AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

114TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
114–537

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4909

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 4, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

114TH CONGRESS
2d Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
114–537

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

R E P O R T

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

H.R. 4909

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

MAY 4, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

99–910 WASHINGTON : 2016

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

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

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

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

ROBERT L. SIMMONS II, *Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose of the Legislation	1
Rationale for the Committee Bill	2
Hearings	9
Committee Position	9
Explanation of the Committee Amendments	9
Relationship of Authorization to Appropriations	9
Summary of Discretionary Authorizations in the Bill	9
Budget Authority Implication	10
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS	10
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT	10
Aircraft Procurement, Army	10
Items of Special Interest	10
Brigade combat team utilization of unmanned aircraft systems in training operations	10
Missile Procurement, Army	11
Items of Special Interest	11
Joint air-to-ground missile increment 2 acquisition strategy	11
Procurement of Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	11
Items of Special Interest	11
Army National Guard M2 Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicle upgrades	11
M240 medium machine gun modernization	12
Multi-Role Anti-Armor Anti-Personnel Weapon System	12
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	13
Items of Special Interest	13
Ammunition industrial base investment strategies	13
Small guided munitions acquisition strategy	13
Other Procurement, Army	14
Items of Special Interest	14
Accelerate fielding of personal dosimeters	14
Army small-scale experimentation	14
Army tactical communications waveforms	14
Bridge Erection Boat program	15
Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Response Enterprise Information Management System	15
Ground mobility vehicle	16
High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle ambulance recapitalization	16
Material handling equipment modernization strategy	17
Mid-Tier Networking Vehicular Radio	17
Tactical Communication and Protective System	17
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	18
Items of Special Interest	18
MQ–8 Fire Scout aircraft	18
V–22 Osprey	18
Weapons Procurement, Navy	19
Items of Special Interest	19
Littoral Combat Ship Over-the-Horizon Missile	19
Tomahawk Block IV	19
Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy	20
Items of Special Interest	20
Arleigh Burke-class destroyer	20
Cruiser replacement strategy	20
CVN–81 advance procurement	20

Page

Expeditionary Mobile Base ship 21
Frigate 21
Landing Craft Air Cushion Service Life Extension Program 21
Littoral Combat Ship 22
LX(R) Dock Landing Ship Replacement Program 22
Modular ship design 22
Service Craft 23
Ship to Shore Connector 23
Strike capability assessment from surface amphibious forces 23
TAO(X) oiler shipbuilding program 24
Undersea Mobility for Special Operation Forces 24
Virginia Class Submarine 25
Virginia class submarine industrial base capacity 25
Other Procurement, Navy 26
Items of Special Interest 26
Destroyer modernization 26
Joint Strike Fighter integration on amphibious ships 26
Navy Communications 27
Navy expeditionary combat patrol boat requirements 27
Ship's Signal Exploitation Equipment Program 28
Procurement, Marine Corps 29
Items of Special Interest 29
Marine Corps fielding of Enhanced Combat Helmet 29
Mobile User Objective System capability 29
Non-lethal ocular interruption capabilities 30
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force 30
Items of Special Interest 30
A–10 aircraft 30
Aerial refueling recapitalization 32
Air Force Command, Control, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C2ISR) Fleet 32
Air National Guard F–16 mission training centers 32
Aircraft urethane sealant upgrades 33
B–21 bomber 33
B–21 Development Progress Matrix 34
Basing priorities for future Air National Guard Modular Airborne Firefighting Systems missions 34
Battlefield Airborne Communications Node 35
C–130H Modernization 35
C–130J Hercules aircraft 36
C–40A Clipper aircraft 36
Demonstration of high performance unmanned jet aircraft 37
E–8C prime mission equipment diminishing manufacturing sources kits 37
EC–130H Compass Call recapitalization 37
F–22 production restart assessment 38
F–35 Lightning II aircraft program 39
MQ–9 production funding in Future Years Defense Program 40
Reporting requirement for C–130H recapitalization and modernization 40
UH–1N replacement program 40
U.S. Air Force combat search and rescue 41
U.S. Marine Corps C/KC–130 digital interoperability 42
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force 43
Items of Special Interest 43
25 millimeter ammunition for the F–35 program 43
Other Procurement, Air Force 43
Items of Special Interest 43
Civil engineers construction, surveying, and mapping equipment 43
Procurement, Defense-Wide 44
Items of Special Interest 44
Replacement of MH–60M for United States Special Operations Command 44
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 44
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 44
Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations 44
Subtitle B—Army Programs 44

Page

Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for AH–64E Apache Helicopters 44
Section 112—Multiyear Procurement Authority for UH–60M and HH–60M Black Hawk Helicopters 44
Section 113—Assessment of Certain Capabilities of the Department of the Army 44
Subtitle C—Navy Programs 45
Section 121—Procurement Authority for Aircraft Carrier Programs 45
Section 122—Sense of Congress on Aircraft Carrier Procurement Schedules 45
Section 123—Design and Construction of LHA Replacement Ship Designated LHA 8 45
Section 124—Design and Construction of Replacement Dock Landing Ship Designated LX(R) or Amphibious Transport Dock Designated LPD–29 46
Section 125—Ship to Shore Connector Program 46
Section 126—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Littoral Combat Ship or Successor Frigate 46
Subtitle D—Air Force Programs 46
Section 131—Elimination of Annual Report on Aircraft Inventory 46
Section 132—Repeal of the Requirement to Preserve Certain Retired C–5 Aircraft 46
Section 133—Repeal of Requirement to Preserve Certain Retired F–117 Aircraft 46
Section 134—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Retirement of A–10 Aircraft 46
Section 135—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Retirement of Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System Aircraft 47
Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters 47
Section 141—Termination of Quarterly Reporting on Use of Combat Mission Requirements Funds 47
Section 142—Fire Suppressant and Fuel Containment Standards for Certain Vehicles 47
Section 143—Report on Department of Defense Munitions Strategy for the Combatant Commands 47
Section 144—Comptroller General Review of F–35 Lightning II Aircraft Sustainment Support 48
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 48
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army 48
Items of Special Interest 48
Armored vehicle fuel tank and bladder safety 48
Army advanced body armor research and development 49
Army network integration evaluations and army warfighting assessments 49
Blast mitigation technologies for combat and tactical vehicles 50
Helicopter seating systems 51
Improved refrigeration and cooling technology 51
Improved Turbine Engine Program 51
Land-Based Anti-Ship Missile program 52
Lightweight metal matrix composite technology for combat and tactical vehicles 52
Lithium ion super-capacitors 53
Long Range Precision Fires 53
Long-range Army surface-to-air missile capability 53
Modular Handgun System 54
Next generation signature management technology 54
Personal protective equipment development for female soldiers 55
Review of ballistic testing policy for body armor 55
Small Unit Support Vehicle 56
Telemedicine capabilities 56
Vehicle active protection systems 56
Warfighter Technology 57
Weight reduction for personal protective equipment 57
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy 58
Items of Special Interest 58
Advanced Low Cost Munitions Ordnance 58
Aegis radar solid state improvements 58

Page

Aircraft carrier design 59
Alternative energy programs 59
Amphibious Ship Replacement Program 59
Automated testing 59
Autonomous Undersea Vehicles 60
Briefing on advanced flight control software for carrier landings 60
Common mount for electromagnetic railgun 61
Deployable and interoperable communications 61
F/A–18 fleet physiological event rate 61
Five-inch precision guided projectile development for naval surface fire support 62
Integrated surveillance system 63
Joint metallurgical technology for combat and tactical vehicle hulls ... 63
Marine Corps unmanned rotary utility aircraft 63
MH–60R/S multi-mission helicopter programs 64
Non-imaging millimeter wave radar technology 64
Ocean warfighting environment applied research 65
Service life extension program for Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research 65
Submarine acoustic warfare development 66
UCLASS, CBARS, RAQ–25, MQ–25, MQ–XX 66
Warfighter sustainment applied research 68
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force 68
Items of Special Interest 68
Adaptive engine transition program 68
Air Force directed energy initiatives 68
Air traffic control and landing systems 69
Deployable air traffic control 70
High efficiency heat exchangers 70
Human-machine teaming 71
Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System recapitalization 71
KC–46 aerial refueling tanker aircraft program 72
MQ–9 automatic takeoff and landing capability 73
MQ–9 unmanned aircraft vehicle tactical datalink integration 73
Open architecture Distributed Common Ground System 74
Precision metrology tools 75
Reusable hypersonic vehicle structures development 75
Silicon carbide for aerospace power applications 75
T–X program 76
Technology transfer 76
Wide-area motion imagery 77
Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide 77
Items of Special Interest 77
Academia and university affiliated research center support for chemical and biological defense 77
Additive manufacturing 78
Alternative solutions to multidrug resistant bacteria 78
Better Gender Reporting in Grantmaking 78
Broad-spectrum antiviral drug modeling 79
Cellular and broadband signals exploitation 79
Comptroller General review of commercial practices for trust in microelectronics 80
Counter-unmanned aerial systems roadmap 80
Department of Defense medical countermeasures Advanced Development and Manufacturing facility roadmap 81
Desalination technology 82
Explosive Ordnance Disposal equipment technology upgrades 82
Foundational Intelligence Modernization 82
Future Vertical Lift 83
Handheld explosive and chemical detectors 83
High-speed aerothermal effects 83
Human systems integration activities 84
Hydrocephalus research 84
Hyperspectral imaging technology 84
Immersive operator control stations 85
Incentives for increasing private sector medical countermeasures development 85

Page

Interagency unmanned aerial system research 85
Intestinal mucosal barrier research to address chemical and biological threats 86
Laboratory Quality Enhancement 86
Low Energy Nuclear Reactions (LENR) Briefing 87
Minority-serving institutions and minority-owned businesses 87
Monoclonal antibody therapeutics 88
MQ–9 anti-icing capability 88
Nanomaterials in Combat Systems 88
Non-destructive counterfeit parts detection tools 89
Prioritization of joint test activities 89
Program intermediary agreements 89
Ribonucleic acid technology research 90
Rotorcraft degraded visual environment 90
Secure cellular communications for senior leaders 90
Small turbine engines for missile programs 91
Social media analysis cell 91
Strategic Capabilities Office 92
Technology enablers for directed energy weapon systems 93
Third Offset Strategy 93
Transition of biosurveillance prototype 94
Treatment of traumatic brain injury 94
United States-Israel Anti-tunnel cooperation 95
Unmanned advanced capability combat aircraft and ground combat vehicles 95
U.S. Special Operations Command rapid prototyping and SOFWERX initiative 96
Utilization of electromagnetic spectrum 97
V–22 defensive weapons integration analysis 97
Vector geo-location technologies for Special Operations Command 98
Operational Test and Evaluation, Defense 98
Items of Special Interest 98
Range capabilities for emerging advanced technologies 98
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 99
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 99
Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations 99
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations 99
Section 211—Laboratory Quality Enhancement Program 99
Section 212—Mechanisms to Provide Funds for Defense Laboratories for Research and Development of Technologies for Military Missions . 100
Section 213—Notification Requirement for Certain Rapid Prototyping, Experimentation, and Demonstration Activities 100
Section 214—Improved Biosafety for Handling of Select Agents and Toxins 100
Section 215—Modernization of Security Clearance Information Technology Architecture 100
Section 216—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction System Constellation 101
Section 217—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defense Innovation Unit Experimental 101
Section 218—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Tactical Combat Training System Increment II 102
Section 219—Restructuring of the Distributed Common Ground System of the Army 102
Section 220—Designation of Department of Defense Senior Official with Principal Responsibility for Directed Energy Weapons 102
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters 102
Section 231—Strategy for Assured Access to Trusted Microelectronics ... 102
Section 232—Pilot Program on Evaluation of Commercial Information Technology 103
Section 233—Pilot Program for the Enhancement of the Laboratories and Test and Evaluation Centers of the Department of Defense 103
Section 234—Pilot Program on Modernization of Electromagnetic Spectrum Warfare Systems and Electronic Warfare Systems 103
Section 235—Independent Review of F/A–18 Physiological Episodes and Corrective Actions 103

