demonstrated to have a high probability of working in an operationally effective manner prior to its operational deployment.

The committee notes that on February 25, 2014, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Frank Kendall described problems with the GMD system as being related to "a lot of bad engineering," saying it was "because there was a rush—to get something out." As acknowledged by Vice Admiral James Syring, Director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), at a press

conference on March 4, 2014, the current GMD system was deployed with prototype kill vehicle designs that were developed and deployed without robust and rigorous acquisition practices, noting that "we cut short the design cycle" and the "systems engineering cycle." Consequently, the GMD system has experienced several flight test failures since 2010 with both models of deployed kill vehicles, the Capability Enhancement-I and the Capability Enhancement-II. In a January 2014 report to Congress, the Director Of Operational Test and Evaluation wrote that these test failures "raise questions regarding the robustness of the EKV design," and recommended that MDA consider re-designing the EKV "using a rigorous systems engineering process to assure its design is robust against failure."

As reflected in the budget request, MDA is planning to re-design the EKV, to increase its reliability, performance, producibility, and affordability, among other features. The committee supports this effort. At a hearing before the committee on April 2, 2014, all witnesses agreed that the re-design effort should be based on a rigorous acquisition process. Admiral Syring testified to Congress that "we have one chance to get it right. And circumventing the system engineering, design cycle, prototype testing and qualification will not happen. There's a very rigorous process that's followed for properly engineered missile systems."

The committee agrees on the need for a rigorous application of existing acquisition requirements established in law and regulation, and believes that a rigorous acquisition process is essential to ensure that the re-designed kill vehicle works in an operationally effective and cost-effective manner.

Testing and assessment of missile defense systems prior to production and deployment (sec. 1615)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense (DOD) needs to follow a "fly before you buy" approach to adequately test and assess the elements of the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) before final production decisions or operational deployment. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that, prior to making a final production decision for, and prior to the operational deployment of, a new or substantially upgraded interceptor or weapon system of the BMDS, sufficient and operationally realistic testing of the system is conducted and that the results of such testing have demonstrated that the interceptor or weapon system will work in an operationally effective and cost-effective manner when needed. The provision would also require the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, prior to any such final production decision or operational deployment, to provide an assessment to the Secretary of the testing, including an assessment of whether the system will be sufficiently effective, suitable, and survivable when needed, and to provide to the congressional defense committees a written summary of the Director's assessment.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has conducted numerous studies of missile defense acquisition programs and found that excessive concurrency has plagued a number of these programs, particularly the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD)

system. The GMD system was deployed starting in 2004 without having conducted adequate testing and assessment of the design of the Ground-Based Interceptor and its Exo-atmospheric Kill Vehicle. The system has suffered several flight test failures since 2010 that have required more than $1.3 billion and 4 years of effort to correct.

One of the keys to avoiding excessive concurrency, and to ensuring that missile defense systems will be operationally effective and cost-effective, is to follow the "fly before you buy" approach of testing systems realistically to assess their performance, prior to making final production decisions or deploying them operationally. In the 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review, the DOD stated that it would conduct operationally realistic testing of new missile defense systems to assess their performance prior to deployment. This provision would help ensure that this policy is implemented, and help avoid post-production and post-deployment problems like those encountered with the GMD system.

Subtitle C—Space Activities

Update of National Security Space Strategy to include space control and space superiority strategy (sec. 1621)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence to update the space control and space superiority strategy pursuant to the Space Posture Review conducted under section 913 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009.

Allocation of funds for the Space Security and Defense Program; Report on Space Control (sec. 1622)

The committee recommends a provision that would require a preponderance of the funds used within the Space Security and Defense Program be allocated to offensive space control and active defense strategies with a statement on the use of such funds at the time of the President's budget submission to Congress.

Prohibition on contracting with Russian suppliers of critical space launch supplies for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program (sec. 1623)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from entering into a new contract or renewing a current contract for space launch supplies if those supplies are provided by Russian suppliers.

The Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle currently relies on a partially state-owned Russian company to provide engines to launch a portion of the Department of Defense's national security satellites—including our intelligence community's satellites. The committee finds this reliance on a Russian company for rocket engines to be inconsistent with the need for assured access to space. Also, given recent geopolitical events, this reliance on Russian suppliers reduces options available to respond to actions affecting the national security interests of the United States and our allies.

Further, this reliance is unnecessary given potential future competition in the area of space launch and the potential development

of a new domestically-produced rocket engine supported by the committee.

The committee also strongly recommends that if the Secretary of Defense determines that a waiver is issued under this section for the procurement of rocket engines, the waiver should be approved well in advance of the start of contract negotiations.

Assessment of Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program (sec. 1624)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Government Accountability Office to assess the advisability of the Secretary of Defense to require that launch providers establish business systems complying with data requirements and cost accounting standards of the Department of Defense.

Report on reliance of Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program on foreign manufacturers (sec. 1625)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Government Accountability Office to submit within 180 days of enactment of this Act, a report on the reliance of the risks to the Expendable Evolved Launch Vehicle program of reliance on foreign manufacturers.

Availability of additional rocket cores pursuant to competitive procedures (sec. 1626)

The committee recommends a provision, based upon the Fiscal Year 2015 National Security Space Launch Forecast, that the Secretary of Defense shall make available during fiscal year 2015 one additional core for open competition. The provision also requires that between fiscal years 2015 and 2017, one additional competitive core shall be made available unless the Secretary determines that there is no practicable way to implement this requirement while remaining in compliance with the terms and conditions of the 36 core block buy under the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program. Upon making such a determination, the Secretary shall certify within 45 days that there is no practicable way to add the second additional core for open competition as well as describing the basis for such a determination and providing both to congressional defense committees.

The National Security Space Launch Forecast is the number the cores to be procured (as a function of payload) under the EELV program between fiscal years 2013 to 2017.

Competitive procedures required to launch payload for mission number five of the Operationally Responsive Space program (sec. 1627)

The committee recommends a provision that would require competitive procedures be used to launch the payload for the Operationally Responsive Space program mission number five.

Limitation on funding for storage of Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites (sec. 1628)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit funding the storage of the last Defense Meteorological Satellite Program

(DMSP) satellite #20 unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense (DOD) intends to launch the satellite and will have sufficient funding to do so in the future years defense program and that storing the satellite until a launch in 2020 is the most cost-effective approach to meeting the requirements of DOD.

The committee is concerned that the budget requested funding to store a satellite the Air Force has no intention of launching. Despite the Air Force's analysis demonstrating the high cost of long-term storage and the low-added mission benefit of launching DMSP #20 in the 2020 timeframe, the budget requested funding to store the satellite for an additional year. In addition, the Air Force terminated the funding to procure the launch vehicle for DMSP #20. This disconnect is especially troubling given the numerous funding shortfalls across the defense space budget, not to mention the greater DOD budget. The committee is concerned that the Air Force would request significant funding to keep a satellite they have no intent of launching into space.

Storing satellite #20 will cost $87.0 million in fiscal year 2015 and approximately that same amount each year thereafter. The satellite is built on components that are not supported, its sensors must be stored at different vendors around the United States and approximately one half of the costs are related to keeping staff on hand until the satellite is launched to support its payload integration at launch.

This year DOD is finalizing an alternative that will meet military needs with fewer sensors and less cost. The committee directs DOD to brief the committee when this alternative is approved by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council.

Plan for development of liquid rocket engine for medium or heavy lift launch vehicle; transfer of certain funds (sec. 1629)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a program plan for the production of a liquid rocket engine capable of supporting the requirements of the Department of Defense (DOD) for a medium or heavy lift launch vehicle to support national security launch missions by no later than 2019. The plan shall be due by September 30, 2014. The provision would require that the plan be based on competition. The committee expects that in developing this program, DOD should consult with other agencies with liquid rocket engine expertise, such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The committee also understands that there are propulsion systems in addition to liquid rocket engines that could provide capabilities in the future that support DOD requirements for medium or heavy launch vehicles, and encourages DOD to continually review the potential of using such propulsion systems. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days of the enactment of this Act given the potential that other propulsion systems have to support this mission.

Study of space situational awareness architecture (sec. 1630)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to task the Defense Science Board to assess the architecture of the ground and space sensors used for space situational awareness (SSA) for both defensive and offensive space operations over a 5-, 10-, and 20-year budget plan. The assessment shall also include ground systems to task the sensors and process the data. The SSA sensor system is a collection of sensors that either have been explicitly designed for SSA or are dual purpose sensors that can contribute to SSA when not performing their primary mission, such as missile warning. Each of these sensors are added over time to close specific gaps as the need has arisen and the number of objects to track in space has grown. This assessment shall look at the threats over the next 20 years and determine the optimal mix of SSA sensors from an integrated viewpoint, taking into account the ground systems to process the data. Given the sensitive nature of this assessment, the report shall be classified with an unclassified summary.

Sense of the Senate on resolution limits on commercial space imagery (sec. 1631)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the Secretary of Defense should support the relaxation of panchromatic, spectral, and infrared imagery resolution limits on the sale of commercial space imagery. The provision would also call for the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy to provide a recommendation to Congress by April 1, 2015, on the design and development of a flexible and dynamic capability to control the collection and sale of commercial space imagery to protect national security.

The administration is now considering a proposal to relax the resolution restrictions on the sale of commercial space imagery in stages through 2017. The committee believes that the Secretary of Defense, in interagency proceedings, should support an official commitment now that industry will be able to sell imagery at the targeted resolution limits in 2017. This step should be taken now to provide certainty for industry to enter into business arrangements in order to be ready to provide products at the improved resolution limits when the new limits go into effect.

The licensing terms for U.S. companies who want to sell images collected from space allow the U.S. Government to impose prohibitions on the collection of imagery on specific places on the ground at specific times. Also, through contract arrangements, the Government can control the tasking of collection operations and thereby prevent the collection of imagery of any specific places or events. Alternatively, the Government can buy such images, classify them, and prevent their sale and dissemination. However, the Government has not chosen to utilize these means to protect national security. Instead, it has placed restrictions on the resolution of images that can be sold commercially on a global basis, despite the fact that there are relatively few places or events for which the capture in high resolution imagery would pose a risk to national security. Since the commercial space imaging industry emerged in

the 1990s, the Government's policy has been to relax resolution limits only when U.S. companies begin to face significant competition from non-U.S. providers. This policy unnecessarily restrains U.S. industry, not only to the detriment of consumers but also to national security, because the intelligence community, our military forces, and emergency responders all have needs for higher resolution imagery products, and especially the unclassified products that commercial industry provides.

In exercising the Government's rights to prevent the collection of sensitive events, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to pursue cost neutral arrangements and to avoid unnecessary image purchases to conserve resources wherever security plans do not require alternative collection.

Subtitle D—Cyber Warfare, Cyber Security, and Related Matters

Cyberspace mapping (sec. 1641)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, within 60 days of the date of enactment of this Act, to designate a network or network segment within the Department of Defense (DOD) to support the execution of a pilot program to demonstrate large-scale cyberspace mapping technology, as approved by the Cyber Investment Management Board (CIMB). The provision also would require the Principal Cyber Advisor, within 180 days of enactment of this Act, to recommend policy to the Secretary of Defense regarding the mapping of cyberspace to support the missions of U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM).

The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence approved a pilot demonstration of technology to comprehensively and rapidly map information networks in fiscal year 2013. The CIMB approved it as a cyber acquisition pilot early in fiscal year 2014. The pilot has not proceeded, however, because no network owner within DOD has volunteered for their network to be the test subject for this pilot, which would require creating an accurate topology to serve as ground truth against which to measure the performance of the mapping technology. The purpose of the provision is to make a decision in order to get the assessment conducted.

As the committee has emphasized in recent years, DOD does not possess the ability to map large portions of cyberspace quickly a—prerequisite for conducting military operations. Military forces can no more operate on the virtual terrain of cyberspace without cartographic support than they can in physical space without maps to guide them. There are a wide variety of mapping techniques used extensively by commercial industry and academia, as well as proposed refinements, that could meet the needs of CYBERCOM. The committee is concerned that a lack of policy is hindering practical planning in this critical area. DOD needs to determine what can be done and under what authorities and circumstances to enable CYBERCOM to develop requirements and the acquisition community to fulfill those needs.

Review of cross domain solution policy and requirement for cross domain solution strategy (sec. 1642)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to review the policies of the Department of Defense (DOD), and develop a strategy concerning the procurement, approval, and use of capabilities to transmit information across networks and systems at different security classification levels.

Military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq have repeatedly shown both the need for, and the perils involved in, transferring critical intelligence and other operational data across networks with different security levels quickly and efficiently. In April 2010, the Deputy Secretary of Defense publicly reported on a widespread intrusion into some of the most sensitive networks in the U.S. Government. This intrusion was enabled by an infected thumb drive that was used, along with countless others, as an expedient means of transferring data quickly across classified and unclassified network domains, in violation of DOD policy, to meet warfighters' needs. This incident shows the importance of effective cross domain capabilities, policies, and oversight to protect the confidentiality and integrity of DOD networks. Although cross domain solutions are recognized as critical enabling technologies, DOD still lacks a cohesive strategy to acquire, use, and audit the capabilities that it requires to securely transfer data. This need is exacerbated by DOD's planned transition to increased uses of enterprise resources and cloud computing. The evolution of DOD and the intelligence agencies to the Joint Information Environment, the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise, and the Intelligence Community Information Technology Environment will bring both opportunities and challenges for the application of cross domain solutions, and a comprehensive strategy will be vital.

Beyond planning for the future, the committee is also concerned that the variety of cross domain solutions fielded to date have inconsistent levels of security and performance, are applied haphazardly, and lack key capabilities to protect against sophisticated threats. DOD needs a better understanding of the current and future requirements, more consistent and enforceable policies, and greater investment in improved technological solutions.

The committee is aware that the Chief Information Officer and the Defense Information Systems Agency are working on a cross-domain enterprise service. In addition, the National Security Agency (NSA) has sponsored development of integrated cross domain solutions with improved security to enable tailoring of cross domain tools to specific security risks and data transfer requirements. NSA and the National Reconnaissance Office have also initiated investments in technology for virtualizing cross domain appliances for cloud applications. However, NSA's program has faltered due to budget cuts, and no initiatives have been taken to modify the current information assurance certification and accreditation process, which is based on the tight coupling of hypervisors to hardware, to support cross domain virtualization.

Budgeting and accounting for cyber mission forces (sec. 1643)

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the Secretary of Defense, for fiscal year 2017 and every succeeding year, for the President's annual budget submission and supporting documents, to develop a major force program (MFP) category and program elements for the Department of Defense (DOD) future years defense program for the training, arming, and equipping of the cyber mission forces. The provision would also require the Secretary to assess the feasibility and advisability of establishing a general fund transfer account to execute the funds programmed in the MFP and provide a recommendation to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2015.

The committee believes that the cyber mission, conducted by large cyber mission forces under a sub-unified command and component command elements in the combatant commands, is important enough and sensitive enough to warrant the degree of visibility and focus provided by a MFP designation and dedicated program elements. The committee recognizes that establishing a MFP could create difficulties in executing funds through existing channels and therefore directs DOD to consider whether to recommend using a transfer account to translate funds from MFP categories to existing ones.

The committee directs the Principal Cyber Advisor, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, to shift the majority of the funding for cyber mission forces personnel from the Military Intelligence Program (MIP) to reflect the warfighting mission of U.S. Cyber Command. MIP funding should be restricted to those personnel whose primary responsibility is providing intelligence support to the operational forces. There is a growing recognition that military operations in cyberspace will, in fact, be substantially different from signals intelligence collection in the cyber domain. Military cyber forces will need distinctly different tools, infrastructure, training, range support, exercise support, and concepts of operation.

The committee directs the Principal Cyber Advisor to provide a report to the congressional defense and intelligence committees by March 15, 2015, on DOD's actions and plans to comply with this direction.

Requirement for strategy to develop and deploy decryption service for the Joint Information Environment (sec. 1644)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a strategy for a decryption service for the Joint Information Environment (JIE). The goal of the strategy would be to acquire the ability to securely and efficiently decrypt and re-encrypt communications to enable the inspection of communications content to detect cyber threats and insider threat activity. The provision would require the strategy to include a requirements definition, an architecture, a concept of operations, a cost estimate, and an assessment of the security benefit of such a service. The provision would require a briefing on the strategy to

be provided to the congressional defense and intelligence committees by October 1, 2015.

The use of encryption to provide security for client-server communications and transactions, and by applications and search engines, has been growing steadily, and comprised a large percentage of total communications traffic traversing Department of Defense (DOD) Internet Access Points (IAP) even prior to the leaks by Edward Snowden. The Snowden revelations are causing an acceleration of this trend. The committee believes it is unwise for DOD to let encrypted traffic pass by its intrusion detection and prevention, packet capture, next-generation firewalls, and behavior-based detection systems because of an inability to decrypt and re-encrypt encrypted communications at IAPs and regional security centers. The entire burden of defense is placed on endpoint or host-based defenses, which are not equal to the task.

The committee recognizes that there are complex choices and trade-offs to be made when such a service is inserted into an enterprise between users, web sites, and applications, but believes that DOD needs to work through those issues and decide on a solution before this problem gets much worse.

Reporting on penetrations into networks and information systems of operationally critical contractors (sec. 1645)

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary to establish procedures for designating contractors as "operationally critical contractors," notifying such contractors that they have been designated, and requiring designated contractors to report successful penetrations of their computer networks by known or suspected advanced persistent threat (APT) actors. The provision narrowly defines an operationally critical contractor as a company designated by the Secretary as a critical source of supply for airlift, sealift, intermodal transportation services, or logistical support that is essential to mobilization, deployment, or sustainment in a contingency operation.

The provision would require that the procedures include mechanisms for the Department of Defense (DOD) to assist contractors in detecting and mitigating network penetrations and include protections for trade secrets, commercial or financial information, and information that could be used to identify a specific person. The provision stipulates that the procedures issued by the Secretary will permit DOD to share reported cyber intrusion information with agencies that conduct counterintelligence investigations for their use in such investigations.

The provision also would require the Secretary to assess existing contractor reporting requirements and department policies and systems for sharing of information on successful cyber intrusions into DOD contractor networks. Upon completion of that assessment, the provision would require the Secretary to designate a single DOD component to receive cyber intrusion reports from contractors and other government agencies and issue or revise guidance to ensure that cyber intrusion-related information is shared by the designated DOD component with other appropriate DOD components.

The private sector plays a crucial role in force mobilization, deployment, and sustainment operations. In fact, the former head of

U.S. Cyber Command estimated that more than 80 percent of our logistics are transported by private companies. According to U.S. Transportation Command (TRANSCOM), private airlines, for example, provide more than 90 percent of DOD's passenger movement capability and more than one third of its bulk cargo capability. In addition, the overwhelming majority of DOD deployment and distribution transactions—the former Commander of TRANSCOM estimated more than 90 percent—occur over unclassified networks.

The Department's reliance on private companies and unclassified networks to conduct contingency mobilization, deployment, and sustainment operations make the networks of operationally critical defense contractors attractive targets for foreign governments and other APT actors.

According to DOD, Chinese military analysts, for example, have identified logistics and mobilization as potential U.S. vulnerabilities and the Department has said that Chinese military doctrine "advocate[es] targeting adversary command and control and logistics networks to impact their ability to operate during the early stages of conflict." U.S. experts on Chinese military planning have raised the prospect of China using cyber capabilities to impede U.S. force deployment in the event of a contingency.

It is critical that DOD be aware of successful cyber intrusions by APTs into the computer networks of operationally critical contractors so that TRANSCOM and other potentially affected combatant commands can assess the risks to contingency operations posed by those intrusions and adjust operational plans, if necessary.

The committee recently completed an investigation into how much information was known to TRANSCOM about successful APT-attributed cyber intrusions into the computer networks of command contractors. The investigation found that TRANSCOM was not aware of the overwhelming majority of such intrusions. Reasons for the lack of awareness included gaps in requirements for cyber intrusion reporting and failures within DOD to share information known about successful APT-attributed cyber intrusions with TRANSCOM. The provision is directed at addressing those reporting gaps and improving the way in which the Department receives, assesses, and disseminates information about successful APT intrusions into the networks of operationally critical contractors.

Sense of Congress on the future of the Internet and the .mil top level domain (sec. 1646)

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should:

(1) Advise the President to transfer the remaining role of the United States Government in the functions of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) to a global multi-stakeholder community only if the President is confident that the .mil top level domain and the Internet protocol address numbers used exclusively by the Department of Defense (DOD) for national security will remain exclusively used by the Department; and

(2) Take all necessary steps to sustain the successful stewardship and good standing of the Internet root zone servers managed by DOD components.

The committee urges the Secretary to seek an agreement through the IANA transition process, or in parallel to it, between the United States and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers and the rest of the global Internet stakeholders that the .mil domain will continue to be afforded the same generic top level domain status after the transition that it has always enjoyed, on a par with all other country-specific domains.

Subtitle E–Intelligence-Related Matters

Extension of Secretary of Defense authority to engage in commercial activities as security for intelligence collection activities (sec. 1651)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend current statutory authority for the Secretary of Defense to authorize the conduct of those commercial activities necessary to provide security for authorized intelligence collection activities abroad undertaken by the Department of Defense by amending subsection 431(a) of title 10, United States Code, to change the current sunset date from December 31, 2015, to December 31, 2017.

Authority for Secretary of Defense to engage in commercial activities as security for military operations abroad (sec. 1652)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend subsections 431 through 437 of title 10, United States Code, to: (1) Allow the Secretary of Defense to employ commercial activities as security for military operations, in addition to existing authority for using such activities for intelligence operations; (2) Direct that reports of audits on commercial activities used as security for intelligence operations as reported to the congressional defense and intelligence committees, and reports on audits of commercial activities used as security for military operations are reported to the congressional defense committees only; and (3) Make conforming changes throughout these subsections.

Extension of authority relating to jurisdiction over Department of Defense facilities for intelligence collection or special operations activities abroad (sec. 1653)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 926(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to extend the sunset dates in the provision in paragraph (1) by striking "September 30, 2015" and inserting "September 30, 2017"; and by striking "fiscal year 2016" and inserting "fiscal year 2018."

Personnel security and insider threat (sec. 1654)

The committee recommends a provision to enable the Department of Defense (DOD) to respond appropriately to the direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense to the numerous serious security and insider threats that have affected the DOD. The provi-

sion would require the Secretary of Defense to establish an interim continuous evaluation (CE) system not later than September 30, 2015, to continuously evaluate the security status of DOD employees and contractors who are approved to access secret or top secret classified information by the DOD Central Adjudicative Facility. The provision would require that the Secretary achieve the ability to at least continuously monitor personnel with access to the most sensitive classified information and privileged access to networks and databases.

The provision also would require the Secretary to capitalize on the interim system to develop business rules, requirements, lessons learned, privacy standards, and operational concepts that will be valuable for the development of an objective CE capability.

The provision would require that both the interim system and the objective CE system be engineered to interface with the larger insider threat detection capability mandated by Executive Order (EO) 13587. The provision would also require that the objective CE capability be acquired competitively to take advantage of the best commercial technology, and be designed as an open system to enable upgrades as technology evolves.

The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a multi-disciplinary team of experts from across the Department to assist the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USDI), as the Senior Agency Official for insider threat detection and prevention under EO 13587. This team would be composed of experts in counterintelligence, personnel security, law enforcement, physical security, human resources, privacy and civil liberties, network monitoring, cybersecurity, systems engineering, information technology, large-scale data analysis, and program acquisition.

This collection of expertise is vital to fulfill the President's mandate in EO 13587 to create an automation-assisted insider threat capability that is integrated across all the currently stove-piped functions listed above. Achieving the ability to conduct integrated insider threat analyses in all these functional areas across the military services, defense agencies, and commands is a daunting management, information technology acquisition, and systems engineering challenge. Currently, the USDI has no structure or team of personnel with the expertise necessary to meet this challenge.

In addition to this management team, the provision would require the Secretary, through the Senior Agency Official, to designate an official to be responsible and accountable for the Department's efforts to create an integrated insider threat detection and prevention capability. The provision also calls for the creation of an Executive Committee, composed of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, and the Chief Information Officer, to support the Senior Agency Official to ensure the cooperation of all components of DOD.

Finally, the provision would require the Senior Agency Official to establish a plan by September 30, 2015, to develop the insider threat capability.

Migration of Distributed Common Ground System of Department of the Army to an open system architecture (sec. 1655)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army, within 3 years of the date of enactment of this Act, to migrate the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS), including the so-called Red Disk or any successor to Red Disk under development at the Army Intelligence and Security Command (INSCOM), to an open systems architecture. The provision would require that the DCGS open systems architecture be compliant with the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise open architecture.

Migrating the Army DCGS to an open system would enable the rapid, competitive acquisition and integration of any DCGS segment, upgrades to any portion of the system, and new applications. Migration would also enable competition for sustainment, which would speed up the modernization cycle, improve capabilities, and lower costs. The committee notes that INSCOM has briefed the committee on plans to make the Red Disk next-generation DCGS upgrade to DCGS an open systems architecture. This provision is consistent with actions the committee recommends on open systems approaches to systems acquisition elsewhere in this bill and report.

Budget Items

Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellites

For fiscal year 2015, the budget proposes $87.0 million for the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program to store satellite #20. The committee recommends a reduction by $87.0 million as excess to need.

Mobile Ground System

For fiscal year 2015, the budget proposes $319.5 million for the Space Based Infrared System, PE 0604441F. The committee recommends an increase of $5 million for the Mobile Ground System to meet a U.S. Strategic Command unfunded requirement to procure spare parts and address obsolescence issues with the Nation's sole survivable missile attack and warning system.

Space Based Infrared System

The fiscal year 2015 Research Development Test and Evaluation budget request for the Space Based Infrared System, PE 0604441F, is $319.1 million. The committee recommends a reduction of $5.0 million to the hosted payloads and $8.0 million to the wide field of view test bed as excess to need.

Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle engine development

The committee recommends an increase of $100.0 million to PE number 0604853F to be used in the development of a liquid rocket engine consistent with section 1629.

Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellite

The fiscal year 2015 Research Development Test and Evaluation budget request for the Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellite, PE 0605431F, is $314.4 million. The committee recommends a reduction of $9.0 million to interim contractor support and $7.0 million to the protected satellite communication demonstration as excess to need.

Operationally Responsive Space

The fiscal Year 2015 budget requested no funding for the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program office. On February 25, 2014, the ORS Executive Committee adopted the U.S. Strategic Command's recommendation for ORS–5 to be a low-cost, short-time-to-launch space situational awareness payload which will launch in fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends $20.0 million to support activities in fiscal year 2015 in developing this payload and other mission needs. The committee expects the Air Force to budget for the follow-on activities in fiscal year 2016.

The Secretary of the Air Force informed the committee on April 14, 2014, that the ORS program would be integrated in the Space and Missile Systems Center (SMC) in order to use the ORS program office's unique streamlined acquisition authorities to "maintain expertise in the rapid fielding of space capabilities in a manner similar to that of the Air Force's Rapid Capabilities Office."

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to brief the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the enactment of this Act on how details of the ORS program office and its personnel will be integrated into the SMC and the programs that SMC plans to use in the ORS office with its unique mandate and acquisition authorities to execute programs ordered to drive down the cost of satellite payloads and launch.

Items of Special Interest

Air Force, Navy, National Nuclear Security Administration collaboration on strategic systems

The committee notes that the Air Force and the Navy have established an Executive Steering Group to identify opportunities and oversee investments for collaborative sustainment and modernization of strategic systems. The committee commends Air Force and Navy strategic programs leadership for pursuing collaborative efforts aggressively, thereby expanding their joint knowledge base and capabilities, leveraging efficiencies, and realizing cost savings in a challenging fiscal environment.

The committee directs the Air Force, the Navy and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to submit a joint report to the congressional defense committees on a plan to expand strategic systems collaboration among the military services and the NNSA. The report shall include a description of current collaborations among the military services on strategic system programs, to include elements of the nuclear triad, the conventional prompt global strike, other strategic forces, and other matters of importance to increase commonality and reduce cost. The Secretary of Defense will also provide a description and assessment of any addi-

tional opportunities for new or enhanced collaboration, including programs that may benefit from those efforts, risks, and benefits that may be realized by cross-service or departmental collaboration, and the potential costs and benefits for collaborative research, development, and production. This report shall be submitted no later than March 1, 2015.

Ammonium Perchlorate

Ammonium perchlorate (AP) is an inorganic compound and solid oxidizer that is critical to key weapons systems—including the Trident II D5 missile.

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense (DOD) relies on a single supplier of AP. The committee also notes that the price DOD pays for AP has increased in recent years.

In light of the fiscal constraints confronted by DOD, the committee believes the department should seek to promote competition in the AP supplier base that will result in DOD paying more competitive prices for AP.

Therefore, the committee directs DOD to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees, no later than September 30, 2014, on DOD's use of AP, as well as DOD's efforts to diversify its supplier base and achieve more competitive prices for AP.

Analysis of satellites available for open competition

For fiscal year 2015, the Air Force moved the launch vehicle for the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS) geostationary orbit (GEO) Satellite 4 from a phase 1A potential competitive launch opportunity to the 36 core block buy. The committee understands that this satellite falls within the launch parameters that a new entrant is capable of launching. The committee encourages increased opportunities for competition and directs the Secretary of the Air Force to report to the committee whether it is feasible to move the SBIRS GEO Satellite 4 back to the phase 1A competitive opportunities within the future years defense program (FYDP) or any other satellite to help offset the decrease in the allotment of open competition satellites across the FYDP.

Analytic support to cyber policy and planning

The committee reiterates its concern that the growth in the strategic and operational importance of the cyberspace domain has not been accompanied by parallel growth in independent, public interest-oriented cyber policy analysis. Therefore, the committee directs that the Principal Cyber Advisor to the Secretary of Defense shall assess the amount and quality of support for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, U.S. Cyber Command, and the combatant commands that is currently available from existing federally funded research and development centers and academia in the areas of operational integration of cyber with other military capabilities, independent analysis of cyber defense policy, deterrence policy, acquisition policies and practices, total force development and management, and cyber risk and threat assessment. The committee further directs that within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, the Principal Cyber Advisor shall provide a brief-

ing to the congressional defense committees of the conclusions and recommendations of this assessment.

Assessment of cost of Space Situational Awareness system

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to estimate the cost of the space situational awareness system over the current future years defense program. The assessment shall be in the form of a briefing due no later than February 28, 2015.

Authorities and responsibilities of the Department of Defense Inspector General

The Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–259) established the defense intelligence agencies of the Department of Defense (DOD) as "designated Federal entities" under section 8G of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–452), as amended, which under that Act provides a statutory foundation for the Inspectors General (IGs) of those agencies. Since that change was implemented, the IGs of these DOD components have questioned the authority of the DOD (IG) to supervise their activities.

The committee supports strong and independent IGs, especially in the intelligence agencies that are involved in sensitive classified activities. However, the independence the committee values is from undue influence of the officials managing the agencies they oversee, not from reasonable supervision by the DOD IG.

Section 8 of the IG Act of 1978 itself states that the DOD IG shall "provide policy direction for audits and investigations relating to fraud, waste, and abuse and program effectiveness; develop policy, monitor and evaluate program performance, and provide guidance with respect to all Department activities relating to criminal investigation programs; monitor and evaluate the adherence of Department auditors to internal audit, contract audit, and internal review principles, policies, and procedures; [and] develop policy, evaluate program performance, and monitor actions taken by all components of the Department in response to contract audits, internal audits, internal review reports, and audits conducted by the Comptroller General of the United States." The committee concludes that the law clearly provides that the DOD IG has the authority to direct and set audit and investigative policy across all DOD components, including the designated Federal entities.