Page

Section 236—Study on Helicopter Crash Prevention and Mitigation Technology 103
Section 237—Report on Electronic Warfare Capabilities 103
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 104
OVERVIEW 104
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 104
Budget Request Adjustments 104
Base Realignment and Closure Request for Fiscal Year 2019 104
Ship Repair Capability in the Western Pacific 105
Energy Issues 105
Alternatively Financed Energy Projects 105
Energy Assurance for Department of Defense 106
Expeditionary Power Management Systems 107
Integration of Installation Energy Authorities 107
Marine and Hydrokinetic Technology 107
Procurement of Alternative Fuels 108
Small Modular Reactors 108
Logistics and Sustainment Issues 109
Defective Spare Parts 109
Discrepancies in the Transportation of Hazardous Material 109
Enhanced Decision Analysis for Weapons System Sustainment 110
F–35 Sustainment 110
Funding for Corrosion Control and Prevention 111
Implementation of Product Support Managers 112
Integration of Operational Contract Support Matters in Joint Training Programs 112
Item Unique Identification Policy Implementation 113
Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems 114
Readiness Issues 114
Air Refueling Requirements 114
Armed Forces Sports Program and Service Academy Athletic Interns 115
Army Aviation Multi-Component Pilot Program 116
Assessment of Navy and Marine Corps Training Requirements 116
C–130 Aircraft Maintenance and Modernization 117
Condition-Based Maintenance on Navy Surface Ships 117
Corrective Actions in Response to the Temporary Detention of United States Sailors by Iran 117
Defense Language Institute Support to the Intelligence Community 118
Defense Travel System 118
Force of the Future 118
Global Response Force Readiness 119
Green Flag East 120
Impact of Mandatory Training Requirements on Achieving Increased Readiness 120
Language Training 121
Management Software for Navy Training 122
Military Bands 123
Mobility Support for Operations on the Korean Peninsula 123
Output-Based Readiness Metrics 124
Refinement of Joint Staff Input into the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress 124
Regional Air Ranges and Exercise 124
Regional Biosecurity Plan Implementation 125
Report on Small Boat Maintenance 126
Review of the Readiness of Military Sealift Command Ships and Employment Plans 126
Rotary-Wing Aviation Readiness and Safety 127
Soldiers Medically Unavailable for Training 128
Support Capabilities for Operations in Europe 128
Synthetic Training System and Small Arms Qualification 129
Other Matters 130
Acquisition of Highly Technical Contract Services 130
Adoption of Tactical Explosive Detection Military Working Dogs 130
Army Explosive Ordnance Disposal 131
Associated Unit Concept for Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Security Force Manning 132
Collaboration with U.S. Universities 132

Page

Combat Footwear Survey 133
Disabled Veterans Non-Profit Groups 133
Disposal of Excess Agriculture-Related Equipment 133
End-of-Service Veterinary Care for Military Working Dogs 134
Flame-Resistant Military Uniform Postures 134
Military Free Fall Course as a Requirement of the U.S. Army Special Forces Qualification Course 135
Military Glove System 135
National Guard Cyber Protection Teams 135
National Guard Unit for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands 136
Procurement and Inspection of Armored Commercial Passenger-Carrying Vehicles 136
Public-Private Partnerships for Cyber Education and Training 137
Retaining Critical Skills and STEM Capabilities During Headquarters Downsizing 138
The Role of the National Security Contractor 139
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 139
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 139
Section 301—Authorization of Appropriations 139
Subtitle B—Energy and Environment 139
Section 311—Rule of Construction Regarding Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement 139
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment 139
Section 321—Pilot Program for Inclusion of Certain Industrial Plants in the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative 139
Section 322—Private Sector Port Loading Assessment 140
Section 323—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defense Contract Management Agency 140
Subtitle D—Reports 140
Section 331—Modification of Annual Department of Defense Energy Management Reports 140
Section 332—Report on Equipment Purchased from Foreign Entities and Authority to Adjust Army Arsenal Labor Rates 141
Subtitle E—Other Matters 141
Section 341—Explosive Ordnance Disposal Corps 141
Section 342—Explosive Ordnance Disposal Program 141
Section 343—Expansion of Definition of Structures Interfering with Air Commerce and National Defense 141
Section 344—Development of Personal Protective Equipment for Female Marines and Soldiers 141
Section 345—Study on Space-Available Travel System of the Department of Defense 142
Section 346—Supply of Specialty Motors from Certain Manufacturers 142
Section 347—Limitation on Use of Certain Funds Until Establishment and Implementation of Required Process by which Members of the Armed Forces May Carry Appropriate Firearms on Military Installations 142
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS 142
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 142
Subtitle A—Active Forces 142
Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces 142
Section 402—Revisions in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels 143
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces 143
Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve 143
Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves 143
Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status) 144
Section 414—Fiscal Year 2017 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians 144
Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support 144
Section 416—Sense of Congress on Full-Time Support for the Army National Guard 145
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations 145
Section 421—Military Personnel 145

Page

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY 145
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 145
Army National Guard Preventive Intervention for Suicide and Substance Abuse 145
Briefing on Credentialing Programs for Service Members in Combat Arms Specialties 146
Briefing on Stars and Stripes Funding 146
Community and Military Education Partnerships 146
Comptroller General Review of the Military Entrance Processing Stations Medical Examinations 147
Cyber Science Education at the Service Academies 147
Database Tracking System for Valor Awards 147
Dual Military Shared Parental Leave Feasibility Study 148
Enhanced Access and Consideration before Discharge Review Boards and Correction of Military Records Boards 148
Implementation by the Services of the recommendations listed in the "Program to Assist Veterans to Acquire Commercial Driver's Licenses Report to Congress" 149
Improved Oversight of Hazing Prevention Programs and Reporting in the Military Services 149
Information Regarding On-the-Job Training and Apprenticeship Programs 150
Informing Service Members About the United Services Military Apprenticeship Program 150
Integration of Women into Previously Closed Military Occupations 150
Military Reemployment Initiatives 151
National Guard Bureau Briefing Requirement 151
Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality Compliance with Department of Defense Policy 151
Report on Department of Defense Efforts to Provide Timely Review of Separation Characterization of Former Members of the Armed Forces who were Separated by Reason of Sexual Orientation 152
Report on the Purpose and Utility of a Registration System for Military Selective Service 152
Review and Report on Port Chicago 153
Review of Qualified Joint Tours 153
Suicide Prevention 154
Troops to Teachers Partnership 154
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 154
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy 154
Section 501—Number of Marine Corps General Officers 154
Section 502—Equal Consideration of Officers for Early Retirement or Discharge 154
Section 503—Modification of Authority to Drop from Rolls a Commissioned Officer 155
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management 155
Section 511—Extension of Removal of Restrictions on the Transfer of Officers Between the Active and Inactive National Guard 155
Section 512—Extension of Temporary Authority to Use Air Force Reserve Component Personnel to Provide Training and Instruction Regarding Pilot Training 155
Section 513—Limitations on Ordering Selected Reserve to Active Duty for Preplanned Missions in Support of the Combatant Commands 155
Section 514—Exemption of Military Technicians (Dual Status) from Civilian Employee Furloughs 155
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities 156
Section 521—Technical Correction to Annual Authorization for Personnel Strengths 156
Section 522—Entitlement to Leave for Adoption or Birth of Child by Dual Military Couples 156
Section 523—Revision of Deployability Rating System and Planning Reform 156
Section 524—Expansion of Authority to Execute Certain Military Instruments 156
Section 525—Technical Correction to Voluntary Separation Pay and Benefits 156

Page

Section 526—Annual Notice to Members of the Armed Forces Regarding Child Custody Protections Guaranteed by the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act 157
Section 527—Pilot Program on Consolidated Army Recruiting 157
Section 528—Application of Military Selective Service Registration and Conscription Requirements to Female Citizens and Residents of the United States Between the Ages of 18 and 26 157
Section 529—Parental Leave for Members of the Armed Forces 157
Subtitle D—Military Justice, Including Sexual Assault and Domestic Violence Prevention and Response 157
Section 541—Expedited Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect to State Child Protective Services 157
Section 542—Extension of the Requirement for Annual Report Regarding Sexual Assaults and Coordination with Release of Family Advocacy Report 158
Section 543—Requirement for Annual Family Advocacy Program Report Regarding Child Abuse and Domestic Violence 158
Section 544—Improved Department of Defense Prevention of and Response to Hazing in the Armed Forces 158
Section 545—Burdens of Proof Applicable to Investigations and Reviews Related to Protected Communications of Members of the Armed Forces and Prohibited Retaliatory Actions 158
Section 546—Improved Investigation of Allegations of Professional Retaliation 158
Subtitle E—Member Education, Training, and Transition 159
Section 561—Revision to Quality Assurance of Certification Programs and Standards 159
Section 562—Establishment Of ROTC Cyber Institutes At Senior Military Colleges 159
Section 563—Military-to-Mariner Transition 159
Section 564—Employment Authority for Civilian Faculty at Certain Military Department Schools 159
Section 565—Revision of Name on Military Service Record to Reflect Change in Name of a Member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, after Separation from the Armed Forces 159
Section 566—Direct Employment Pilot Program for Members of the National Guard and Reserve 160
Section 567—Prohibition on Establishment, Maintenance, or Support of Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Units at Educational Institutions That Display Confederate Battle Flag 160
Subtitle F—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters 160
Section 571—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees 160
Section 572—Support for Programs Providing Camp Experience for Children of Military Families 160
Subtitle G—Decorations and Awards 160
Section 581—Review Regarding Award of Medal of Honor to Certain Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander War Veterans 160
Section 582—Authorization for Award of Medals for Acts of Valor 161
Section 583—Authorization for Award of the Medal of Honor to Gary M. Rose for Acts of Valor During the Vietnam War 161
Section 584—Authorization for Award of the Medal of Honor to Charles S. Kettles for Acts of Valor During the Vietnam War 161
Subtitle H—Miscellaneous Reports and Other Matters 161
Section 591—Burial of Cremated Remains in Arlington National Cemetery of Certain Persons Whose Service Is Deemed To Be Active Service 161
Section 592—Representation from Members of the Armed Forces on Boards, Councils, and Committees Making Recommendations Relating to Military Personnel Issues 162
Section 593—Body Mass Index Test 162
Section 594—Preseparation Counseling Regarding Options for Donating Brain Tissue at Time of Death for Research 162

Page

Section 595—Recognition of the Expanded Service Opportunities Available to Female Members of the Armed Forces and the Long Service of Women in the Armed Forces 162
Section 596—Sense of Congress Regarding Plight of Male Victims of Military Sexual Trauma 162
Section 597—Sense of Congress Regarding Section 504 of Title 10, United States Code, on Existing Authority of the Department of Defense to Enlist Individuals, Not Otherwise Eligible for Enlistment, Whose Enlistment Is Vital to the National Interest 162
Section 598—Protection of Second Amendment Rights of Military Families 162
Section 599—Pilot Program on Advanced Technology for Alcohol Abuse Prevention 163
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS 163
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 163
Feasibility study to expanding Veterans Access to Commissary 163
Inspector General Review of the Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Contract for the Pacific 163
Service Members Group Life Insurance Report 164
Student Loan Interest for Eligible Military Borrowers 165
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 165
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances 165
Section 601—Annual Adjustment of Monthly Basic Pay 165
Section 602—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances 165
Section 603—Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reductions Based on the Duration of Temporary Duty Assignment or Civilian Travel 166
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays 166
Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces 166
Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals 166
Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers 166
Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities 166
Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays 167
Section 616—Increase in Maximum Amount of Aviation Special Pays for Flying Duty 167
Section 617—Conforming Amendment to Consolidation of Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities 167
Section 618—Technical and Clerical Amendments Relating to 2008 Consolidation of Certain Special Pay Authorities 167
Section 619—Combat-Related Special Compensation Coordinating Amendment 168
Subtitle C—Disability, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits 168
Section 621—Separation Determinations for Members Participating in Thrift Savings Plan 168
Section 622—Continuation Pay for Full Thrift Savings Plan Members Who Have Completed 8 to 12 Years of Service 168
Section 623—Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance 168
Section 624—Equal Benefits Under Survivor Benefit Plan for Survivors of Reserve Component Members who Die in the Line of Duty during Inactive-Duty Training 168
Section 625—Use of Member's Current Pay Grade and Years of Service, Rather Than Final Retirement Pay Grade and Years of Service, in a Division of Property Involving Disposable Retired Pay 169
Subtitle D—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations 169
Section 631—Protection and Enhancement of Access to and Savings at Commissaries and Exchanges 169
Subtitle E—Travel and Transportation Allowances and Other Matters 169
Section 641—Maximum Reimbursement Amount for Travel Expenses of Members of the Reserves Attending Inactive Duty Training Outside of Normal Commuting Distances 169