In April 2012, the Deputy Secretary of Defense issued an updated DOD Directive (DODD 5106.01) on the DOD IG, which reaffirms the role of the DOD IG as "the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense on all audit and criminal investigative matters and for matters relating to the prevention of fraud, waste, and abuse in the programs and operations of the DOD." This role includes the responsibility to provide "policy and direction for audits, investigations, evaluations, and inspections; monitor and give particular regard to the activities of the internal audit, investigations, evaluation, inspection, and IG units of DOD Components . . . with a view toward avoiding duplication and ensuring effective coverage, coordination, and cooperation; [and] audit, evaluate, monitor, and review the programs, policies, procedures, and functions of the DOD Intelligence Components to ensure that intelligence re-

sources, including those funded through the National Intelligence Program, are properly managed." This Directive also clearly establishes the authority and responsibility of the DOD IG to set policy for audits and investigations across DOD, and to coordinate with all component IGs to achieve effective oversight.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, the heads of the defense intelligence agencies, the DOD IG, and the defense intelligence agency IGs to develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that sets forth the relationship of the component IGs to the DOD IG, consistent with the requirements of section 8 of the IG Act and DODD 5106.01. The committee expects to receive regular updates on the progress of this effort.

Electro-optical infrared capabilities for the follow on weather satellite

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to brief the congressional defense committees on whether other technical capabilities, agencies, and/or countries can provide or fulfill the military requirement for electro-optical and infrared weather imaging. This briefing should address the cost-effectiveness and performance record of the various options as well as how the Air Force intends to avoid reliance on non-allied foreign sources. This briefing shall occur no later than September 30, 2014.

Foreign interest in United States air and missile defense technology

In light of the growing regional missile threats around the world, the committee believes it is important for the Department of Defense to work closely with allied and partner nations to help them establish and improve their air and missile defense capabilities.

Therefore, no later than November 1, 2014, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing the nations that have approached the United States Government with requests to acquire, improve, or expand air and missile defense systems and capabilities—including lower-tier air and missile defense systems and capabilities. This report should also describe the maturity of these discussions and progress toward securing the appropriate export control permissions with each nation that has expressed interest. The report shall be unclassified, but may include a classified annex.

Information assurance and certified workforce training

The committee commends the Department of Defense (DOD) for its ongoing efforts related to providing certifications to personnel responsible for Information Assurance (IA) activities pursuant to DOD Directive 8570, which establishes the policy and assigns the responsibilities for Department IA training, certification, and workforce management. The committee also understands the importance of testing to verify skills, which raises the effectiveness of information technology professionals and can help identify gaps in training. The committee therefore encourages the DOD to continue to evolve the performance-based assessment of skills and progression toward certification.

Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense System

The committee is encouraged that the March 2014 "Agreement between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement" resolves many aspects of coproduction of Iron Dome components and interceptors in the United States. The committee is aware that the Missile Defense Agency and the Israeli Missile Defense Organization have entered into this international agreement to govern how the United States will support up to $605.8 million from fiscal years 2013 to 2015 for Iron Dome.

Given the significant U.S. taxpayers' investment in the Iron Dome system, the committee believes that coproduction of parts and components should be done in a manner that will maximize U.S. industry participation in interceptor and battery deliveries for Israel's defense needs.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees, not later than November 1, 2014, on its ongoing efforts to resolve details and agreements required for U.S.-based coproduction of Iron Dome technology, including coproduction of parts, components, and all-up-rounds of the Iron Dome system.

Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor

The committee notes that U.S military forces and those of our allies confront a growing threat from cruise missiles, large caliber rockets, tactical ballistic missiles, and unmanned aerial vehicles.

The committee also notes the completion of the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor (JLENS) engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) program in December 2013.

The JLENS is a bi-static tethered aerostat system intended to provide persistent elevated sensor data to detect, track, and help defeat airborne threats, including cruise missiles, manned and unmanned aircraft, and surface moving targets, including swarming boats.

Based on the successful EMD and the potential of JLENS to meet combatant commander requirements in varying areas of responsibility, the committee supports the budget request for JLENS through the Army's Aerostat Joint Project Office.

The committee also supports the decision of the Department of Defense to deploy a JLENS orbit to the National Capital Region (NCR) to demonstrate its capabilities in a 3-year operational exercise in support of the North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Northern Command for their NCR homeland defense mission, to improve the system, and to evaluate its potential ability to meet the requirements of other combatant commanders.

The committee notes that the report accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Senate Report 113–44), directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 90 days after the initiation of the JLENS operational exercise demonstration, identifying the data and analyses that it plans to use from the dem-

onstration to guide potential future acquisition and deployment decisions for JLENS. The committee continues to believe that it is important for DOD to have clearly defined objectives and metrics for this demonstration before it begins and looks forward to submission of this report.

The committee notes that several combatant commands have expressed an interest in a persistent, elevated sensor capable of supporting cruise missile defense. The committee also notes that an incomplete set of equipment for a second JLENS orbit remains in long-term storage in the United States. As a result, the committee requests a briefing no later than October 30, 2014, regarding the status of the additional JLENS equipment and the options and considerations for a potential deployment of a second JLENS orbit to another combatant command in a future fiscal year.

Mobile User Objective System Ground Terminals

The Mobile User Objective System (MUOS) is a satellite constellation that will replace the aging Ultra High Frequency Follow On (UFO) satellite constellation. The committee has a number of ongoing concerns. First, whether the MUOS constellation becomes fully operational in time to replace the aging UFO fleet of satellites. The second issue of concern is the fielding of a valid terminal to fully utilize the MUOS waveform. Third, questions remain about the end-to-end system integration of the ground stations to satellites and the ground terminals, including associated costs. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to report, no later than October 31, 2014, on the status of launching the MUOS satellites in order to replace the UFO fleet, the end-to-end integration of the MUOS system, the ability to procure user terminals meeting the MUOS waveform, and whether existing software defined or other terminals can be upgraded to utilize the waveform at a lower or comparable cost.

New START Treaty Force Structure

The committee supports the nuclear force structure proposed by the President to meet the requirements of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), as described in the report provided to Congress pursuant to section 1042 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81). In particular, the committee supports the decision to maintain, in an operational status, the 50 active intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) silos that will be emptied as a result of the reductions. In testimony before the committee's Strategic Forces Subcommittee on 5 March, 2014, Major General Garrett Harencak described the important infrastructure sustainment benefits associated with this posture and explained that, "We need to keep the silos in a warm status so [that] we maintain a continuity between them and the communication aspect that was built for many, many, many good reasons back in the [19]60s. . . . It'd be my highest recommendation."

Vice Admiral Terry Benedict, in his April 8, 2014, testimony before the House Armed Services' Subcommittee on Strategic Forces also noted that the new force structure "is very much in concert with the course that has been set as we move towards the Ohio replacement program of 12 submarines with 16 tubes. So, the deacti-

vation of four tubes on Ohio is very consistent with the long-range decision that has already been made by the Secretary of Defense and the administration."

The committee appreciates that the proposed schedule allows the Department of Defense to implement the required reductions efficiently and provides sufficient time to accommodate unforeseen delays.

The committee notes that the Air Force intends to distribute empty silos across the ICBM force. The committee supports this approach that will maximize the Air Force's ability to maintain all silos in the inventory as well as provide the highest possible mission-capable rates.

Ohio Replacement Program

The committee remains committed to the full funding of the *Ohio*-class Replacement Program (ORP) and supports the research and development activities budgeted in fiscal year 2015. The committee notes that in fiscal year 2014, the Department of Energy budget for the National Nuclear Security Administration, and specifically the Naval Reactors Office, fell below requested levels. One reported impact of this shortfall was insufficient funding to support a planned capital equipment procurement for High Performance Computers (HPC) that are necessary to complete the reactor core design for ORP. In testimony before this committee, Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jonathan Greenert, stated, "The program has to stay on track. We have no slack in this program," and he has since indicated the possibility of a military interdepartmental purchase request (MIPR) to reconcile the Naval Reactors funding shortfall.

The committee remains concerned that a lack of funding for essential equipment and technologies for nuclear reactor core development could further delay this critical program and jeopardize the future of our sea-based strategic deterrent. Therefore, the committee requires the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the status of the ORP, the status of the Naval Reactors Office's reactor core development, and any collaborative efforts with the Department of Energy to address the identified funding shortfalls no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

Processes for the secure provision of sensitive compartmented information to congressional committees

The Secretary of Defense shall provide a briefing and accompanying supporting material to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2014, explaining the process for coordinating security arrangements to convey sensitive compartmented information from the Department of Defense to the congressional defense committees, including in-person briefings and meetings, secure telephone conversations, physical transmission of documents, and electronic communications. The briefing shall include the requirements and processes for exchanging and verifying accesses and clearances, confirming identities and identifications, the receipting of documents, arranging the use of secure rooms and SCIFs, and any other processes or procedures relating to this topic.

Projected workload at wide band satellite operations centers

The Army is the designated scheduling agent for all Department of Defense owned wide band communications satellites whose workload continues to increase. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to project the workload requirements for scheduling wideband communication over the next 10 years consistent with the mix of media study. The report shall be due no later than February 28, 2015.

Replacement of the Mission Planning and Analysis System

The U.S. Strategic Command's Mission Planning and Analysis system (MPAS) is a 1980s tool that supports the command's responsibilities for strategic deterrence planning and global strike. MPAS uses outdated interfaces and programming languages that are becoming unsupportable. The U.S. Strategic Command is updating MPAS through increments 4 and 5 of the Integrated Strategic Planning and Analysis Network (ISPAN). The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review the ongoing effort to update MPAS against generally accepted program planning and cost guidelines and whether ISPAN increments 4 and 5 will resolve the documented deficiencies of MPAS. The GAO shall present their findings in the form of a briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than January 31, 2015.

Report on Intercontinental Ballistic Missile readiness

In order to inform the ongoing Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) guidance modernization effort, the Secretary of the Air Force shall direct the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board to report on the range of inertial navigation and guidance technologies, including those currently used, that will give a range of accuracy and time to launch so as to determine whether it is possible to maintain the same strategic alert posture with additional decision time associated with launch. Additionally, in the course of this review the Board shall determine whether it is necessary to maintain the same alert status as is used today.

The current inertial navigation and guidance systems are based on 1970s mechanical gyroscopic technologies, which must be continuously powered and rotated to maintain their alert status. These systems are aging out due to material wear and are in need of a technology refresh. There are more modern technologies that are solid state in nature, that do not mechanically wear as much, and where it is possible to achieve the same alert posture while giving more time for senior leadership decision making. This increase in senior leadership decision making time is consistent with the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), which in an effort to strengthen Presidential Decision Time, notes that efforts should be made to "maximize the time available to the President to consider whether to authorize the use of nuclear weapons," including "[f]urther strengthening the U.S. command and control system to maximize presidential decision time in a nuclear crisis." Technologies have advanced considerably since the inertial guidance and navigation systems of the 1970s that required mechanical systems to gyroscop-

ically spin continuously and should be explored consistent with the NPR.

As noted earlier, this report requirement shall not be construed to suggest or recommend a change to the U.S. strategic force alert posture for the ICBM. The 2010 NPR considered the possibility of reducing alert rates for ICBMs "and concluded that such steps could reduce crisis stability by giving an adversary the incentive to attack before 're-alerting' was complete." The existing strategic alert posture was again reaffirmed in the 2013 Nuclear Employment Strategy of the United States.

The report shall include technology readiness level and cost to implement. The report shall be due to the congressional defense committees no later than January 31, 2015.

Report on the Reconstitution of Air Force Weapons Storage Areas

The committee finds the following:

(1) The capability provided by the nuclear capable, air launched cruise missile (ALCM) is critical to maintaining a credible and effective air-delivery leg of the triad, preserving the ability to respond to geopolitical and technical surprise, and reassuring U.S. allies through credible extended deterrence.

(2) Additionally, the committee has received testimony that relying on a single weapons storage areas (WSA) has negative operational impacts and could increase the burdens placed on other legs of the triad in an operational situation.

(3) The committee has previously supported that enhanced WSA could improve the resiliency of the bomber force, provide redundancy in a critical national security mission, and reduce operational risk.

(4) The committee notes that the Air Force has completed the report, "Reconstituting Air Force Weapons Storage Areas," as requested in the committee report (S. Rpt. 113–44) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

(5) In its report, the Air Force acknowledged that it currently does not have a funded project to reconstitute a second WSA for ALCMs.

(6) Additionally, the report states that the Air Force's WSA modernization plan, the WSA Recapitalization Corporate Initiative, is in the preliminary stages, and indicates that it should be finalized in time to be programmed in fiscal year 2016.

(7) However, the Air Force did not include in its report an analysis of the requirements and costs of reconstituting a second nuclear WSA capability for ALCMs and the potential benefits or savings of shortening the recapitalization timeframe as requested in S. Rpt. 113–44.

The committee directs that no later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, that the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Strategic Command, shall submit to the congressional defense committees the fol-

lowing information on the plan for the WSA Recapitalization Corporate Initiative including:

(1) A business-case analysis of the requirements and costs for reconstituting a second WSA for ALCMs;

(2) An analysis of potential cost-savings and benefits achieved through a shortened recapitalization timeframe;

(3) An analysis of potential cost-savings and benefits of advances in physical and security surveillance technologies; and

(4) A validation of requirements.

Review of GPS III Operational Ground Control

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to review the cost, scope, and schedule of the Global Positioning System (GPS) III Operational Control System (OCX) including synchronization with the launch of the GPS III constellation with recommendations for improvement. An interim briefing shall be given to the congressional defense committees no later September 30, 2014, with a final briefing no later than February 28, 2015.

Science and technology talent options for the Missile Defense Agency

The committee notes that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) is faced with a myriad of highly complex technical challenges in executing its designated missions, both in the near- and far-term. These technical challenges will require the agency to leverage the best technical talent and resources available in government, industry, small businesses, and academia. The committee notes that MDA has the authority to partner with high quality technical organizations through a number of pathways, including—but not limited to—grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, technology prizes, access to Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) and government laboratories, establishment of and access to University Affiliated Research Centers (UARCs), and the Small Business Innovative Research program. These can all serve to harness the best innovative minds and ideas in the Nation, and engage with and build the technical workforce that can help address MDA's significant technology challenges in the future.

The committee encourages MDA to consider all of these options to address its technical goals. The committee directs MDA to develop a report describing its strategy and actions to address it long-range science and technology challenges, including its engagement strategy with universities, small businesses, UARCs, FFRDCs, and government laboratories, and to submit the report to the congressional defense committees not later than December 1, 2014.

Security of Department of Defense industrial control systems

In March 2014, the Department of Defense (DOD) reissued two DOD Instructions related to cybersecurity: 8500.01, "Risk Management Framework for DOD Information Technology" and 8510.01, "Cybersecurity". These Instructions for the first time mandated specific actions to secure industrial control systems (ICS) through the implementation of a Risk Management Framework. In addition, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition,

Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)) issued a memorandum in March 2014 that focused on the security of ICS. This memorandum provided access across DOD to a standard security assessment tool developed by the Department of Homeland Security, and established an enterprise-wide working group to develop design criteria for new ICS equipment and systems.

The newly issued Instructions require DOD components to inventory and register all ICS, and apply to them the new risk assessment methodology. The committee recognizes that this important initiative is just getting underway, but seeks to ensure that it is implemented immediately. Therefore, the committee directs that the USD(AT&L) and the Chief Information Officer provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 1 year of the enactment of this Act, on the results of the inventory, along with an assessment of the risks from ICS vulnerabilities to critical DOD operational missions.

Standing and Implementation of Nuclear Forces

The committee believes that the United States must maintain its commitment to ensuring the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of its nuclear forces. The committee supports longstanding principles of strategic military balance including that effective deterrence requires forces of sufficient size and flexibility to attack selectively a range of military and other targets yet enable us to hold back a significant and enduring reserve. Each leg of the nuclear triad delivery systems continues to provide unique contributions to stability. As the overall force shrinks, their unique values become more prominent. The committee is concerned that since 2011, nuclear modernization efforts have encountered funding setbacks, cost overruns, schedule delays, mismanagement, and reductions in scope. The committee supports the view established within the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review that the United States nuclear triad has no equivalent mission.

The committee requests the Department of Defense (DOD) to report back to the committee on the additional investments that will be needed in future years to avoid a militarily significant disruption to the nuclear enterprise.

(1) DOD should incorporate how the possible return of sequester-level budgets in the next fiscal year would impact the Secretary of Defense's priorities for nuclear modernization programs; and

(2) The Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command and corresponding commanders, should report under what conditions the June 2013 Nuclear Employment Strategy meets our national security objectives.

Update on nuclear command, control, and communications systems acquisition

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to update recent prior assessments of nuclear command, control, and communications acquisition programs with an interim briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2014, and a final briefing no later than January 31, 2015.

TITLE XVII—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF THE ARMY

National commission on the future of the Army (secs. 1701–1709)

The committee recommends a provision that would create a commission to study the size and force structure of the Army, including active-duty forces, the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR), and the Army National Guard (ARNG). The committee is aware that the Army and the Department of Defense continue their analysis, course of action development, and decisionmaking process with respect to the distribution of reductions of both end strength and force structure necessary to achieve the savings required by the Budget Control Act of 2011. The committee believes that under these circumstances an independent and objective review of Army size and force structure by a national commission is worthwhile. The commission would be required to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2016.

The provision would prohibit the use of funds in fiscal year 2015 to reduce the end strength of the regular Army, ARNG, or USAR below the levels provided in the budget request. The provision would also prohibit the use of funds in fiscal year 2015 to divest, retire, or transfer any AH–64 Apache aircraft assigned to the ARNG. An exception to this aircraft prohibition, however, would allow the transfer of up to 48 Apache aircraft from the ARNG to the regular Army.

The commission would be made up of four members appointed by the chairman and ranking members of the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives and four members appointed by the President.

The commission would undertake a comprehensive study of the structure of the Army and policy assumptions related to the size and force mixture of the Army. In addition to the review of the Army's structure, the commission would conduct a study of plans to transfer Apache aircraft from the ARNG to the regular Army. The commission would also evaluate the distribution of responsibility and authority, as well as the strategic basis or rationale, analytical methodology, and decisionmaking process, related to the allocation of ARNG end strength and force structure to the states and territories.

In its assessment of the Army's size and structure, the commission should also consider the need for any changes to existing legislation—such as the Militia Act of 1903, the National Defense Act of 1920, the National Security Act of 1947, and the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986—that establishes the roles and missions of the active and reserve components.

The committee notes the difficulties expressed by the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force associated with the Department of Defense's (DOD) interpretation and application of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) as amended (Public Law 92–463). The commissioners stated in their report that, "As the Commission proceeded with its work, it became increasingly clear that the DOD's interpretation of FACA's purpose would have a significant, and frequently negative, impact on the Commission's work." It is apparent from the views of the commissioners that the Department's interpretation of the oversight safeguards intended by the FACA may have unnecessarily complicated the conduct of their study. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to support the National Commission on the Future of the Army in a balanced manner and in a spirit consistent with congressional intent and appropriate FACA oversight while avoiding the negative impacts that were experienced by the Air Force Commission.

The committee is also aware that certain aspects of the Army's "1993 Offsite Agreement" pertaining to reserve component core competencies has, in part, for the last 20 years, guided its analysis and decisionmaking with respect to reserve component force structure. This agreement, between senior leadership of the regular Army, ARNG, USAR, and the associations representing their members, guided the realignment of combat arms, combat support, and combat service support force structure between the ARNG and USAR. The agreement provides that the ARNG should retain a mix of combat arms and support structure while the USAR would divest its combat arms and retain combat support and combat service support capabilities. In this manner the core competencies of the Army's reserve components are established: for the ARNG a balance of combat and supporting arms, and for the USAR combat support and service support.

By and since this agreement, therefore, the ARNG has been and remains the reserve component within which the Army places those combat arms capabilities to reinforce, supplement, or compliment the combat capabilities of the active Army. The committee notes that, as appropriate and necessary to address the national security and support for civil authorities requirements of the United States, there are several examples of units and capabilities in the regular Army that are not in the reserves, as well as units and capabilities in the reserves that are not in the regular Army.

This system for the alignment of core capabilities among the Army's reserve components has served the Nation, the Army, and the domestic support and public safety needs of the states very well ever since. The committee recognizes the success of this agreement, as evident by the successful partnerships in combat, security, and support missions by active and reserve servicemembers in the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq. The committee encourages the Army to continue to maintain the reserve components as an operational reserve and manage the distribution of combat arms, combat support, and combat service support capabilities and forces consistent with and respectful of the intent of its "1993 Offsite Agreement" regarding reserve component core competencies.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

Summary and explanation of funding tables

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense (DOD). It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing as well as military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that fund military construction, environmental cleanup, and other activities required to implement the decisions in base closure rounds.

The tables contained in this Act provide the project-level authorizations for the military construction funding authorized in Division B of this Act and summarize that funding by account.

The fiscal year 2015 budget requested $6.56 billion for military construction and housing programs. Of this amount, $5.1 billion was requested for military construction, $1.19 billion for the construction and operation of family housing, and $270.1 million for base closure activities.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction, housing programs, and base closure activities totaling $6.45 billion. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects the committee's continuing commitment to invest in the recapitalization of DOD facilities and infrastructure.

Short title (sec. 2001)

The committee recommends a provision that would designate division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015."

Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002)

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the expiration date for authorizations in this Act for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as of October 1, 2017, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $539.4 million for military construction and $429.6 million for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $544.8 million for military construction and $429.6 million for family housing for fiscal year 2015.

The budget request included $96.0 million for the third of six planned phases of construction of a Command and Control Facility at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. The committee understands that all six phases are necessary to provide for a complete facility that meets the requirements of U.S. Army Pacific. Furthermore, the committee understands that combining the remaining four phases into a single authorized project would save the Army significant military construction funding and accelerate facility construction by up to 4 years.

Therefore, the committee recommends authorization of $311.4 million for the remaining four phases of the Command and Control Facility at Fort Shafter, Hawaii. This authorization assumes at least 10 percent savings will be achieved through construction and contracting efficiencies. Consistent with these efficiencies, the committee recommends an authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2015 of $86.4 million for the first increment of this project. The committee believes that it is inappropriate to phase, rather than increment, large military construction projects when each distinct phase does not fully meet the requirements of the user and directs the Army to refrain from requesting similarly phased projects in the future.

The committee recognizes that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes that the Army's military construction request for fiscal year 2015 is 52 percent less than what was requested for fiscal year 2014. Therefore, in light of savings achieved by incrementally funding large military construction projects elsewhere in the bill, the committee recommends $15.0 million for a Consolidated Shipping Center at Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky, the Army's top unfunded military construction priority.

Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the active component of the Army for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2015. This provision would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2015. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Army. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2004 project (sec. 2104)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2004 (division B of Public Law 108–136) for construction of an Explosives Research and Development Loading Facility at Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2105)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239), for construction of an Aircraft Maintenance Hangar at Fort Drum, New York, a Battalion Headquarters at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, a Vehicle Storage Building at Fort McNair, District of Columbia, and a Secure Administration/Operations Facility at Fort Belvoir, Virginia.

With regard to the Secure Administration/Operations Facility at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, the committee understands that the third phase of construction currently planned for fiscal year 2018 is necessary to provide a complete facility that meets the requirements of the Army. Furthermore, the committee understands that modifying the authorization for the second phase of construction to include the third phase of construction, as recommended by the committee in the provision, would save the Army at least $11.0 million in construction costs, accelerate completion of the facility by 18 months, and avoid at least $16.0 million in operation and maintenance costs that would no longer be necessary for leased facilities. The committee believes that it is inappropriate to phase, rather than increment, large military construction projects when each distinct phase does not fully meet the requirements of the user and therefore directs the Army to refrain from requesting similarly phased projects in the future.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2106)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for one project until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2107)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2012 authorization for seven projects until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Limitation on construction of cadet barracks at United States Military Academy, New York (sec. 2108)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army to certify to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary intends to award a contract for the renovation of MacArthur Long Barracks concurrent with assuming beneficial occupancy of the renovated MacArthur Short Barracks before obligating or expending funds for construction of increment 3 of the Cadet Barracks at the United States Military Academy, New York.

Limitation on funding for family housing construction at Camp Walker, Republic of Korea (sec. 2109)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized for construction of military family housing units at Camp Walker, Republic of Korea (ROK), until 30 days following the delivery of a report to the congressional defense committees validating on-post housing requirements in the ROK, including Camp Walker and Camp Humphries, and a plan for meeting such requirements.

As outlined in the committee's April 2013 report titled "Inquiry Into U.S. Costs and Allied Contributions to Support the U.S. Military Presence Overseas," the annual cost of supporting U.S. troops in the ROK is more than $3.0 billion each year. The ROK contributes funding to support U.S. military presence in the country, known as Special Measures Agreement (SMA) funds, which can be used to offset U.S. labor, logistics, and construction costs.

The military family housing requirement of U.S. Forces-Korea (USFK) is significant, largely unfunded, and has been exacerbated in recent years because of a decision by USFK to increase the number of authorized Command Sponsored Families (CSF) from approximately 1,700 in 2007 to more than 4,600 today. Furthermore, the Commander of USFK has specified a requirement that at least 40 percent of the 3,308 families assigned to Camp Humphries live on post. In total, the committee understands that USFK currently faces an on-post housing deficit of 1,021 homes at Camp Walker and Camp Humphries that would require at least $530.0 million in military construction to resolve.

The committee is concerned that the military family housing requirements in the ROK are unaffordable in the current budget en-

vironment and believes that USFK should revalidate its CSF and on-post housing requirements. If such requirements are to remain valid, the committee believes that USFK should look at alternative sources of funding, to include using SMA funds, to satisfy all or a significant portion of the housing requirement. The committee believes USFK should also consider reengaging with the ROK Government to determine whether funds set aside for low-priority Yongsan Relocation Plan projects could be reallocated for family housing. The committee believes that SMA funds used for construction of facilities must be prioritized to ensure lower priority projects are not funded before higher priority projects, such as military family housing.

Furthermore, the committee notes that section 2807 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), as clarified elsewhere in this bill, requires that all future military construction projects funded using in-kind payments and in-kind contributions pursuant to bilateral agreements with partner nations be submitted for congressional authorization in the Military Construction Authorization Act. The committee reiterates that this provision applies to ROK-funded construction under the new SMA signed February 2, 2014, and all future SMAs or bilateral agreements that allow for in-kind military construction.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $1.02 billion for military construction and $370.4 million for family housing for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $993.2 million for military construction and $370.4 million for family housing for fiscal year 2015.

The budget request included $120.1 million for a Center for Cyber Studies Building in Annapolis, Maryland. The committee understands the Navy would be unable to expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, recommends a $90.1 million reduction.

The committee recognizes that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes that the Navy's military construction request for fiscal year 2015 is 40 percent less than what was requested for fiscal year 2014. Therefore, in light of savings achieved by incrementally funding large military construction projects elsewhere in the bill, the committee recommends $13.8 million for a Regional Ship Maintenance Support Facility at Kitsap, Washington, and $50.7 million for a Radio Battalion Complex at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, the top unfunded military construction priorities of the Navy and Marine Corps, respectively.

Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Navy and Marine Corps military construction projects for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Family housing (sec. 2202)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2015. This provision would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize funding for fiscal year 2015 to improve existing Navy family housing units.

Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Department of the Navy authorized for construction for fiscal year 2015. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty components of the Navy and the Marine Corps. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2205)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81; 125 Stat. 1666), for construction of a Double Aircraft Maintenance Hangar at Yuma, Arizona, an Infantry Squad Defense Range at Camp Pendleton, California, and a Crab Island Security Enclave at Kings Bay, Georgia.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project (sec. 2206)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66), for construction of Small Arms Ranges at Yorktown, Virginia.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 projects (sec. 2207)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for two projects until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2208)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2012 authorization for seven projects until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Item of Special Interest

Quarterly reports on Naval Sea Systems Command Headquarters restoration

The committee strongly supports the Navy's effort to restore the Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) Headquarters at the Washington Navy Yard following the tragic shooting incident that occurred there in September 2013. The committee believes the project is important to reestablish a sense of normalcy for Navy personnel, civilians, and contractors who survived that day and to honor those who were lost by carrying on their work.

However, the committee has concerns about the acquisition strategy that was chosen for the restoration project. Using the Global Contingency Construction Multiple Award Contract (GCC MAC), the Navy awarded a competitive task order to one of the four GCC MAC contract holders for facility stabilization, basic repairs, and development of plans for a complete restoration of the facility. The inclusion of restoration plans in that initial task order appears to have locked the Navy into a sole-source follow-on task order for the restoration of the facility at a cost of approximately $74.0 million. The committee recognizes that other factors, including the expedited timeline necessary to allow NAVSEA personnel to vacate temporary and expensive leased facilities, influenced this acquisition strategy, but the committee is concerned that such an approach may have prevented the Navy from considering other competitive offers and may have resulted in additional cost for the restoration project.

Given these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to:

(1) Provide the congressional defense committees with a report not later than July 1, 2014, that, at a minimum, includes the following:

(a) an explanation of the acquisition strategy used for the renovation project;

(b) the cost and schedule of the renovation project;

(c) an accounting of and explanation for any deviation from the original cost and schedule for the renovation project; and (d) a description of any lessons learned from the acquisition strategy used for this project and how they are being applied to improve future GCC MAC contacting actions.

(2) Provide the congressional defense committees with a report every 90 days after the initial report in paragraph (1) above and until completion of the NAVSEA Headquarters restoration project that, at a minimum, includes an accounting of, and explanation for, any deviation from the original cost and schedule for the renovation project.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $811.7 million for military construction and $327.7 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $846.2 million for military construction and $327.7 million for family housing for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recognizes that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes that the Air Force's military construction request for fiscal year 2015 is 30 percent less than what was requested for fiscal year 2014. Therefore, in light of savings achieved by incrementally funding large military construction projects elsewhere in the bill, the committee recommends $34.4 million for a Corrosion Control and Composite Repair Shop at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, the Air Force's top unfunded military construction priority.

Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Air Force military construction projects for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2302)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Air Force authorized for construction for fiscal year 2015. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Air Force. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2008 project (sec. 2303)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2301(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (division B of Public Law 110–181; 122 Stat. 515), for acquisition of land at Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2304)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for one project until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2305)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2012 authorization for two projects until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of $2.06 billion for military construction for the defense agencies, $38.7 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and $61.1 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2015.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1.86 billion for military construction, $38.7 million for chemical demilitarization construction, and $61.1 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2015.

The budget request included $259.7 million for the Medical Center Replacement at Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany. The committee understands the Department of Defense would be unable to expend the full amount of the budget request and, therefore, recommends a $200.0 million reduction.

Subtitle A—Defense Agency Authorizations

Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the military construction and family housing projects of the defense agencies authorized for construction for fiscal year 2015. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the defense agencies. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2404)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for three projects until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2405)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2012 authorization for six projects until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Subtitle B—Chemical Demilitarization

Authorizations

Authorization of appropriations, chemical demilitarization construction, defense-wide (sec. 2411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the chemical demilitarization program for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2000 project (sec. 2412)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2401(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (division B of Public Law 106–65), as most recently amended by section 2412 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (division B of Public Law 111–383), for construction of a munitions demilitarization facility at Blue Grass Army Depot, Kentucky.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $199.7 million for military construction in fiscal year 2015 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP).

The committee understands that the NSIP has expended prior-year funds more slowly than anticipated and does not require the full requested amount for fiscal year 2015. Therefore, the committee recommends a $25.0 million reduction.

Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations of $174.7 million for the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2015.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

Summary

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of $426.5 million for military construction in fiscal year 2015 for facilities for the guard and reserve components.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $532.1 million for military construction in fiscal year 2015 for facilities for the guard and reserve components. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the state list table included in this report.

The committee recognizes that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes that the Department's military construction request for the guard and reserve components for fiscal year 2015 is 38 percent less than what was requested for fiscal year 2014. Therefore, in light of savings achieved by incrementally funding large military construction projects elsewhere in the bill, the committee recommends $5.0 million for a Readiness Center in Alamogordo, New Mexico; $13.2 million for a Consolidated Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility at Fort Smith Municipal Airport, Arkansas; $25.0 million for an Army Reserve Center in Riverside, California; $47.9 million for a Joint Reserve Intelligence Center in Everett, Washington; and $14.5 million for a Guardian Angel Operations Facility at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona. Each of these projects were identified as the top unfunded military construction priorities of the respective guard and reserve components.

Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations

Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2015. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the reserve component military construction projects authorized for construction for fiscal year 2015 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for each of the reserve components of the military departments. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2611)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) for construction of Army Reserve Centers in Kansas City, Kansas, and Attleboro, Massachusetts. The provision would also extend the authorization for these projects until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2612)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2601 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239), for construction of a Combined Maintenance Shop at Stormville, New York.

Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2011 project (sec. 2613)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the fiscal year 2011 authorization for one project until October 1, 2015, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2016, whichever is later.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

Summary and explanation of tables

The budget request included $270.1 million for the ongoing cost of environmental remediation and other activities necessary to continue implementation of the 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005 Base Realignment and Closure rounds. The committee recommends this amount. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the state list table included in this report.

Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account (sec. 2701)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions of the 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005 Base Realignment and Closure rounds.

Prohibition on conducting additional base realignment and closure (BRAC) round (sec. 2702)

The committee recommends a provision that would make clear that nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize a future Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. Elsewhere in the bill, the committee recommends a reduction of $4.8 million for BRAC planning activities.

HUBZones (sec. 2703)

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 632 of title 15, United States Code, to expand the area around former military installations closed under the Base Realignment and Closure process that can be considered for purposes of satisfying employee residency requirements under the HUBZone program and would extend the period of applicability from 5 to 8 years.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes

Clarification of authorized use of in-kind payments and in-kind contributions (sec. 2801)

The committee recommends a provision 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.

The committee released a report in April 2013 titled "Inquiry into U.S. Costs and Allied Contributions to Support the U.S. Military Presence Overseas" that, among other things, found that in-kind payments and in-kind contributions from partner nations to support the overseas presence of U.S. military forces in Germany, South Korea, and Japan have been used to fund questionable military construction projects.

The committee is disappointed that the Department of Defense (DOD) has chosen to interpret the requirements of section 2807 of Public Law 113–66 as applying only to military construction projects funded with in-kind residual value payments made by foreign governments in exchange for the return of U.S. facilities, despite the clear intent of Congress that the provision apply to any military construction projects built using in-kind payments or in-kind contributions pursuant to a bilateral agreement.

The DOD interpretation is surprising given the statement in the November 18, 2013, Statement of Administration Policy that section 2807 applied to "military construction projects provided pursuant to bilateral agreements with host countries or as in-kind payment of residual value." Further, the Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment gave no indication that there were questions about the provision's scope of applicability when he pledged DOD would comply with the law in his testimony before the committee on April 2, 2014.

The committee reiterates its intent that section 2807 of Public Law 113–66 and the clarifications made by this provision apply to bilateral agreements including, but not limited to, the Special Measures Agreement (SMA) with the Republic of Korea signed February 2, 2014 and any successor SMA agreements, the U.S.-Korea Land Partnership Plan, and residual value payments in-kind for the return of facilities to Germany and elsewhere. This provision would exclude projects built using voluntary in-kind payments or in-kind contributions, including those under the Japanese Facilities

Improvement Program, since they are not required by a bilateral agreement.

Given that DOD has chosen to interpret the requirements of section 2807 of Public Law 113–66 in a manner inconsistent with congressional intent, the committee directs the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment to notify the congressional defense committees at least 30 days prior to the initiation of any military construction project built for DOD personnel outside the United States that is not specifically authorized by law or that is funded with other than appropriated dollars during fiscal year 2014.

Residential building construction standards (sec. 2802)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow for residential buildings designed and constructed using funds authorized by this bill to meet an above code green building standard or rating system to use the ICC 700 National Green Building Standard, the LEED Green Building Standard System, or an equivalent protocol.

Modification of minor military construction authority for projects to correct deficiencies that are life-, health-, or safety-threatening (sec. 2803)

The committee recommends a provision that would increase 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 recommends an increase in this threshold to reflect its view that life, safety, and health deficiencies are at least equal to, if not more important than, laboratory revitalization for which the unspecified minor military construction threshold is $4.0 million.

Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2804)

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize contingency construction authority in certain areas outside the United States for an additional year.

Limitation on construction projects in European Command area of responsibility (sec. 2805)

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense or a secretary of a military department from awarding a contract for any new military construction and family housing project, with certain exceptions, in the U.S. European Command (EUCOM) area of responsibility until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the installations and specific military construction requirements authorized in this Act have been examined as part of the ongoing European Infrastructure Consolidation Assessment (EICA), have been determined to be of an enduring nature, and most effectively meet military requirements at the authorized location.

The committee understands that the proposed Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex (JIAC) consolidation at Royal Air Force

Croughton, United Kingdom, would be expected to result in annual recurring savings of approximately $74.0 million, an approximately 4.5 year payback on the cost of construction, and allow for the divestment of 21 dispersed and aging facilities that do not meet current requirements. Furthermore, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force testified before the committee on April 10, 2014, on the operational benefits of consolidation, saying "There's some great benefits to this program from an intelligence perspective. First, is it allows U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command, who are supported by this Joint Analysis Center, to keep their intelligence and analysis capability on the same continent . . . it's really important to be in the same time zone for coordination of activity. The second thing it does is it allows them to keep an integrated intelligence coordination organization between European Command, Africa Command, and NATO. A lot of the colonial powers that know a lot more about Africa than we do are actually connected to U.S. European Command. This allows their analysts to be connected to U.S. Africa Command for their support. It also lets us be interoperable and interchange and share more intelligence with NATO."

The committee strongly supports the JIAC consolidation and believes projects of this type illustrate the intent of the EICA review. The committee encourages DOD to proceed with planning and design of the JIAC as soon as possible and recommends that consideration be given to combining future phases of the project to achieve cost, schedule, and contracting efficiencies, where possible.

Limitation on construction of new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 2806)

The committee recommends a provision that would limit funding authorized by the bill for new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that any new construction of facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, have enduring military value independent of a high-value detention mission.

Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration

Deposit of reimbursed funds to cover administrative expenses relating to certain real property transactions (sec. 2811)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow for reimbursements paid by non-federal persons or entities for administrative expenses incurred by the military departments for certain real property transactions to be merged with those in the current appropriation, fund, or account used by the military departments for payment of such expenses.

Renewals, extensions, and succeeding leases for financial institutions operating on Department of Defense installations (sec. 2812)

The committee recommends a provision that would allow for the renewal or extension of existing real estate leases in support of an on-base financial institution without competition.

Subtitle C—Provisions Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment

Realignment of Marine Corps forces in Asia-Pacific region (sec. 2821)

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the prohibition on funds for construction activities to implement the realignment of Marine Corps forces from Okinawa, Japan.

The committee remains concerned about the overall affordability of the realignment of Marine Corps forces in the Asia-Pacific region and believes that responsible stewardship of taxpayers' funds requires that Congress be provided high-confidence estimates of construction costs and schedules before initiating construction of new facilities in support of the realignment. In an October 24, 2013, letter to Chairman Levin, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations, and Environment, Mr. Dennis V. McGinn, described the Marine Corps estimate of $12.1 billion for the proposed relocation as "conservative and programmatic" and noted that the estimate "does not include any potential costs for strategic lift or for the relocation of marines to Australia." While the committee remains supportive of projects which have military utility independent of the permanent realignment of marines to Guam, including supporting training requirements, the committee believes that the costs associated with the realignment need to be accurately quantified and informed by the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision that is expected to be complete in early 2015. Strategic lift requirements necessary to support the distributed laydown must also be specifically addressed before moving forward.

Additionally, the committee stresses that the requirements of the recommended provision should be fulfilled prior to any Department of Defense (DOD) funds being spent for the development of civilian infrastructure, including water and wastewater infrastructure, on Guam in preparation for the permanent relocation of marines and their families. The committee reiterates the congressional intent outlined in the January 16, 2014, colloquy between Senators Durbin, Levin, and McCain that section 8102 of the DOD Appropriations Act contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Bill, 2014 (Public Law 113–76) should not be interpreted to supersede section 2822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

Lastly, the committee remains concerned about the sustainment of Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Futenma on Okinawa until the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF) is complete and operational at Camp Schwab. While actions taken by the Governor of Okinawa late last year to allow construction of the FRF to move forward were significant and encouraging, the committee believes that the complexity of the project, the long construction timeline, and the potential for additional delays make it critical that the Marine Corps and the Government of Japan continue to adequately sustain operations, support and housing facilities at MCAS Futenma. The committee understands that MCAS Futenma has identified approximately $52.0 million in necessary facilities sustainment projects in fiscal years 2015 and 2016 and will require

approximately $20.0 million on an annual basis thereafter to meet its facilities sustainment requirements. The committee strongly supports the commitment of the Marine Corps of approximately $22.0 million in facilities sustainment funding for MCAS Futenma in fiscal year 2015 and encourages a similar level of funding each year until the FRF is complete and operational.

Subtitle D—Land Conveyances

Land conveyance, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii (sec. 2831)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey approximately 1.2 acres at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii, to the Honolulu Authority for Rapid Transportation for the public benefit of a rail platform.

Land exchange, Arlington County, Virginia (sec. 2832)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to exchange real property with Arlington County, Virginia, and the Commonwealth of Virginia, for purposes of expanding the contiguous land available to Arlington National Cemetery.

The committee understands Arlington County's desire to utilize the land south of a realigned Columbia Pike for a variety of uses, including public transportation uses and facilities, a museum to honor the history of Arlington County and the Freedman's Village, and to accommodate the indoor space and parking needs of the Air Force Memorial. The committee encourages all interested parties to work together in the development of their respective parcels, making sure these objectives can be achieved while not detracting from the dignity, honor, and solemnity of Arlington National Cemetery.

Additionally, the committee notes that Arlington County and the Army signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in January 2013 intended to serve as a guiding document for the land exchange. The committee encourages the Army and the Commonwealth of Virginia to enter into a similar MOU, if it would help facilitate the land exchange.

Transfers of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Frank D. Merrill and Lake Lanier, Georgia (sec. 2833)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer approximately 10 acres adjacent to Lake Lanier, Georgia, in exchange for the transfer of approximately 282 acres at Camp Frank D. Merrill, Dahlonega, Georgia, by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Transfer of administrative jurisdiction, Camp Gruber, Oklahoma (sec. 2834)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of property at Camp Gruber, Oklahoma, to the Department of the Army for the purpose of military training.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

Establishment of memorial to the victims of the shooting at the Washington Navy Yard on September 16, 2013 (sec. 2841)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit a third party to establish and maintain a memorial dedicated to the victims of the shooting attack at the Washington Navy Yard that occurred on September 16, 2013. Prior to establishment of the memorial authorized under this section, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees detailing, at a minimum, the design, specific location, and funding dedicated to the construction and long-term maintenance of the memorial.

Items of Special Interest

Design build contracts

The committee notes that section 3309 of title 41, United States Code, provides for a two-phase process for selecting contractors eligible to compete for design-build military construction contracts. For the second competitive proposal phase of such contract solicitations, section 3309 states that "the maximum number specified in the solicitation shall not exceed five unless the agency determines with respect to an individual solicitation that a specified number greater than five is in the Federal Government's interest and is consistent with the purposes and objectives of the two-phase selection process." The committee has been made aware of industry concerns that the Department of Defense frequently includes more than five eligible contractors in the second phase of design-build solicitations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment to submit to the congressional defense committees, no later than March 1, 2015, a report describing its use of the two-phased selection process for design-build contracts, including benefits and disadvantages, and the criteria that are used when making a determination that inclusion of more than five contractors in the second phase of such solicitations is in the best interests of the Federal Government.

Laboratory revitalization

Historically, Department of Defense (DOD) laboratory facilities and test centers have not fared well in the internal competition for limited military construction and facility sustainment funds. The committee notes that the maintenance and construction of world-class research and development (R&D) facilities is an important part of ensuring that the best new technologies and capabilities are delivered to warfighters, and that reports indicate that global competitors are investing increased resources in advanced research infrastructure. The quality of these facilities is also key to efforts to attract and retain world-class technical talent at all experience levels in DOD organizations.

For fiscal year 2015, the Department's budget request includes $116.4 million for R&D facilities out of a total military construction

request of $6.56 billion. Neither the Army nor the Air Force included any funding for R&D facilities in their budget requests for either fiscal years 2014 or 2015. The committee remains concerned about the adequacy of recapitalization rates of these facilities and has provided a number of tools, including expanded minor military construction authorities and the ability for DOD laboratories to accumulate funds, known as section 219, for up to 5 years for revitalization projects up to $4.0 million in cost.

The committee also notes that section 2805 of title 10, United States Code, required the Secretary of Defense, not later than February 1, 2014, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the use of expanded minor military construction authority for laboratory revitalization. The committee encourages DOD to complete and submit the required report as soon as possible.

Privatized lodging

The committee notes the success of the Privatized Army Lodging (PAL) program in eliminating inadequate lodging facilities. Furthermore, the committee understands that by the end of fiscal year 2016, the Army expects to have privatized more than 14,000 rooms at 41 different installations. While the committee supports the PAL initiative, it is also concerned that some PAL hotels, in the interest of improving occupancy rates, may have provided lodging to persons who wouldn't otherwise have access to the installation. Such practices have the potential to expose Department of Defense (DOD) installations to unnecessary security threats.

Therefore, the committee directs the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, in coordination with the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Energy and Environment, to conduct a review to ensure that DOD policies regarding base access for persons utilizing privatized lodging facilities are being consistently and appropriately applied at all PAL locations and to provide the results of such review to the congressional defense committees not later than October 1, 2014.

Report on military construction unfunded requirements

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's (DOD) military construction (MILCON) request for fiscal year 2015 is 40 percent less than was requested for fiscal year 2014. In particular, the Army's MILCON funding request declined by 52 percent compared to its request for fiscal year 2014.

As the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment testified on April 2, 2014, "infrastructure degradation is not immediate, so DOD Components are taking more risk in the MilCon program in order to decrease risk in other operational and training budgets. This funding will still enable the Department to respond to warfighter requirements and mission readiness. However, the reduced budget will have an impact on routine operations and quality of life as projects to improve aging workplaces are deferred."

The committee is concerned about the significant cuts to MILCON and their likely impact of increasing the number of facilities in poor to failing condition. The committee is concerned that MILCON cuts will ultimately lead to lasting negative impacts to

our military's readiness and their ability to effectively respond to crisis abroad and at home.

These concerns apply not only to the active component, but to the guard and reserve as well. The committee believes that MILCON funding should be equitably distributed among each service's active, guard, and reserve components based on a comprehensive MILCON strategy. Furthermore, the committee would like to have a better understanding of how National Guard MILCON funding is prioritized and distributed among the States.

Therefore, the committee directs the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment, in coordination with each of the Service secretaries, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on DOD MILCON requirements, with focus on each of the Services—active, guard, and reserve facilities. The report shall include, at a minimum: an accounting of unfunded MILCON requirements over the future years defense program by Service, component, and State; an assessment of the risk to readiness assumed by not funding these requirements; a review of the procedures the Army and the Air Force, in collaboration with the National Guard Bureau, use to allocate National Guard MILCON funding among the States; and procedures used by each Service and their components to prioritize and allocate MILCON funding and balance risk across the active, guard, and reserve components.

Reprogramming packages for military construction projects

While the Department of Defense (DOD) complies with notification requirements for the use of various standing authorities under title 10, United States Code, to construct facilities not specifically authorized by Congress, the committee is concerned that the DOD does not routinely submit reprogramming requests to fund such projects, including the source of funds to be used for the project, to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Rather, such reprogramming requests are generally only submitted to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives for approval, thereby depriving the authorizing committees of visibility into, and oversight of, reprogrammings of military construction funds that had previously been authorized for other purposes.

Therefore, the committee directs the DOD to ensure that courtesy copies of all reprogramming requests for military construction funds be provided to the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Scope of work variations

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has proposed modifications to section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, that would allow the DOD to increase the scope of a military construction project by up to 10 percent above the amount authorized by Congress.

On February 27, 2012, the DOD Inspector General (DOD IG) published a report titled, "Guidance Needed to Prevent Military Construction Projects from Exceeding the Approved Scope of Work." The report found that in 3 of 17 case studies, military construction projects carried out by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

(USACE) and Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment (AFCEE) officials did not comply with facility sizes on the congressional request for authorization. According to the report, "This occurred because the scope of work variations permissible by section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, from the congressional request for authorization are unclear and inconsistently applied. As a result, DOD officials do not have assurance that military construction projects are built consistent with congressional intent and in accordance with legislative requirements."

The committee strongly supports the new guidance issued in response to congressional concerns and the DOD IG report by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment on June 24, 2013, that seeks to provide greater clarity and consistency in defining the authorized scope for military construction projects. The committee reiterates its position that the cost and scope of projects identified on Military Construction Project Data Sheets, also known as DD Form 1391, define the authorized limits of the contract authority for projects included in the annual National Defense Authorization Act. Given the problems identified by the DOD IG, the relatively recent implementation of revised guidance, and the critical importance of thorough planning and design activities to reduce uncertainty with regard to project cost and scope, the committee believes it would be inappropriate to provide additional flexibility under section 2853 of title 10, United States Code.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations

Overview

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy (DOE) for fiscal year 2015, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment, research and development, nuclear weapons, naval nuclear propulsion, environmental restoration and waste management, operating expenses, and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). This title authorizes appropriations in three categories: (1) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), (2) Defense environmental cleanup, and (3) Other defense activities.

The budget request for atomic energy defense activities at the Department totaled $17.842 billion, a 4.6 percent increase above the fiscal year 2014 appropriated level. Of the total amount requested (rounded up to the first significant decimal point):

(1) $11.7 billion is for NNSA, of which:
  (a) $8.3 billion is for weapons activities;
  (b) $1.5 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;
  (c) $1.3 billion is for naval reactors; and
  (d) $410.8 million is for the Office of the Administrator;
(2) $5.3 billion is for defense environmental cleanup;
(3) $753.0 million is for other defense activities; and
(4) $104.0 million for Idaho site-wide security.

The committee recommends $17.8 billion for atomic energy defense activities.

Of the amounts authorized, the committee recommends:

(1) $12.0 billion for NNSA, of which;
  (a) $8.3 billion is for weapons activities;
  (b) $1.9 billion is for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities;
  (c) $1.4 billion is for naval reactors, the amount of the budget request; and
  (d) $410.8 million is for the Office of the Administrator, the amount of the budget request;

(2) $4.9 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities (based on not reauthorizing the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund);

(3) $753.0 million for other defense activities, the amount of the budget request; and

(4) $104.0 million for Idaho site-wide security.

National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of $12.0 billion for the DOE in fiscal year 2015 for the NNSA to carry out programs necessary to national security.

Weapons activities

The committee recommends $8.3 billion for weapons activities, the amount of the budget request.

The committee recommends funding for these programs as follows: $2.7 billion for directed stockpile work; $1.8 billion for campaigns; $2.05 billion for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities; $233.8 million for the secure transportation assets; $173.4 million for nuclear counterterrorism incident response; $76.9 for counterterrorism and counter-proliferation; and $797.8 million for defense nuclear security and the Chief Information Officer.

The committee notes that notwithstanding the congressional support for further modernization of the nuclear weapons complex infrastructure and the life extension programs, the committee urges the NNSA to find efficiencies where and whenever possible. The ability to robust modernization funding during a time of decreasing federal and defense budgets will be increasingly difficult as time goes on. Good stewardship of the funding, as well as the nuclear weapons and the nuclear weapons complex, is critical to the long-term support for and sustainment of the projected increases.

Directed stockpile work

The committee recommends $2.7 billion for directed stockpile work. The directed stockpile account supports work directly related to weapons in the stockpile, including day-to-day maintenance as well as research, development, engineering, and certification activities to support planned life extension programs. This account also includes fabrication and assembly of weapons components, feasibility studies, weapons dismantlement and disposal, training, and support equipment.

The committee understands that for fiscal year 2015, the B61 is undergoing a life extension (Mod 12) that will make one variant reducing the overall number of such B61 systems by 50 percent and once certified operational by the Department of Defense (DOD) will permit the elimination of the B83 weapon system, the last Cold War era megaton class weapon.

The funding for B61–12 life extension program is proposed at $643.0 million. The committee understands the importance of the Mod 12 life extension but is concerned about meeting the 2020 first production unit in order to begin replacing the system deployed by NATO allies and needs to understand what backup plan, if any, the Departments of Defense and Energy have to provide temporary

lifetime extension of the existing weapons if the Mod 12 schedule slips as it most likely will.

The committee understands that the NNSA has slipped the interoperable warhead out beyond the 5-year budget window and questions whether beginning this program at such a late stage is cost-effective compared to simply performing a life extension of the W88 (after it has had its fuse replaced under the ALT 370 program) and the W78, which will be in need of a full life extension program.

The committee also understands that the NNSA has slipped the decision on the warhead for long-range stand-off weapon from 1 to 3 years, which is to replace the air launched cruise missile which will end service life in the late 2020s.

The committee continues to be concerned about overall workflow coordination between the design laboratories and the production facilities: Pantex, Y–12, and the Kansas City plant. While unlikely due to the program delays this year, there could be up to five life extension programs underway, the B61–12, the long range stand-off weapon, the W88 fuse program, an interoperable warhead to replace the W–88 and W78 systems, and the ongoing W–76 program. Concurrency, funding delays, or program slips in any one of these programs can impact the others given they all use the three production facilities.

Finally, the committee has concern about the fragile nature of maintaining a workload balance and key personnel at the two physics laboratories given that the majority of the work with the W76–1 is now at Pantex, the warhead replacement for the long-range stand-off weapon has been delayed, and that work for the interoperable warhead or life extensions of the W88 and W78 separately will be pushed out at least 5 years. This concern was evident in testimony of Drs. McMillan and Goldstein who are the directors of Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore, respectively, when they testified before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee on April 9, 2014. The essence of the stockpile certification program is the ability of each laboratory to independently assess the warheads in the current stockpile using separate computer codes and key personnel.

Campaigns

The committee recommends $1.8 billion for campaigns, including a $7.5 million reduction to the inertial confinement fusion and high-yield campaign. The campaigns focus on science and engineering efforts involving the three nuclear weapons laboratories, the Nevada National Security Site, and the weapons production plants. Each campaign is focused on a specific activity to support and maintain the nuclear stockpile without underground nuclear weapons testing. These efforts form the scientific underpinning of the DOE's annual certification that the stockpile remains safe, secure, and reliable without nuclear weapons testing.

The committee notes that as life extension programs take on more importance in the future years, the campaigns, particularly those associated with the science base, will need to sustain ongoing work and budget. The stockpile stewardship program by all accounts has exceeded all expectations compared to what it was envisioned in the 1990s. More importantly, it is the seed corn to bring

in the best and brightest young post-doctorate scientists to work with senior scientists. Testimony this year before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee by the three weapons laboratory directors has supported the success of this program.

The committee continues to be concerned regarding funding for the enhanced surveillance program, which produces the future tools to inspect the stockpile. The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to review this program against best program practices as to whether the program has a long-term plan and understands the full amount of funding needed to maintain that plan. The GAO shall give an interim briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than October 31, 2014, with a final briefing no later than February 28, 2015.

Site Stewardship and Nuclear Operations

The committee recommends $2.0 billion for Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities Operations.

The committee understands that the projected costs for the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) project for replacing the combined Y–12 plant buildings consisting of 9212, 9215, and 9204–2E has risen to $11,000 to $14,000 per square foot for a 650,000-square-foot facility. It took almost 10 years and almost $1 billion in design to reach these projections with the encouragement and the help of the DOD Office of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation. The committee understands that similar to the replacement of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research (CMR) facility at Los Alamos, the replacement for the UPF will occur in a smaller series of buildings to distribute cost over time, given that some operations in buildings such as 9215 and 9204–2E are not in dire need of a new facility like the uranium operations in building 9212, where the structure literally dates to the Manhattan Project. The committee looks forward to a conservative cost estimate for the first module in replacing building 9212 but will approach it with trepidation and caution given the past record of this project. The committee directs the GAO to continue monitoring this project with periodic updates to the congressional defense committees on the direction the program is taking and recommendations for sound program management.

Elsewhere in this bill there is a provision directing the NNSA to establish a budget line for uranium sustainment so that uranium capabilities, so essential to the stockpile, are not developed using Plant Directed Research and Development funds, which are not intended to be long-term sustainable sources of funding for capabilities replacement at the Y–12 plant.

The committee believes that the proposal to replace lithium production capabilities at the Y–12 plant starting in fiscal year 2017 (project 17–D–XXX) should begin in fiscal year 2016. Portions of the concrete ceiling above equipment that supplies components to the stockpile are spalling as the rebar inside the 60-plus-year-old concrete has corroded due to a desiccant used in the air handling system. Such working conditions are unacceptable if not dangerous. The committee directs the GAO to review the status of the existing facility to meet stockpile needs, whether the NNSA has a long-term and coherent program plan for lithium sustainment, and how well-

developed the plans are to replace this unacceptable facility. The GAO shall brief the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2015, on the results of this review with an interim briefing no later than October 31, 2014.

With the deferral of the CMR Replacement project, the committee continues to be concerned about implementing a long-term strategy for plutonium sustainment. Testimony by Dr. McMillan before the Strategic Forces Subcommittee on April 9, 2014, indicates that a modular approach to a smaller series of buildings holds promise for lower costs and greater flexibility. However, the ability to accomplish the first two stages of moving out of the 60-year-old CMR facility into other facilities within Technical Area 55 are in danger of not being met by the required date of 2019. Like Dr. McMillan, the committee remains concerned about meeting the 2019 deadline for vacating the CMR facility. Direction is given elsewhere in the bill to assist the NNSA in accomplishing the move out of the CMR facility in a timely fashion.

Secure transportation asset

The committee recommends $233.8 million for the secure transportation asset, the amount of the budget request. The secure transportation asset is responsible for the transportation of nuclear weapons, weapons materials, components, and other materials requiring safe and secure transport.

Defense Nuclear Security and Chief Information Officer

The committee recommends $618.1 million for safeguards and security and the Chief Information Officer; the same as the budget request. The committee is aware of the recent formation of the Departmental Security Committee for execution of departmental security policy across the nuclear enterprise. It is the committee's understanding that the Office of Defense Nuclear Security is developing an enterprise-wide life-cycle management plan for the physical security infrastructure by June 2014. The committee directs the GAO to review this plan against GAO's program management and best practices with a briefing to congressional defense committees no later than January 30, 2015.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation programs

The committee recommends $1.8 billion for the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program, an increase of $285.0 million to the budget request. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has management and oversight responsibility for the nuclear nonproliferation programs at the Department of Energy (DOE).

The committee directs the Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation program to report no later than December 1, 2015, on a 5-year budget profile, if feasible, for a program to equip and train other countries on nuclear incident response. This effort should be joint with the NNSA nuclear counterterrorism incident response program and the counterterrorism and counterproliferation program.

Nonproliferation and verification research and development

The committee recommends $390.8 million for nonproliferation and verification research, an increase of $30.0 million for research associated with detection of enrichment and reprocessing activities.

Nonproliferation and international security

The committee recommends $141.4 million for nonproliferation and international security, the same as the budget request.

International nuclear materials protection and cooperation

The committee recommends $375.5 million for international nuclear materials production and cooperation, an increase of $70.0 million to assist countries in detecting nuclear materials and implementing measures to install security upgrades.

Fissile Materials Disposition program

The Fissile Materials Disposition program converts excess weapons grade plutonium to mixed oxide fuel (MOX) for use in commercial power reactors. The United States and Russia have signed the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement where each country has agreed to the disposition of 34 metric tons of excess weapons grade plutonium, thus removing the possibility that this plutonium could be reused for weapons or fall into the hands of terrorists. Russia has modified the agreement so that they will not produce MOX but instead burn the plutonium in fast reactors. After the United States considered more than 40 different options on how to dispose of surplus plutonium, a 2010 amendment to the agreement eliminated immobilization as an option and selected MOX as the disposition path for the U.S. share of the plutonium. The NNSA has now estimated that the life cycle cost of the project is on the order of $26.0 billion with construction of the MOX facility ranging from $9.6 to $12.0 billion (depending on level of annual appropriation). The original cost estimate of the facility was $4.8 billion. The facility is currently 60 percent complete.

The committee recommends $456.1 million for fissile materials disposition, an increase of $145.0 million which is for the MOX fabrication facility construction.

For fiscal year 2015, the NNSA has proposed to place the construction of the MOX project in cold stand-by. Until such time as the committee receives and evaluates a final report listing alternatives to reducing the 34 metric tons of weapons grade plutonium to MOX, the NNSA is directed to continue construction of the facilities.

Global threat reduction initiative

The committee recommends $373.5 million for the global threat reduction initiative, an increase of $40.0 million to accelerate the return of U.S. and non-U.S. origin nuclear material as well as radiological material protection.

Naval Reactors

The committee recommends $1.4 billion for naval reactors. The committee understands that in fiscal year 2014, naval reactors did not receive funding for a super computer to model the Ohio Re-

placement fuel core, as well as funds needed for the Modifications and Additions to a Reactor Facility at Knolls Atomic Power Laboratories. The committee encourages the Secretary of Energy to approve necessary reprogramming funds to meet these important program objectives. The committee supports the replacement for the Spent Fuel Handling Facility to be constructed at the Idaho National Laboratory.

Nuclear counterterrorism incident response

The committee recommends $173.4 million for nuclear counterterrorism incident response, the amount of the budget request.

Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs

The committee recommends $76.9 million, the amount of the budget request.

Office of the Administrator

The committee recommends $403.3 million for the Office of the Administrator, the amount of the budget request, a decrease of $87.5 million.

Defense environmental cleanup (sec. 3102)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $4.9 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities at the DOE. The defense environmental cleanup activities support the cleanup of contaminated facilities, soil, ground and surface water, and the treatment and disposal of radioactive and other waste generated through the production of nuclear weapons and weapons materials. The Environmental Management program was established in 1989 to clean up 50 years of Cold War waste from the production of nuclear weapons and materials, including plutonium and highly enriched uranium. The committee notes that the budget request of $463.0 million for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund assumes that Congress will reauthorize section 1101 of the Energy Policy Act of 2002 (42 U.S.C. 2297g) for industry contributions. In fiscal years 2013 and 2014, this legislation was not reauthorized and the committee assumes it will not be reauthorized again this year. Accordingly, the committee redistributes the $463.0 million associated with this assumption to other higher priority needs.

Savannah River Site

The committee recommends $1.2 billion for the Savannah River Site cleanup to help accelerate and meet tank stabilization milestones under the consent order with the State of South Carolina. The committee is aware of the critical milestones with the State of South Carolina for tank close-out by 2028. In that regard, the start-up of the Salt Waste Processing Facility is a critical element to separate high-level waste from low-level waste. The committee expects to be informed of the final baseline cost estimate for the Salt Waste Processing Facility due to the delays of the large vessels that are part of the facility.

Waste Treatment Plant and Tank Farm Activities

The committee recommends $690.0 million, the amount of the budget request for the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP). The committee recommends $545.0 million for tank farm activities. The committee continues to follow the progress at the WTP at the DOE Hanford Site in Richland, Washington. Unlike the Savannah River Site, the composition of the waste in the tanks is non-uniform, adding complexity to the separation and treatment of high- and low-level waste. The Department is encouraged to expedite the treatment of the low-level waste streams and fully inform the committee of the costs associated with the pre-treatment of the low-level waste. The overall completion cost of the project has risen from $5.8 billion to $12.3 billion. The committee directs the Department to ensure that the committee is informed of decisions on directly treating the low-level waste and whether another pre-treatment plant is needed for the high-level waste.