Page

Section 642—Statute of Limitations on Department of Defense Recovery of Amounts Owed to the United States by Members of the Uniformed Services, Including Retired and Former Members 169
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS 169
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 169
Briefing on TRICARE Coverage for Emerging Health Care Services 169
Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Partnerships 170
Designation of TRICARE Providers with Military Awareness and Cultural Training 170
Diabetes Prevention Programs 171
Expedited Treatment for Fetal Repair 171
Full Spectrum Ultraviolet Technologies for Routine Disinfection and Outbreak Mitigation 171
Gluten-Free Meals Ready to Eat 172
Improving Beneficiary Experience and Outcomes 172
Improving Pediatric Health Care Under TRICARE 172
Infertility Treatment and Services for Wounded Ill or Injured Members of the Armed Forces 172
Joint Medical Research Test Centers 173
Military Medical Photonics 173
Network of Support 173
Osteoarthritis 174
Prescription Opioid Abuse and Effects on Readiness 174
Private-Public Partnership in Military Treatment Facilities 175
Storage of DNA Samples of Members of the Armed Forces 175
TRICARE Coverage of Medically Necessary Foods 175
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 176
Subtitle A—Reform of TRICARE and Military Health System 176
Section 701—TRICARE Preferred and Other TRICARE Reform 176
Section 702—Reform of Administration of the Defense Health Agency and Military Medical Treatment Facilities 176
Section 703—Military Medical Treatment Facilities 177
Section 704—Access to Urgent Care Under TRICARE Program 177
Section 705—Access to Primary Care Clinics at Military Medical Treatment Facilities 177
Section 706—Incentives for Value-Based Health Under TRICARE Program 177
Section 707—Improvements to Military-Civilian Partnerships to Increase Access to Health Care and Readiness 178
Section 708—Joint Trauma System 178
Section 709—Joint Trauma Education and Training Directorate 178
Section 710—Improvements to Access to Health Care in Military Medical Treatment Facilities 178
Section 711—Adoption of Core Quality Performance Metrics 179
Section 712—Study on Improving Continuity of Health Care Coverage for Reserve Components 179
Subtitle B—Other Health Care Benefits 179
Section 721—Provision of Hearing Aids to Dependents of Retired Members 179
Section 722—Extended TRICARE Program Coverage for Certain Members of the National Guard and Dependents During Certain Disaster Response Duty 179
Subtitle C—Health Care Administration 179
Section 731—Prospective Payment of Funds Necessary to Provide Medical Care for the Coast Guard 179
Subtitle D—Reports and Other Matters 180
Section 741—Mental Health Resources for Members of the Military Services at High Risk of Suicide 180
Section 742—Research of Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy 180
Section 743—Active Oscillating Negative Pressure Treatment 180
Section 744—Long-Term Study on Health of Helicopter and Tiltrotor Pilots 180
Section 745—Pilot Program for Prescription Drug Acquisition Cost Parity in the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program 180

Page

Section 746—Study on Display of Wait Times at Urgent Care Clinics, Pharmacies, and Emergency Rooms of Military Medical Treatment Facilities 180
Section 747—Report on Feasibility of Including Acupuncture and Chiropractic Services for Retirees Under TRICARE Program 180
Section 748—Clarification on Submission of Reports on Longitudinal Study on Traumatic Brain Injury 181
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS 181
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 181
Acquisition Auditing and Agility 181
Acquisition Manager Career Paths 182
Advanced Small Business 182
Appropriate Use of Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable Source Selection Processes and Contracts 183
Contracting Delays for the Small Business Innovative Research Program 184
Defense Acquisition University Course Curriculum 184
Development Planning 184
Developmental and Operational Testing Agility 185
Discussions Between Government and Industry After Receipt of Proposals 185
Domestic Source of Traveling Wave Tubes 186
Innovation Clusters 186
Large Lot Procurement 186
Operation and Support Cost Data 187
Public-Private Competitions Conducted under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 188
Rare Earths 188
Requirement for Non-U.S. Contracts in Afghanistan 189
Service Contracts Inventory and Accountability 189
Small Business Participation Across Industry Categories 190
Veterans in Piping program 190
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 190
Subtitle A—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations 190
Section 801—Revision to Authorities Relating to Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center 190
Section 802—Amendments to Restrictions on Undefinitized Contractual Actions 191
Section 803—Revision to Requirements Relating to Inventory Method for Department of Defense Contracts for Services 191
Section 804—Procurement of Personal Protective Equipment 191
Section 805—Revision to Effective Date of Senior Executive Benchmark Compensation for Allowable Cost Limitations 191
Section 806—Amendments Related to Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts 191
Section 807—Amendments to Special Emergency Procurement Authority 192
Section 808—Compliance with Domestic Source Requirements for Footwear Furnished to Enlisted Members of the Armed Forces Upon Their Entry into the Armed Forces 192
Section 809—Requirement for Policies and Standard Checklist in Procurement of Services 192
Section 810—Extension of Limitation on Aggregate Annual Amount Available for Contract Services 192
Subtitle B—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs ... 192
Section 811—Change in Date of Submission to Congress of Selected Acquisition Reports 192
Section 812—Amendments Relating to Independent Cost Estimation and Cost Analysis 192
Section 813—Revisions to Milestone B Determinations 193
Section 814—Review and Report on Sustainment Planning in the Acquisition Process 193
Section 815—Revision to Distribution of Annual Report on Operational Test and Evaluation 194
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Commercial Items 194

Page

Section 821—Revision to Definition of Commercial Item 194
Section 822—Market Research for Determination of Price Reasonableness in Acquisition of Commercial Items 194
Section 823—Value Analysis for the Determination of Price Reasonableness 194
Section 824—Clarification of Requirements Relating to Commercial Item Determinations 195
Section 825—Pilot Program for Authority to Acquire Innovative Commercial Items Using General Solicitation Competitive Procedures 195
Subtitle D—Other Matters 195
Section 831—Review and Report on the Bid Protest Process 195
Section 832—Review and Report on Indefinite Delivery Contracts 195
Section 833—Review and Report on Contractual Flow-Down Provisions 196
Section 834—Review of Anti-Competitive Specifications in Information Technology Acquisitions 196
Section 835—Coast Guard Major Acquisition Programs 196
Section 836—Waiver of Congressional Notification for Acquisition of Tactical Missiles and Munitions Greater than Quantity Specified in Law 197
Section 837—Closeout of Old Department of the Navy Contracts 198
Section 838—Requirement that Certain Ship Components be Manufactured in the National Technology and Industrial Base 198
Section 839—Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund Determination Adjustment 198
Section 840—Amendment to Prohibition on Performance of Non-Defense Audits by Defense Contract Audit Agency to Exempt Audits for National Nuclear Security Administration 198
Section 841—Selection of Service Providers for Auditing Services and Audit Readiness Services 198
Section 842—Modifications to the Justification and Approval Process for Certain Sole-Source Contracts for Small Business Concerns 198
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT 199
OVERVIEW 199
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 200
Conference Travel Policy 200
Defense Logistics Agency Overhead Costs 201
Human Capital Plan for Business Transformation 202
Oversight and Management of Defense-Wide Training 202
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 203
Subtitle A—Goldwater-Nichols Reform 203
Section 901—Sense of Congress on Goldwater-Nichols Reform 203
Section 902—Repeal of Defense Strategy Review 203
Section 903—Commission on National Defense Strategy for the United States 204
Section 904—Reform of Defense Strategic and Policy Guidance 204
Section 905—Reform of the National Military Strategy 205
Section 906—Modification to Independent Study of National Security Strategy Formulation Process 206
Section 907—Term of Office for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff 206
Section 908—Responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relating to Operations 206
Section 909—Assigned Forces within the Continental United States 207
Section 910—Reduction in General Officer and Flag Officer Grades and Positions 207
Section 911—Establishment of Unified Combatant Command for Cyber Operations 208
Section 912—Revision of Requirements Relating to Length of Joint Duty Assignments 208
Section 913—Revision of Definitions Used for Joint Officer Management 208
Section 914—Independent Assessment of Combatant Command Structure 208
Subtitle B—Other Matters 208
Section 921—Modifications to Corrosion Report 208

Page

Section 922—Authority to Employ Civilian Faculty Members at Joint Special Operations University 208
Section 923—Guidelines for Conversion of Functions Performed by Civilian or Contractor Personnel to Performance by Military Personnel . 209
Section 924—Public Release by Inspectors General of Reports of Misconduct 209
Section 925—Modifications to Requirements for Accounting for Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees Listed as Missing 209
Subtitle C—Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 209
Section 931—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps 209
Section 932—Conforming Amendments to Title 10, United States Code 209
Section 933—Other Provisions of Law and Other References 209
Section 934—Effective Date 209
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS 210
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 210
Counter-Drug Activities 210
Colombia Peace Process 210
United States Southern Command Operational Support 210
Other Matters 211
Accessibility of Translated Foreign Military and Technical Writings 211
Air Force Combat Search and Rescue Associate Units 211
Airlift Safety and Readiness for Certain Aircraft 212
Army and Joint Force Integration of Former Unmanned Aircraft System Center of Excellence Responsibilities 212
Carrier Air Wing Force Structure 213
Comprehensive Detention Strategy 214
Comptroller General Assessment of Deployable Identity Management Forensics Capability 214
Countering Violent Extremism 215
Department of Defense Briefing on United States Ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea 215
Department of Defense Strategy for Countering Unconventional Warfare 215
Enterprise Resource Planning Financial Management Implementation . 216
Financial Management Systems for Army Non-Appropriated Fund Activities 217
Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account 217
Maintaining Compliance with the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan 218
Minerva Research Initiative 218
Preventing Unfair Trade Practices in Military Equipment Sales 219
Recommendations of the National Commission on the Future of the Army 219
Repeal of Report on Unmanned Aircraft Systems 220
Special Operations Forces Education Briefing 220
Wassenaar Arrangement Impacts to the Department of Defense 221
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 221
Subtitle A—Financial Matters 221
Section 1001—General Transfer Authority 221
Section 1002—Requirement to transfer Funds from Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund to the Treasury 221
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities 222
Section 1011—Extension of Authority to Provide Additional Support for Counter-Drug Activities of Foreign Governments 222
Section 1012—Secretary of Defense Review of Curricula and Program Structures of National Guard Counterdrug Schools 222
Section 1013—Extension of Authority to Support Unified Counterdrug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia 222
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards 222
Section 1021—Definition of Short-Term Work with Respect to Overhaul, Repair, or Maintenance of Naval Vessels 222
Section 1022—Warranty Requirements for Shipbuilding Contracts 222
Section 1023—National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund 223
Section 1024—Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga-Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships 223

Page

Section 1025—Restrictions on the Overhaul and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards 223
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism 223
Section 1031—Frequency of Counterterrorism Operations Briefings 223
Section 1032—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to the United States 223
Section 1033—Prohibition on Use of Funds to Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States to House Detainees Transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 224
Section 1034—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Transfer or Release to Certain Countries of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 224
Section 1035—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Realignment of Forces at or Closure of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba 224
Section 1036—Modification of Congressional Notification of Sensitive Military Operations 224
Section 1037—Comprehensive Strategy for Detention of Certain Individuals 224
Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations 225
Section 1041—Expanded Authority for Transportation by the Department of Defense of Non-Department of Defense Personnel and Cargo 225
Section 1042—Limitation on Retirement, Deactivation, or Decommissioning of Mine Countermeasures Ships 225
Section 1043—Extension of Authority of Secretary of Transportation to Issue Non-Premium Aviation Insurance 225
Section 1044—Evaluation of Navy Alternate Combination Cover and Unisex Combination Cover 225
Section 1045—Department of Defense Protection of National Security Spectrum 226
Section 1046—Transportation on Military Aircraft on a Space-Available Basis for Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces with Disabilities Rated as Total 226
Section 1047—National Guard Flyovers of Public Events 226
Subtitle F—Studies and Reports 226
Section 1061—Temporary Continuation of Certain Department of Defense Reporting Requirements 226
Section 1062—Matters for Inclusion in Report on Designation of Countries for which Rewards May Be Paid under Department of Defense Rewards Program 227
Section 1063—Congressional Notification of Biological Select Agent and Toxin Theft, Loss, or Release Involving the Department of Defense 227
Section 1064—Report on Service-Provided Support to United States Special Operations Forces 227
Section 1065—Report on Citizen Security Responsibilities in the Northern Triangle of Central America 227
Section 1066—Report on Counterproliferation Activities and Programs . 227
Section 1067—Inclusion of Ballistic Missile Defense Information in Annual Report on Requirements of Combatant Commands 228
Section 1068—Reviews by Department of Defense Concerning National Security Use of Spectrum 228
Section 1069—Annual Report on Personnel, Training, and Equipment Requirements for the Non-Federalized National Guard to Support Civilian Authorities in Prevention and Response to Domestic Disasters 229
Subtitle G—Other Matters 229
Section 1081—Technical and Clerical Amendments 229
Section 1082—Modification to Support for Non-Federal Development and Testing of Material for Chemical Agent Defense 229
Section 1083—Increase in Maximum Amount Available for Equipment, Services, and Supplies Provided for Humanitarian Demining Assistance 229
Section 1084—Liquidation of Unpaid Credits Accrued as a Result of Transactions Under a Cross-Servicing Agreement 230
Section 1085—Clarification of Contracts Covered by Airlift Service Provision 230