Hanford Site

The committee recommends $848.1 million for the Hanford River Site (excluding the waste treatment and immobilization plant), the amount of the budget request.

Idaho National Laboratory

The committee recommends $367.2 million, the amount of the budget request, for the Idaho Waste Cleanup to continue to remove the transuranic waste and other buried waste, as applicable, for shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant and to continue sodium bearing waste treatment operations.

Los Alamos National Laboratory

The committee recommends $224.6 million for Los Alamos National Laboratory to continue to remove transuranic waste for shipment to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant and to monitor groundwater contamination as well as to design a system to treat the hexavalent chromium contamination in the ground water.

Oak Ridge Reservation

The committee recommends $206.9 million for the Oak Ridge Reservation, the amount of the budget request.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

The committee recommends $216.0 million. The committee directs the GAO to review program operations at the plant with respect to safety and contractor assurance systems and compare the operation of the plant with respect to best practices developed by the GAO for program management and safety standards by the DOE and other applicable agencies. The review shall consist of an interim briefing no later than November 30, 2014, with the final product consisting of a briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than March 31, 2015.

Safeguards and Security

The committee recommends $233.9 million, the amount of the budget request.

Technology Development

The committee recommends $13.0 million for technology development, the amount of the budget request.

Program Direction and Support

The committee recommends $295.8 million for program direction and support, the amount of the budget request.

Other defense activities (sec. 3103)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize $751.0 million for other defense activities, a $2 million reduction from the budget request. Of this amount, the committee recommends $179.9 million for health, safety, and security, a $1 million reduction from the budget request; $202.1 million for specialized security, the amount of the budget request; $170.9 million for Legacy Management, a $1 million reduction from the budget request; $73.5 million for Independent Enterprise Assessment, the amount of the budget request; $118.8 million for other defense-related administrative support, the amount of the budget request; and $5.5 million for the Office of Hearings and Appeals, the amount of the budget request.

Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations

Life-cycle cost estimates of certain atomic energy defense capital assets (sec. 3111)

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Atomic Energy Defense Act to require that, under order 413.3 at the end of phase CD–1 and before phase CD–4, the Secretary of Energy perform an independent life-cycle cost estimate of capital assets that have a single purpose mission. This is to reduce the likelihood of large increases in life-cycle estimates late in the program cycle of facilities as evidenced by the mixed oxide fuel facility and the waste treatment plant.

Expansion of requirement for independent cost estimates on life extension programs and new nuclear facilities (sec. 3112)

The committee recommends a provision that would align the independent cost estimating practices for life extension programs and new nuclear facilities with those performed by the Department of Defense as required by the Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act (P.L. 111–23), which requires independent cost estimates early in the concept definition phase. For Department of Energy (DOE) programs, this is the 6.1 concept assessment phase of a life extension program and critical decision 1 of DOE Order 413.3, Program Management for Acquisition of Capital Assets.

Implementation of Phase I of Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project (sec. 3113)

The committee recommends a provision that would require in replacing building 9212 at the Y–12 plant, the technologies (or their substitutes) that are to go into the replacement building have a

technology readiness level of at least seven. Technologies (or their substitutes) that were in building 9212 that do not go into the replacement building are also to have a technology readiness level of at least seven. Critical decision-3 (construction) as defined by Department of Energy order 413.3 (Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets) for the replacement of building 9212 may not begin until this condition is met.

This section applies only to process technologies that require protection levels consistent with Categories I and II found under Department of Energy Order 474.2 (Nuclear Material Control and Accountability), such as casting and material purification and enrichment.

Establishment of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health (sec. 3114)

The committee recommends a provision would create an advisory board reporting to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Program on toxic substances and worker health.

Comments of Administrator for Nuclear Security on reports of Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 3115)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to respond within 90 days to the findings of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise, created in section 3166 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (P.L. 112–239), which shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees.

Identification of amounts required for uranium technology sustainment in budget materials for fiscal year 2016 (sec. 3116)

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator for Nuclear Security to include in the fiscal year 2016 budget request a uranium sustainment budget line for technology development past technology readiness level five so that plant-directed research and development (R&D) at facilities such as Y–12 can concentrate on projects involving technology readiness level four and below. Currently, facilities such as Y–12 must develop most if not all future uranium technologies on plant directed R&D.

Budget Items

Cruise Missile Warhead Life Extension Program

The fiscal year 2015 budget request contained $9.4 million for the 6.1 study for extending the life of the cruise missile warhead. This effort is a high priority for the Air Force, which predicts that the current warhead and the missile will have to be life extended in the 2025 timeframe. The requested fiscal year 2015 funding will result in a 1 to 3 year delay in the overall effort. The committee recommends an increase of $7.5 million to this life extension program to mitigate the delay.

Environment Safety and Health

The fiscal year 2015 budget request for the DOE Office of Environment Safety and Health is $188.7 million. The committee recommends a reduction of $1 million as excess to need.

Legacy Management

The fiscal year 2015 budget request for the Department of Energy Office of Legacy Management is $158.6 million. The committee recommends a reduction of $1.0 million as excess to need.

Establishment of the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health

The fiscal year 2015 budget request contained no funding for the Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health. The committee recommends an increase of $2.0 million to fund activities in section 3114.

Inertial confinement facility operations and target production

The fiscal year 2015 National Nuclear Security Administration budget request for the inertial confinement facility operations and target production is $335.9 million. The committee recommends a reduction of $7.5 million as excess to need.

Federal salaries and expenses

The fiscal year 2015 National Nuclear Security Administration budget request for federal salaries and expenses is $410.8 million. The committee recommends a reduction of $7.5 million as excess to need.

Items of Special Interest

Efforts to meet the 2019 move of plutonium capabilities from the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research facility

The Strategic Forces Subcommittee is aware of the administration's plans to execute the first two phases of the plutonium (Pu) strategy (maximize use of the new radiological laboratory/utility/office building and repurpose existing space in Plutonium Facility (PF)–4) as new subprojects to the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research (CMR) Replacement project. The third phase (module construction) will be a separate line item to be submitted in fiscal year 2016. This approach will add additional visibility into the process as it will follow a more rigorous application of Department of Energy (DOE) Order 413.3B, "Program and Project Management for the Acquisition of Capital Assets." Recognizing that the Pu strategy includes a mixture of tasks that support the 2019 end of programmatic activities in the CMR facility and some tasks that do not support the 2019 milestone, the administration is encouraged to identify those tasks required to support the 2019 milestone and to pursue a streamlined DOE Order 413.3B process associated with those tasks. It is important that such streamlining should not in any way degrade reasonable program control and oversight. The third phase of the Pu strategy concerning module construction is not to be part of this streamlining consideration. The intent of

streamlining is to avoid deferring tasks that will reduce the risk in either CMR or PF–4, while awaiting broader approvals on critical decisions. The administration will provide a report to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, no later than September 31, 2014, that provides details on activities that can be accelerated to achieve the 2019 CMR milestone.

Laboratory Scientific Equipment Sustainment

The committee understands the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has repurposed funding, including resources that previously supported scientific equipment and capabilities needed to support and sustain the nuclear weapons mission, to meet infrastructure maintenance, repair, and recapitalization requirements. While the committee believes basic infrastructure needs are important, the committee is concerned that a sustained lack of investment in scientific capabilities could increase risk to the laboratories' primary mission—science-based stockpile stewardship—and is not consistent with the stated national goal of achieving a modern and responsive nuclear infrastructure. The committee supports a solution that allows investment in both areas of pressing need and appreciates the considerable challenges confronting NNSA, as well as the difficulties stemming from not having a Senate-confirmed Administrator. In this regard, the committee welcomes the recent confirmation of the Administrator and encourages him to review its investment in scientific capabilities.

National Nuclear Security Administration Governance

The committee remains concerned about the current governance structure and management of the Nuclear Security Enterprise. Since the 2009 conclusion of the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, which found that "the governance structure of the [National Nuclear Security Administration] NNSA is not delivering the needed results," evidence has only mounted that serious, bold reforms are necessary. The interim report of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise provides the most recent confirmation of the dire need for governance reform.

The committee appreciates the work of the Panel and the detailed description provided in its report of the abortive structure currently in place. The Panel's interim report makes clear that the current system chiefly prevents the efficient use of resources and the effective execution of its mission—arguably the two most important requirements of the Nuclear Security Enterprise.

The committee believes reform is imperative in order to maintain confidence in the U.S. nuclear deterrent and looks forward to the Panel's final report, but notes that legislation ultimately cannot make an organization meet the expectations laid upon it. Leadership is the primary driver of excellence and the committee has great expectations for the new Administrator of the NNSA.

Procurement of unencumbered special nuclear material for tritium production

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to determine if the Mutual Defense Agreement between the United Kingdom and

Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Purpose, dated July 5, 1958, permits the United States to obtain low enriched uranium for the purposes of tritium production or purchase directly tritium from the United Kingdom. Such a determination shall be due to the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2014.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

Authorization (sec. 3201)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board at $30.2 million.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Maritime Administration (sec. 3501)

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize certain aspects of the Maritime Administration.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

Authorization of amounts in funding tables (sec. 4001)

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, the provision would also require that decisions by agency heads to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on authorized, transparent, statutory criteria, or merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

Funding tables (secs. 4101–4701)

The committee recommends provisions that provide line-item guidance for the funding authorized in this Act, in accordance with the requirements of section 4001. The provisions also display the line-item funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2015 budget request and show where the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts.

The Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts, as set forth in the provision or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense, without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures. Unless noted in this report, funding changes to the budget request are made without prejudice.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
National Defense (Budget Function 050)			
Department of Defense-Military (Budget Sub-Function 051)			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Title I--Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	5,102,685	334,000	5,436,685
Missile Procurement, Army	1,017,483	0	1,017,483
Procurement of Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	1,471,438	86,011	1,557,449
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,031,477	–18,400	1,013,077
Other Procurement, Army	4,893,634	–356,400	4,537,234
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund	115,058	–115,058	0
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	13,074,317	10,000	13,084,317
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,217,945	93,000	3,310,945
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	771,945	0	771,945
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	14,400,625	91,000	14,491,625
Other Procurement, Navy	5,975,828	–15,000	5,960,828
Procurement, Marine Corps	983,352	2,900	986,252
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	11,542,571	–15,900	11,526,671
Missile Procurement, Air Force	4,690,506	–139,531	4,550,975
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	677,400	8,800	686,200
Other Procurement, Air Force	16,566,018	20,600	16,586,618
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,221,437	–210,772	4,010,665
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	20,000	0	20,000
Prior Year Rescissions	–265,685	265,685	0
Subtotal, Title I--Procurement	**89,508,034**	**40,935**	**89,548,969**
Title II--Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Army	6,593,898	5,702	6,599,600
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy	16,266,335	–243,639	16,022,696
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force	23,739,892	–227,434	23,512,458
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide	16,766,084	415,822	17,181,906
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	167,738	0	167,738
Subtotal, Title II--Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**63,533,947**	**–49,549**	**63,484,398**
Title III--Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	33,240,148	–21,400	33,218,748
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,490,569	20,000	2,510,569
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	6,030,773	14,200	6,044,973
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	39,025,857	79,500	39,105,357
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,909,487	25,857	5,935,344
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	1,007,100	5,000	1,012,100
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	268,582	5,000	273,582
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	35,331,193	206,590	35,537,783

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,015,842	5,000	3,020,842
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,392,859	5,000	6,397,859
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	31,198,232	12,700	31,210,932
United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces	13,723		13,723
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid	100,000		100,000
Cooperative Threat Reduction	365,108		365,108
DoD Acquisition Workforce Development Fund	212,875		212,875
Environmental Restoration, Army	201,560		201,560
Environmental Restoration, Navy	277,294		277,294
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	408,716		408,716
Environmental Restoration, Defense-Wide	8,547		8,547
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Defense Sites	208,353		208,353
Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund	5,000		5,000
Support of International Sporting Competitions, Defense	10,000	–4,300	5,700
Subtotal, Title III--Operation and Maintenance	**165,721,818**	**353,147**	**166,074,965**
Title IV--Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	128,957,593	–46,910	128,910,683
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	6,236,092		6,236,092
Subtotal, Title IV--Military Personnel	**135,193,685**	**–46,910**	**135,146,775**
Title XIV--Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	13,727		13,727
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	61,717		61,717
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	44,293	–5,000	39,293
Working Capital Fund, Defense Commissary Agency	1,114,731	200,000	1,314,731
National Sea-based Deterrence Fund		100,000	100,000
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction, Defense	828,868		828,868
Office of the Inspector General	311,830		311,830
Drug Interdiction & Counter-Drug Activities, Defense	820,687	20,000	840,687
Defense Health Program	31,833,061	–78,000	31,755,061
Subtotal, Title XIV--Other Authorizations	**35,028,914**	**237,000**	**35,265,914**
Total, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations	**488,986,398**	**534,623**	**489,521,021**
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Military Construction			
Army	539,427	5,400	544,827
Navy	1,018,772	–25,573	993,199
Air Force	811,774	34,400	846,174
Defense-Wide	2,061,890	–200,000	1,861,890
Army National Guard	126,920	5,000	131,920
Air National Guard	94,663	13,200	107,863
Army Reserve	103,946	25,000	128,946
Navy Reserve	51,528	47,869	99,397
Air Force Reserve	49,492	14,500	63,992
Chemical Demilitarization Construction	38,715		38,715
NATO Security Investment Program	199,700	–25,000	174,700

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Subtotal, Military Construction	**5,096,827**	**–105,204**	**4,991,623**
Family Housing			
Construction, Army	78,609		78,609
Operation and Maintenance, Army	350,976		350,976
Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	16,412		16,412
Operation and Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps	354,029		354,029
Operation and Maintenance, Air Force	327,747		327,747
Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide	61,100		61,100
Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,662		1,662
Subtotal, Family Housing	**1,190,535**		**1,190,535**
Base Realignment and Closure			
Army	84,417		84,417
Navy	94,692		94,692
Air Force	90,976		90,976
Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure	**270,085**		**270,085**
Total, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations	**6,557,447**	**–105,204**	**6,452,243**
Department of Defense-Military (Budget Sub-Function 051)	**495,543,845**	**429,419**	**495,973,264**
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (Budget Sub-Function 053)			
Division C: Department of Energy National Security and Independent Federal Agency Authorizations			
Department of Energy Authorizations			
Energy Programs			
Nuclear Energy	104,000		104,000
Subtotal, Energy Programs	**104,000**		**104,000**
Advisory Board			
Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health		2,000	2,000
Subtotal, Advisory Board		**2,000**	**2,000**
National Nuclear Security Administration			
Weapons Activities	8,314,902		8,314,902
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,555,156	285,000	1,840,156
Naval Reactors	1,377,100		1,377,100
Federal Salaries and Expenses	410,842	–7,500	403,342
Subtotal, National Nuclear Security Administration	**11,658,000**	**277,500**	**11,935,500**
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,327,538	–463,000	4,864,538
Other Defense Activities	753,000	–2,000	751,000
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**6,080,538**	**–465,000**	**5,615,538**
Subtotal, Department of Energy Authorizations	**17,842,538**	**–185,500**	**17,657,038**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	30,150		30,150
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	**30,150**		**30,150**
Total, Division C: Department of Energy National Security and Independent Federal Agency Authorizations	**17,872,688**	**–185,500**	**17,687,188**
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (Budget Sub-Function 053)	**17,872,688**	**–185,500**	**17,687,188**
Total, National Defense (Budget Function 050)	**513,416,533**	**243,919**	**513,660,452**
MEMORANDUM: SUMMARY TOTALS			
Department of Defense-Military (051)	495,543,845	429,419	495,973,264
Atomic energy defense activities (053)	17,872,688	185,500	17,687,188
Total, National Defense (050)	**513,416,533**	**243,919**	**513,660,452**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV—Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	63,400		63,400
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADDS)			
Title X—General Transfer Authority	[5,000,000]		[5,000,000]
Title XV—Special Transfer Authority			[4,000,000]

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Summary Defense Discretionary Authorizations Programs in the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
National Defense (050)			
Department of Defense-Military, Base Budget (051)	495,543,845	429,419	495,973,264
Atomic energy defense activities (053)	17,872,688	–185,500	17,687,188
Total, National Defense (050)	**513,416,533**	**243,919**	**513,660,452**
Other Defense Discretionary Authorizations Programs Outside the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Already Authorized			
Department of Defense-Military (051)			
Defense Production Act Purchases	22,000		22,000
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	8,000		8,000
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	31,000		31,000
Subtotal, Department of Defense-Military (051)	**61,000**		**61,000**
Atomic energy defense activities (053)			
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	100,000		100,000
Subtotal, Atomic energy defense activities (053)	**100,000**		**100,000**
Defense-related activities (054)			
Other Discretionary Programs	7,681,000		7,681,000
Subtotal, Defense-related activities (054)	**7,681,000**		**7,681,000**
Total, Other Defense Discretionary Authorizations (050)	**7,842,000**		**7,842,000**
Discretionary Budget Authority Implication (050)			
National Defense (050)			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	495,604,845	429,419	496,034,264
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	17,972,688	–185,500	17,787,188
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,681,000		7,681,000
Total, Discretionary Budget Authority Implication, 050	**521,258,533**	**243,919**	**521,502,452**
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Estimates)			
Department of Defense-Military (051)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	7,071,000		7,071,000
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,169,000		1,169,000
Offsetting receipts	–1,591,000		–1,591,000
Subtotal, Department of Defense-Military (051)	**6,649,000**		**6,649,000**
Atomic energy defense activities (053)			
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,197,000		1,197,000
Subtotal, Atomic energy defense activities (053)	**1,197,000**		**1,197,000**
Defense-related activities (054)			

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	59,000		59,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	514,000		514,000
Subtotal, Defense-related activities (054)	**573,000**		**573,000**
Total, National Defense Mandatory Programs (050)	**8,419,000**		**8,419,000**
Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implication (050)			
Discretionary and Mandatory Budget Authority Implication (050)			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	502,253,845	429,419	502,683,264
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,169,688	–185,500	18,984,188
Defense-Related Activities (054)	8,254,000		8,254,000
Total, Budget Authority Implication (050)	**529,677,533**	**243,919**	**529,921,452**

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
2	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	1	13,617			1	13,617
3	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP)	16	185,090			16	185,090
4	MQ–1 UAV	19	190,581			19	190,581
5	RQ–11 (RAVEN)	0	3,964				3,964
	ROTARY						
6	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)	55	416,617	35	196,000	90	612,617
	Risk reduction for buy of LUH to meet Army training fleet plans			[35]	[196,000]		
7	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	25	494,009			25	494,009
8	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	0	157,338				157,338
12	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	79	1,237,001	8	145,000	87	1,382,001
	Army unfunded priority only for Army National Guard			[8]	[145,000]		
13	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	0	132,138				132,138
14	CH–47 HELICOPTER	32	892,504			32	892,504
15	CH–47 HELICOPTER	0	102,361				102,361
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
16	MQ–1 PAYLOAD (MIP)	2	26,913			2	26,913
18	GUARDRAIL MODS (MIP)	0	14,182				14,182

19	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)	0	131,892			131,892
20	AH–64 MODS	0	181,869			181,869
21	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)	0	32,092			32,092
22	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS	0	15,029			15,029
23	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS	0	76,515			76,515
25	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN	0	114,182			114,182
26	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE	0	115,795			115,795
27	GATM ROLLUP	0	54,277			54,277
28	RQ–7 UAV MODS	0	125,380			125,380
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS					
29	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT	0	66,450	7,800		74,250
	At Army request transfer from APA 31			[7,800]		
30	SURVIVABILITY CM	0	0	32,400		32,400
	At Army request transfer from APA 31			[32,400]		
31	CMWS	0	107,364	–47,200		60,164
	At Army request transfer to APA 29 and APA 30			[–47,200]		
	OTHER SUPPORT					
32	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	6,847			6,847
33	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	0	29,231			29,231
34	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS	0	48,081			48,081
35	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	0	127,232			127,232
36	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	1,203			1,203
37	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET	387	2,931		387	2,931
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY TOTAL		**5,102,685**	**334,000**		**5,436,685**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM					
2	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD)	0	110,300			110,300
3	MSE MISSILE	70	384,605		70	384,605
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM					
4	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	0	4,452			4,452
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	338	77,668			338	77,668
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	1008	50,368			1008	50,368
7	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	0	19,984				19,984
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	534	127,145			534	127,145
9	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	2994	21,274			2994	21,274
	MODIFICATIONS						
12	PATRIOT MODS	0	131,838				131,838
13	STINGER MODS	0	1,355				1,355
14	AVENGER MODS	0	5,611				5,611
15	ITAS/TOW MODS	0	19,676				19,676
16	MLRS MODS	0	10,380				10,380
17	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS	0	6,008				6,008
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
18	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	36,930				36,930
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
19	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS	0	3,657				3,657
20	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MISSILES)	0	1,522				1,522
21	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT	0	4,710				4,710
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY TOTAL		**1,017,483**		**0**		**1,017,483**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	STRYKER VEHICLE	0	385,110				385,110
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
2	STRYKER (MOD)	0	39,683				39,683
3	FIST VEHICLE (MOD)	0	26,759				26,759

4	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)	0	107,506	37,000		144,506
	Army unfunded priority and industrial base risk mitigation			[37,000]		
5	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)	0	45,411			45,411
6	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	18	247,400		18	247,400
7	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	15	50,451	75,913	15	126,364
	Army unfunded priority and industrial base risk mitigation			[75,913]		
8	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)	0	2,473			2,473
9	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE	7	36,583		7	36,583
10	M88 FOV MODS	0	1,975			1,975
11	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	8	49,462	–41,200	8	8,262
	Early to need			[–41,200]		
12	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)	0	237,023	24,000		261,023
	Army unfunded priority and industrial base risk mitigation			[24,000]		
14	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV)	0	6,478			6,478
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES					
16	MORTAR SYSTEMS	0	5,012			5,012
17	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)	8959	28,390		8959	28,390
18	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM	0	148			148
19	CARBINE	38234	29,366	–8,750	38234	20,616
	At Army request transfer to WTCV 31 and RDTEA 70 and 86			[–8,750]		
21	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION	0	8,409			8,409
22	HANDGUN	4811	3,957		4811	3,957
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH					
24	M777 MODS	0	18,166			18,166
25	M4 CARBINE MODS	0	3,446	3,000		6,446
	At Army request transfer from WTCV 19, 28, and 31			[3,000]		
26	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS	0	25,296			25,296
27	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS	0	5,546			5,546
28	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS	0	4,635	–2,000		2,635
	At Army request transfer to WTCV 31 and RDTEA 70 and 86			[–2,000]		
29	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS	0	4,079			4,079
30	M119 MODIFICATIONS	0	72,718			72,718

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
31	M16 RIFLE MODS	0	1,952		–1,952		0
	At Army request transfer to WTCV 31 and RDTEA 70 and 86				[–1,952]		
32	MORTAR MODIFICATION	0	8,903				8,903
33	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	0	2,089				2,089
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
34	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)	0	2,005				2,005
35	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV)	0	8,911				8,911
36	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	0	414				414
37	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)	0	1,682				1,682
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY TOTAL		**1,471,438**		**86,011**		**1,557,449**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES	0	34,943				34,943
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES	0	12,418				12,418
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES	0	9,655		–1,500		8,155
	Program decrease—ahead of need				[–1,500]		
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES	0	29,304				29,304
6	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES	0	8,181				8,181
7	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	0	52,667				52,667
8	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	0	40,904		–1,900		39,004
	Program decrease—ahead of need				[–1,900]		
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
9	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	0	41,742				41,742
10	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	0	42,433				42,433
11	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	0	39,365				39,365

	TANK AMMUNITION					
12	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES	0	101,900			101,900
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION					
13	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES	0	37,455			37,455
14	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	0	47,023			47,023
15	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	416	35,672		416	35,672
16	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	0	94,010	–15,000		79,010
	Program decrease—PGK			[–15,000]		
	ROCKETS					
19	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	945			945
20	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	0	27,286			27,286
	OTHER AMMUNITION					
21	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	0	22,899			22,899
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	22,751			22,751
23	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES	0	7,082			7,082
24	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES	0	11,638			11,638
	MISCELLANEOUS					
25	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES	0	3,594			3,594
27	CAD/PAD ALL TYPES	0	5,430			5,430
28	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (AMMO)	0	8,337			8,337
29	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT	0	14,906			14,906
30	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)	0	14,349			14,349
31	CLOSEOUT LIABILITIES	0	111			111
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT					
32	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	148,092			148,092
33	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION	0	113,881			113,881
34	ARMS INITIATIVE	0	2,504			2,504
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY TOTAL		**1,031,477**	**–18,400**		**1,013,077**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	TACTICAL VEHICLES					
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS	0	7,987			7,987

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:	1	160			1	160
4	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	176	164,615			176	164,615
6	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP	19	8,415			19	8,415
7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	444	28,425			444	28,425
8	PLS ESP	198	89,263			198	89,263
13	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS	735	38,226			735	38,226
14	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP	768	91,173			768	91,173
15	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS	1	14,731			1	14,731
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
16	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN	1	175			1	175
17	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	25	1,338			25	1,338
18	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER	0	11,101				11,101
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
19	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK	1280	763,087		–125,000	1280	638,087
	Point of Presence (POP) and Soldier Network Extension (SNE) delay				[–125,000]		
20	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	69	21,157			69	21,157
21	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY	0	7,915				7,915
22	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)	0	5,440				5,440
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
23	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS	18	118,085			18	118,085
24	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS	21	13,999			21	13,999
25	SHF TERM	0	6,494				6,494
26	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE)	0	1,635				1,635
27	SMART-T (SPACE)	0	13,554				13,554
28	GLOBAL BRDCST SVC—GBS	0	18,899				18,899
29	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT)	0	2,849				2,849

30	ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC)	0	100,000			100,000
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS					
33	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM	2674	175,711	–88,000	2674	87,711
	Under execution of prior years funds			[–88,000]		
34	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	0	9,692	–8,000		1,692
	Under execution of prior years funds			[–8,000]		
35	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)	620	17,136		620	17,136
37	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2	3081	22,099		3081	22,099
38	TRACTOR DESK	0	3,724			3,724
39	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT	0	969			969
40	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS	0	294			294
41	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM	8344	24,354		8344	24,354
42	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE	0	17,445			17,445
43	RADIO, IMPROVED HF (COTS) FAMILY	0	1,028			1,028
44	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE	974	22,614		974	22,614
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM					
46	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE	0	1,519			1,519
47	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT	305	12,478		305	12,478
	INFORMATION SECURITY					
50	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP	0	2,113			2,113
51	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)	2750	69,646		2750	69,646
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS					
52	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS	0	28,913			28,913
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS					
53	INFORMATION SYSTEMS	0	97,091			97,091
54	DEFENSE MESSAGE SYSTEM (DMS)	0	246			246
55	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	0	5,362			5,362
56	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	0	79,965			79,965
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)					
60	JTT/CIBS-M	0	870			870
61	PROPHET GROUND	11	55,896		11	55,896
63	DCGS-A (MIP)	2423	128,207		2423	128,207

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
64	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	2	5,286			2	5,286
65	TROJAN (MIP)	0	12,614				12,614
66	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	0	3,901				3,901
67	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	358	7,392			358	7,392
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)						
68	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	3	24,828			3	24,828
70	AIR VIGILANCE (AV)	0	7,000				7,000
72	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	0	1,285				1,285
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
75	SENTINEL MODS	81	44,305			81	44,305
76	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	9700	160,901			9700	160,901
78	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	1935	18,520			1935	18,520
80	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS	173	68,296			173	68,296
81	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS)	1716	49,205		–12,000	1716	37,205
	Early to need				[–12,000]		
82	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	137	4,896			137	4,896
83	PROFILER	0	3,115				3,115
84	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (FIREFINDER RADARS)	0	4,186				4,186
85	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	2622	97,892		–10,000	2622	87,892
	Under execution of prior years funds				[–10,000]		
86	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS)	41	27,450			41	27,450
87	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	34	14,085			34	14,085
88	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	255	29,040			255	29,040
89	COUNTERFIRE RADARS	13	209,050		–80,400	13	128,650
	Excessive LRIP and concurrency				[–80,400]		
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						

92	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY	0	13,823			13,823
95	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	5	27,374		5	27,374
97	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)	0	2,508			2,508
99	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE	0	21,524			21,524
100	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)	3748	95,455		3748	95,455
101	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)	0	118,600			118,600
102	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP	0	32,970			32,970
104	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET	56	10,113		56	10,113
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION					
105	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION	0	9,015			9,015
106	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP	0	155,223	–15,000		140,223
	Reduce IT procurement			[–15,000]		
107	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM	0	16,581			16,581
108	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)	0	65,252			65,252
110	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)	0	17,631			17,631
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)					
112	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)	51	5,437		51	5,437
	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT					
113	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	0	426			426
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
113A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	3,707			3,707
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT					
115	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	0	937			937
116	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS)	0	1,930			1,930
117	CBRN DEFENSE	14506	17,468		14506	17,468
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT					
119	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	6	5,442		6	5,442
120	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP	0	11,013			11,013
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT					
121	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)	0	37,649			37,649
122	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS)	84	18,545		84	18,545
123	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)	1	4,701		1	4,701

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
124	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION	0	6,346				6,346
125	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	133	15,856			133	15,856
126	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	0	4,485				4,485
127	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	92	4,938			92	4,938
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
128	HEATERS AND ECU'S	628	9,235			628	9,235
130	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	1	1,677			1	1,677
131	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)	12273	16,728			12273	16,728
132	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM	3581	84,761			3581	84,761
134	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT	141	15,179			141	15,179
135	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM	1386	28,194			1386	28,194
137	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS	336	41,967			336	41,967
138	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)	859	20,090			859	20,090
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
139	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT	0	1,435				1,435
140	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	599	40,692			599	40,692
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
141	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL	2388	46,957			2388	46,957
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
142	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS	60	23,758			60	23,758
143	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)	585	2,789			585	2,789
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
144	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)	22	5,827			22	5,827
145	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	22	14,926			22	14,926
147	COMPACTOR	617	4,348			617	4,348
148	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	14	4,938			14	4,938

149	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED	95	34,071		95	34,071
150	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	4	4,938		4	4,938
151	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING	0	667			667
153	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP	0	14,924			14,924
154	CONST EQUIP ESP	79	15,933		79	15,933
155	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	53	6,749		53	6,749
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT					
156	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP	0	10,509			10,509
157	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	0	2,166			2,166
	GENERATORS					
158	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	3882	115,190		3882	115,190
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT					
160	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	146	14,327		146	14,327
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT					
161	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	1	65,062		1	65,062
162	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	43	101,295		43	101,295
163	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	0	13,406			13,406
164	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	0	14,440			14,440
165	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING	0	10,165			10,165
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)					
166	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT	0	5,726			5,726
167	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)	1657	37,482		1657	37,482
168	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)	415	16,061		415	16,061
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
170	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	2,380			2,380
171	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)	0	30,686			30,686
172	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT	0	1,008			1,008
173	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)	3209	98,559	–18,000	3209	80,559
	Watercraft C4ISR early to need			[–18,000]		
174	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)	0	1,697			1,697
175	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING	0	25,394			25,394
176	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS OPA3	963	12,975		963	12,975

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OPA2						
180	INITIAL SPARES—C&E	11	50,032			11	50,032
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY TOTAL		**4,893,634**		**–356,400**		**4,537,234**
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND						
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
4	OPERATIONS	0	115,058		–115,058		0
	Program decrease				[–115,058]		
	JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND TOTAL		**115,058**		**–115,058**		**0**
	SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY		**13,631,775**		**–69,847**		**13,561,928**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
1	EA–18G	0	43,547		25,000		68,547
	Preserve option of buying more EA–18G aircraft				[25,000]		
5	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	2	610,652			2	610,652
6	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	0	29,400				29,400
7	JSF STOVL	6	1,200,410			6	1,200,410
8	JSF STOVL	0	143,885				143,885
9	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	19	1,487,000			19	1,487,000
10	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	0	45,920				45,920
11	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	26	778,757			26	778,757
12	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	0	80,926				80,926
13	MH–60S (MYP)	8	210,209			8	210,209
15	MH–60R (MYP)	29	933,882			29	933,882

16	MH–60R (MYP)	0	106,686			106,686
17	P–8A POSEIDON	8	2,003,327		8	2,003,327
18	P–8A POSEIDON	0	48,457			48,457
19	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	4	819,870		4	819,870
20	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	0	225,765			225,765
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
23	KC–130J	1	92,290		1	92,290
26	MQ–4 TRITON	0	37,445			37,445
27	MQ–8 UAV	0	40,663			40,663
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT					
29	EA–6 SERIES	0	10,993			10,993
30	AEA SYSTEMS	0	34,768			34,768
31	AV–8 SERIES	0	65,472			65,472
32	ADVERSARY	0	8,418			8,418
33	F–18 SERIES	0	679,177			679,177
34	H–46 SERIES	0	480			480
36	H–53 SERIES	0	38,159			38,159
37	SH–60 SERIES	0	108,850			108,850
38	H–1 SERIES	0	45,033			45,033
39	EP–3 SERIES	0	32,890	20,000		52,890
	SPIRAL 3 & ELINT KITS			[20,000]		
40	P–3 SERIES	0	2,823			2,823
41	E–2 SERIES	0	21,208			21,208
42	TRAINER A/C SERIES	0	12,608			12,608
44	C–130 SERIES	0	40,378			40,378
45	FEWSG	0	640			640
46	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES	0	4,635			4,635
47	E–6 SERIES	0	212,876			212,876
48	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES	0	71,328			71,328
49	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT	0	21,317			21,317
50	T–45 SERIES	0	90,052			90,052
51	POWER PLANT CHANGES	0	19,094			19,094

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
52	JPATS SERIES	0	1,085				1,085
54	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT	0	155,644				155,644
55	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES	0	157,531				157,531
56	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM	0	1,958				1,958
57	ID SYSTEMS	0	38,880				38,880
58	P–8 SERIES	0	29,797				29,797
59	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION	0	14,770				14,770
60	MQ–8 SERIES	0	8,741				8,741
61	RQ–7 SERIES	0	2,542				2,542
62	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY	0	135,584				135,584
63	F–35 STOVL SERIES	0	285,968				285,968
64	F–35 CV SERIES	0	20,502				20,502
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
65	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	1,229,651		–35,000		1,194,651
	Reduce rate of growth in replenishment spares				[–35,000]		
66	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT	0	418,355				418,355
67	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	23,843				23,843
68	WAR CONSUMABLES	0	15,939				15,939
69	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	0	5,630				5,630
70	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	65,839				65,839
71	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	1,768				1,768
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY TOTAL		**13,074,317**		**10,000**		**13,084,317**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
1	TRIDENT II MODS	0	1,190,455		11,000		1,201,455

	Additional FCET				[11,000]		
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	5,671				5,671
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
3	TOMAHAWK	100	194,258	100	82,000	200	276,258
	Maintain minimum sustaining rate of production			[100]	[82,000]		
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
4	AMRAAM	0	32,165				32,165
5	SIDEWINDER	167	73,928			167	73,928
6	JSOW	200	130,759			200	130,759
7	STANDARD MISSILE	110	445,836			110	445,836
8	RAM	90	80,792			90	80,792
11	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	14	1,810			14	1,810
12	AERIAL TARGETS	0	48,046				48,046
13	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT	0	3,295				3,295
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
14	ESSM	104	119,434			104	119,434
15	HARM MODS	0	111,739				111,739
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
16	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	0	2,531				2,531
17	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON	0	208,700				208,700
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
18	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	73,211				73,211
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
19	SSTD	0	6,562				6,562
20	MK–48 TORPEDO	0	14,153				14,153
21	ASW TARGETS	0	2,515				2,515
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
22	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS	0	98,928				98,928
23	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS	0	46,893				46,893
24	QUICKSTRIKE MINE	0	6,966				6,966
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
25	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	52,670				52,670
26	ASW RANGE SUPPORT	0	3,795				3,795
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
27	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	3,692				3,692
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
28	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS	0	13,240				13,240
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
29	CIWS MODS	0	75,108				75,108
30	COAST GUARD WEAPONS	0	18,948				18,948
31	GUN MOUNT MODS	0	62,651				62,651
33	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS	0	15,006				15,006
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
35	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	74,188				74,188
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY TOTAL		**3,217,945**		**93,000**		**3,310,945**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC						
	NAVY AMMUNITION						
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	0	107,069				107,069
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	0	70,396				70,396
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	0	20,284				20,284
4	PRACTICE BOMBS	0	26,701				26,701
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	0	53,866				53,866
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	0	59,294				59,294
7	JATOS	0	2,766				2,766
8	LRLAP 6″ LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE	0	113,092				113,092
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	0	35,702				35,702

10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	0	36,475			36,475	
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	0	43,906			43,906	
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	0	51,535			51,535	
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	0	11,652			11,652	
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	4,473			4,473	
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION						
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	0	31,708			31,708	
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES	0	692			692	
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES	0	13,630			13,630	
18	60MM, ALL TYPES	0	2,261			2,261	
19	81MM, ALL TYPES	0	1,496			1,496	
20	120MM, ALL TYPES	0	14,855			14,855	
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	0	4,000			4,000	
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	0	16,853			16,853	
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	0	14,772			14,772	
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES	0	9,972			9,972	
27	NON LETHALS	0	998			998	
28	AMMO MODERNIZATION	0	12,319			12,319	
29	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	11,178			11,178	
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC TOTAL		**771,945**	**0**		**771,945**	
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY						
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	0	1,300,000			1,300,000	
2	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,553,254		2	3,553,254	
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	0	2,330,325			2,330,325	
04	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		0	46,000		46,000	
	Transfer from OMN, line 360			[46,000]			
6	DDG 1000	0	419,532			419,532	
7	DDG–51	2	2,671,415		2	2,671,415	
8	DDG–51	0	134,039			134,039	
9	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	3	1,427,049		3	1,427,049	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
10	LPD–17	0	12,565				12,565
14	LHA REPLACEMENT	0	29,093				29,093
15	JOINT HIGH SPEED VESSEL	0	4,590				4,590
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
16	MOORED TRAINING SHIP	1	737,268			1	737,268
17	MOORED TRAINING SHIP	0	64,388				64,388
18	OUTFITTING	0	546,104				546,104
19	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR	2	123,233			2	123,233
20	LCAC SLEP	2	40,485	2	45,000	4	85,485
	At USMC request transfer from RDTEN 53			[2]	[45,000]		
21	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS	0	1,007,285				1,007,285
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY TOTAL		**14,400,625**		**91,000**		**14,491,625**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
1	LM–2500 GAS TURBINE	0	7,822				7,822
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE	0	2,155				2,155
3	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)	0	22,704				22,704
	GENERATORS						
4	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E	0	29,120				29,120
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT						
5	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	0	45,431				45,431
	PERISCOPES						
6	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP	0	60,970				60,970
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						

7	DDG MOD	0	338,569	338,569
8	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	0	15,486	15,486
9	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	0	2,219	2,219
10	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE	0	17,928	17,928
11	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM	0	22,025	22,025
12	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	0	12,607	12,607
13	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	16,492	16,492
14	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	74,129	74,129
15	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	36,206	36,206
16	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	0	37,352	37,352
17	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	49,095	49,095
18	ELECTRONIC DRY AIR	0	2,996	2,996
19	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	0	11,558	11,558
20	DSSP EQUIPMENT	0	5,518	5,518
22	LCAC	0	7,158	7,158
23	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	0	58,783	58,783
24	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	68,748	68,748
25	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	0	2,937	2,937
26	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	8,385	8,385
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT			
28	REACTOR COMPONENTS	0	288,822	288,822
	OCEAN ENGINEERING			
29	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	0	10,572	10,572
	SMALL BOATS			
30	STANDARD BOATS	0	129,784	129,784
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT			
31	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	17,152	17,152
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT			
32	OPERATING FORCES IPE	0	39,409	39,409
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT			
33	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS	0	118,129	118,129
34	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT	0	37,413	37,413

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
35	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES	0	15,270				15,270
36	LCS ASW MISSION MODULES	0	2,729				2,729
37	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES	0	44,208				44,208
38	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	0	42,276				42,276
	SHIP SONARS						
40	SPQ–9B RADAR	0	28,007				28,007
41	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM	0	79,802				79,802
42	SSN ACOUSTICS	0	165,655				165,655
43	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	9,487				9,487
44	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS	0	11,621				11,621
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
46	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM	0	24,221				24,221
47	SSTD	0	12,051				12,051
48	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	0	170,831				170,831
49	SURTASS	0	9,619				9,619
50	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNSAISANCE FORCE	0	14,390				14,390
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
51	AN/SLQ–32	0	214,582				214,582
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
52	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT	0	124,862				124,862
53	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	0	164				164
	SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT						
54	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG	0	45,362				45,362
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
55	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	0	33,939				33,939
56	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS)	0	324				324

57	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	0	18,192	18,192
58	ATDLS	0	16,768	16,768
59	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	0	5,219	5,219
60	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	0	42,108	42,108
62	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	0	15,232	15,232
63	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	0	4,524	4,524
64	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	0	6,382	6,382
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT			
65	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	46,122	46,122
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT			
66	MATCALS	0	16,999	16,999
67	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	0	9,366	9,366
68	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM	0	21,357	21,357
69	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM	0	26,639	26,639
70	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS	0	9,214	9,214
71	LANDING SYSTEMS	0	13,902	13,902
72	ID SYSTEMS	0	34,901	34,901
73	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	0	13,950	13,950
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT			
74	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL	0	1,205	1,205
75	MARITIME INTEGRATED BROADCAST SYSTEM	0	3,447	3,447
76	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	0	16,766	16,766
77	DCGS-N	0	23,649	23,649
78	CANES	0	357,589	357,589
79	RADIAC	0	8,343	8,343
80	CANES-INTELL	0	65,015	65,015
81	GPETE	0	6,284	6,284
82	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	0	4,016	4,016
83	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	0	4,113	4,113
84	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	45,053	45,053
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS			
85	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	0	14,410	14,410

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
86	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	0	20,830				20,830
88	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	0	14,145				14,145
89	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	0	11,057				11,057
90	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT	0	67,852				67,852
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
91	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	0	13,218				13,218
92	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)	0	272,076				272,076
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
93	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT	0	4,369				4,369
94	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS	0	1,402				1,402
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
95	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	0	110,766				110,766
96	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM	0	979				979
97	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP	0	11,502				11,502
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
98	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT	0	2,967				2,967
	SONOBUOYS						
100	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES	0	182,946				182,946
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
101	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	47,944				47,944
103	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	76,683				76,683
106	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT	0	12,575				12,575
107	DCRS/DPL	0	1,415				1,415
109	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES	0	23,152				23,152
114	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	52,555				52,555
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						

115	SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT	0	5,572	5,572
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT			
118	SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	165,769	165,769
123	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	61,462	61,462
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
126	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	0	229,832	229,832
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
127	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	0	66,020	66,020
128	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	7,559	7,559
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
132	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	0	20,619	20,619
133	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	11,251	11,251
137	TRAINING DEVICE MODS	0	84,080	84,080
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
138	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	0	2,282	2,282
139	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	0	547	547
140	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	0	8,949	8,949
141	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	0	14,621	14,621
142	TACTICAL VEHICLES	0	957	957
143	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	0	8,187	8,187
144	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	0	2,942	2,942
145	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	0	17,592	17,592
146	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	0	1,177	1,177
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
147	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	0	10,937	10,937
148	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	10,374	10,374
149	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	5,668	5,668
150	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	0	90,921	90,921
	TRAINING DEVICES			
151	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	22,046	22,046
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
152	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	24,208	24,208

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
153	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	874				874
154	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	2,634				2,634
156	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	3,573				3,573
157	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	3,997				3,997
158	C4ISR EQUIPMENT	0	9,638				9,638
159	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	21,001				21,001
160	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0	94,957				94,957
161	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	0	87,214		–15,000		72,214
	Program reduction				[–15,000]		
	OTHER						
164	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE	0	116,165				116,165
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
164A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	10,847				10,847
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
165	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	325,084				325,084
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY TOTAL		**5,975,828**		**–15,000**		**5,960,828**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
1	AAV7A1 PIP	0	16,756				16,756
2	LAV PIP	0	77,736				77,736
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
3	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	5,742				5,742
4	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER	0	4,532				4,532
5	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM	0	19,474				19,474
6	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION	0	7,250				7,250

	OTHER SUPPORT				
7	MODIFICATION KITS	0	21,909		21,909
8	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM	0	3,208		3,208
	GUIDED MISSILES				
9	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE	0	31,439		31,439
10	JAVELIN	0	343		343
11	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW	0	4,995		4,995
12	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)	0	1,589		1,589
	OTHER SUPPORT				
13	MODIFICATION KITS	0	5,134		5,134
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS				
14	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER	0	9,178		9,178
15	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C	0	12,272		12,272
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT				
16	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT	0	30,591		30,591
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)				
17	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	2,385		2,385
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)				
19	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)	0	4,205		4,205
20	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS	0	8,002		8,002
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
21	RADAR SYSTEMS	0	19,595		19,595
22	Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar	2	89,230	2	89,230
23	RQ–21 UAS	3	70,565	3	70,565
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
24	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM	0	11,860		11,860
25	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	44,340		44,340
28	RQ–11 UAV	0	2,737		2,737
30	DCGS-MC	0	20,620		20,620
	OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
31	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT	0	9,798		9,798
32	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN)	0	2,073		2,073

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
33	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES	0	33,570				33,570
34	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS	0	38,186				38,186
35	RADIO SYSTEMS	0	64,494				64,494
36	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS	0	72,956				72,956
37	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT	0	43,317				43,317
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
37A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	2,498				2,498
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES						
38	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES	0	332				332
39	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES	0	11,035				11,035
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
40	5/4T TRUCK HMMWV (MYP)	0	57,255				57,255
41	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS	0	938				938
44	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	7	7,500			7	7,500
45	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS	0	10,179				10,179
	OTHER SUPPORT						
46	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	11,023				11,023
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
47	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT	0	994				994
48	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT	0	1,256				1,256
49	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS	0	3,750				3,750
50	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED	0	8,985		2,900		11,885
	USMC unfunded priority				[2,900]		
51	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	0	4,418				4,418
52	EOD SYSTEMS	0	6,528				6,528
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						

53	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	0	26,510			26,510	
54	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE)	0	1,910			1,910	
55	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	0	8,807			8,807	
56	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	0	128			128	
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
58	TRAINING DEVICES	0	3,412			3,412	
59	CONTAINER FAMILY	0	1,662			1,662	
60	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT	0	3,669			3,669	
62	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	4,272			4,272	
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
63	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	16,210			16,210	
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS TOTAL		**983,352**	**2,900**		**986,252**	
	SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY		**38,424,012**	**181,900**		**38,605,912**	
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
1	F–35	26	3,553,046		26	3,553,046	
2	F–35	0	291,880			291,880	
3	KC–46A TANKER	7	1,582,685		7	1,582,685	
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
4	C–130J	7	482,396		7	482,396	
5	C–130J	0	140,000			140,000	
6	HC–130J	4	332,024		4	332,024	
7	HC–130J	0	50,000			50,000	
8	MC–130J	2	190,971		2	190,971	
9	MC–130J	0	80,000			80,000	
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT						
12	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	6	2,562		6	2,562	
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
13	TARGET DRONES	37	98,576		37	98,576	
16	RQ–4	0	54,475	–10,000		44,475	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Delayed trainer				[–10,000]		
17	AC–130J	0	1				1
18	MQ–9	12	240,218		–37,800	12	202,418
	Use available prior year funds for FY 15 requirements				[–37,800]		
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT						
20	B–2A	0	23,865				23,865
21	B–1B	0	140,252				140,252
22	B–52	0	180,148				180,148
23	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES	0	13,159				13,159
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
25	F–15	0	387,314				387,314
26	F–16	0	12,336				12,336
27	F–22A	0	180,207				180,207
28	F–35 MODIFICATIONS	0	187,646				187,646
29	INCREMENT 3.2B	0	28,500				28,500
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
30	C–5	0	14,731				14,731
31	C–5M	0	331,466		–50,000		281,466
	Delayed installation of RERP kits				[–50,000]		
33	C–17A	0	127,494				127,494
34	C–21	0	264				264
35	C–32A	0	8,767				8,767
36	C–37A	0	18,457				18,457
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
38	GLIDER MODS	0	132				132
39	T–6	0	14,486				14,486

40	T–1	0	7,650		7,650
41	T–38	0	34,845		34,845
	OTHER AIRCRAFT				
42	U–2 MODS		0	64,300	64,300
	Keep U–2 rather than enhance Global Hawk Block 30			[64,300]	
44	KC–10A (ATCA)	0	34,313		34,313
45	C–12	0	1,960		1,960
48	VC–25A MOD	0	1,072		1,072
49	C–40	0	7,292		7,292
50	C–130	0	35,869	47,600	83,469
	C–130 enigine upgrades			[22,600]	
	C–130 avionics modernization program			[25,000]	
51	C–130J MODS	0	7,919		7,919
52	C–135	0	63,568		63,568
53	COMPASS CALL MODS	0	57,828		57,828
54	RC–135	0	152,746		152,746
55	E–3	0	16,491		16,491
56	E–4	0	22,341		22,341
58	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	0	160,284		160,284
59	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	0	32,026		32,026
60	H–1	0	8,237		8,237
61	H–60	0	60,110		60,110
62	RQ–4 MODS	0	21,354		21,354
63	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS	0	1,902		1,902
64	OTHER AIRCRAFT	0	32,106		32,106
65	MQ–1 MODS	0	4,755		4,755
66	MQ–9 MODS	0	155,445	–30,000	125,445
	Lynx radar			[–30,000]	
69	CV–22 MODS	0	74,874		74,874
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
70	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	0	466,562		466,562
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
71	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP	0	22,470				22,470
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
74	B–2A	0	44,793				44,793
75	B–52	0	5,249				5,249
77	C–17A	0	20,110				20,110
78	CV–22 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT	0	16,931				16,931
80	C–135	0	4,414				4,414
81	F–15	0	1,122				1,122
82	F–16	0	10,994				10,994
83	F–22A	0	5,929				5,929
84	OTHER AIRCRAFT	0	27				27
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
85	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS	0	21,363				21,363
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
86	WAR CONSUMABLES	0	82,906				82,906
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
87	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES	0	1,007,276				1,007,276
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
87A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	69,380				69,380
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE TOTAL		**11,542,571**		**–15,900**		**11,526,671**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC						
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC	0	80,187				80,187
	TACTICAL						
3	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE	224	337,438			224	337,438

4	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	303	132,995		303	132,995	
5	AMRAAM	200	329,600		200	329,600	
6	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	283	33,878		283	33,878	
7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	246	70,578	–52,531	246	18,047	
	Delay in Milestone C and contract award			[–52,531]			
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
8	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION	0	749			749	
	CLASS IV						
9	MM III MODIFICATIONS	0	28,477			28,477	
10	AGM–65D MAVERICK	0	276			276	
11	AGM–88A HARM	0	297			297	
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	0	16,083			16,083	
13	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	0	6,924			6,924	
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
14	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS	0	87,366			87,366	
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
15	ADVANCED EHF	0	298,890			298,890	
16	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)	0	38,971			38,971	
17	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	1	235,397		1	235,397	
18	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	0	57,000			57,000	
19	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)	0	16,201			16,201	
20	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)	0	52,090			52,090	
21	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE)	0	87,000	–87,000		0	
	Program decrease			[–87,000]			
22	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH (INFRAST.)	0	750,143			750,143	
23	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	3	630,903		3	630,903	
24	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)	0	450,884			450,884	
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
28	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS	0	60,179			60,179	
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
28A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	888,000			888,000	
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE TOTAL		**4,690,506**	**–139,531**		**4,550,975**	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
1	ROCKETS	0	4,696				4,696
	CARTRIDGES						
2	CARTRIDGES	0	133,271				133,271
	BOMBS						
3	PRACTICE BOMBS	0	31,998				31,998
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	0	148,614		8,800		157,414
	Readiness funding increase—PACOM unfunded priority list				[8,800]		
5	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2973	101,400			2973	101,400
	OTHER ITEMS						
6	CAD/PAD	0	29,989				29,989
7	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)	0	6,925				6,925
8	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	494				494
9	MODIFICATIONS	0	1,610				1,610
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	4,237				4,237
	FLARES						
11	FLARES	0	86,101				86,101
	FUZES						
12	FUZES	0	103,417				103,417
	SMALL ARMS						
13	SMALL ARMS	0	24,648				24,648
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE TOTAL		**677,400**		**8,800**		**686,200**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						

	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES				
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	0	6,528		6,528
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES				
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE	0	7,639		7,639
3	CAP VEHICLES	0	961		961
4	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	11,027		11,027
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES				
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	0	4,447		4,447
6	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	693		693
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT				
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES	0	10,152		10,152
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT				
8	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	15,108		15,108
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT				
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP	0	10,212		10,212
10	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	57,049		57,049
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)				
11	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	0	106,182		106,182
12	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC)	0	1,363		1,363
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS				
13	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	0	2,832		2,832
14	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT	0	32,329	–3,000	29,329
	NCCT			[–3,000]	
16	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	0	15,649		15,649
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS				
17	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS	0	42,200		42,200
18	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	0	6,333		6,333
19	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED	0	2,708		2,708
20	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS	0	50,033		50,033
21	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	0	16,348		16,348
22	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	0	139,984		139,984
23	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	0	20,101		20,101

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
26	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN)	0	9,060				9,060
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
27	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	0	39,100				39,100
28	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	0	19,010				19,010
29	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	0	11,462				11,462
30	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	0	37,426				37,426
31	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	0	26,634				26,634
32	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N	0	1,289				1,289
33	C3 COUNTERMEASURES	0	11,508				11,508
34	GCSS-AF FOS	0	3,670				3,670
35	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM	0	15,298				15,298
36	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM	0	9,565				9,565
37	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS	0	25,772				25,772
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
38	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS	0	81,286		31,300		112,586
	Transfer from OPAF 39				[31,300]		
39	AFNET	0	122,228		–31,300		90,928
	Transfer to OPAF 38				[–31,300]		
41	USCENTCOM	0	16,342				16,342
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
42	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	0	60,230				60,230
43	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	0	26,100				26,100
44	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	0	2,075				2,075
45	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	0	4,656				4,656
46	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	0	54,630				54,630
47	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	0	69,713				69,713

48	MILSATCOM SPACE	0	41,355		41,355
49	SPACE MODS SPACE	0	31,722		31,722
50	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	0	61,603		61,603
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE				
51	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	0	50,335		50,335
53	RADIO EQUIPMENT	0	14,846		14,846
54	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	0	3,635		3,635
55	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	0	79,607		79,607
	MODIFICATIONS				
56	COMM ELECT MODS	0	105,398		105,398
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP				
57	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	0	12,577		12,577
58	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	31,209		31,209
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ				
59	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	0	7,670		7,670
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
60	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	0	14,125	23,600	37,725
	ICBM training equipment			[23,600]	
61	CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	0	16,744		16,744
62	PRODUCTIVITY CAPITAL INVESTMENT	0	2,495		2,495
63	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	0	10,573		10,573
64	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	5,462		5,462
66	DARP RC135	0	24,710		24,710
67	DCGS-AF	0	206,743		206,743
69	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM	0	537,370		537,370
70	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG.	0	77,898		77,898
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
70A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	13,990,196		13,990,196
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
72	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS	0	32,813		32,813
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE TOTAL		**16,566,018**	**20,600**	**16,586,618**

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE		**33,476,495**		**–126,031**		**33,350,464**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
1	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	1,594				1,594
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA						
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	4,325				4,325
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
3	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	0	17,268				17,268
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
8	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY	0	10,491				10,491
10	TELEPORT PROGRAM	0	80,622				80,622
11	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	0	14,147				14,147
12	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	0	1,921				1,921
13	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK	0	80,144				80,144
15	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	0	8,755				8,755
16	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY	0	33,737				33,737
17	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE	0	32,544				32,544
18	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT	0	13,300				13,300
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA						
20	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	7,436				7,436
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT						
21	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	11,640			3	11,640
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA						
22	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS	0	1,269				1,269
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS						

24	VEHICLES	0	1,500				1,500
25	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	0	1,039				1,039
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
26	VEHICLES	1	50			1	50
27	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT	3	7,639			3	7,639
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY						
28	AEGIS BMD ADVANCE PROCUREMENT	0	68,880				68,880
29	THAAD	31	464,424			31	464,424
30	AEGIS BMD	30	435,430			30	435,430
31	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS	0	48,140				48,140
32	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III	0	225,774				225,774
34	IRON DOME	1	175,972	–1	–175,972		0
	Transfer to RDT&E, Defense-Wide Line 96			-01	[–175,972]		
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA						
41	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)	0	3,448				3,448
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD						
42	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	0	43,708				43,708
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
44	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS	0	10,783				10,783
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS						
46	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS	0	29,599				29,599
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
46A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	0	540,894				540,894
	AVIATION PROGRAMS						
47	MC–12	0	40,500		–40,500		0
	Unjustified Request				[–40,500]		
48	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT	0	112,226				112,226
49	MH–60 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	0	3,021				3,021
50	NON-STANDARD AVIATION	0	48,200				48,200
52	MH–47 CHINOOK	0	22,230				22,230
53	RQ–11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	0	6,397				6,397
54	CV–22 MODIFICATION	0	25,578				25,578

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
56	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE	0	15,651		5,700		21,351
	Capability Improvements				[5,700]		
57	STUASL0	0	1,500				1,500
58	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE	0	145,929				145,929
59	AC/MC–130J	0	65,130				65,130
61	C–130 MODIFICATIONS	0	39,563				39,563
	SHIPBUILDING						
63	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS	0	25,459				25,459
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS						
65	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M	0	144,336				144,336
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS						
68	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS	0	81,001				81,001
70	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	0	17,323				17,323
71	OTHER ITEMS <$5M	0	84,852				84,852
72	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS	0	51,937				51,937
74	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	0	31,017				31,017
75	TACTICAL VEHICLES	0	63,134				63,134
76	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <$5M	0	192,448				192,448
78	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS	0	19,984				19,984
81	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	0	5,044				5,044
82	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	0	38,126				38,126
88	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	0	243,849				243,849
	CBDP						
95	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS	0	170,137				170,137
96	CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION	0	150,392				150,392
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE TOTAL		**4,221,437**		**–210,772**		**4,010,665**

	SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE-WIDE		**4,221,437**	**–210,772**	**4,010,665**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND				
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND				
1	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND	0	20,000		20,000
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND TOTAL		**20,000**	**0**	**20,000**
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS				
1	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS		–265,685	265,685	0
	PRIOR YEAR RESCISSIONS TOTAL		**–265,685**	**265,685**	**0**
	TOTAL, TITLE I		**89,508,034**	**40,935**	**89,548,969**

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	13,464		13,464
2	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	238,167		238,167
3	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	69,808	20,000	89,808
		Basic research program increase		[20,000]	
4	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	102,737		102,737
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**424,176**	**20,000**	**444,176**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
5	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	28,006		28,006
6	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	33,515		33,515
7	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	16,358		16,358
8	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	63,433		63,433
9	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	18,502		18,502
10	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	46,194		46,194
11	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	28,528		28,528
12	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	27,435		27,435

13	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	72,883		72,883
14	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	85,597		85,597
15	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,971		3,971
16	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	6,853		6,853
17	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	38,069		38,069
18	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	56,435		56,435
19	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	38,445		38,445
20	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	25,939		25,939
21	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	23,783		23,783
22	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	15,659		15,659
23	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	33,817		33,817
24	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	10,764		10,764
25	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	63,311		63,311
26	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	23,295		23,295
27	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	25,751		25,751
28	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	76,068		76,068
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**862,611**	**0**	**862,611**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
29	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	65,139		65,139
30	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	67,291		67,291
31	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	88,990		88,990
32	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	57,931		57,931
33	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	110,031		110,031
34	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	6,883		6,883
35	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,580		13,580
36	0603008A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,871		44,871
37	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	7,492		7,492
38	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	16,749		16,749
39	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	14,483		14,483
41	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	24,270		24,270
42	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	3,440		3,440

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
43	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,406		2,406
44	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	26,057		26,057
45	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,957		44,957
46	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	11,105		11,105
47	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	181,609		181,609
48	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	13,074		13,074
49	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	7,321		7,321
50	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,138		44,138
51	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	9,197		9,197
52	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	17,613		17,613
53	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	39,164		39,164
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**917,791**	**0**	**917,791**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
54	0603305A	ARMY MISSLE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	12,797		12,797
55	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	13,999		13,999
58	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	29,334		29,334
60	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	9,602		9,602
61	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	8,953		8,953
62	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	3,052		3,052
63	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	7,830		7,830
65	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,954		2,954
67	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	13,386		13,386
69	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	23,659		23,659
70	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	6,830	3,000	9,830
		At Army request transfer from WTCV 19, 28, and 31		[3,000]	
72	0604100A	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	9,913		9,913

73	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	74,740		74,740
74	0604120A	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT)	9,930		9,930
76	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2–INTERCEPT (IFPC2)	96,177	–30,000	66,177
		Program delay and funds requested early to need		[–30,000]	
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**323,156**	**–27,000**	**296,156**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
79	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	37,246		37,246
81	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	6,002		6,002
82	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO	9,832		9,832
83	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	9,730		9,730
84	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	5,532		5,532
85	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	19,929		19,929
86	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	27,884	1,702	29,586
		Only for XM25 CDTEWS under execution of prior years funds		[–5,000]	
		At Army request transfer from WTCV 19, 28, and 31		[6,702]	
87	0604604A	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLES	210		210
88	0604611A	JAVELIN	4,166		4,166
89	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	12,913		12,913
90	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	16,764		16,764
91	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	6,770		6,770
92	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	65,333		65,333
93	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	1,335		1,335
94	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	8,945		8,945
96	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	15,906		15,906
97	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,394		4,394
98	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	11,084		11,084
99	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	10,027		10,027
100	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	42,430		42,430
101	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	105,279		105,279
102	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	15,006		15,006
103	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	24,581		24,581

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
104	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	4,433		4,433
105	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	30,397		30,397
106	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	57,705		57,705
108	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	29,683		29,683
109	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	5,224		5,224
111	0604823A	FIREFINDER	37,492		37,492
112	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	6,157		6,157
113	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	1,912		1,912
116	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	69,761		69,761
117	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	138,465		138,465
118	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	92,353		92,353
119	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	8,440		8,440
120	0605031A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN)	17,999		17,999
121	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM)	145,409		145,409
122	0605350A	WIN-T INCREMENT 3—FULL NETWORKING	113,210		113,210
123	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	6,882		6,882
124	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	83,838		83,838
125	0605456A	PAC–3/MSE MISSILE	35,009		35,009
126	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	142,584		142,584
127	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE	49,160		49,160
128	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR	17,748		17,748
129	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	15,212		15,212
130	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	45,718		45,718
131	0605830A	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	10,041		10,041
132	0210609A	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	83,300		83,300
133	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	983		983
134	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	8,961		8,961