Page

Section 1086—National Biodefense Strategy 230
Section 1087—Global Cultural Knowledge Network 231
Section 1088—Modification of Requirements Relating to Management of Military Technicians 231
Section 1089—Sense of Congress Regarding Connecticut's Submarine Century 232
Section 1090—LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency 232
Section 1091—Sense of Congress Regarding the Reporting of the MV–22 Mishap in Marana, Arizona, on April 8, 2000 232
Section 1092—Transfer of Surplus Firearms to Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety 232
Section 1093—Sense of Congress Regarding the Importance of Panama City, Florida, to the History and Future of the Armed Forces 232
Section 1094—Protections Relating to Civil Rights and Disabilities 232
Section 1095—Nonapplicability of Certain Executive Order to Department of Defense and National Nuclear Security Administration 232
Section 1096—Determination and Disclosure of Transportation Costs Incurred by Secretary of Defense for Congressional Trips Outside the United States 233
Section 1097—Waiver of Certain Polygraph Examination Requirements 233
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS 233
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 233
Defense Intelligence Agency Housing Allowances 233
Five-Year Limitation on Civilian Personnel Working Overseas 233
Joint Base Wage Grade Parity 234
Security Clearances 234
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 235
Section 1101—Temporary Direct Hire Authority for Domestic Defense Industrial Base Facilities and the Major Range and Test Facilities Base 235
Section 1102—Temporary Personnel Flexibilities for Domestic Defense Industrial Base Facilities and Major Range and Test Facilities Base Civilian Personnel 235
Section 1103—One-Year Extension of Temporary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Civilian Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone 235
Section 1104—Advance Payments for Employees Relocating within the United States and Its Territories 235
Section 1105—Permanent Authority for Alternative Personnel Program for Scientific and Technical Personnel 235
Section 1106—Modification to Information Technology Personnel Exchange Program 236
Section 1107—Treatment of Certain Localities for Calculation of Per Diem Allowances 236
Section 1108—Eligibility of Employees in a Time-Limited Appointment to Compete for a Permanent Appointment at Any Federal Agency 236
Section 1109—Limitation on Administrative Leave 236
Section 1110—Record of Investigation of Personnel Action in Separated Employee's Official Personnel File 236
Section 1111—Review of Official Personnel File of Former Federal Employees before Rehiring 236
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS 237
OVERVIEW 237
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 238
Assistance to Iraqi Forces for Mosul Operations 238
Assistance to the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces 239
Chinese Participation in Rim of the Pacific Exercise 239
Comptroller General of the United States Assessment of Foreign Military Sales 240
Countering Adversarial Messaging 241
Counterterrorism and Security Cooperation Efforts in Somalia and the Horn of Africa 241
Department of Defense Briefing on Foreign Military Sales 242
Enduring Basing Requirements in the U.S. Central Command Area of Responsibility 242
Enduring High-Resolution Geospatial Data 243

Page

Instability in Libya 243
Interpretation of gross violation of human rights 244
Military Assistance to the Government of Ukraine 244
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Defense Spending Commitments 244
Report on U.S. Military Enabler Support within Operation Inherent Resolve 245
Reporting Requirements of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism 245
Review of Taiwan Midshipman Cruise Training Port Call 246
Social Media Analytics and Publically Available Information Supporting Battlespace Awareness 246
State Partnership Program Activities in Ukraine 247
Strategy for Regional Counter-Narrative Capabilities 247
Syria No Fly Zone 248
The Military Campaign to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant 248
Transparency in Security Cooperation Activities 249
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 250
Subtitle A—Assistance and Training 250
Section 1201—One-Year Extension of Logistical Support for Coalition Forces Supporting Certain United States Military Operations 250
Section 1202—Extension of Authority for Training of General Purpose Forces of the United States Armed Forces with Military and Other Security Forces of Friendly Foreign Countries 250
Section 1203—Modification and Extension of Authority to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction 250
Section 1204—Extension of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism 250
Section 1205—Modification and Codification of Reporting Requirements Relating to Security Cooperation Authorities 250
Section 1206—Independent Assessment of Department of Defense Security Cooperation Programs 251
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan and Pakistan 252
Section 1211—Extension and Modification of Commanders' Emergency Response Program 252
Section 1212—Extension and Modification of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations 252
Section 1213—Extension of Authority to Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries Along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan 253
Section 1214—Extension of Authority to Transfer Defense Articles and Provide Defense Services to the Military and Security Forces of Afghanistan 253
Section 1215—Sense of Congress on United States Policy and Strategy in Afghanistan 253
Section 1216—Special Immigrant Status for Certain Afghans 253
Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Syria and Iraq 254
Section 1221—Modification and Extension of Authority to Provide Assistance to the Vetted Syrian Opposition 254
Section 1222—Modification and Extension of Authority to Provide Assistance to Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant 254
Section 1223—Extension and Modification of Authority to Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq ... 255
Section 1224—Report on Prevention of Future Terrorist Organizations in Iraq and Syria 255
Section 1225—Semiannual Report on Integration of Political and Military Strategies Against ISIL 256
Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation 256
Section 1231—Limitation on Use of Funds to Approve or Otherwise Permit Approval of Certain Requests by Russian Federation Under Open Skies Treaty 256
Section 1232—Military Response Options to Russian Federation Violation of INF Treaty 257
Section 1233—Limitation on Military Cooperation between the United States and the Russian Federation 257

Page

Section 1234—Statement of Policy on United States Efforts in Europe to Reassure United States Partners and Allies and Deter Aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation 258
Section 1235—Modification of Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative 258
Section 1236—Prohibition on Availability of Funds Relating to Sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea 258
Section 1237—Modification and Extension of Report on Military Assistance to Ukraine 259
Section 1238—Additional Matters in Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Russian Federation 259
Subtitle E—Other Matters 259
Section 1241—Sense of Congress on Malign Activities of the Government of Iran 259
Section 1242—Modification of Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 259
Section 1243—Sense of Congress on Trilateral Cooperation Between Japan, South Korea, and the United States 260
Section 1244—Sense of Congress on Cooperation Between Singapore and the United States 260
Section 1245—Monitoring and Evaluation of Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid Programs of the Department of Defense 260
Section 1246—Enhancement of Interagency Support During Contingency Operations and Transition Periods 260
Section 1247—Two-Year Extension and Modification of Authorization of Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities 261
Section 1248—Authority to Destroy Certain Specified World War II-Era United States-Origin Chemical Munitions Located on San Jose Island, Republic of Panama 261
Section 1249—Strategy for United States Defense Interests in Africa 262
Section 1250—United States-Israel Directed Energy Cooperation 262
Section 1251—Sense of Congress on Support for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania 262
Section 1252—Sense of Congress on Support for Georgia 262
Section 1253—Modification of Annual Report on Military Power of Iran 263
Section 1254—Sense of Congress on Senior Military Exchanges Between the United States and Taiwan 263
Section 1255—Quarterly Report on Freedom of Navigation Operations . 263
Subtitle F—Codification and Consolidation of Department of Defense Security Cooperation Authorities 263
Section 1261—Enactment of New Chapter for Department of Defense Security Cooperation Authorities and Transfer of Certain Authorities to New Chapter 263
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION 264
OVERVIEW 264
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 264
Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Funds 264
Section 1302—Funding Allocations 264
Section 1303—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cooperative Threat Reduction in People's Republic of China 265
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 265
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 265
Beryllium Metal Supply 265
Clarification of Product Improvement Pilot Program Authority 265
Defense Production Act Implications for Propeller Shafts 266
Destruction of Chemical Weapons Stockpile 266
Locality Pay at Department of Defense Working Capital Fund Facilities 267
Rare Earth Stockpile Acquisitions by the Defense Logistics Agency 267
Successful Changes to Working Capital Fund Cash Management Policy 268
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 269
Subtitle A—Military Programs 269
Section 1401—Working Capital Funds 269
Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund 269
Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense 269

Page

Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 269
Section 1405—Defense Inspector General 269
Section 1406—Defense Health Program 269
Section 1407—National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund 269
Subtitle B—National Defense Stockpile 269
Section 1411—Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials from and to Acquire Additional Materials for the National Defense Stockpile 269
Section 1412—Revisions to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act 270
Subtitle C—Other Matters 270
Section 1421—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 270
Section 1422—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home 270
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS 270
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 270
Execution of Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund 270
National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Account 271
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 272
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations 272
Section 1501—Purpose and Treatment of Certain Authorizations of Appropriations 272
Section 1502—Procurement 272
Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 272
Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance 272
Section 1505—Military Personnel 273
Section 1506—Working Capital Funds 273
Section 1507—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide 273
Section 1508—Defense Inspector General 273
Section 1509—Defense Health Program 273
Section 1510—Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund 273
Subtitle B—Financial Matters 274
Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations 274
Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority 274
Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters 274
Section 1531—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund 274
Section 1532—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund 274
Section 1533—Extension of Authority to Use Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund for Training of Foreign Security Forces to Defeat Improvised Explosive Devices 275
TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS 275
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 275
Accrediting Models for Missile Defense Testing 275
Air Force Global Strike Command 275
Analytic Line Review of U.S. Central Command Intelligence Assessments 276
Army Small Satellite Technology Development 276
Assessment of Department of Defense Efforts to Secure Internet of Things 277
Assessment of Hardening Technologies for Microgrids 277
Asset Tracking for Information Technology Security 278
Biennial Cyber Exercises 279
Briefing on B61–12 Deployment Plans and Costs for Modifying Dual-Capable Aircraft 279
Briefing on Security Standards Related to Forward-Deployed U.S. Nuclear Weapons 279
Cloud Access Points 280
Command and Control of National Security Space Assets 281
Commercial Geospatial Intelligence 281
Commercial Satellite Communications 281
Commercial Space-Based Capabilities 282

Page

Comptroller General Assessment of the Management and Measurement of Cyber Activities 283
Comptroller General Review of Software-Intensive Space Acquisition Programs 284
Comptroller General Review of the Space Acquisition Workforce 284
Confidence-Building Measures Related to Conventional Prompt Global Strike Capabilities 285
Contribution of AN/TPY–2 Radars 286
Cyber Hardening Through Program Sustainment 286
Cyber Training Equivalency 287
Department of Defense Equities on Approval of the Galileo Positioning, Navigation, and Timing System 288
Department of Defense Requirements for National Reconnaissance Office Programs 288
Ensuring Robust Missile Defense for Hawaii 288
Ensuring Technical Expertise for Sustainment of the Nuclear Command and Control System 289
Evaluation of Department of Defense Use of Non-Allied Global Navigation Satellite Systems 289
Excess Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Motor Certification 290
Expeditionary Large Data Object Repository for Analytics in Deployed Operations 290
Ground Based Strategic Deterrent 290
Host Based Security System Best Practices 291
Hosted Payloads 291
Improving Intelligence Support to Acquisition 292
Improving Sea-Based X Band radar 292
Information Assurance of Joint Test and Evaluation Activities 294
Insider Threat Capabilities for the Joint Information Environment 294
Integrated Department of Defense Intelligence Priorities 295
Intelligence Analysis Processes of the Combatant Commands 295
Interagency Collaboration on Physical Security for Nuclear Weapons 296
Intermediate-Range Ground-Launched Missiles 297
JLENS Redeployment 298
Joint Interagency Combined Space Operations Center 299
Military Space Acquisition Improvements 300
Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network 301
Modernizing the Ballistic Missile Defense System 301
- Accelerating development of missile defense radars for homeland defense 302
- Booster upgrades for improved homeland defense interceptor 302
- Cyber protection improvements to the Ballistic Missile Defense System 302
- Ground system communications and fire control software upgrades to enable full Redesigned Kill Vehicle capabilities 303
- Missile defense test ranges 303
- Multi-Object Kill Vehicle technology maturation 303
- Post-Intercept Assessment acceleration 304
- Redesigned Kill Vehicle risk reduction 304