		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**1,719,374**	**1,702**	**1,721,076**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
135	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	18,062		18,062
136	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,040		10,040
137	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	60,317		60,317
138	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,612		20,612
139	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	176,041	11,000	187,041
		Additional SSA operations (STRATCOM unfunded priority)		[11,000]	
140	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	19,439		19,439
142	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	275,025		275,025
143	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	45,596		45,596
144	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	33,295		33,295
145	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,700		4,700
146	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,413		6,413
147	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	20,746		20,746
148	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	7,015		7,015
149	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	49,221		49,221
150	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	55,039		55,039
151	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	1,125		1,125
152	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	64,169		64,169
153	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	32,319		32,319
154	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	49,052		49,052
155	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	2,612		2,612
156	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	49,592		49,592
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,000,430**	**11,000**	**1,011,430**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
158	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	17,112		17,112
159	0607141A	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION	3,654		3,654
160	0607664A	BIOMETRIC ENABLING CAPABILITY (BEC)	1,332		1,332
161	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	152,991		152,991

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
194	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	76,225		76,225
162	0102419A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT OFFICE	54,076		54,076
163	0203726A	ADV FIELD ARTILLERY TACTICAL DATA SYSTEM	22,374		22,374
164	0203728A	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOCS)	24,371		24,371
165	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	295,177		295,177
166	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	45,092		45,092
167	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	264,887		264,887
168	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	381		381
169	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	10,912		10,912
170	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	5,115		5,115
171	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	49,848		49,848
172	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	22,691		22,691
173	0205402A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	4,364		4,364
174	0205410A	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	834		834
175	0205412A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV	280		280
176	0205456A	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM	78,758		78,758
177	0205778A	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS)	45,377		45,377
178	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	10,209		10,209
181	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	12,525		12,525
182	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	14,175		14,175
183	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	4,527		4,527
184	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	11,011		11,011
185	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	2,151		2,151
187	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	22,870		22,870
188	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	20,155		20,155
189	0305219A	MQ–1C GRAY EAGLE UAS	46,472		46,472
191	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	16,389		16,389

192	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	1,974		1,974
193	0310349A	WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING	3,249		3,249
194A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,802		4,802
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,346,360**	**0**	**1,346,360**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**6,593,898**	**5,702**	**6,599,600**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	113,908	20,000	133,908
		Basic research program increase		[20,000]	
2	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,734		18,734
3	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	443,697		443,697
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**576,339**	**20,000**	**596,339**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
4	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	95,753		95,753
5	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	139,496		139,496
6	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	45,831		45,831
7	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	43,541		43,541
8	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	46,923		46,923
9	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	107,872		107,872
10	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,388		45,388
11	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	5,887		5,887
12	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	86,880		86,880
13	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	170,786		170,786
14	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	32,526		32,526
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**820,883**	**0**	**820,883**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
15	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	37,734		37,734
16	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,831		25,831

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
17	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	64,623		64,623
18	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	128,397		128,397
19	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,506		11,506
20	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	256,144		256,144
21	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,838		4,838
22	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	9,985		9,985
23	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	53,956		53,956
24	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	2,000		2,000
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**595,014**	**0**	**595,014**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
25	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	40,429		40,429
26	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	4,325		4,325
27	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	2,991		2,991
28	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	12,651		12,651
29	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,782		7,782
30	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	5,275		5,275
31	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	1,646		1,646
32	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	100,349		100,349
33	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	52,781		52,781
34	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	5,959		5,959
35	0603525N	PILOT FISH	148,865		148,865
36	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	25,365		25,365
37	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	80,477		80,477
38	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	669		669
39	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	1,060		1,060
40	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	70,551		70,551

41	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	8,044		8,044
42	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	17,864		17,864
43	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	23,716		23,716
44	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	499,961		499,961
45	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	21,026		21,026
46	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	542,700		542,700
47	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	88,734		88,734
48	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	20,881		20,881
49	0603595N	OHIO REPLACEMENT	849,277		849,277
50	0603596N	LCS MISSION MODULES	196,948		196,948
51	0603597N	AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST (ATRT)	8,115		8,115
52	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	7,603		7,603
53	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	105,749	–67,700	38,049
		At USMC request transfer to RDTEN 183		[–7,000]	
		At USMC request transfer to SCN 20		[–45,000]	
		At USMC request transfer to OMMC 130		[–15,700]	
54	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,342		1,342
55	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	21,399		21,399
56	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT	43,578		43,578
57	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	7,764		7,764
58	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	13,200		13,200
59	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	69,415		69,415
60	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	2,588		2,588
61	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	176,301		176,301
62	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,873		3,873
63	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	376,028		376,028
64	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	272,096		272,096
65	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	42,233		42,233
66	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	46,504		46,504
67	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	25,109		25,109
68	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,659		9,659
69	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	318		318

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
70	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	40,912		40,912
71	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	54,896		54,896
73	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	58,696		58,696
74	0604112N	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80)	43,613		43,613
75	0604122N	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	21,110		21,110
76	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	5,657		5,657
77	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION	8,033		8,033
78	0604454N	LX (R)	36,859		36,859
79	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW)	15,227		15,227
81	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	22,393		22,393
82	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	202,939	–202,939	0
		Halt program pending analysis demonstrating need		[–202,939]	
83	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH ..	11,450		11,450
84	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	6,495		6,495
85	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	332		332
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**4,591,812**	**–270,639**	**4,321,173**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
86	0603208N	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	25,153		25,153
87	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	46,154		46,154
88	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	25,372		25,372
89	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	53,712		53,712
90	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	11,434		11,434
91	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	2,164		2,164
92	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,710		1,710
93	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	9,094		9,094
94	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	70,248		70,248

95	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	193,200	193,200
96	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	44,115	44,115
97	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	23,227	23,227
98	0604262N	V–22A	61,249	61,249
99	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	15,014	15,014
100	0604269N	EA–18	18,730	18,730
101	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	28,742	28,742
102	0604273N	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	388,086	388,086
103	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	246,856	246,856
104	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	7,106	7,106
105	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	189,112	189,112
106	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	376	376
107	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	71,849	71,849
108	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	53,198	53,198
109	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	38,941	38,941
110	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION	7,832	7,832
111	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	15,263	15,263
112	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM	403,017	403,017
113	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	20,409	20,409
114	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	71,565	71,565
115	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	29,037	29,037
116	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	122,083	122,083
118	0604522N	ADVANCED MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM	144,706	144,706
119	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	72,695	72,695
120	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	38,985	38,985
121	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	48,470	48,470
122	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,935	3,935
123	0604580N	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM)	132,602	132,602
124	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	19,067	19,067
125	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	25,280	25,280
126	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	8,985	8,985
127	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	7,669	7,669

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
128	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	4,400		4,400
129	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	56,889		56,889
130	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	96,937		96,937
131	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	134,564		134,564
132	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	200		200
133	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	8,287		8,287
134	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	29,504		29,504
135	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	513,021		513,021
136	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	516,456		516,456
137	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,887		2,887
138	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	66,317		66,317
139	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	573,187		573,187
140	0605220N	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC)	67,815		67,815
141	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	6,300		6,300
142	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	308,037		308,037
143	0204202N	DDG–1000	202,522		202,522
144	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	1,011		1,011
145	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	10,357		10,357
146	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	23,975		23,975
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**5,419,108**	**0**	**5,419,108**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
147	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	45,272		45,272
148	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	79,718		79,718
149	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	123,993		123,993
150	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	4,960		4,960
151	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	8,296		8,296

152	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	45,752		45,752
154	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	876		876
155	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	72,070		72,070
156	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,237		3,237
157	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	73,033		73,033
158	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	138,304		138,304
159	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	336,286		336,286
160	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	16,658		16,658
161	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	2,505		2,505
162	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	8,325		8,325
163	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	17,866		17,866
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**977,151**	**0**	**977,151**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
168	0604402N	UNMANNED COMBAT AIR VEHICLE (UCAV) ADVANCED COMPONENT AND PROTOTYPE DEVELOPMENT.	35,949		35,949
169	0604766M	MARINE CORPS DATA SYSTEMS	215		215
170	0605525N	CARRIER ONBOARD DELIVERY (COD) FOLLOW ON	8,873		8,873
172	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	96,943		96,943
173	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	30,057		30,057
174	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	4,509		4,509
175	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	13,676		13,676
176	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT)	12,480		12,480
177	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	76,216		76,216
179	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	27,281		27,281
180	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	2,878		2,878
181	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	32,385		32,385
182	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	39,371		39,371
183	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	4,609	7,000	11,609
		At USMC request transfer from RDTEN 53		[7,000]	
184	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	99,106		99,106
185	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	39,922		39,922

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
186	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,157		1,157
187	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	22,067		22,067
188	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	17,420		17,420
189	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	151,208		151,208
190	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	26,366		26,366
191	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	25,952		25,952
192	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	106,936		106,936
194	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	104,023		104,023
195	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	77,398		77,398
196	0206335M	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S)	32,495		32,495
197	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	156,626		156,626
198	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	20,999		20,999
199	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	14,179		14,179
200	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	47,258		47,258
201	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	10,210		10,210
206	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	41,829		41,829
207	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	22,780		22,780
208	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	23,053		23,053
209	0303150M	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	296		296
212	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC)	359		359
213	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	6,166		6,166
214	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,505		8,505
216	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	11,613		11,613
217	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	18,146		18,146
218	0305220N	RQ–4 UAV	498,003		498,003
219	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	47,294		47,294
220	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	718		718

221	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	851		851
222	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	4,813		4,813
223	0305239M	RQ–21A	8,192		8,192
224	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	22,559		22,559
225	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)	2,000		2,000
226	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	4,719		4,719
227	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	21,168		21,168
228	0708011N	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	37,169		37,169
229	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	4,347		4,347
229A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,162,684		1,162,684
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,286,028**	**7,000**	**3,293,028**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**16,266,335**	**–243,639**	**16,022,696**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	314,482		314,482
2	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	127,079	20,000	147,079
		Basic research program increase		[20,000]	
3	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	12,929		12,929
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**454,490**	**20,000**	**474,490**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
4	0602102F	MATERIALS	105,680		105,680
5	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	105,747		105,747
6	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	81,957		81,957
7	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	172,550		172,550
8	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	118,343		118,343
9	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	98,229		98,229
10	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	87,387		87,387
11	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	125,955		125,955
12	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	147,789		147,789

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
13	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	37,496		37,496
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,081,133**	**0**	**1,081,133**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
14	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	32,177		32,177
15	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	15,800		15,800
16	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	34,420		34,420
17	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	91,062		91,062
18	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	124,236		124,236
19	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	47,602		47,602
20	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	69,026		69,026
21	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	14,031		14,031
22	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	21,788		21,788
23	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	42,046		42,046
24	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	23,542		23,542
25	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	42,772		42,772
26	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	35,315		35,315
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**593,817**	**0**	**593,817**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
27	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,408		5,408
31	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	6,075		6,075
32	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	10,980		10,980
33	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,392		2,392
34	0603791F	INTERNATIONAL SPACE COOPERATIVE R&D	833		833
35	0603830F	SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM	32,313		32,313
37	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	30,885		30,885

39	0603859F	POLLUTION PREVENTION—DEM/VAL	1,798		1,798
40	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE	913,728		913,728
42	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,669		2,669
45	0604422F	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON	39,901		39,901
49	0604800F	F–35—EMD	4,976		4,976
51	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	59,004		59,004
54	0207110F	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE	15,722		15,722
55	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	88,825		88,825
56	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	156,659		156,659
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**1,372,168**	**0**	**1,372,168**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
59	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	13,324		13,324
60	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	1,965		1,965
61	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	39,110		39,110
62	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	3,926		3,926
63	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	68,759		68,759
64	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	23,746		23,746
65	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	9,462		9,462
66	0604426F	SPACE FENCE	214,131		214,131
67	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	30,687		30,687
68	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	319,501	–8,000	311,501
		Upgrade mobile ground units (STRATCOM unfunded priority)		[5,000]	
		Hosted payload demonstration		[–5,000]	
		Wide field of view test bed		[–8,000]	
69	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	31,112		31,112
70	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,543		2,543
71	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	46,340		46,340
72	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	8,854		8,854
73	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	10,129		10,129
75	0604800F	F–35—EMD	563,037		563,037
77	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	0	100,000	100,000

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		Liquid rocket engine		[100,000]	
78	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	4,938		4,938
79	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	59,826		59,826
80	0605030F	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	78		78
81	0605213F	F–22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	173,647		173,647
82	0605214F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	5,332		5,332
83	0605221F	KC–46	776,937		776,937
84	0605223F	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING	8,201		8,201
86	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	7,497		7,497
87	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	314,378	–16,000	298,378
		Satellite contractor support		[–9,000]	
		Protected tactical demonstration		[–7,000]	
88	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	103,552		103,552
89	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	31,425		31,425
90	0605458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E	85,938		85,938
91	0605931F	B–2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	98,768		98,768
92	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	198,357		198,357
94	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	8,831		8,831
95	0307581F	NEXTGEN JSTARS	73,088	–63,088	10,000
		Integrate exisitng technology in replacement		[–63,088]	
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**3,337,419**	**12,912**	**3,350,331**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
97	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	24,418		24,418
98	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	47,232		47,232
99	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	30,443		30,443

101	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	12,266		12,266
102	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	689,509		689,509
103	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	34,364		34,364
104	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	21,161		21,161
104A		OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	0	20,000	20,000
		Program Increase		[20,000]	
105	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	46,955		46,955
106	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	32,965		32,965
107	0606017F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	13,850		13,850
108	0606116F	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT	19,512		19,512
110	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	181,727		181,727
111	0308602F	ENTEPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS)	4,938		4,938
112	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	18,644		18,644
113	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,425		1,425
114	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	3,790		3,790
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,183,199**	**20,000**	**1,203,199**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
115	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	299,760		299,760
118	0604618F	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	2,469		2,469
119	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	90,218	–30,000	60,218
		Delayed contract award		[–30,000]	
120	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	34,815		34,815
122	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	55,457		55,457
123	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	450		450
124	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	5,353		5,353
125	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	131,580		131,580
126	0101213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	139,109		139,109
127	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	35,603		35,603
128	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM	32		32
130	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,522		1,522
131	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	3,134		3,134

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
133	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	170,396		170,396
136	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	133,105		133,105
137	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	261,969		261,969
138	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,831		14,831
139	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	156,962		156,962
140	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	43,666		43,666
141	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	29,739		29,739
142	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	82,195		82,195
144	0207171F	F–15 EPAWSS	68,944	–19,500	49,444
		Delays in pre-EMD phase		[–19,500]	
145	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY	5,095		5,095
146	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	883		883
147	0207247F	AF TENCAP	5,812		5,812
148	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	1,081		1,081
149	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	14,411		14,411
150	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	109,664		109,664
151	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	15,897		15,897
152	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	41,066		41,066
153	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	552		552
154	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	180,804		180,804
155	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	3,754		3,754
157	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	7,891		7,891
158	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	5,891		5,891
159	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,782		1,782
161	0207452F	DCAPES	821		821
163	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	23,844		23,844
164	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	16,723		16,723

165	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	5,956		5,956
166	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	4,457		4,457
167	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	60,679		60,679
169	0208059F	CYBER COMMAND ACTIVITIES	67,057		67,057
170	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	13,355		13,355
171	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	5,576		5,576
179	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	12,218		12,218
180	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	28,778		28,778
181	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	81,035		81,035
182	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	70,497		70,497
183	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	692		692
185	0303601F	MILSATCOM TERMINALS	55,208		55,208
187	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	106,786	–30,700	76,086
		ASIP 2C		[–30,700]	
190	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,157		4,157
193	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	20,806		20,806
194	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	25,102		25,102
195	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	23,516		23,516
196	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	8,639		8,639
199	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	498		498
200	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	13,222		13,222
201	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	360		360
206	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,674		3,674
207	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	2,480		2,480
208	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	8,592		8,592
209	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	13,462		13,462
210	0305202F	DRAGON U–2	5,511	5,800	11,311
		Keep U–2 rather than enhance Global Hawk Block 30		[5,800]	
212	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	28,113		28,113
213	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,516		13,516
214	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	27,265		27,265
215	0305219F	MQ–1 PREDATOR A UAV	1,378		1,378

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
216	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	244,514	–136,000	108,514
		Keep U–2 rather than enhance Global Hawk Block 30		[–136,000]	
217	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	11,096	–8,800	2,296
		NCCT		[–8,800]	
218	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK (CDL)	36,137		36,137
219	0305238F	NATO AGS	232,851		232,851
220	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	20,218		20,218
221	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	212,571		212,571
222	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	73,779		73,779
223	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	4,102		4,102
225	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	20,468		20,468
226	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	11,596		11,596
227	0306250F	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,938		4,938
228	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	1,212		1,212
230	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	38,773		38,773
231	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	83,773		83,773
232	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	26,715		26,715
233	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	5,172		5,172
234	0401219F	KC–10S	2,714		2,714
235	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	27,784		27,784
236	0401318F	CV–22	38,719		38,719
237	0401319F	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)	11,006		11,006
238	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	8,405		8,405
239	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,407		1,407
241	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	109,685	–12,500	97,185
		Reduce unjustified program growth		[–12,500]	
242	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	16,209		16,209

243	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	987		987
244	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	126		126
245	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	2,603		2,603
246	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	1,589		1,589
247	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	5,026		5,026
248	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,394		1,394
249	0901279F	FACILITIES OPERATION—ADMINISTRATIVE	3,798		3,798
250	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	107,314		107,314
250A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	11,441,120	–48,646	11,392,474
		Classified program reduction		[–16,700]	
		Classified adjustment		[–31,946]	
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**15,717,666**	**–280,346**	**15,437,320**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**23,739,892**	**–227,434**	**23,512,458**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
1	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	37,778		37,778
2	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	312,146	20,000	332,146
		Basic research program increase		[20,000]	
3	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	44,564	–10,000	34,564
		Faculty fellows program reduction		[–10,000]	
4	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	49,848		49,848
5	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	45,488	10,000	55,488
		Military Child STEM Education programs		[10,000]	
6	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	24,412	10,000	34,412
		Program increase		[10,000]	
7	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	48,261		48,261
		SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH	**562,497**	**30,000**	**592,497**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
8	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	20,065		20,065

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
9	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	112,242		112,242
11	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,875		51,875
12	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	41,965	–10,000	31,965
		Program reduction		[–10,000]	
13	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	334,407		334,407
15	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	44,825		44,825
16	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	226,317		226,317
18	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	15,000	–7,500	7,500
		Program reduction		[–7,500]	
20	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	305,484		305,484
21	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	160,389		160,389
22	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	179,203		179,203
23	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	151,737		151,737
24	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	9,156		9,156
25	1160401BB	SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	39,750		39,750
		SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,692,415**	**–17,500**	**1,674,915**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
26	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	26,688		26,688
27	0603121D8Z	SO/LIC ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	8,682		8,682
28	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	69,675		69,675
29	0603133D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	30,000	–10,000	20,000
		Program reduction		[–10,000]	
30	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	283,694		283,694
32	0603176C	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	8,470		8,470
33	0603177C	DISCRIMINATION SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	45,110		45,110
34	0603178C	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	14,068		14,068

35	0603179C	ADVANCED C4ISR	15,329		15,329
36	0603180C	ADVANCED RESEARCH	16,584		16,584
37	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	19,335		19,335
38	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY	2,544		2,544
39	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	51,033		51,033
40	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	129,723		129,723
41	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	179,883		179,883
42	0603288D8Z	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS	12,000	–7,500	4,500
		Program reduction		[–7,500]	
43	0603289D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS	60,000	–15,000	45,000
		Program reduction		[–15,000]	
44	0603294C	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY	25,639		25,639
45	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	132,674		132,674
46	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	10,965		10,965
47	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	131,960	–20,000	111,960
		Program reduction		[–20,000]	
52	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	91,095		91,095
53	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	33,706		33,706
54	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	16,836		16,836
55	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY	29,683		29,683
56	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	57,796		57,796
57	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	72,144		72,144
58	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,405		7,405
59	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	92,246		92,246
60	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	243,265		243,265
62	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	386,926	–20,000	366,926
		Program reduction		[–20,000]	
63	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	312,821		312,821
64	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	10,692		10,692
65	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	15,776		15,776
66	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	69,319		69,319
68	0603832D8Z	DOD MODELING AND SIMULATION MANAGEMENT OFFICE	3,000		3,000

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
71	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	81,148		81,148
72	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	31,800		31,800
73	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	46,066		46,066
74	1160402BB	SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	57,622		57,622
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**2,933,402**	**–72,500**	**2,860,902**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
77	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	41,072		41,072
79	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	90,558		90,558
80	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM	15,518	4,000	19,518
		Continue important test programs		[4,000]	
81	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	51,462		51,462
82	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	299,598	–15,000	284,598
		THAAD 2.0 early to need		[–15,000]	
83	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	1,003,768	30,000	1,033,768
		GMD reliability and maintenance improvements		[30,000]	
84	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	179,236		179,236
85	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	392,893		392,893
86	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	410,863		410,863
87	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	310,261		310,261
88	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	929,208		929,208
89	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	31,346		31,346
90	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	6,389		6,389
91	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI.	443,484		443,484
92	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	46,387		46,387
93	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	58,530		58,530

94	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	16,199		16,199
95	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	64,409		64,409
96	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	96,803	350,972	447,775
		Israeli Missile Defense Programs		[175,000]	
		Transfer from Procurement, Defense-Wide Line 34		[175,972]	
97	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	386,482		386,482
98	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	485,294		485,294
99	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	10,194		10,194
100	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	10,139		10,139
101	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	2,907	5,000	7,907
		Program increase		[5,000]	
102	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	190,000		190,000
103	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT	3,702		3,702
104	0604445J	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	53,000		53,000
106	0604775D8Z	DEFENSE RAPID INNOVATION FUND	0	75,000	75,000
		Program increase		[75,000]	
107	0604787J	JOINT SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	7,002		7,002
108	0604828J	JOINT FIRES INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY TEAM	7,102		7,102
109	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	123,444		123,444
110	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	263,695		263,695
113	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	12,500		12,500
114	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	2,656		2,656
115	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	961		961
		SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**6,047,062**	**449,972**	**6,497,034**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
116	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	7,936		7,936
117	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	70,762		70,762
118	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	345,883	–10,000	335,883
		Program under-execution		[–10,000]	
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)	25,459		25,459
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	17,562		17,562

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	6,887		6,887
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	12,530		12,530
123	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	286		286
124	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	3,244		3,244
125	0605027D8Z	OUSD(C) IT DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES	6,500		6,500
126	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	15,326		15,326
127	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION	19,351		19,351
128	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INTIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	41,465		41,465
129	0605090S	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS)	10,135		10,135
130	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	9,546		9,546
131	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	14,241		14,241
132	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	3,660		3,660
		SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**610,773**	**–10,000**	**600,773**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
133	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	5,616		5,616
134	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	3,092		3,092
135	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	254,503		254,503
136	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	21,661		21,661
138	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	27,162		27,162
139	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	24,501		24,501
142	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	43,176		43,176
145	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	44,246		44,246
146	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	2,665		2,665
147	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	4,366		4,366
148	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	27,901		27,901
149	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	2,855		2,855

150	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	105,944		105,944
156	0605502KA	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATIVE RESEARCH	400		400
159	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	1,634		1,634
160	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	12,105	–4,750	7,355
		Program reduction		[–4,750]	
161	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	50,389		50,389
162	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	8,452		8,452
163	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	15,187		15,187
164	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	71,362		71,362
165	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,100		4,100
166	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	1,956		1,956
167	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	10,321		10,321
170	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	11,552		11,552
172	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	6,748		6,748
174	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)	44,005	–4,000	40,005
		Program decrease—historical under-execution		[–4,000]	
175	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	36,998		36,998
176	0901598D8W	MANAGEMENT HEADQUARTERS WHS	612		612
177A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	44,367		44,367
		SUBTOTAL, RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**887,876**	**–8,750**	**879,126**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
178	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	3,988		3,988
179	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA	1,750		1,750
180	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	286		286
181	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	14,778		14,778
182	0607310D8Z	OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	2,953		2,953
183	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS)	10,350		10,350
184	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	28,496		28,496
185	0607828J	JOINT INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	11,968		11,968
186	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	1,842		1,842
187	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	63,558		63,558

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
189	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	3,931		3,931
193	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	924		924
194	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	9,657		9,657
195	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	25,355		25,355
196	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	12,671		12,671
197	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	222		222
198	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	32,698		32,698
199	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	11,304		11,304
200	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	125,854	30,000	155,854
		Sharkseer		[30,000]	
201	0303140K	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	0	12,600	12,600
		Transfer from line 212 (PE 0305103K)		[3,200]	
		Cyber Situational Awareness		[9,400]	
202	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	33,793		33,793
203	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	13,423		13,423
204	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)	3,774		3,774
205	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	951		951
206	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	2,697		2,697
208	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES	19,294		19,294
212	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	3,234	–3,200	34
		Transfer to line 201 (PE 0303140K)		[–3,200]	
213	0305125D8Z	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION (CIP)	8,846		8,846
217	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	7,065		7,065
218	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	23,984		23,984
221	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,286		5,286
224	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,400		3,400
229	0305327V	INSIDER THREAT	8,670		8,670

230	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,110		2,110
239	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	22,366		22,366
240	0708012S	LOGISTICS SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	1,574		1,574
241	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	4,409		4,409
242	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	9,702	5,200	14,902
		Capability Improvements		[5,200]	
243	1105232BB	RQ–11 UAV	259		259
245	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	164,233		164,233
247	1160405BB	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	9,490		9,490
248	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	75,253		75,253
252	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	24,661		24,661
253	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	20,908		20,908
259	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,672		3,672
262	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	57,905		57,905
264	1160489BB	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,788		3,788
265	1160490BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	16,225		16,225
265A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,118,502		3,118,502
		SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,957,490**	**44,600**	**4,002,090**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**16,766,084**	**415,822**	**17,181,906**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
1	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	74,583		74,583
2	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	45,142		45,142
3	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	48,013		48,013
		TOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**167,738**	**0**	**167,738**
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**167,738**	**0**	**167,738**
		TOTAL, TITLE II	**63,533,947**	**–49,549**	**63,484,398**

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	969,281		969,281
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	61,990		61,990
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	450,987		450,987
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	545,773		545,773
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,057,453		1,057,453
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,409,347		1,409,347
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,592,334		3,592,334
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	411,388		411,388
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,001,232	185,600	1,186,832
	Readiness funding increase		[185,600]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,428,972		7,428,972
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,066,434	113,000	2,179,434
	Facilities Sustainment		[18,750]	
	Readiness funding increase—fully funds 6% CIP		[94,250]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	411,863		411,863
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	179,399		179,399
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	432,281		432,281
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**20,018,734**	**298,600**	**20,317,334**

	MOBILIZATION			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	316,776		316,776
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	187,609		187,609
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	6,463		6,463
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	**510,848**	**0**	**510,848**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	124,766		124,766
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	51,968		51,968
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	43,735		43,735
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	456,563		456,563
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	886,529		886,529
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	890,070		890,070
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	193,291		193,291
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	552,359		552,359
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	466,927		466,927
300	EXAMINING	194,588		194,588
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	205,782		205,782
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	150,571		150,571
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	169,784		169,784
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**4,386,933**	**0**	**4,386,933**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	541,877		541,877
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	722,291		722,291
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	602,034		602,034
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	422,277		422,277
390	ADMINISTRATION	405,442		405,442
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,624,742		1,624,742
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	289,771		289,771
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	390,924		390,924

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,118,540		1,118,540
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	241,234		241,234
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	243,509		243,509
460	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS	200,615		200,615
470	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	462,591		462,591
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	27,375		27,375
525	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,030,411		1,030,411
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**8,323,633**	**0**	**8,323,633**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
530	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	–320,000	–320,000
	Foreign currency fluctuation savings		[–48,900]	
	Program decrease—overestimate of civilian personnel		[–250,000]	
	Travel savings		[–21,100]	
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	**0**	**–320,000**	**–320,000**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**33,240,148**	**–21,400**	**33,218,748**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	15,200		15,200
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	502,664		502,664
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	107,489		107,489
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	543,989		543,989
060	AVIATION ASSETS	72,963		72,963
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	360,082		360,082
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	72,491		72,491

090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	58,873	15,000	73,873
	Readiness funding increase		[15,000]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	388,961		388,961
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	228,597	5,000	233,597
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	39,590		39,590
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**2,390,899**	**20,000**	**2,410,899**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,608		10,608
140	ADMINISTRATION	18,587		18,587
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	6,681		6,681
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	9,192		9,192
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	54,602		54,602
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**99,670**	**0**	**99,670**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**2,490,569**	**20,000**	**2,510,569**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	660,648	23,000	683,648
	Readiness funding increase		[23,000]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	165,942		165,942
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	733,800		733,800
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	83,084		83,084
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	22,005		22,005
060	AVIATION ASSETS	920,085		920,085
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	680,887		680,887
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	69,726		69,726
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	138,263		138,263
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	804,517		804,517
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	490,205	5,000	495,205

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	872,140		872,140
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**5,641,302**	**28,000**	**5,669,302**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	6,690		6,690
140	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	1,765		1,765
150	ADMINISTRATION	63,075		63,075
160	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	37,372		37,372
170	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	6,484		6,484
180	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	274,085	–13,800	260,285
	Program decrease for advertising		[–13,800]	
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**389,471**	**–13,800**	**375,671**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**6,030,773**	**14,200**	**6,044,973**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,947,202		4,947,202
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,647,943		1,647,943
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	37,050		37,050
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	96,139		96,139
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	363,763		363,763
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	814,770	108,900	923,670
	Readiness funding increase		[108,900]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	36,494		36,494
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	350,641		350,641

090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,865,379		3,865,379
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	711,243		711,243
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,296,408		5,296,408
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,339,077		1,339,077
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	708,634		708,634
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	91,599		91,599
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	207,038		207,038
160	WARFARE TACTICS	432,715		432,715
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	338,116		338,116
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	892,316		892,316
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	128,486		128,486
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,472		2,472
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	101,200		101,200
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	188,920		188,920
230	CRUISE MISSILE	109,911		109,911
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,172,823	1,300	1,174,123
	Additional FCET		[1,300]	
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	104,139		104,139
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	490,911		490,911
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	324,861		324,861
290	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	936,743		936,743
300	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,483,495	104,000	1,587,495
	Facilities Sustainment		[18,750]	
	Readiness funding increase—fully funds 6% CIP		[85,250]	
310	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,398,667		4,398,667
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**31,619,155**	**214,200**	**31,833,355**
	MOBILIZATION			
320	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	526,926		526,926
330	READY RESERVE FORCE	195		195
340	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,704		6,704
350	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	251,538	–46,000	205,538

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	Transfer to SCN, line4, for CVN 73 RCOH		[–46,000]	
360	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	124,323		124,323
370	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,323		2,323
380	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	20,333		20,333
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	**932,342**	**–46,000**	**886,342**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
390	OFFICER ACQUISITION	156,214		156,214
400	RECRUIT TRAINING	8,863		8,863
410	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	148,150		148,150
420	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	601,501		601,501
430	FLIGHT TRAINING	8,239		8,239
440	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	164,214		164,214
450	TRAINING SUPPORT	182,619		182,619
460	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	230,589		230,589
470	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	115,595		115,595
480	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	79,606		79,606
490	JUNIOR ROTC	41,664		41,664
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,737,254**	**0**	**1,737,254**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
500	ADMINISTRATION	858,871		858,871
510	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	12,807		12,807
520	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	119,863		119,863
530	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	356,113		356,113
540	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	255,605		255,605
550	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	339,802		339,802

570	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	172,203		172,203
590	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	283,621		283,621
600	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,111,464		1,111,464
610	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	43,232		43,232
620	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	25,689		25,689
630	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	73,159		73,159
640	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	548,640		548,640
700	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,713		4,713
705	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	531,324		531,324
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**4,737,106**	**0**	**4,737,106**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
710	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	–88,700	–88,700
	Foreign currency fluctuation savings		[–74,200]	
	Travel savings		[–14,500]	
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	**0**	**–88,700**	**–88,700**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**39,025,857**	**79,500**	**39,105,357**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	905,744	33,800	939,544
	Readiness funding increase—SPMAGTFs in CENTCOM and SOUTHCOM		[33,800]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	921,543		921,543
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	229,058		229,058
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	87,660		87,660
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	573,926	18,750	592,676
	Facilities Sustainment		[18,750]	
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	1,983,118		1,983,118
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**4,701,049**	**52,550**	**4,753,599**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	18,227		18,227
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	948		948
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	98,448		98,448
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	42,305		42,305
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	330,156		330,156
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	161,752		161,752
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	19,137	15,700	34,837
	At USMC request transfer from RDTEN 53		[15,700]	
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,277		23,277
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**694,250**	**15,700**	**709,950**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	36,359		36,359
160	ADMINISTRATION	362,608	–9,193	353,415
	Program decrease—museum expansion		[–9,193]	
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	70,515		70,515
185	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	44,706		44,706
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**514,188**	**–9,193**	**504,995**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	–33,200	–33,200
	Foreign currency fluctuation savings		[–28,400]	
	Travel savings		[–4,800]	
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	**0**	**–33,200**	**–33,200**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**5,909,487**	**25,857**	**5,935,344**

	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	565,842		565,842
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	5,948		5,948
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	82,636		82,636
050	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	353		353
060	AVIATION LOGISTICS	7,007		7,007
070	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	8,190		8,190
080	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	556		556
090	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	4,571		4,571
100	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	14,472		14,472
110	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	119,056		119,056
120	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	1,852		1,852
130	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	25,354		25,354
140	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	48,271	5,000	53,271
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]	
150	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	101,921		101,921
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**986,029**	**5,000**	**991,029**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
160	ADMINISTRATION	1,520		1,520
170	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	12,998		12,998
180	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,395		3,395
190	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,158		3,158
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**21,071**	**0**	**21,071**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**1,007,100**	**5,000**	**1,012,100**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	93,093		93,093
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,377		18,377

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	29,232	5,000	34,232
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]	
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	106,447		106,447
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**247,149**	**5,000**	**252,149**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	914		914
060	ADMINISTRATION	11,831		11,831
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,688		8,688
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**21,433**	**0**	**21,433**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**268,582**	**5,000**	**273,582**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,163,457		3,163,457
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,694,339		1,694,339
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,579,178		1,579,178
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	6,119,522		6,119,522
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,453,589	18,750	1,472,339
	Facilities Sustainment		[18,750]	
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,599,419		2,599,419
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	908,790		908,790
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	856,306		856,306
090	TACTICAL INTEL AND OTHER SPECIAL ACTIVITIES	800,689	–8,000	792,689
	RC–135		[–8,000]	
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	282,710		282,710

110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	397,818		397,818
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	871,840	–11,000	860,840
	Program decrease—classified program		[–11,000]	
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	237,348	–20,000	217,348
	Program decrease—JECC		[–20,000]	
130A	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM	0	34,600	34,600
	Retain current AWACS fleet		[34,600]	
130B	A–10 FLYING HOURS	0	188,400	188,400
	Retain current A–10 fleet		[188,400]	
130C	A–10 WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUSTAINMENT	0	68,100	68,100
	Retain current A–10 fleet		[68,100]	
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**20,965,005**	**270,850**	**21,235,855**
	MOBILIZATION			
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,968,810		1,968,810
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	139,743		139,743
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,534,560		1,534,560
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	173,627		173,627
180	BASE SUPPORT	688,801		688,801
	SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION	**4,505,541**	**0**	**4,505,541**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	82,396		82,396
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	19,852		19,852
210	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	76,134		76,134
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	212,226		212,226
230	BASE SUPPORT	759,809		759,809
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	356,157		356,157
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	697,594		697,594
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	219,441		219,441
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	91,001		91,001
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	316,688		316,688

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	73,920		73,920
300	EXAMINING	3,121		3,121
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	181,718		181,718
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	147,667		147,667
330	JUNIOR ROTC	63,250		63,250
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,300,974**	**0**	**3,300,974**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,003,513	10,300	1,013,813
	Readiness funding increase—PACOM unfunded priority list		[10,300]	
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	843,449		843,449
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	78,126		78,126
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	247,677		247,677
380	BASE SUPPORT	1,103,442		1,103,442
390	ADMINISTRATION	597,234		597,234
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	506,840		506,840
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	892,256		892,256
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL	24,981		24,981
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	92,419		92,419
465	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,169,736	–5,360	1,164,376
	Classified adjustment		[–5,360]	
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**6,559,673**	**4,940**	**6,564,613**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
470	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	–69,200	–69,200
	Foreign currency fluctuation savings		[–51,900]	
	Travel savings		[–17,300]	

	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	**0**	**–69,200**	**–69,200**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**35,331,193**	**206,590**	**35,537,783**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,719,467		1,719,467
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	211,132		211,132
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	530,301		530,301
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	85,672	5,000	90,672
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	367,966		367,966
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**2,914,538**	**5,000**	**2,919,538**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	59,899		59,899
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,509		14,509
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	20,345		20,345
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	6,551		6,551
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**101,304**	**0**	**101,304**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**3,015,842**	**5,000**	**3,020,842**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,367,729		3,367,729
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	718,295		718,295
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,528,695		1,528,695
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	137,604	5,000	142,604
	Facilities Sustainment		[5,000]	
050	BASE SUPPORT	581,536		581,536
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**6,333,859**	**5,000**	**6,338,859**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	27,812		27,812
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	31,188		31,188
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**59,000**	**0**	**59,000**
	TOTAL, OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**6,392,859**	**5,000**	**6,397,859**
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	462,107		462,107
020	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	4,762,245	29,600	4,791,845
	USSOCOM NCR		[–5,000]	
	USSOCOM RSCC		[–1,800]	
	UFR Flying Hours		[36,400]	
	UFR Unit Readiness Training		[20,000]	
	SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES	**5,224,352**	**29,600**	**5,253,952**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
030	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	135,437		135,437
040	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY	80,082		80,082
050	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING	371,620		371,620
	SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**587,139**	**0**	**587,139**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	119,888	25,000	144,888
	Starbase		[25,000]	

080	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	556,493		556,493
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,340,374		1,340,374
100	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	633,300		633,300
110	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,263,678		1,263,678
130	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	26,710		26,710
140	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	381,470	12,700	394,170
	PTAP funding increase		[12,700]	
150	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	194,520		194,520
160	DEFENSE POW/MIA OFFICE	21,485		21,485
170	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	544,786	–7,000	537,786
	Program decrease—Combatting terrorism fellowship		[–7,000]	
180	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	527,812		527,812
200	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	32,787		32,787
230	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,566,424	30,000	2,596,424
	Supplemental Impact Aid		[25,000]	
	Disability Impact Aid		[5,000]	
240	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	416,644		416,644
260	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	186,987	–80,600	106,387
	Program decrease—ahead of need		[–80,600]	
270	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,891,163	–8,800	1,882,363
	Program decrease—BRAC 2015		[–4,800]	
	Program decrease for DOD rewards program		[–4,000]	
280	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES	87,915		87,915
290	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	610,982		610,982
295	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,983,323	41,600	14,024,923
	Additional AFRICOM ISR Support		[60,000]	
	DCS		[–18,400]	
	SUBTOTAL, ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**25,386,741**	**12,900**	**25,399,641**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
305	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	–29,800	–29,800
	Foreign currency fluctuation savings		[–17,500]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	Travel savings		[–17,300]	
	Blue water review		[5,000]	
	SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED	**0**	**–29,800**	**–29,800**
	TOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**31,198,232**	**12,700**	**31,210,932**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	13,723		13,723
010	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	100,000		100,000
010	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT	365,108		365,108
010	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD	212,875		212,875
030	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	201,560		201,560
040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	277,294		277,294
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	408,716		408,716
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	8,547		8,547
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	208,353		208,353
080	OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS TRANSFER FUND	5,000		5,000
090	SUPPORT OF INTERNATIONAL SPORTING COMPETITIONS, DEFENSE	10,000	–4,300	5,700
	Program decrease—SISC		[–4,300]	
	TOTAL, MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,811,176**	**–4,300**	**1,806,876**
	TOTAL, TITLE III	**165,721,818**	**353,147**	**166,074,965**

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILITARY PERSONNEL			
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS			
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	128,957,593	–46,910	128,910,683
Military Personnel Historical Underexecution		[–761,610]	
Restore lost savings relating to retiree COLA		[500,000]	
Restore assumed savings for TRICARE consolidation		[78,000]	
Readiness funding increase—CTC rotations for Army National Guard		[45,000]	
Reduction in meals-ready-to-eat		[–20,000]	
Retain current A–10 fleet		[82,800]	
Retain current AWACS fleet		[24,900]	
Increase state ESGR personnel		[4,000]	
SUBTOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS	**128,957,593**	**–46,910**	**128,910,683**
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS			
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS	6,236,092		6,236,092
SUBTOTAL, MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS	**6,236,092**	**0**	**6,236,092**
TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL	**135,193,685**	**–46,910**	**135,146,775**

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
010	PREPOSITIONED WAR RESERVE STOCKS	13,727		13,727
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**13,727**	**0**	**13,727**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
010	SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (MEDICAL/DENTAL)	61,717		61,717
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**61,717**	**0**	**61,717**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
010	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	44,293	–5,000	39,293
	Program decrease—MREs		[–5,000]	
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**44,293**	**–5,000**	**39,293**
	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
010	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,114,731	200,000	1,314,731
	Restore Commissary Cut		[200,000]	
	TOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,114,731**	**200,000**	**1,314,731**
	TOTAL, ALL WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS	**1,234,468**	**195,000**	**1,429,468**

	NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND			
010	NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND	0	100,000	100,000
	National Sea-based Deterrence Fund		[100,000]	
	TOTAL, NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND	**0**	**100,000**	**100,000**
	CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
010	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	222,728		222,728
020	RDT&E	595,913		595,913
030	PROCUREMENT	10,227		10,227
	TOTAL, CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**828,868**	**0**	**828,868**
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
010	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	310,830		310,830
020	PROCUREMENT	1,000		1,000
	TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**311,830**	**0**	**311,830**
	DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
010	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	719,096	20,000	739,096
	Additional SOUTHCOM ISR Support		[20,000]	
020	DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	101,591		101,591
	TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**820,687**	**20,000**	**840,687**
	DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
	DHP OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
010	IN-HOUSE CARE	8,799,086		8,799,086
020	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	15,412,599		15,412,599
030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,462,096		2,462,096
040	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,557,347		1,557,347
050	MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	366,223		366,223
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING	750,866		750,866
070	BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	1,683,694		1,683,694
070A	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	–78,000	–78,000

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	Reduction for anticipated cost of TRICARE consolidation		[–88,000]	
	Mental Health Assessments		[10,000]	
	SUBTOTAL, DHP OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**31,031,911**	**–78,000**	**30,953,911**
	DHP RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT			
090	R&D RESEARCH	10,317		10,317
100	R&D EXPLORATRY DEVELOPMENT	49,015		49,015
110	R&D ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	226,410		226,410
120	R&D DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	97,787		97,787
130	R&D ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	217,898		217,898
140	R&D MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	38,075		38,075
150	R&D CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	15,092		15,092
	SUBTOTAL, DHP RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT	**654,594**	**0**	**654,594**
	DHP PROCUREMENT			
160	PROC INITIAL OUTFITTING	13,057		13,057
170	PROC REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	283,030		283,030
180	PROC THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM	3,145		3,145
190	PROC IEHR	9,181		9,181
	SUBTOTAL, DHP PROCUREMENT	**308,413**	**0**	**308,413**
	DHP UNDISTRIBUTED			
190A	TRANSFERS TO THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION	–161,857		–161,857
	SUBTOTAL, DHP UNDISTRIBUTED	**–161,857**	**0**	**–161,857**
	TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**31,833,061**	**–78,000**	**31,755,061**

TOTAL, TITLE XIV	35,028,914	237,000	35,265,914

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Military Construction, Army						
MC, Army	CALIFORNIA	Concord	Access Control Point	9,900		9,900
MC, Army	CALIFORNIA	Concord	General Purpose Maintenance Shop	5,300		5,300
MC, Army	CALIFORNIA	Fort Irwin	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	45,000		45,000
MC, Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson, Colorado	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	60,000		60,000
MC, Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson, Colorado	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	29,000		29,000
MC, Army	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	Guantanamo Bay	Dining Facility	12,000		12,000
MC, Army	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	Guantanamo Bay	Health Clinic	11,800		11,800
MC, Army	HAWAII	Fort Shafter	Command and Control Facility (SCIF)	96,000	–9,600	86,400
MC, Army	JAPAN	Kadena AB	Missile Magazine	10,600		10,600
MC, Army	KENTUCKY	Blue Grass Army Depot	Consolidated Shipping Center	0	15,000	15,000
MC, Army	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell, Kentucky	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	23,000		23,000
MC, Army	NEW YORK	Fort Drum, New York	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	27,000		27,000
MC, Army	NEW YORK	U.S. Military Academy	Cadet Barracks, Incr 3	58,000		58,000
MC, Army	PENNSYLVANIA	Letterkenny Army Depot	Rebuild Shop	16,000		16,000
MC, Army	SOUTH CAROLINA	Fort Jackson	Trainee Barracks Complex 3, Ph1	52,000		52,000
MC, Army	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Tactical Vehicle Hardstand	7,700		7,700
MC, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Host Nation Support FY15	33,000		33,000
MC, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Minor Construction FY15	25,000		25,000
MC, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design FY15	18,127		18,127
Subtotal, Military Construction, Army				**539,427**	**5,400**	**544,827**

Military Construction, Navy

MC, Navy	ARIZONA	Yuma	Aviation Maintenance and Support Complex	16,608		16,608
MC, Navy	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	P–8A Hangar	27,826		27,826
MC, Navy	CALIFORNIA	Bridgeport	E-LMR Communications Towers	16,180		16,180
MC, Navy	CALIFORNIA	San Diego	Steam Distribution System Decentralization	47,110		47,110
MC, Navy	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	District Of Columbia	Electronics Science and Technology Laboratory	31,735		31,735
MC, Navy	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier, Djibouti	Entry Control Point	9,923		9,923
MC, Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	MH60 Parking Apron	8,583		8,583
MC, Navy	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	P–8A Runway Thresholds and Taxiways	21,652		21,652
MC, Navy	FLORIDA	Mayport	LCS Operational Training Facility	20,520		20,520
MC, Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	GSE Shops at North Ramp	21,880		21,880
MC, Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	MWSS Facilities at North Ramp	28,771		28,771
MC, Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Facility Modifications for VMU, MWSD, & CH53E	51,182		51,182
MC, Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Road and Infrastructure Improvements	2,200		2,200
MC, Navy	HAWAII	Pearl Harbor	Submarine Maneuvering Room Trainer Facility	9,698		9,698
MC, Navy	JAPAN	Iwakuni	Security Mods DPRI MC167–T (CVW–5 E2D EA–18G)	6,415		6,415
MC, Navy	JAPAN	Kadena AB	Aircraft Maint Hangar Alterations and SAP-F	19,411		19,411
MC, Navy	JAPAN	MCAS Futenma	Hangar & Rinse Facility Modernizations	4,639		4,639
MC, Navy	JAPAN	Okinawa	LHD Practice Site Improvements	35,685		35,685
MC, Navy	MARYLAND	Annapolis	Center for Cyber Security Studies Building	120,112	–90,112	30,000
MC, Navy	MARYLAND	Indian Head	Advanced Energetics Research Lab Complex Ph 2	15,346		15,346
MC, Navy	MARYLAND	Patuxent River	Atlantic Test Range Facility	9,860		9,860
MC, Navy	NEVADA	Fallon	Air Wing Training Facility	27,763		27,763
MC, Navy	NEVADA	Fallon	Facility Alteration for F–35 Training Mission	3,499		3,499
MC, Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	2nd Radio Bn Complex, Phase I	0	50,706	50,706
MC, Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point MCAS	Water Treatment Plant Replacement	41,588		41,588
MC, Navy	PENNSYLVANIA	Philadelphia	Ohio Replacement Power & Propulsion Facility	23,985		23,985
MC, Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	Charleston	Nuclear Power Operational Support Facility	35,716		35,716
MC, Navy	SPAIN	Rota	Ship Berthing Power Upgrades	20,233		20,233
MC, Navy	VIRGINIA	Dahlgren	Missile Support Facility	27,313		27,313
MC, Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	EOD Consolidated Ops & Logistics Facilities	39,274		39,274
MC, Navy	VIRGINIA	Portsmouth	Submarine Maintenance Facility	9,743		9,743

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MC, Navy	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Ammunition Supply Point Expansion	12,613		12,613
MC, Navy	VIRGINIA	Yorktown	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters	19,152		19,152
MC, Navy	VIRGINIA	Yorktown	FAST Company Training Facility	7,836		7,836
MC, Navy	WASHINGTON	Bremerton	Integrated Water Treatment Syst. DD 1, 2, & 5	16,401		16,401
MC, Navy	WASHINGTON	Kitsap	Explosives Handling Wharf #2 (INC)	83,778		83,778
MC, Navy	WASHINGTON	Kitsap	Regional Ship Maintenance Support Facility	0	13,833	13,833
MC, Navy	WASHINGTON	Port Angeles	TPS Port Angeles Forward Operating Location	20,638		20,638
MC, Navy	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	P–8A Aircraft Apron and Supporting Facilities	24,390		24,390
MC, Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	F–35C Facility Addition and Modification	16,594		16,594
MC, Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	F–35C Operational Training Facility	22,391		22,391
MC, Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	MCON Design Funds	33,366		33,366
MC, Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	7,163		7,163
Subtotal, Military Construction, Navy				**1,018,772**	**–25,573**	**993,199**
Military Construction, AF						
MC, AF	ALASKA	Clear AFS	Emergency Power Plant Fuel Storage	11,500		11,500
MC, AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35 Aircraft Mx Hangar—Sqdn #2	11,200		11,200
MC, AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35 Flightline Fillstands	15,600		15,600
MC, AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Guam Strike Fuel Systems Maint.Hangar Inc 2	64,000		64,000
MC, AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PAR Low Observable / Corrosion Control / Composite Repair Shop.	0	34,400	34,400
MC, AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—Combat Comm Infrastr Facility	3,750		3,750
MC, AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—RED HORSE Logistics Facility	3,150		3,150
MC, AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC—Satellite Fire Station	6,500		6,500
MC, AF	KANSAS	Mcconnell AFB	KC–46A ADAL Mobility Bag Strg Expansion	2,300		2,300
MC, AF	KANSAS	Mcconnell AFB	KC–46A ADAL Regional Mx Tng Facility	16,100		16,100
MC, AF	KANSAS	Mcconnell AFB	KC–46A Alter Composite Mx Shop	4,100		4,100

MC, AF	KANSAS	Mcconnell AFB	KC–46A Alter Taxiway Foxtrot	5,500		5,500
MC, AF	KANSAS	Mcconnell AFB	KC–46A Fuselage Trainer	6,400		6,400
MC, AF	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	CYBERCOM Joint Operations Center, Increment 2	166,000		166,000
MC, AF	MASSACHUSETTS	Hanscom AFB	Dormitory (72 RM)	13,500		13,500
MC, AF	NEBRASKA	Offutt AFB	USSTRATCOM Replacement Facility- Incr 4	180,000		180,000
MC, AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–22 Flight Simulator Facility	14,000		14,000
MC, AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35 Aircraft Mx Unit—4 Bay Hangar	31,000		31,000
MC, AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35 Weapons School Facility	8,900		8,900
MC, AF	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base Mcguire-Dix-Lakehurst	Fire Station	5,900		5,900
MC, AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	KC–46A Depot Maint Complex Spt Infrastr	48,000		48,000
MC, AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	KC–46A Two-Bay Depot Mx Hangar	63,000		63,000
MC, AF	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Fire Station	5,800		5,800
MC, AF	UNITED KINGDOM	Croughton RAF	JIAC Consolidation—Phase 1	92,223		92,223
MC, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide	Planning and Design	10,738		10,738
MC, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Military Construction	22,613		22,613
Subtotal, Military Construction, AF				**811,774**	**34,400**	**846,174**
Military Construction, Defense-Wide						
MC, Def-Wide	ARIZONA	Fort Huachuca	JITC Building 52120 Renovation	1,871		1,871
MC, Def-Wide	AUSTRALIA	Geraldton	Combined Communications Gateway Geraldton	9,600		9,600
MC, Def-Wide	BELGIUM	Brussels	Brussells Elementary/High School Replacement	41,626		41,626
MC, Def-Wide	BELGIUM	Brussels	NATO Headquarters Facility	37,918		37,918
MC, Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton, California	SOF Comm/Elec Maintenance Facility	11,841		11,841
MC, Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Logistics Support Unit 1 Ops Facility #1	41,740		41,740
MC, Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Support Activity Ops Facility #2	28,600		28,600
MC, Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	Replace Fuel Storage & Distribution Fac.	52,500		52,500
MC, Def-Wide	COLORADO	Peterson AFB	Dental Clinic Replacement	15,200		15,200
MC, Def-Wide	CONUS CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	SOF Skills Training Facility	53,073		53,073
MC, Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Hunter Army Airfield	SOF Company Operations Facility	7,692		7,692
MC, Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Robins AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	19,900		19,900

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MC, Def-Wide	GERMANY	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Medical Center Replacement Incr 4	259,695	–200,000	59,695
MC, Def-Wide	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	Guantanamo Bay	Replace Fuel Tank	11,100		11,100
MC, Def-Wide	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	Guantanamo Bay	W.T. Sampson E/M and HS Consolid./Replacement	65,190		65,190
MC, Def-Wide	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Replace Fuel Tanks	3,000		3,000
MC, Def-Wide	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	Upgrade Fire Supression & Ventilation Sys.	49,900		49,900
MC, Def-Wide	JAPAN	Misawa AB	Edgren High School Renovation	37,775		37,775
MC, Def-Wide	JAPAN	Okinawa	Killin Elementary Replacement/Renovation	71,481		71,481
MC, Def-Wide	JAPAN	Okinawa	Kubasaki High School Replacement/Renovation	99,420		99,420
MC, Def-Wide	JAPAN	Sasebo	E.J. King High School Replacement/Renovation	37,681		37,681
MC, Def-Wide	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell, Kentucky	SOF System Integration Maintenance Office Fac	18,000		18,000
MC, Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW Campus Feeders Phase 1	54,207		54,207
MC, Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW Recapitalize Building #1/Site M Inc 3	45,521		45,521
MC, Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	Construct Hydrant Fuel System	18,300		18,300
MC, Def-Wide	MICHIGAN	Selfridge Angb	Replace Fuel Distribution Facilities	35,100		35,100
MC, Def-Wide	MISSISSIPPI	Stennis	SOF Applied Instruction Facility	10,323		10,323
MC, Def-Wide	MISSISSIPPI	Stennis	SOF Land Acquisition Western Maneuver Area	17,224		17,224
MC, Def-Wide	NEVADA	Fallon	SOF Tactical Ground Mob. Vehicle Maint Fac.	20,241		20,241
MC, Def-Wide	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF Squadron Operations Facility (STS)	23,333		23,333
MC, Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune, NC	Lejeune High School Addition/Renovation	41,306		41,306
MC, Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune, NC	SOF Intel/Ops Expansion	11,442		11,442
MC, Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Battalion Operations Facility	37,074		37,074
MC, Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility	8,000		8,000
MC, Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Training Command Building	48,062		48,062
MC, Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	8,500		8,500
MC, Def-Wide	SOUTH CAROLINA	Beaufort	Replace Fuel Distibution Facilities	40,600		40,600

MC, Def-Wide	SOUTH DAKOTA	Ellsworth AFB	Construct Hydrant System	8,000		8,000
MC, Def-Wide	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Hospital Replacement Incr 6	131,500		131,500
MC, Def-Wide	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Medical Clinic Replacement	38,300		38,300
MC, Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Craney Island	Replace & Alter Fuel Distibution Facilities	36,500		36,500
MC, Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Def Dist Depot Richmond	Replace Access Control Point	5,700		5,700
MC, Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	Parking Lot	7,239		7,239
MC, Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Hopsital Addition/CUP Replacement	41,200		41,200
MC, Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Exp Base Little Creek	SOF Human Performance Center	11,200		11,200
MC, Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Exp Base Little Creek	SOF Indoor Dynamic Range	14,888		14,888
MC, Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Joint Exp Base Little Creek	SOF Mobile Comm Det Support Facility	13,500		13,500
MC, Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Redundant Chilled Water Loop	15,100		15,100
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Contingency Construction	9,000		9,000
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	ECIP Design	10,000		10,000
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Energy Conservation Investment Program	150,000		150,000
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Exercise Related Minor Construction	8,581		8,581
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning & Design	38,704		38,704
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	24,425		24,425
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	745		745
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	42,387		42,387
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	599		599
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	1,183		1,183
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,700		2,700
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	4,100		4,100
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	5,932		5,932
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	6,846		6,846
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,000		2,000
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	10,334		10,334
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Milcon	2,994		2,994
MC, Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide	Planning and Design	24,197		24,197
Subtotal, Military Construction, Defense-Wide				**2,061,890**	**–200,000**	**1,861,890**

Military Construction, Army National Guard

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MC, ARNG	MAINE	Augusta	National Guard Reserve Center	30,000		30,000
MC, ARNG	MARYLAND	Havre De Grace	National Guard Readiness Center	12,400		12,400
MC, ARNG	MONTANA	Helena	National Guard Readiness Center Add/Alt	38,000		38,000
MC, ARNG	NEW MEXICO	Alamagordo	Readiness Cener ADD/ALT	0	5,000	5,000
MC, ARNG	NORTH DAKOTA	Valley City	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	10,800		10,800
MC, ARNG	VERMONT	North Hyde Park	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	4,400		4,400
MC, ARNG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	17,600		17,600
MC, ARNG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	13,720		13,720
Subtotal, Military Construction, Army National Guard				**126,920**	**5,000**	**131,920**
Military Construction, Air National Guard						
MC, ANG	ARKANSAS	Ft Smith Municipal Airport	Consolidated SCIF	0	13,200	13,200
MC, ANG	CONNECTICUT	Bradley IAP	Construct C–130 Fuel Cell and Corrosion Contr	16,306		16,306
MC, ANG	IOWA	Des Moines Map	Remotely Piloted Aircraft and Targeting Group	8,993		8,993
MC, ANG	MICHIGAN	W. K. Kellog Regional Airport	RPA Beddown	6,000		6,000
MC, ANG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC–46A ADAL Airfield Pavements & Hydrant Syst	7,100		7,100
MC, ANG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC–46A ADAL Fuel Cell Building 253	16,800		16,800
MC, ANG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC–46A ADAL Maint Hangar Building 254	18,002		18,002
MC, ANG	PENNSYLVANIA	Willow Grove ARF	RPA Operations Center	5,662		5,662
MC, ANG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide	Planning and Design	7,700		7,700
MC, ANG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	8,100		8,100
Subtotal, Military Construction, Air National Guard				**94,663**	**13,200**	**107,863**

Military Construction, Army Reserve						
MC, Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Riverside	Army Reserve Center, Phase II	0	25,000	25,000
MC, Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Fresno	Army Reserve Center/AMSA	22,000		22,000
MC, Army Res	COLORADO	Fort Carson, Colorado	Training Building Addition	5,000		5,000
MC, Army Res	NEW JERSEY	Joint Base Mcguire-Dix-Lakehurst	Army Reserve Center	26,000		26,000
MC, Army Res	NEW YORK	Mattydale	Army Reserve Center/AMSA	23,000		23,000
MC, Army Res	VIRGINIA	Fort Lee	TASS Training Center	16,000		16,000
MC, Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Planning and Design	8,337		8,337
MC, Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Construction	3,609		3,609
Subtotal, Military Construction, Army Reseserve				**103,946**	**25,000**	**128,946**
Military Construction, Navy Reseserve						
MC, Navy Res	PENNSYLVANIA	Pittsburgh	Reserve Training Center—Pittsburgh, PA	17,650		17,650
MC, Navy Res	WASHINGTON	Everett	Joint Reserve Intelligence Center	0	47,869	47,869
MC, Navy Res	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	C–40 Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	27,755		27,755
MC, Navy Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	MCNR Planning & Design	2,123		2,123
MC, Navy Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	MCNR Unspecified Minor Construction	4,000		4,000
Subtotal, Military Construction, Navy Reserve				**51,528**	**47,869**	**99,397**
Military Construction, AF Reseserve						
MC, AF Res	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	Guardian Angel Operations	0	14,500	14,500
MC, AF Res	GEORGIA	Robins AFB	AFRC Consolidated Mission Complex, Ph I	27,700		27,700
MC, AF Res	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	KC–135 Tanker Parking Apron Expansion	9,800		9,800
MC, AF Res	TEXAS	Fort Worth	EOD Facility	3,700		3,700
MC, AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide	Planning and Design	6,892		6,892
MC, AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide	Unspecified Minor Military Construction	1,400		1,400
Subtotal, Military Construction, AF Reserve				**49,492**	**14,500**	**63,992**
Chemical Demilitarization Construction						
Chem Demil	KENTUCKY	Blue Grass Army Depot	Ammunition Demilitarization Ph XV	38,715		38,715
Subtotal, Chemical Demilitarization Construction				**38,715**	**0**	**38,715**

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
NATO Security Investment Program						
NATO SIP	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Nato Security Investment Program	Nato Security Investment Program	199,700	–25,000	174,700
Subtotal, NATO Security Investment Program				**199,700**	**–25,000**	**174,700**
Total, Military Construction				**5,096,827**	**–105,204**	**4,991,623**
Family Housing						
Family Housing Construction, Army						
FHC, Army	ILLINOIS	Rock Island	Family Housing New Construction	19,500		19,500
FHC, Army	KOREA	Camp Walker	Family Housing New Construction	57,800		57,800
FHC, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing P & D	1,309		1,309
Subtotal, Family Housing Construction, Army				**78,609**	**0**	**78,609**
Family Housing O&M, Army						
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings	14,136		14,136
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Leased Housing	112,504		112,504
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property Facilities	65,245		65,245
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	3,117		3,117
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	43,480		43,480
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Military Housing Privitization Initiative	20,000		20,000
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous	700		700
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Services	9,108		9,108
FHO, Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities	82,686		82,686
Subtotal, Family Housing O&M, Army				**350,976**	**0**	**350,976**

Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps						
FHC, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Design	472		472
FHC, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Improvements	15,940		15,940
Subtotal, Family Housing Construction, Navy and Marine Corps				**16,412**	**0**	**16,412**
Family Housing O&M, Navy and Marine Corps						
FHO, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	17,881		17,881
FHO, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	65,999		65,999
FHO, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	97,612		97,612
FHO, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	55,124		55,124
FHO, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	366		366
FHO, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Privatization Support Costs	27,876		27,876
FHO, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	18,079		18,079
FHO, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	71,092		71,092
Subtotal, Family Housing O&M, Navy and Marine Corps				**354,029**	**0**	**354,029**
Family Housing O&M, AF						
FHO, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	38,543		38,543
FHO, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Housing Privatization	40,761		40,761
FHO, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	43,651		43,651
FHO, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance	99,934		99,934
FHO, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	47,834		47,834
FHO, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Miscellaneous Account	1,993		1,993
FHO, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	12,709		12,709
FHO, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	42,322		42,322
Subtotal, Family Housing O&M, AF				**327,747**	**0**	**327,747**
Family Housing O&M, Defense-Wide						
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	3,362		3,362
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	20		20
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Furnishings Account	746		746
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	42,083		42,083