Next Generation Operational Control Segment 304
Nuclear Weapons Security Forces Standards 305
Operationally Responsive Space 305
Plan for Strengthening Outer Space Cooperation with Japan 306
Propulsion Test Facilities 306
Quarterly Briefings on Strategic Forces 306
Report on Long-Range Standoff Weapon 307
Report on Strategic Missile Commonality 308
Report on Theater Missile Defense Training and Deployment Requirements 308
Review of Dual-Hatting Relationship 309
Satellite Ground Control Systems 310
Space Defense and Protection 310
Space Situational Awareness 311
Spaceports 311
Strategic Plan for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center 311
Streamlining Missile Defense Oversight 312

Page

Supply Chain Security of Strategic Capabilities 313
Sustainment and Modernization of the Cobra Dane Radar 314
Trusted foundries for strategic-hardened microelectronics 315
Unified Platform 315
Use of Surplus ICBM Motors for Commercial Space Launches 316
Weather Forecasting Model 316
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 317
Subtitle A—Space Activities 317
Section 1601—Rocket Propulsion System to Replace RD–180 317
Section 1602—Exception to the Prohibition on Contracting with Russian Suppliers of Rocket Engines for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program 318
Section 1603—Analysis of Alternatives for Wide-Band Communications 318
Section 1604—Modification to Pilot Program for Acquisition of Commercial Satellite Communication Services 319
Section 1605—Space-Based Environmental Monitoring 319
Section 1606—Prohibition on Use of Certain Non-Allied Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Systems 319
Section 1607—Limitation of Availability of Funds for the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System 320
Section 1608—Space-Based Infrared System and Advanced Extremely High Frequency Program 320
Section 1609—Plans on Transfer of Acquisition and Funding Authority of Certain Weather Missions to National Reconnaissance Office 321
Section 1610—Pilot Program on Commercial Weather Data 322
Section 1611—Organization and Management of National Security Space Activities of the Department of Defense 322
Section 1612—Review of Charter of Operationally Responsive Space Program Office 322
Section 1613—Backup and Complementary Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Capabilities of Global Positioning System 323
Subtitle B—Defense Intelligence and Intelligence-Related Activities 323
Section 1621—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Intelligence Management 323
Section 1622—Limitations on Availability of Funds for United States Central Command Intelligence Fusion Center 323
Section 1623—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex 324
Subtitle C—Cyberspace-related Matters 324
Section 1631—Special Emergency Procurement Authority to Facilitate the Defense Against or Recovery from a Cyber Attack 324
Section 1632—Change in Name of National Defense University's Information Resources Management College to College of Information and Cyberspace 324
Section 1633—Requirement to Enter into Agreements Relating to Use of Cyber Opposition Forces 324
Section 1634—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cryptographic Systems and Key Management Infrastructure 325
Subtitle D—Nuclear Forces 325
Section 1641—Improvements to Council on Oversight of National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System 325
Section 1642—Treatment of Certain Sensitive Information by State and Local Governments 326
Section 1643—Procurement Authority for Certain Parts of Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Fuzes 326
Section 1644—Prohibition on the Availability of Funds for Mobile Variant of Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent Missile 327
Section 1645—Limitation On Availability of Funds for Extension of New START Treaty 327
Section 1646—Consolidation of Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications Functions of the Air Force 327
Section 1647—Report on Russian and Chinese Political and Military Leadership Survivability, Command and Control, and Continuity of Government Programs and Activities 328
Section 1648—Sense of Congress on Importance of Independent Nuclear Deterrent of United Kingdom 328
Subtitle E—Missile Defense Programs 328

Page

Section 1651—Extensions of Prohibitions Relating to Missile Defense Information and Systems 328
Section 1652—Review of the Missile Defeat Policy and Strategy of the United States 328
Section 1653—Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense System and Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense Program Codevelopment and Coproduction 329
Section 1654—Maximizing Aegis Ashore Capability 330
Section 1655—Technical Authority for Integrated Air and Missile Defense Activities and Programs 331
Section 1656—Development and Research of Non-Terrestrial Missile Defense Layer 331
Section 1657—Hypersonic Boost Glide Vehicle Defense 332
Section 1658—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Patriot Lower Tier Air and Missile Defense Capability of the Army 332
Section 1659—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Conventional Prompt Global Strike Weapons System 333
Section 1660—Pilot Program on Loss of Unclassified, Controlled Technical Information 333
Section 1661—Review of Missile Defense Agency Budget Submissions for Ground-based Midcourse Defense and Evaluation of Alternative Ground-based Interceptor Deployments 333
Section 1662—Declaratory Policy, Concept of Operations, and Employment Guidelines for Left-of-Launch Capability 334
Section 1663—Procurement of Medium-Range Discrimination Radar to Improve Homeland Missile Defense 334
Section 1664—Semiannual Notifications on Missile Defense Tests and Costs 335
Section 1665—National Missile Defense Policy 335
Section 1666—Sense of the Congress on Initial Operating Capability of Phase 2 of European Phased Adaptive Approach to Missile Defense 335
Subtitle F—Other Matters 335
Section 1671—Protection of Certain Facilities and Assets from Unmanned Aircraft 335
Section 1672—Improvement of Coordination by Department of Defense of Electromagnetic Spectrum Usage 335
TITLE XVII—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION AGILITY 336
OVERVIEW 336
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 337
Implementation of the Acquisition Agility Authorities 337
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 338
Section 1701—Modular Open System Approach in Development of Major Weapon Systems 338
Section 1702—Development, Prototyping, and Deployment of Weapon System Components or Technology 339
Section 1703—Cost, Schedule, and Performance of Major Defense Acquisition Programs 340
Section 1704—Transparency in Major Defense Acquisition Programs 341
Section 1705—Amendments Relating to Technical Data Rights 341
TITLE XVIII—MATTERS RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT 342
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 342
Nonapplicability to Defense Production Act 342
Review of Surety Bonds Required by Federal Contractors 343
Review of the Office of Government Contracting and Business Development of the Small Business Administration 343
Small Business Subcontractor Transparency 344
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 344
Subtitle A—Improving Transparency and Clarity for Small Businesses 344
Section 1801—Plain Language Rewrite of Requirements for Small Business Procurements 344
Section 1802—Improving Reporting on Small Business Goals 344
Section 1803—Transparency in Small Business Goals 345
Section 1804—Uniformity in Procurement Terminology 345
Subtitle B—Clarifying the Roles of Small Business Advocates 345

Page

Section 1811—Scope of Review by Procurement Center Representatives 345
Section 1812—Responsibilities of Commercial Market Representatives . 345
Section 1813—Duties of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization 346
Section 1814—Improving Contractor Compliance 346
Section 1815—Responsibilities of Business Opportunity Specialists 346
Subtitle C—Strengthening Opportunities for Competition in Subcontracting 346
Section 1821—Good Faith in Subcontracting 346
Section 1822—Pilot Program to Provide Opportunities for Qualified Subcontractors to Obtain Past Performance Ratings 347
Subtitle D—Mentor-Protege Programs 347
Section 1831—Amendments to the Mentor-Protege Program of the Department of Defense 347
Section 1832—Improving Cooperation between the Mentor-Protege Programs of the Small Business Administration and the Department of Defense 347
Subtitle E—Women's Business Programs 347
Section 1841—Office of Women's Business Ownership 347
Section 1842—Women's Business Center Program 347
Section 1843—Matching Requirements Under Women's Business Center Program 348
Subtitle F—SCORE Program 348
Section 1851—SCORE Reauthorization 348
Section 1852—SCORE Program 348
Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Provisions 348
Section 1861—Improving Education on Small Business Regulations 348
Section 1862—Protecting Task Order Competition 348
Section 1863—Improvements to Size Standards for Small Agricultural Producers 349
Section 1864—Uniformity in Service-Disabled Veteran Definitions 349
Section 1865—Required Reports Pertaining to Capital Planning and Investment Control 349
Section 1866—Office of Hearings and Appeals 349
Section 1867—Issuance of Guidance on Small Business Matters 349

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS 350
PURPOSE 350
MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW 350
Section 2001—Short Title 350
Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required To Be Specified by Law 350
Section 2003—Effective Date 350
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 350
SUMMARY 350
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 351
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 351
Combat Aviation Hangar Sustainment 352
Former Fitzsimons Army Medical Center 352
Relocation of the Defense Non-Tactical Generator and Rail Equipment Center 352
Statue of Ulysses S. Grant at United States Military Academy 353
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 353
Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 353
Section 2102—Family Housing 353
Section 2103—Authorization of Appropriations, Army 354
Section 2104—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project 354
Section 2105—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects 354
Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Projects 354
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 354
SUMMARY 354
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 354
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 354

Page
Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle 356
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training 356
Implementation of Guam Munitions and Explosives of Concern Clearance Policy 357
Infrastructure Requirements to Support Marine Rotational Force–Darwin 357
Port of Virginia Channel 358
Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility 359
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 360
Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 360
Section 2202—Family Housing 360
Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 360
Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy 360
Section 2205—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project 360
Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects 360
Section 2207—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Projects 360
Section 2208—Status of "Net Negative" Policy Regarding Navy Acreage on Guam 361
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 361
SUMMARY 361
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 361
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 361
Air Force Remotely Piloted Aircraft Stationing, Basing, and Laydown Selection Process 362
Lincoln Laboratory Recapitalization 362
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 363
Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 363
Section 2302—Family Housing 363
Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units 363
Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force 363
Section 2305—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2016 Project 363
Section 2306—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project 364
Section 2307—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project 364
Section 2308—Restriction on Acquisition of Property in Northern Mariana Islands 364
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 364
SUMMARY 364
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 364
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 364
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 366
Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 366
Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects 366
Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies 366
Section 2404—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project 366
Section 2405—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects 366
Section 2406—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Projects 366
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM 367
SUMMARY 367
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 367
Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 367
Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO 367
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES 367

Page

SUMMARY 367
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 367
Explanation of Funding Adjustments 367
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 369
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorization of Appropriations ... 369
Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 369
Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 369
Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 369
Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 369
Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 370
Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve 370
Subtitle B—Other Matters 370
Section 2611—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project 370
Section 2612—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2015 Project 370
Section 2613—Modification of Authority to Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2016 Project 370
Section 2614—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project 370
Section 2615—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Projects 371
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES 371
SUMMARY 371
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 371
Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account 371
Section 2702—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round 371
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS 371
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 371
Aqueous Film-Forming Foam 371
Concept of Operations for Military Environmental Control Units 372
Condition of Military Airfield Infrastructure 372
Consultation with Federally-Recognized Indian Tribes 373
Contract Management of Problem Construction Projects 373
Facility Industrial Control Systems 374
Improvement of Design-Build Selection Process 374
Innovative Construction Materials and Design Process for Military Engineering in Cold Regions 375
Installation Access for Ride Sharing Services 375
Live-Fire Small Arms Training Ranges 376
Military Construction for Military Intelligence Facilities 376
Military Housing Privatization Initiative 377
Modification of Guidance on Use of Airfield Pavement Markings 377
Okinawa Consolidation Plan 378
Overseas Infrastructure Long-Range Planning 379
Report on Military Construction Project Cost Estimating and Execution 379
Workforce Issues for Relocation of Marines to Guam 380
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 380
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing 380
Section 2801—Modification of Criteria for Treatment of Laboratory Revitalization Projects as Minor Military Construction Projects 380
Section 2802—Classification of Facility Conversion Projects as Repair Projects 381
Section 2803—Extension of Temporary, Limited Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States 381