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Leasing	11,179		11,179
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	344		344
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Maintenance of Real Property	2,128		2,128
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Management Account	378		378
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Services Account	31		31
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	170		170
FHO, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Utilities Account	659		659
Subtotal, Family Housing O&M, Defense-Wide				**61,100**	**0**	**61,100**
Family Housing Improvement Fund						
FHIF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	Family Housing Improvement Fund	1,662		1,662
Subtotal, Family Housing Improvement Fund				**1,662**	**0**	**1,662**
Total, Family Housing				**1,190,535**	**0**	**1,190,535**
Base Realignment and Closure						
Defense Base Closure Account—Army						
BRAC—Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	BRAC, Army	Base Realignment and Closure	84,417		84,417
Subtotal, Defense Base Closure Account—Army				**84,417**	**0**	**84,417**
Defense Base Closure Account—Navy						
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	BRAC, Navy	Base Realignment & Closure	57,406		57,406
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	DON–100: Planing, Design and Management	7,682		7,682
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	DON–101: Various Locations	21,416		21,416
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	DON–138: NAS Brunswick, ME	904		904
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	DON–157: MCSA Kansas City, MO	40		40
BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	DON–172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA	6,066		6,066

BRAC—Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	DON–84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg AP	1,178		1,178
Subtotal, Defense Base Closure Account—Navy				**94,692**	**0**	**94,692**
Defense Base Closure Account—AF						
BRAC—AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide	DoD BRAC Activities—Air Force	90,976		90,976
Subtotal, Defense Base Closure Account—AF				**90,976**	**0**	**90,976**
Total, Base Realignment and Closure				**270,085**	**0**	**270,085**
Grand Total, Military Construction & Family Housing				**6,557,447**	**–105,204**	**6,452,243**

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development And Related Agencies			
Appropriation Summary:			
Energy Programs			
Nuclear energy	104,000	0	104,000
Advisory Board			
Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health	0	2,000	2,000
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	8,314,902	0	8,314,902
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,555,156	285,000	1,840,156
Naval reactors	1,377,100	0	1,377,100
Federal salaries and expenses	410,842	–7,500	403,342
Total, National nuclear security administration	**11,658,000**	**277,500**	**11,935,500**
Environmental and other defense activities:			

Defense environmental cleanup	5,327,538	–463,000	4,864,538
Other defense activities	753,000	–2,000	751,000
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**6,080,538**	**–465,000**	**5,615,538**
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**17,738,538**	**–187,500**	**17,551,038**
Total, Discretionary Funding	**17,842,538**	**–185,500**	**17,657,038**
Nuclear Energy			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	104,000		104,000
Total, Nuclear Energy	**104,000**	**0**	**104,000**
Advisory Board			
Advisory Board on Toxic Substances and Worker Health	0	2,000	2,000
Total, Advisory Board	**0**	**2,000**	**2,000**
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
B61 Life extension program	643,000		643,000
W76 Life extension program	259,168		259,168
W88 Alt 370	165,400		165,400
Cruise missile warhead life extension program	9,418	7,500	16,918
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	109,615		109,615
W76 Stockpile systems	45,728		45,728
W78 Stockpile systems	62,703		62,703
W80 Stockpile systems	70,610		70,610
B83 Stockpile systems	63,136		63,136
W87 Stockpile systems	91,255		91,255
W88 Stockpile systems	88,060		88,060
Total, Stockpile systems	**531,107**	**0**	**531,107**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	30,008		30,008
Stockpile services			
Production support	350,942		350,942
Research and development support	29,649		29,649
R&D certification and safety	201,479		201,479
Management, technology, and production	241,805		241,805
Plutonium sustainment	144,575		144,575
Tritium readiness	140,053		140,053
Total, Stockpile services	**1,108,503**	**0**	**1,108,503**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**2,746,604**	**7,500**	**2,754,104**
Campaigns:			
Science campaign			
Advanced certification	58,747		58,747
Primary assessment technologies	112,000		112,000
Dynamic materials properties	117,999		117,999
Advanced radiography	79,340		79,340
Secondary assessment technologies	88,344		88,344
Total, Science campaign	**456,430**	**0**	**456,430**
Engineering campaign			
Enhanced surety	52,003		52,003
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	20,832		20,832
Nuclear survivability	25,371		25,371
Enhanced surveillance	37,799		37,799

Total, Engineering campaign	**136,005**	**0**	**136,005**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield campaign			
Ignition	77,994		77,994
Support of other stockpile programs	23,598		23,598
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimenta support	61,297		61,297
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	5,024		5,024
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	9,100		9,100
Facility operations and target production	335,882	–7,500	328,382
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield campaign	**512,895**	**–7,500**	**505,395**
Advanced simulation and computing campaign	610,108		610,108
Readiness Campaign			
Nonnuclear readiness	125,909		125,909
Total, Readiness campaign	**125,909**	**0**	**125,909**
Total, Campaigns	**1,841,347**	**–7,500**	**1,833,847**
Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)			
Operations of facilities			
Kansas City Plant	125,000		125,000
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	71,000		71,000
Los Alamos National Laboratory	198,000		198,000
Nevada National Security Site	89,000		89,000
Pantex	75,000		75,000
Sandia National Laboratory	106,000		106,000
Savannah River Site	81,000		81,000
Y–12 National security complex	151,000		151,000
Total, Operations of facilities	**896,000**	**0**	**896,000**
Program readiness	136,700		136,700
Material recycle and recovery	138,900		138,900

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Containers	26,000		26,000
Storage	40,800		40,800
Maintenance and repair of facilities	205,000		205,000
Recapitalization	209,321		209,321
Subtotal, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**1,652,721**	**0**	**1,652,721**
Construction:			
15–D–613 Emergency Operations Center, Y–12	2,000		2,000
15–D–612 Emergency Operations Center, LLNL	2,000		2,000
15–D–611 Emergency Operations Center, SNL	4,000		4,000
15–D–301 HE Science & Engineering Facility, PX	11,800		11,800
15–D–302, TA–55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL	16,062		16,062
12–D–301 TRU waste facilities, LANL	6,938		6,938
11–D–801 TA–55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL	10,000		10,000
07–D–220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, Lanl	15,000		15,000
06–D–141 PED/Construction, UPF Y–12, Oak Ridge, TN	335,000		335,000
Total, Construction	**402,800**	**0**	**402,800**
Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities	**2,055,521**	**0**	**2,055,521**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	132,851		132,851
Program direction	100,962		100,962
Total, Secure transportation asset	**233,813**	**0**	**233,813**
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response	173,440		173,440
Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs	76,901		76,901

Site stewardship			
Environmental projects and operations	53,000		53,000
Nuclear materials integration	16,218		16,218
Minority serving institution partnerships program	13,231		13,231
Total, Site stewardship	**82,449**	**0**	**82,449**
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	618,123		618,123
Total, Defense nuclear security	**618,123**	**0**	**618,123**
Information technology and cybersecurity	179,646		179,646
Legacy contractor pensions	307,058		307,058
Subtotal, Weapons activities	**8,314,902**	**0**	**8,314,902**
Total, Weapons Activities	**8,314,902**	**0**	**8,314,902**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs			
Global threat reduction initiative			
Global threat reduction initiative	333,488	40,000	373,488
Total, Global threat reduction initiative	**333,488**	**40,000**	**373,488**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D			
Operations and maintenance	360,808	30,000	390,808
Nonproliferation and international security	141,359		141,359
International material protection and cooperation	305,467	70,000	375,467
Fissile materials disposition			
U.S. surplus fissile materials disposition			

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Operations and maintenance			
U.S. plutonium disposition	85,000		85,000
U.S. uranium disposition	25,000		25,000
Total, Operations and maintenance	**110,000**	**0**	**110,000**
Construction:			
99–D–143 Mixed oxide fuel fabrication facility, Savannah River, SC	196,000	145,000	341,000
99–D–141–02 Waste Solidification Building, Savannah River, SC	5,125		5,125
Total, Construction	**201,125**	**145,000**	**346,125**
Total, Fissile materials disposition	**311,125**	**145,000**	**456,125**
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs	**1,452,247**	**285,000**	**1,737,247**
Legacy contractor pensions	102,909		102,909
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,555,156**	**285,000**	**1,840,156**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	412,380		412,380
Naval reactors development	425,700		425,700
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	156,100		156,100
S8G Prototype refueling	126,400		126,400
Program direction	46,600		46,600
Construction:			
15–D–904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3	400		400
15–D–903 KL Fire System Upgrade	600		600
15–D–902 KS Engineroom team trainer facility	1,500		1,500
15–D–901 KS Central office building and prototype staff facility	24,000		24,000

14–D–901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	141,100		141,100
13–D–905 Remote-handled low-level waste facility, INL	14,420		14,420
13–D–904 KS Radiological work and storage building, KSO	20,100		20,100
10-D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL	7,400		7,400
08–D–190 Expended Core Facility M–290 receiving/discharge station, Naval Reactor Facility, ID	400		400
Total, Construction	**209,920**	**0**	**209,920**
Subtotal, Naval Reactors	**1,377,100**	**0**	**1,377,100**
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,377,100**	**0**	**1,377,100**
Federal Salaries And Expenses			
Program direction	410,842	–7,500	403,342
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	4,889		4,889
Hanford site:			
River corridor and other cleanup operations	332,788		332,788
Central plateau remediation:			
Central plateau remediation	474,292		474,292
Construction			
15–D–401 Containerized sludge (RI-0012)	26,290		26,290
Total, Central plateau remediation	**500,582**	**0**	**500,582**
Richland community and regulatory support	14,701		14,701
Total, Hanford site	**848,071**	**0**	**848,071**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	364,293		364,293
Idaho community and regulatory support	2,910		2,910

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**367,203**	**0**	**367,203**
NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,366		1,366
Nuclear facility D & D Nevada	64,851		64,851
Sandia National Laboratories	2,801		2,801
Los Alamos National Laboratory			
Los Alamos National Laboratory	196,017		196,017
Construction:			
15–D–406 Hexavalent chromium D & D (VI-LanI-0030)	28,600		28,600
Total, Los Alamos National Laboratory	**224,617**	**0**	**224,617**
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**293,635**	**0**	**293,635**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
OR Nuclear facility D & D	73,155		73,155
Construction			
14–D–403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility	9,400		9,400
Total, OR Nuclear facility D & D	**82,555**	**0**	**82,555**
U233 Disposition Program	41,626		41,626
OR cleanup and disposition			
OR cleanup and disposition	71,137		71,137
Construction:			
15–D–405—Sludge Buildout	4,200		4,200
Total, OR cleanup and disposition	**75,337**	**0**	**75,337**

OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,365		4,365
Solid waste stabilization and disposition			
Oak Ridge technology development	3,000		3,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**206,883**	**0**	**206,883**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
01–D–416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction	575,000		575,000
01–D–16E Pretreatment facility	115,000		115,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**690,000**	**0**	**690,000**
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	522,000		522,000
Construction:			
15–D–409 Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford	23,000		23,000
Total, Tank farm activities	**545,000**	**0**	**545,000**
Total, Office of River protection	**1,235,000**	**0**	**1,235,000**
Savannah River sites:			
Savannah River risk management operations:			
Savannah River risk management operations	416,276		416,276
SR community and regulatory support	11,013		11,013
Radioactive liquid tank waste:			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	553,175		553,175
Construction:			
15–D–402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6	34,642		34,642
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River	135,000		135,000
Total, Construction	**169,642**	**0**	**169,642**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2015 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**722,817**	**0**	**722,817**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,150,106**	**0**	**1,150,106**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Waste isolation pilot plant	216,020		216,020
Program direction	280,784		280,784
Program support	14,979		14,979
Safeguards and Security:			
Oak Ridge Reservation	16,382		16,382
Paducah	7,297		7,297
Portsmouth	8,492		8,492
Richland/Hanford Site	63,668		63,668
Savannah River Site	132,196		132,196
Waste Isolation Pilot Project	4,455		4,455
West Valley	1,471		1,471
Total, Safeguards and Security	**233,961**	**0**	**233,961**
Technology development	13,007		13,007
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**4,864,538**	**0**	**4,864,538**
Legislative Proposal			
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution	463,000	–463,000	0
Subtotal Legislative Proposal	**463,000**	**–463,000**	**0**
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,327,538**	**–463,000**	**4,864,538**

Other Defense Activities			
Specialized security activities	202,152		202,152
Environment, health, safety and security			
Environment, health, safety and security	118,763	–1,000	117,763
Program direction	62,235		62,235
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security	**180,998**	**–1,000**	**179,998**
Independent enterprise assessments			
Independent enterprise assessments	24,068		24,068
Program direction	49,466		49,466
Total, Independent enterprise assessments	**73,534**	**0**	**73,534**
Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	158,639	–1,000	157,639
Program direction	13,341		13,341
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**171,980**	**–1,000**	**170,980**
Defense related administrative support			
Chief financial officer	46,877		46,877
Chief information officer	71,959		71,959
Total, Defense related administrative support	**118,836**	**0**	**118,836**
Office of hearings and appeals	5,500		5,500
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**753,000**	**–2,000**	**751,000**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**753,000**	**–2,000**	**751,000**

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

Departmental Recommendations

Two separate legislative proposals on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 were submitted as executive communications to the President of the Senate by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs of the Department of Defense and subsequently referred to the committee. Information on these executive communications appears below. All of these executive communications are available for review at the committee.

Executive Communication No.	Dated	Received in the Committee on Armed Services:
EC–5276	April 1, 2014	April 3, 2014
EC–5717	May 5, 2014	May 9, 2014

On May 5, 2014, Senators Levin and Inhofe introduced by request the Administration's proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. This bill—S. 2289—was introduced for the purpose of placing the Administration's proposals before Congress and the public without expressing the views of Senators Levin or Inhofe on the substance of those proposals. In accordance with past practice, the committee reported an original bill rather than acting on S. 2289.

Committee Action

The committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 passed by roll call vote, 25–1, as follows: In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, and Cruz. Opposed: Senator Lee.

The 9 other roll call votes on motions and amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the full committee markup are as follows:

1. MOTION: To conduct full committee markups in closed session because classified information will be discussed.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 18–8.

In Favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Fischer, Graham, and Blunt.

Opposed: Senators McCaskill, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Ayotte, Vitter, Lee, and Cruz.

2. MOTION: To include a provision addressing decontamination of a portion of former bombardment area on the island of Culebra, Puerto Rico.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 20–6.

In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Blunt, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Vitter, and Lee.

3. MOTION: To include a provision prohibiting direct or indirect use of funds to enter into contracts or agreements with Rosoboronexport.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 15–11.

In favor: Senators McCaskill, Hagan, Manchin, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, Udall, Shaheen, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, and Fischer.

4. MOTION: To modify language in a sense of the Senate on sequestration.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 22–3.

In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Blunt, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Sessions, Vitter, and Lee.

5. MOTION: To include language on consideration by Congress of a Secretary of Defense report within a provision limiting transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 26–0.

In favor: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: None.

6. MOTION: To strike a provision regarding assistance to foster a negotiated settlement to the conflict in Syria.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 3–23.

In favor: Senators Manchin, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, and Blunt.

7. MOTION: To include a provision prohibiting transfer or release to Yemen of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

VOTE: Adopted by roll call vote, 14–12.

In favor: Senators Hagan, Donnelly, King, Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Hirono, Kaine, and McCain.

8. MOTION: To include a provision repealing mandates on use of renewable energy by the Department of Defense.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 10–16.

In favor: Senators Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Graham, Vitter, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Fischer, and Blunt.

9. MOTION: To include a provision limiting military cooperation with countries that violate the sovereignty of other countries or do not abide by certain treaty obligations.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote, 5–21.

In favor: Senators Inhofe, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Opposed: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, and Graham.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during Senate floor debate on the legislation.

Regulatory Impact

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2015.

Changes in Existing Law

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. INHOFE

This bill includes numerous provisions that improve U.S. national security and provide the needed training, equipment and support our service men and women—active, guard and reserve—deserve. However, the President is underfunding defense and despite the best efforts of this committee, our overall readiness will continue to degrade, putting the lives of not only U.S. servicemembers at risk, but all Americans.

Acquisition and Audit

Fewer resources are being dedicated to our national defense, making every dollar count. Accordingly, I have arranged for the inclusion of a number of provisions designed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of our defense acquisition system. In addition, I have grown increasingly concerned over what has been referred to as the "personnel churn" of acquisition program managers. Specifically, program managers are transferred in and out of programs haphazardly. I included provisions in the bill which require acquisi-

tion program managers to remain with a program until milestone decisions are ready to be made or other seminal events are completed. This will help ensure greater accountability and help to improve the performance of acquisition programs.

Also included in the bill's report language is a requirement for a GAO report which will determine the advantages and disadvantages of conducting property valuations as the Department works to achieve its audit obligations. Specifically, I question whether the Department truly needs to know the monetary value of each piece of its property. Unlike a private business that needs this information to determine a company's worth, what are the benefits to the warfighter and taxpayer of knowing the cash value of every destroyer or tank in the Department's inventory? In addition, will not such an exercise result in the Department hiring a large number of accountants? Therefore, I hope this report will answer a number of these questions.

Military Compensation

In an era of declining financial resources, the President's budget presented a troubling dilemma to the members of this committee on how to maintain the right balance between properly compensating our military men and women while at the same time ensuring they have the training and capabilities necessary to defend the nation with the least risk to their lives. The members of this committee all agree that there needs to be a serious look at military pay and compensation. A piecemeal approach is the wrong way to go about any changes. When the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission was created, Congress sought outside guidance and expertise on any possible structural changes to the military compensation and benefits systems. I am pleased that the provisions of the Chairman's Mark allow for non-structural changes to generate cost savings while we await the results of the Commission's work in February 2015.

Force Structure and Modernization

Defense budget cuts are driving force structure decisions that increase risk to unacceptable levels. Under this Administration, we will see our Air Force at the smallest level in history, our Navy at a historical low level of ships, and our ground forces falling to levels not seen since the beginning of World War II. Through prioritization, exploitation of efficiency and elimination of waste, this committee was able to authorize funding for refueling the USS George Washington, acquiring a 12th LPD–17, developing and procuring the KC–46, F–35 and Long Range Strike Bomber, enabling the Navy to keep open its EA–18 Growler production line, and sustaining the armor industrial base through Abrams and Bradley modifications as well as the Hercules recover vehicle. I also supported the committee's decision to limit aircraft movements and retirements until the Air Force and the Army provide additional analysis on their proposed force structure moves. Finally, I remain concerned about the drastic cut to the size of our Army and supported creating the National Commission on the Future of the Army to study the size and force structure of the Army and the transfer of Apache helicopters from the Army National Guard to

the regular Army. Despite steps taken by this committee on the bill, our capability, readiness, and modernization continue to decrease and our capacity to decidedly defeat and deter our adversaries is less certain.

Space Launch

To address our critical national security space requirements, I am pleased that the bill includes language that will end our dependence—and eventually prohibit—the use of Russian rocket engines for National Security Space launch. To begin the process of developing and procuring a new domestically sourced world class rocket engine, the bill authorizes $20 million in funds already appropriated in FY14 and an additional $100 million in FY15 to further expedite the development. This effort, which quite frankly should have started years ago, is a national priority and will require a whole-of-government approach and sustained funding over the next six years. The provision recognizes that the need to develop a domestic engine should be pursued regardless of the viability of a Russian rocket engine and is consistent with the findings and recommendations of the Air Force chartered quick reaction review on the "RD–180 Availability Risk Mitigation Study Summary" by Maj. Gen. (ret) H.J. "Mitch" Mitchell.

Missile Defense

The Fiscal Year 2015 budget request includes $1.2 billion for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system—our only protection for the homeland against long-range ballistic missiles. Of this amount approximately $766 million is devoted to research and development which includes the work necessary to continue to develop the system, discover and fix problems associated with recent intercept test failures, and maintain and sustain the system over its projected 20 year lifetime. Funding reductions to the MDA program over the past few years, coupled with higher-than-anticipated costs to fix problems associated with the GBI kill vehicle, have meant that stockpile reliability work has been substantially delayed and deferred in order to help resolve technical issues with the kill vehicle. As a result, the ten-year old GMD system has not undergone needed improvements and technology upgrades—as any military system would require. Efforts to assess the impact of aging on the system, such as rocket motor life assessments, have also been deferred—which means we don't know for certain whether the system will last for its intended 20 years.

Shortfalls in GMD maintenance and aging have been known for some time, but were brought to light by an independent assessment of the GMD system, which indicated to this Committee that "a number of important reliability and maintenance functions are not included in the current GMD program of record." The GAO has reached a similar conclusion, informing committee staff recently that "while MDA has indicated in its budget material in the past several years that it was requesting funds to pursue such work, as it has encountered technical difficulties resolving CE–II design issues, that reliability work was often substantially delayed and funds redirected to help resolve technical issues." According to an April 30, 2014 report from GAO, "the cost to demonstrate, as well

as fix, the already produced CE–IIs has increased from $236 million to $1.3 billion." Clearly, this unanticipated cost to improve the readiness of the GBI has eaten into funding originally intended for maintenance and upgrades to the important ground systems that support the interceptor.

To be sure, even while the need has grown for additional funding to address flight test failures and improve the reliability of an aging stockpile of missiles, funding for the GMD program has been in decline. In Fiscal Year 2008, the GMD budget was just over $2.0 billion, yet between FY 2010 and FY 2015, funding for GMD would decline to about $1.0 billion per year. This decline is even more troubling when you consider the sharp decrease in GMD research and development funding, which fell from $1.4 billion in FY 2008 to $761 million in FY 2014, and which will be as low as $509 million by FY 2019. This is the funding category that provides hardware and software upgrades, conducts aging assessments, provides network communications improvements, and develops and implements the solutions to flight test failures.

To his great credit, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, Admiral James Syring, recognizes this shortfall. I trust that the additional $30 million provided in this bill for these efforts in FY 2015, which matches a similar amount included in the House-passed National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2015, will send a strong message to the Department of Defense that additional funding and attention is needed for life cycle improvements, maintenance, and stockpile reliability for the only missile defense system that protects the homeland against the growing threat of long-range ballistic missiles. It is not enough for the President to add 14 GBIs in Alaska to address this threat; it is time for us to accord the same level of commitment to the GMD system that we provide our nuclear strategic systems.

Global Train and Equip

Regarding U.S. ability to build defense capabilities of other nations, permanently authorizing the highly successful "1206" Global Train and Equip authority codifies what has become an essential tool for combatant commanders to address urgent and emerging threats to U.S. national security, including to improving partner counterterrorism capabilities. The proliferation of al Qaeda from Afghanistan and Pakistan to Syria and Iraq, Yemen, and North Africa presents a growing challenge. Commanders have told the defense committees that the use of this authority has proven essential in their efforts to defeat terrorist threats and to enable more capable coalition partners to participate in U.S. combat operations around the globe.

Guantanamo Bay Detention Center

Further, the Chairman's Mark contained a provision authorizing the transfer of Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States for "detention and trial." I continue to adamantly oppose any provision that would allow the transfer of Guantanamo detainees into the Homeland. Therefore, I was very pleased to support an amendment by Senator Graham that was adopted unanimously by the Committee which will ensure Congress continues to have substantial

oversight of any decision by the Executive Branch to transfer detainees to the United States. Specifically, in the Chairman's Mark is a requirement for the President to file a report to Congress detailing a closure plan of Guantanamo Bay's detention facility before the transfer of detainees to the Homeland can occur. Under the Graham amendment, the filing of the report will trigger the expedited consideration of a Joint Resolution of disapproval in both Houses of Congress. This will ensure Congress maintains an important say in any effort by the Administration to close Guantanamo Bay by authorizing a "fast-track" process which can terminate the transfer of detainees to the United States for detention and trial.

Finally, I am pleased with the bipartisan adoption of Senator Ayotte's amendment which was adopted by a 14–12 vote and imposes a one year prohibition on the transfer of detainees to Yemen. Yemen is a critical ally and friend of the United States. Unfortunately, there have been a number of significant and well-coordinated prison breaks in Yemen where a number of al Qaeda terrorists have been able to escape. According to the Yemeni media, since 2006, 459 inmates have escaped in 23 prison breaks. Of that number, 306 inmates escaped just in 2012 alone. In an attack this February, armed gunmen assaulted the Sanaa Central Prison using vehicle-borne improvised explosive devices. As a result of this attack, 19 al Qaeda prisoners escaped and seven Yemeni guards were killed.

Currently, the population at Guantanamo Bay consists of 154 detainees including 88, more than half, from Yemen. In addition, half of those detainees slated for transfer are from Yemen. For detainees as a whole, there is a 29 percent recidivism rate in which individuals are confirmed or suspected to have returned to the battlefield. Clearly, the United States would not be assisting our ally by sending what have been referred to as the "worst of the worst" to Yemen, until the security situation improves.

I thank my colleagues on the committee and commend the continued leadership of Chairman Levin for completing markup of this bipartisan bill. However, we must stand together to ensure this bill is brought up and passed on the Senate floor in an expeditious fashion to avoid further impacting our military and their readiness.

JAMES M. INHOFE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MS. AYOTTE

A–10

When we send our troops into harm's way, we have a solemn obligation to ensure they have the very best support possible so they can accomplish their missions and return home safely. This is certainly true when it comes to close air support (CAS) aircraft, which provide ground troops with the decisive firepower they need when they are engaged in close combat with the enemy.

When it comes to CAS, there is no question which aircraft is the best: the A–10.

Echoing the virtually unanimous praise offered by soldiers and special operators with combat experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, General Ray Odierno, the Army Chief of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee on April 3 and April 8, 2014, that the A–10 is "the best close air support aircraft" and that "obviously, we prefer the A–10."

While the F–15, F–16, and B–1 aircraft are excellent airframes with important capabilities and missions, none of them can fully replace the A–10's CAS capabilities—especially in situations involving moving targets, bad weather, and the close proximity of friendly and enemy forces.

In a world that is less stable and predictable, any proposal to eliminate the A–10 before an adequate replacement achieves full operational capability is dangerously short-sighted. We have a responsibility to ensure our ground troops in the next conflict receive the best possible CAS. When we fail to fulfill that responsibility, the cost can be measured in the lives of our troops.

The fact that the House Armed Services Committee, the full House, and now the Senate Armed Services Committee have voted in an overwhelming and bipartisan manner to prevent the divestment of the A–10 in fiscal year 2015 represents great news for our ground troops.

I appreciate that the Air Force confronts difficult budget decisions, but it does not make sense to prematurely retire the Air Force's most combat-effective and cost-efficient CAS aircraft to save money.

In future conflicts, when our ground troops are about to be overrun by enemy forces and call for assistance, we have an obligation to send the very best to help them. That is why I will continue to work with my colleagues to prevent the premature divestment of the A–10 that would create a dangerous CAS capability gap.

Military Compensation Reform

Personnel costs are consuming significant portions of the Department of Defense budget. Without significant reform, especially if defense sequestration resumes in 2016, these personnel costs will

increasingly crowd out the resources available to ensure our troops have the best weapons and training in the world.

However, any proposed reforms to military compensation must recognize the uniquely difficult and valuable nature of military service. Service members and their families voluntarily endure sacrifices that cannot be compared to any other profession. Therefore, their compensation should reflect that fact.

The committee has responded to these personnel costs by authorizing some of the Department of Defense's personnel proposals. For example, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) passed by the Senate Armed Services Committee calls for at least a doubling over five years in cost-sharing for certain prescription drugs for service members who cannot utilize military treatment facilities. It also authorizes a lower basic pay raise and implements Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) reforms that, after three years, will require a five percent out-of-pocket contribution by service members.

Some argue these reforms are modest, but we should not ask service members and their families—those who have sacrificed the most for our country—to sacrifice again when Congress has not shown the courage to undertake the necessary structural reforms to Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security.

While of great importance, our entitlement programs—not the housing allowances for our junior enlisted service members or the costs of their prescriptions—are the real drivers of our debt. We could eliminate the entire defense budget and it would not fully address our deficit.

Addressing our national debt and our budget deficit—and preserving and protecting critically important entitlement programs for future generations—requires Congress to demonstrate just a fraction of the courage our service members have shown in Iraq and Afghanistan.

I stand ready to work with members from both sides of the aisle to develop a bipartisan solution that will put our country on a more sustainable fiscal path that does not require us to cut the benefits our service members and their families have earned.

KELLY A. AYOTTE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MESSRS. INHOFE, SESSIONS, CHAMBLISS, WICKER, MS. AYOTTE, AND MR. VITTER

Guantanamo Bay

When we capture al Qaeda affiliated terrorists, the focus must be on gathering the intelligence necessary to protect our country and prevent future attacks. Consistent with U.S. and international law, the best way to accomplish this is to detain foreign enemy combatants at a secure, humane, and state of the art facility that allows for long-term law of war detention and interrogation.

The detention facility at Guantanamo Bay provides just such a place. Unfortunately, this administration has refused to place new detainees at Guantanamo for detention and interrogation and has instead reiterated its goal to close Guantanamo and bring detainees to the United States.

To make matters worse, the administration has failed to develop a comprehensive policy for the law of war long-term detention and interrogation of foreign enemy combatants. On February 15, 2011, now-Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, Michael Vickers, testified, "The administration is in the final stages of revising its—or establishing its detention policy." More than three years later, we are still waiting for this detention policy.

As we saw with Ahmed Abudulkadir Warsame and Abu Anas al-Libi, this has led to the use of substandard, ad-hoc workarounds for detaining and interrogating high-value terrorists. Rather than placing these individuals at Guantanamo for long-term law of war detention and interrogation, the administration conducted rushed interrogations onboard U.S. Navy vessels and then flew them to the United States and read them their *Miranda* Rights.

Treating members of al Qaeda like common criminals and focusing more on indictments rather than the collection of intelligence has resulted in a dangerous failure to gather the intelligence our country desperately needs to prevent future attacks.

We hope this is not the model the administration plans to use if we capture Ayman al-Zawahiri.

As FBI Director James Comey testified on November 14, 2013, "The more flexibility we have to delay the reading of those rights, the better." He also said that reading a detainee his *Miranda* Rights "would end the interrogation. And in situations like that, it's not that I'm looking for confessions to be able to use in a court."

Similarly, on November 13, 2013, Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson described captured terrorists as a "gold mine" in terms of what we may learn through national security interrogations."

We take Director Comey and Secretary Johnson's words seriously, and remain concerned about the effect that the administration's policies will have on our military and intelligence community's ability to fully interrogate terrorists and utilize intelligence

assets to both exploit enemy vulnerabilities and protect the homeland from planned terrorist attacks.

For these reasons, we were troubled by some of the Guantanamo-related provisions in the Chairman's mark for the fiscal year (FY) 2015 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA). The most troubling provision permits the administration—after certain requirements are met—to transfer Guantanamo detainees to the United States.

We would have preferred to strike this provision from the bill and replace it with language similar to section 1034 of the FY 2014 NDAA, but we are pleased that Senator Graham's amendment to strengthen Congressional oversight of any plan to close Guantanamo and bring the detainees there to the United States received a unanimous vote.

Under the Graham amendment, the filing of the report will trigger the expedited consideration of a Joint Resolution of disapproval in both Houses of Congress. This will ensure Congress maintains an important say in any effort by the administration to close Guantanamo Bay by authorizing a "fast-track" process which can terminate the transfer of detainees to the United States for detention and trial.

We are pleased that a bipartisan majority of the committee voted to adopt Senator Ayotte's amendment to impose a one year prohibition on the transfer of detainees to Yemen. While the government of Yemen is an important partner in the war in terrorism, Yemen is home to al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula—one of the most dangerous al Qaeda affiliates. Yemen also has a long history of jail breaks and terrorist attacks—some of which have occurred as recently as the last few months. For these reasons, the administration was wrong to end its moratorium on detainee transfers to Yemen. The security of the American people, not a misguided desire to close Guantanamo Bay, should guide detainee transfer decisions.

We stand ready to work with the administration to develop a detention policy that will best protect our country. The security of the American people will be best served by a facility not in the United States, as well as a plan, for conducting long-term law of war detention and interrogation of foreign enemy combatants to gather the intelligence we need to protect our country.

JAMES M. INHOFE.
JEFF SESSIONS.
SAXBY CHAMBLISS.
ROGER F. WICKER.
KELLY A. AYOTTE.
DAVID VITTER.

○