Page

Section 2804—Extension of Temporary Authority for Acceptance and Use of Contributions for Certain Construction, Maintenance, and Repair Projects Mutually Beneficial to the Department of Defense and Kuwait Military Forces 381
Section 2805—Notice and Reporting Requirements for Energy Conservation Construction Projects 381
Section 2806—Additional Entities Eligible for Participation in Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program 381
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration 381
Section 2811—Congressional Notification of In-Kind Contributions for Overseas Military Construction Projects 381
Section 2812—Prohibition on Use of Military Installations to House Unaccompanied Alien Children 382
Section 2813—Allotment of Space and Provision of Services to WIC Offices Operating on Military Installations 382
Section 2814—Sense of Congress Regarding Need to Consult with State and Local Officials Prior to Acquisitions of Real Property 382
Section 2815—Sense of Congress Regarding Inclusion of Stormwater Systems and Components within the Meaning of "Wastewater System" Under the Department of Defense Authority for Conveyance of Utility Systems 382
Section 2816—Assessment of Public Schools on Department of Defense Installations 382
Subtitle C—Provision Related to Asia-Pacific Military Realignment 382
Section 2821—Limited Exceptions to Restriction on Development of Public Infrastructure in Connection with Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region 382
Subtitle D—Land Conveyances 383
Section 2831—Land Conveyances, High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program Facility and Adjacent Property, Gakona, Alaska 383
Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Campion Air Force Radar Station, Galena, Alaska 383
Section 2833—Exchange of Property Interests, San Diego Unified Port District, California 383
Section 2834—Release of Property Interests Retained in Connection with Land Conveyance, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida 383
Section 2835—Land Exchange, Fort Hood, Texas 383
Section 2836—Land Conveyance, P–36 Warehouse, Colbern United States Army Reserve Center, Laredo, Texas 384
Section 2837—Land Conveyance, St. George National Guard Armory, St. George, Utah 384
Section 2838—Release of Restrictions, Richland Innovation Center, Richland, Washington 384
Subtitle E—Military Land Withdrawals 384
Section 2841—Bureau of Land Management Withdrawn Military Lands Under Military Land Withdrawal Act of 1999 384
Section 2842—Permanent Withdrawal or Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction of Public Land, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California 384
Subtitle F—Military Memorials, Monuments, and Museums 385
Section 2851—Cyber Center for Education and Innovation-Home of the National Cryptologic Museum 385
Section 2852—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio 385
Section 2853—Support for Military Service Memorials and Museums Highlighting Role of Women in the Military 385
Section 2854—Petersburg National Battlefield Boundary Modification .. 385
Section 2855—Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act .. 385
Section 2856—Recognition of the National Museum of World War II Aviation 386
Subtitle G—Designations and Other Matters 386
Section 2861—Designation of Portion of Moffett Federal Airfield, California, as Moffett Air National Guard Base 386
Section 2862—Redesignation of Mike O'Callaghan Federal Medical Center 386
Section 2863—Transfer of Certain Items of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the Descendants of General Omar Bradley 386

Page

Section 2864—Protection and Recovery of Greater Sage Grouse 386
Section 2865—Implementation of Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan and Other Conservation Measures 387
Section 2866—Removal of Endangered Species Status for American Burying Beetle 387
TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 387
SUMMARY 387
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 387
Section 2901—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 387
Section 2902—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects 387
Section 2903—Authorization of Appropriations 387
TITLE XXX—UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE ENCROACHMENT PREVENTION AND TEMPORARY CLOSURE AUTHORITIES 388
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 388
Section 3001—Findings and Definitions 388
Subtitle A—Utah Test and Training Range 388
Section 3011—Management of BLM Land 388
Section 3012—Temporary Closures 388
Section 3013—Community Resource Group 388
Section 3014—Liability 388
Section 3015—Effects of Subtitle 388
Subtitle B—Land Exchange 388
Section 3021—Findings and Purpose 388
Section 3022—Definitions 389
Section 3023—Exchange of Federal Land and Non-Federal Land 389
Section 3024—Status and Management of Non-Federal Land after Exchange 389
Section 3025—Hazardous Materials 389
Subtitle C—Highway Rights-of-way 389
Section 3031—Recognition and Transfer of Certain Highway Rights-of-Way 389
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 389
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 389
OVERVIEW 389
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 390
National Nuclear Security Administration 390
Overview 390
Weapons Activities 390
Attraction and retention of personnel within the nuclear security enterprise 390
Defense nuclear security and physical security infrastructure recapitalization 391
Deferred maintenance 392
Domestic uranium enrichment program 393
Funding prioritization within Weapons Activities 393
Future Years Nuclear Security Program funding 394
Life extension programs 395
Plutonium strategy 396
Stockpile systems, surveillance and assessments, and Integrated Surety Architecture 396
Strategic commodities 397
Technology maturation programs, prototypes program, and stockpile responsiveness program 398
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation 399
Comptroller General assessment of project management processes and systems for defense nuclear nonproliferation programs 399
Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response Program and emergency preparedness 400
Naval Reactors 401
Naval Reactors program 401
Federal Salaries and Expenses 401
Briefing on contracting strategy and plan 401

Page

Briefing on damage assessment of improper disposal of sensitive information 402
Governance and management reform 402
Environmental and Other Defense Activities 403
Overview 403
Defense Environmental Cleanup 403
Hanford Site 403
Technology development 403
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant 404
Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal 404
Defense nuclear waste repository 404
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 405
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations 405
Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration 405
Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup 405
Section 3103—Other Defense Activities 405
Section 3104—Nuclear Energy 405
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations 405
Section 3111—Independent Acquisition Project Reviews of Capital Assets Acquisition Projects 405
Section 3112—Research and Development of Advanced Naval Nuclear Fuel System Based on Low-Enriched Uranium 406
Section 3113—Disposition of Weapons-Usable Plutonium 406
Section 3114—Design Basis Threat 407
Section 3115—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Provision of Certain Assistance to Russian Federation 407
Section 3116—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Federal Salaries and Expenses 408
Section 3117—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defense Environmental Cleanup Program Direction 408
Section 3118—Limitation on Availablity of Funds for Acceleration of Nuclear Weapons Dismantlement 408
Section 3119—Annual Certification of Shipments to Waste Isolation Pilot Plant 409
Subtitle C—Plans and Reports 410
Section 3121—Clarification of Annual Report and Certification on Status of Security of Atomic Energy Defense Facilities 410
Section 3122—Annual Report on Service Support Contracts of the National Nuclear Security Administration 410
Section 3123—Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements 410
Section 3124—Independent Assessment of Technology Development under Defense Environmental Cleanup Program 410
Section 3125—Updated Plan for Verification and Monitoring of Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material 411
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD 412
OVERVIEW 412
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 412
Section 3201—Authorization 412
TITLE XXXIII—NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION CAPABILITIES 412
Section 3301—Short Title 412
Section 3302—Nuclear Energy 412
Section 3303—Nuclear Energy Research Programs 413
Section 3304—Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative 413
Section 3305—University Nuclear Science and Engineering Support 413
Section 3306—Department of Energy Civilian Nuclear Infrastructure and Facilities 413
Section 3307—Security of Nuclear Facilities 413
Section 3308—High-Performance Computation and Supportive Research 413
Section 3309—Enabling Nuclear Energy Innovation 413
Section 3310—Budget Plan 413
Section 3311—Conforming Amendments 414
TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES 414
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 414
Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations 414
TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION 414
ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST 414

Page

Non-Availability of Vessels 414
Recycling United States Vessels in the United States 414
LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS 415
Section 3501—Authorization of the Maritime Administration 415
Section 3502—Authority to Make Pro Rata Annual Payments Under Operating Agreements for Vessels Participating in Maritime Security Fleet 415
Section 3503—Authority to Extend Certain Age Restrictions Relating to Vessels in the Maritime Security Fleet 415
Section 3504—Corrections to Provisions Enacted by Coast Guard Authorization Acts 415
Section 3505—Status of National Defense Reserve Fleet Vessels 415
Section 3506—NDRF National Security Multi-Mission Vessel 415
Section 3507—United States Merchant Marine Academy 416
Section 3508—Use of National Defense Reserve Fleet Scrapping Proceeds 416
Section 3509—Floating Dry Docks 416
TITLE XXXVI—BALLAST WATER 416
Section 3601—Short Title 416
Section 3602—Definitions 416
Section 3603—Regulation and Enforcement 416
Section 3604—Uniform National Standards and Requirements for the Regulation of Discharges Incidental to the Normal Operation of a Vessel 416
Section 3605—Treatment Technology Certification 416
Section 3606—Exemptions 416
Section 3607—Alternative Compliance Program 417
Section 3608—Judicial Review 417
Section 3609—Effect on State Authority 417
Section 3610—Application with Other Statutes 417

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES 417
Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables 417
Summary of National Defense Authorizations for Fiscal Year 2017 417
National Defense Budget Authority Implication 424
TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT 426
Section 4101—Procurement 426
Section 4102—Procurement for Overseas Contingency Operations 466
Section 4103—Procurement for Overseas Contingency Operations for Base Requirements 479
TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION 489
Section 4201—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation 489
Section 4202—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for Overseas Contingency Operations 523
Section 4203—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation for Overseas Contingency Operations for Base Requirements 525
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE 527
Section 4301—Operation and Maintenance 528
Section 4302—Operation and Maintenance for Overseas Contingency Operations 545
Section 4303—Operation and Maintenance for Overseas Contingency Operations for Base Requirements 558
TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL 566
Section 4401—Military Personnel 566
Section 4402—Military Personnel for Overseas Contingency Operations 567
Section 4403—Military Personnel for Overseas Contingency Operations for Base Requirements 567
TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS 568
Section 4501—Other Authorizations 568
Section 4502—Other Authorizations for Overseas Contingency Operations 571
Section 4503—Other Authorizations for Overseas Contingency Operations for Base Requirements 573
TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION 573
Section 4601—Military Construction 573
Section 4602—Military Construction for Overseas Contingency Operations 585

Page

Section 4603—Military Construction for Overseas Contingency Operations for Base Requirements 587
TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS 587
Section 4701—Department of Energy National Security Programs 588

DIVISION E—MILITARY JUSTICE 600
OVERVIEW 600
TITLE LX—GENERAL PROVISIONS 601
Section 6001—Definitions 601
Section 6002—Clarification of Persons Subject to UCMJ while on Inactive-Duty Training 601
Section 6003—Staff Judge Advocate Disqualification Due to Prior Involvement in Case 601
Section 6004—Conforming Amendment Relating to Military Magistrates 601
Section 6005—Rights of Victim 602
TITLE LXI—APPREHENSION AND RESTRAINT 602
Section 6101—Restraint of Persons Charged 602
Section 6102—Modification of Prohibition of Confinement of Armed Forces Members with Enemy Prisoners and Certain Others 602
TITLE LXII—NON-JUDICIAL PUNISHMENT 602
Section 6201—Modification of Confinement as Non-Judicial Punishment 602
TITLE LXIII—COURT–MARTIAL JURISDICTION 603
Section 6301—Courts-Martial Classified 603
Section 6302—Jurisdiction of General Courts-Martial 603
Section 6303—Jurisdiction of Special Courts-Martial 603
Section 6304—Summary Court-Martial as Non-Criminal Forum 603
TITLE LXIV—COMPOSITION OF COURTS–MARTIAL 603
Section 6401—Technical Amendment Relating to Persons Authorized to Convene General Courts-Martial 603
Section 6402—Who May Serve on Courts-Martial; Detail of Members ... 604
Section 6403—Number of Court-Martial Members in Capital Cases 604
Section 6404—Detailing, Qualifications, etc. of Military Judges 604
Section 6405—Qualifications of Trial Counsel and Defense Counsel 604
Section 6406—Assembly and Impaneling of Members; Detail of New Members and Military Judges 604
Section 6407—Military Magistrates 605
TITLE LXV—PRE–TRIAL PROCEDURE 605
Section 6501—Charges and Specifications 605
Section 6502—Preliminary Hearing Required before Referral to General Court-Martial 605
Section 6503—Disposition Guidance 605
Section 6504—Advice to Convening Authority before Referral for Trial . 605
Section 6505—Service of Charges and Commencement of Trial 606
TITLE LXVI—TRIAL PROCEDURE 606
Section 6601—Duties of Assistant Defense Counsel 606
Section 6602—Sessions 606
Section 6603—Technical Amendments Relating to Continuances 606
Section 6604—Conforming Amendments Relating to Challenges 606
Section 6605—Statute of Limitations 606
Section 6606—Former Jeopardy 606
Section 6607—Pleas of the Accused 607
Section 6608—Contempt 607
Section 6609—Depositions 607
Section 6610—Admissibility of Sworn Testimony by Audiotape or Videotape from Records of Courts of Inquiry 607
Section 6611—Conforming Amendment Relating to Defense of Lack of Mental Responsibility 607
Section 6612—Voting and Rulings 607
Section 6613—Votes Required for Conviction, Sentencing, and Other Matters 607
Section 6614—Plea Agreements 608
Section 6615—Record of Trial 608
TITLE LXVII—SENTENCES 608
Section 6701—Sentencing 608

Page

Section 6701A—Minimum Confinement Period Required for Conviction of Certain Sex-Related Offenses Committed by Members of the Armed Forces 608
Section 6702—Effective Date of Sentences 608
Section 6703—Sentence of Reduction in Enlisted Grade 609
TITLE LXVIII—POST–TRIAL PROCEDURE AND REVIEW OF COURTS–MARTIAL 609
Section 6801—Post-Trial Processing in General and Special Courts-Martial 609
Section 6802—Limited Authority to Act on Sentence in Specified Post-Trial Circumstances 609
Section 6803—Post-Trial Actions in Summary Courts-Martial and Certain General and Special Courts-Martial 609
Section 6804—Entry of Judgment 610
Section 6805—Waiver of Right to Appeal and Withdrawal of Appeal 610
Section 6806—Appeal by the United States 610
Section 6807—Rehearings 610
Section 6808—Judge Advocate Review of Finding of Guilty in Summary Court-Martial 610
Section 6809—Transmittal and Review of Records 610
Section 6810—Courts of Criminal Appeals 610
Section 6811—Review by Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces 611
Section 6812—Supreme Court Review 611
Section 6813—Review by Judge Advocate General 611
Section 6814—Appellate Defense Counsel in Death Penalty Cases 611
Section 6815—Authority for Hearing on Vacation of Suspension of Sentence to be Conducted by Qualified Judge Advocate 611
Section 6816—Extension of Time for Petition for New Trial 611
Section 6817—Restoration 612
Section 6818—Leave Requirements Pending Review of Certain Court-Martial Convictions 612
TITLE LXIX—PUNITIVE ARTICLES 612
Section 6901—Reorganization of Punitive Articles 612
Section 6902—Conviction of Offense Charged, Lesser Included Offenses, and Attempts 612
Section 6903—Soliciting Commission of Offenses 612
Section 6904—Malingering 612
Section 6905—Breach of Medical Quarantine 612
Section 6906—Missing Movement; Jumping from Vessel 613
Section 6907—Offenses Against Correctional Custody and Restriction 613
Section 6908—Disrespect Toward Superior Commissioned Officer; Assault of Superior Commissioned Officer 613
Section 6909—Willfully Disobeying Superior Commissioned Officer 613
Section 6910—Prohibited Activities with Military Recruit or Trainee by Person in Position of Special Trust 613
Section 6911—Offenses by Sentinel or Lookout 613
Section 6912—Disrespect Toward Sentinel or Lookout 613
Section 6913—Release of Prisoner without Authority; Drinking with Prisoner 614
Section 6914—Penalty for Acting as a Spy 614
Section 6915—Public Records Offenses 614
Section 6916—False or Unauthorized Pass Offenses 614
Section 6917—Impersonation Offenses 614
Section 6918—Insignia Offenses 614
Section 6919—False Official Statements; False Swearing 614
Section 6920—Parole Violation 614
Section 6921—Wrongful Taking, Opening, Etc. of Mail Matter 615
Section 6922—Improper Hazarding of Vessel or Aircraft 615
Section 6923—Leaving Scene of Vehicle Accident 615
Section 6924—Drunkenness and Other Incapacitation Offenses 615
Section 6925—Lower Blood Alcohol Content Limits for Conviction of Drunken or Reckless Operation of Vehicle, Aircraft, or Vessel 615
Section 6926—Endangerment Offenses 615
Section 6927—Communicating Threats 615
Section 6928—Technical Amendment Relating to Murder 616
Section 6929—Child Endangerment 616
Section 6930—Deposit of Obscene Matter in the Mail 616

Page

Section 6931—Fraudulent Use of Credit Cards, Debit Cards, and Other Access Devices 616
Section 6932—False Pretenses to Obtain Services 616
Section 6933—Robbery 616
Section 6934—Receiving Stolen Property 616
Section 6935—Offenses Concerning Government Computers 616
Section 6936—Bribery 617
Section 6937—Graft 617
Section 6938—Kidnapping 617
Section 6939—Arson; Burning Property with Intent to Defraud 617
Section 6940—Assault 617
Section 6941—Burglary and Unlawful Entry 617
Section 6942—Stalking 617
Section 6943—Subornation of Perjury 618
Section 6944—Obstructing Justice 618
Section 6945—Misprision of Serious Offense 618
Section 6946—Wrongful Refusal to Testify 618
Section 6947—Prevention of Authorized Seizure of Property 618
Section 6948—Wrongful Interference with Adverse Administrative Proceeding 618
Section 6949—Retaliation 618
Section 6950—Extraterritorial Application of Certain Offenses 618
Section 6951—Table of Sections 619
TITLE LXX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS 619
Section 7001—Technical Amendment Relating to Courts of Inquiry 619
Section 7002—Technical Amendment to Article 136 619
Section 7003—Articles of Uniform Code of Military Justice to be Explained to Officers Upon Commissioning 619
Section 7004—Military Justice Case Management; Data Collection and Accessibility 619
TITLE LXXI—MILITARY JUSTICE REVIEW PANEL AND ANNUAL REPORTS 620
Section 7101—Military Justice Review Panel 620
Section 7102—Annual Reports 620
TITLE LXXII—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND EFFECTIVE DATES .. 620
Section 7201—Amendments to UCMJ Subchapter Tables of Sections 620
Section 7202—Effective Dates 620

Department of Defense Authorization Request 620
Communications from Other Committees 624
Congressional Budget Office Estimate 637
Statement Required by the Congressional Budget Act 640
Committee Cost Estimate 640
Advisory of Earmarks 640
Oversight Findings 640
General Performance Goals and Objectives 640
Statement of Federal Mandates 642
Federal Advisory Committee Statement 642
Applicability to the Legislative Branch 642
Duplication of Federal Programs 642
Disclosure of Directed Rule Makings 642
Committee Votes 642
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported 668
Additional Views 669

114TH CONGRESS
2d Session
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
REPORT
114–537

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

MAY 4, 2016.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 4909]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 4909) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

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

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

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2017: (a) the personnel strength for each Active Duty component of the military departments; (b) the

personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Energy national security programs; and (8) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2017 for the Maritime Administration.

RATIONALE FOR THE COMMITTEE BILL

H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common defense, to raise and support an Army, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the House of Representatives provides the House Committee on Armed Services with jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally and over the military application of nuclear energy. The committee bill includes the large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, conducted through hearings, briefings, and roundtable discussions with Department of Defense and Department of Energy civilian and military officials, intelligence analysts, outside experts, and industry representatives, and informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

The security environment framing the committee's deliberations on H.R. 4909 is, as stated by the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, a world that "is far more complicated, it's far more destabilized, it's far more complex than at any time that I've seen it." The Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has carried out terror attacks in Paris, Brussels, and Istanbul, while also continuing to expand throughout the Middle East, Africa, and Southeast Asia. Instability and the breakdown of nation-states across the Middle East and Africa continue to grow. The Russian Federation, the People's Republic of China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea all continue to take actions that threaten their neighbors and, in some cases, directly threaten the United States. Additionally, with the continued diffusion of advanced technology, U.S. military technological superiority is no longer assumed and the dominance U.S. forces have long enjoyed across the land, air, sea, space, and cyberspace domains is no longer assured.

These security trends demand agility and strength from the Nation's Armed Forces to defend U.S. interests, deter would-be aggressors, and reassure allies and partners. They also require that the United States military be prepared for everything from nuclear conflict to hybrid warfare to terrorism. However, the committee is concerned that the U.S. Armed Forces continue to be asked to do more with less. The U.S. military continues to operate at a high tempo and, as stated in testimony by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the joint force will be stressed to execute a major

contingency operation. Furthermore, the committee has received testimony from each of the military services on the readiness shortfalls across the force.

H.R. 4909 reflects the committee's steadfast support of the courageous, professional, and dedicated men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces and the committee's appreciation for the sacrifices they make to accomplish their required missions. The committee understands that the capabilities of the Armed Forces are underpinned by the dedicated civilian employees of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, as well as the defense industrial base. Each of these elements is required to enable the U.S. military to be the guarantor of peace and economic security that it has been for generations.

In addition to providing the vital funding and authorities the Nation's military requires, the bill would prioritize resources to address readiness shortfalls across the services. The committee believes that it is fundamentally wrong to send service members out on missions for which they are not fully prepared or fully supported. The bill would also implement major reforms within the Department of Defense, as the committee recognizes the need to get more defense for the dollar regardless of the fiscal environment. The bill also seeks to provide the funding required to enhance the quality of life of military service members and their families; support ongoing military operations and U.S. presence in the Republic of Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Europe, and elsewhere across the globe; sustain and improve the Armed Forces; and properly safeguard the national security of the United States.

While the funding authorized in the bill matches the President's request, the committee acknowledges that this level is insufficient to restore readiness, fully fund overseas contingency operations, and invest in critical capabilities. It further acknowledges that, at this funding level, the Department of Defense is at risk of being unable to execute the current defense strategy, much less address emerging threats. The committee believes that sequestration must be addressed and the committee will continue its bipartisan work to ensure that resources provided for the Nation's defense are sufficient to protect the safety and security of the American people and our vital interests around the world.

Reforming the Department of Defense

The committee believes that reform of the Department of Defense is necessary to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the defense enterprise to get more defense for the dollar. But more importantly, reform is necessary to improve the military's agility and the speed at which it can adapt and respond to an increasingly complex security environment and unprecedented technological challenges. The bill reflects five major reform initiatives undertaken by the committee in H.R. 4909: (1) acquisition reform, (2) healthcare reform; (3) commissary reform, (4) military justice reform, and (5) Goldwater-Nichols reform. These reform proposals build upon the committee's previous legislative activities and reflect its further oversight in these areas through multiple hearings and briefings, as well as consultation with Department of Defense officials, outside experts, industry representatives, and other stakeholders. The

committee recognizes that instituting lasting reform is a long-term, collaborative effort, and therefore, it looks forward to working with all key stakeholders to build upon these proposals.

In the area of defense acquisition reform, H.R. 4909 seeks to create an engine of experimentation and innovation within the core acquisition system, while further strengthening acquisition planning and accountability. Specifically, the bill requires major defense acquisition programs, to the maximum extent practicable after January 1, 2019, to be designed with modular, open-system approaches that enable weapon system components to be more easily upgraded as technology and threats evolve. The bill authorizes the military services, rather than specifying projects two years beforehand through the traditional budget process, to budget flexible funds with which to experiment with and rapidly field emerging technologies during the year of execution. It aligns intellectual property rights to an open-system approach and rebalances property rights so the government continues to receive necessary technical data while encouraging companies to do business with the Department. Regarding program planning and oversight, the bill requires the Secretary of Defense, or the Secretary's designee, to establish cost and fielding targets at program inception against which the military services can be held accountable for program management. Milestone decision authority for joint programs would be delegated to the military services after January 1, 2019, while independent assessments of technical readiness and cost would inform a new "acquisition scorecard" to improve transparency in key program decisions.

In the area of healthcare reform, the committee is steadfast in maintaining a robust Military Health System with the primary responsibility of readiness of the force. To accomplish this goal, the committee undertook a comprehensive review of the Military Health System to identify necessary reforms to sustain the long term viability of the System. To that end, the committee seeks to ensure the Military Health System can sustain trained and ready healthcare providers to support the readiness of the force and a quality healthcare benefit that is valued by its beneficiaries. The committee's efforts were focused in three areas: the Military Health System structure, medical readiness, and the TRICARE benefit.

In the area of commissary reform, H.R. 4909 authorizes the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy across the defense resale system and the Defense Commissary Agency to optimize practices across the defense commissary and exchange system. The objective of such strategy would be to reduce the reliance of the system on appropriated funds without reducing the benefits to the patrons of the system or the revenue generated by non-appropriated fund instrumentalities (NAFI) of the Department of Defense for the morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the Armed Forces. Under this authority, the commissaries would be able to use flexible product pricing, while ensuring that the level of savings to commissary patrons is consistent with the current level of savings. The bill also authorizes the Secretary to convert the commissary system to a NAFI if the benchmarks for success (specifically including required savings levels for beneficiaries) have been met. Congressional oversight would be maintained as it requires quarterly briefings from the Department, which would in-

clude: ongoing savings assessment, NAFI implementation status, viability of variable pricing and private label program, and other matters the committee deems necessary. Lastly, the Secretary of Defense would not be able to move forward with any action that would: establish a market basket of goods, establish a private label/variable pricing system, or convert to a NAFI until 30 days have elapsed following a briefing on each action.

In the area of military justice, the bill includes the first comprehensive reform of the Uniform Code of Military Justice in decades. These provisions, which incorporate recommendations from the Military Justice Review Group, reflect the committee's sustained commitment to making the military justice system just, efficient, and effective. The bill would enhance the rights of victims, improve transparency, and modernize the post-trial process. Given the scope of the proposed reform, these provisions would not take effect until two years after enactment, giving the President and the Department of Defense sufficient time to draft implementing rules and execute training.

Lastly, in the area of Goldwater-Nichols reform, the committee believes that 30 years after the initial Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act (Public Law 99–433), the time is right to review and reevaluate that legislation. The committee recognizes that security challenges have become more transregional, multi-domain, and multi-functional; that U.S. superiority in key warfighting areas is at risk with other nations' technological advances; and that the Department of Defense lacks the agility and adaptability necessary to support timely decisionmaking and the rapid fielding of new capabilities. The proposals contained in title IX are focused on increasing accountability and oversight, enhancing global synchronization and joint operations, and strengthening strategic thinking and planning, while preserving civilian control of the military and the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the principal, independent military advisor to the President and Secretary of Defense.

Resources for Warfighters and Families

The committee believes that caring for the troops and their families is the cornerstone of readiness. H.R. 4909 builds upon the bipartisan work of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel in providing the troops the benefits they need, deserve, and have earned. As always, the guiding consideration for the committee's work is the viability and readiness of the All-Volunteer Force while ensuring that the Nation does not break faith with U.S. service members, retirees, their family members, and survivors.

H.R. 4909 authorizes a fully funded, by-law pay raise for all U.S. service members at 2.1 percent. To lessen the stress and strain on the force and their families, the bill also halts and begins to reverse the drawdown of military end strength, by preserving the active duty Army at 480,000, and adding 3,000 Marines, 1,715 sailors, and 4,000 airmen in fiscal year 2017.

As discussed elsewhere in this section, H.R. 4909 proposes a series of reforms to improve benefits earned by service members and their families. The committee approached these reforms from the perspective of the beneficiary and the effects that change could have on the value and sustainability of the benefit. The committee

also elicited perspectives from current and retired service members, military families, the military service organizations, the Department of Defense, the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, and many others.

The healthcare reform package reflects the committee's commitment to ensure that the Military Health System can sustain the readiness of both Department of Defense military healthcare providers and the overall force, while providing a quality health benefit that is valued by its beneficiaries. The commissary reform proposal is done in a way that preserves the benefit while also improving the system so it remains a value for shoppers. And, finally, the bill modernizes the Uniform Code of Military Justice to address issues identified by the Military Justice Review Group. This group of provisions would improve the system's efficiency and transparency, while also enhancing victims' rights.

Readiness, Force Structure, and Support to Ongoing Military Operations

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

On the Continent of Africa, deployed U.S. forces continue to conduct counterterrorism operations and provide training and assistance to partners combating violent extremist organizations. In Europe, U.S. forces and capabilities have been enhanced as part of Operation Atlantic Resolve to deter aggression by the Russian Federation and reassure U.S. allies and partners in Europe. In Asia, U.S. forces are forward-deployed to reassure allies and partners concerned about the territorial assertiveness by the People's Republic of China and the nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In Central and South America, U.S. forces are providing key capabilities to detect and interdict illicit trafficking that has driven violence and instability to the southern border of the United States. Meanwhile, U.S. forces stationed at home are working to maintain force readiness and are defending the homeland.

The committee recognizes that while the Department's missions and requirements have increased, its resources have decreased and readiness has suffered. The Chief of Staff of the Army testified, "Right now the readiness of the United States Army . . . is not at a level that is appropriate for what the American people would ex-

pect to defend them." The Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps testified, "Our deployment-to-dwell-time ratio continues to exceed the rate that we consider sustainable . . . The strains on our personnel and our equipment are showing in many areas." And, the Air Force Secretary testified, "Less than half of our combat forces are ready for . . . a high-end fight." These readiness shortfalls in the services ultimately lead to a joint force that is, as stated in testimony by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "stressed to execute a major contingency operation" and on a path towards being "unable to execute the current defense strategy."

The committee believes that it is fundamentally wrong to send service members out on missions for which they are not fully prepared or fully supported. The committee shares the responsibility of reducing the risk for the Nation's warfighters by ensuring that they are well-trained and supported, and that the equipment they use is properly maintained and combat-ready. Therefore, H.R. 4909 would prioritize resources to address readiness shortfalls across the services and, as discussed elsewhere in this report, reverse end strength cuts to the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

The bill would include more than $5.0 billion in additional funds for ship and aircraft depot maintenance; aviation training and readiness; and long-neglected facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization accounts—all of which were identified as unfunded requirements by the military services. The bill would direct several assessments on the military departments' plans to rebuild readiness, enhance exercises, and modernize training requirements, and prohibit the Department of Defense from implementing another round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) in the absence of an accurate end-strength assessment.

H.R. 4909 also responds to numerous other unfunded, yet critical, requirements identified by the services. The bill funds 11 additional F–35s and 14 F–18s to address a critical fighter shortfall; three C–130Js, four C–40s, and two V–22 aircraft; and 36 UH–60 Black Hawk and five Apache helicopters. It restores a Carrier Air Wing, funds Navy cruiser modernization, and invests nearly $600.0 million to address war reserve shortfalls in critical munitions. The bill would also authorize additional funding for the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) nuclear weapons activities, including critical programs to modernize the nuclear weapons stockpile, and take action to address the $3.7 billion backlog of deferred maintenance at NNSA that is threatening worker safety and mission performance.

While the committee recognizes tough choices have to be made in the allocation of limited resources, the committee believes it has taken prudent steps to begin to restore readiness and invest in needed capabilities for the warfighter. However, should sequestration-level budget caps return after fiscal year 2017, the committee recognizes that even harder choices will have to be made. The committee agrees with the conclusion reached by the 2014 independent, bipartisan National Defense Panel, that "significant cuts to our defense budgets will not solve our fiscal woes, but will increasingly jeopardize our international defense posture and ultimately damage our security."

Addressing Emerging Threats and Challenges

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

The committee recognizes that the cyber domain of modern warfare continues to grow in scope and sophistication. H.R. 4909 fully funds the budget request for cyber operations and prioritizes the readiness of the cyber mission forces. The bill provides special procurement authority to facilitate recovery from a cyber attack, as well as increases resiliency for Department of Defense networks, weapon systems, and capabilities. As part of its reform proposals, H.R. 4909 would elevate U.S. Cyber Command to a unified command to provide greater military readiness and preparedness to carry out assigned missions.

The committee also believes that robust military intelligence collection and analysis are essential to ensuring the Department of Defense is postured to address current and future threats, is investing in the right capabilities, and able to protect its forces in the field. The bill provides resources for the Grey Eagle, MQ–9 Reaper, and Triton MQ–4 unmanned aerial vehicles. It would also require options to accelerate the development of a new Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (Joint STARS) platform. Reflecting the committee's investigation into allegations that senior officials at U.S. Central Command improperly influenced intelligence analysis, the bill also directs several actions to improve the documentation of intelligence processes and procedures.

The committee remains focused on assuring access to space, given the military's dependence on the capabilities provided from satellites. Thus, it remains concerned about the Department's continuing reliance on Russian-designed RD–180 rocket engines. The bill would authorize funds for the development of a new American engine to replace the RD–180 by 2019, and provide funds for launch system investments.

In the area of missile defense, the bill would require the Department of Defense to develop a new missile defeat strategy, including ballistic missile and cruise missile defense; provide additional funds for Israeli missile defense; and require the Army to develop an acquisition strategy for the replacement of the Patriot radar system.

Lastly, the committee report reflects the committee's general support for the Department's Third Offset Strategy development effort. The committee believes that the Third Offset is a useful vehicle for focusing the Department on how to deter and counter the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China. The report notes that, while much of the focus is on technology, the committee also believes that further attention should be given to strategic thinking about deterrence, including the relationship between conventional and nuclear deterrence. Further, while greater innovation is a necessary element of such a strategy, the committee expects the Department to simultaneously address incentives and

barriers to entry for private sector partnerships and impediments to transfer of innovative technologies to the military.

HEARINGS

Committee consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 results from posture and budget-related hearings that began on February 9, 2016, and that were completed on April 14, 2016. The full committee conducted 6 hearings and the 6 subcommittees conducted a total of 23 sessions during this time period. Additionally, over the past year, the committee conducted numerous policy and program oversight hearings, including hearings in support of its reform initiatives, to inform its development of the legislative proposals contained in this Act.

COMMITTEE POSITION

On April 27, 2016, the Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, approved H.R. 4909, as amended, by a vote of 60–2.

EXPLANATION OF THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute during the consideration of H.R. 4909. The title of the bill is amended to reflect the amendment to the text of the bill. The remainder of the report discusses the bill, as amended.

RELATIONSHIP OF AUTHORIZATION TO APPROPRIATIONS

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

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

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

SUMMARY OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS IN THE BILL

The President requested discretionary budget authority of $602.2 billion for programs within the jurisdiction of the committee for fiscal year 2017. Of this amount, $524.0 billion was requested for "base" Department of Defense programs, $58.8 billion was requested for Overseas Contingency Operations requirements covering the entire fiscal year, $19.2 billion was requested for Department of Energy national security programs and the Defense Nu-

clear Facilities Safety Board, and $0.2 billion was requested for defense-related activities associated with Maritime Administration.

To comport with the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25), the committee recommends an overall discretionary authorization of $602.2 billion in fiscal year 2017. The base committee authorization of $543.4 billion is a $28.4 billion increase above the levels provided for in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). The authorization provided in title XV totals $58.8 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations, of which $23.1 billion is authorized in support of base budget requirements.

The table preceding the detailed program adjustments in division D of this report summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2017 and compares these amounts to the President's request.

BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

The President's total request for the national defense budget function (050) in fiscal year 2017 is $618.9 billion, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. In addition to funding for programs addressed in this bill, the total 050 request includes discretionary funding for national defense programs not in the committee's jurisdiction, discretionary funding for programs that do not require additional authorization in fiscal year 2017, and mandatory programs.

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

DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Brigade combat team utilization of unmanned aircraft systems in training operations

The budget request contained $55.4 million for MQ–1C Gray Eagle unmanned aircraft systems, but contained no funds for the additional procurement of ground mounted airspace deconfliction radars to directly support brigade combat teams during training event operations with unit organic unmanned aircraft systems (UAS).

The committee notes that multiple U.S. Army posts, which have brigade combat teams (BCT) stationed to operate unit organic medium or large UAS aircraft within continental United States (CONUS) and outside CONUS airspace, lack adequate and certified ground radar facilities and capabilities to provide realistic training operations involving the employment of UAS aircraft. Army posts affected by this training environment limitation include: Ft. Hood, Texas; Ft. Stewart, Georgia; Ft. Riley, Kansas; Ft. Campbell, Ken-

tucky; Ft. Bragg, North Carolina; Ft. Drum, New York; Ft. Huachuca, Arizona; Ft. Polk, Louisiana; Ft. Carson, Colorado; Ft. Wainwright, Alaska; and Kunsan Air Base, South Korea. The committee is concerned that BCT units that must rely on maintaining visual sight of the UAS, or that have to procure chase aircraft services to maintain situational awareness of the UAS, are not able to fully optimize training as a result of the inability to create realistic combat environments to conduct employment of UAS doctrine, tactics, techniques, and procedures in support of the BCT. The committee believes that BCT training with unit organic UAS aircraft could be made more efficient and effective with the use of ground-based radar capabilities and facilities to alleviate reliance upon visual sight or chase aircraft procured services. The committee also notes that ground-based radar facilities supporting Army UAS training operations for BCTs are a high-priority and unfunded requirement of the Army.

Therefore, the committee recommends $85.0 million, an increase of $29.6 million, for procurement of ground mounted airspace deconfliction radars to support BCT unit organic UAS training operations.

MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Joint air-to-ground missile increment 2 acquisition strategy

The committee understands the joint air-to-ground missile (JAGM) program is a new generation of air-launched, ground-attack tactical missiles that will complement and replace the Army's legacy inventory of Hellfire missiles.

The committee is aware the Army is pursuing an incremental approach to JAGM acquisition. The committee understands the program consists of two increments, with Increment I beginning low-rate production in fiscal year 2017 and consisting of a dual-mode seeker tactical missile capable of attacking stationary and moving targets. The committee is concerned over the lack of clarity and funding in the Army's budget request for the JAGM Increment II program.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by February 1, 2017, on the status of the JAGM Increment II program that shall include the program's requirements, acquisition strategy, and funding profile.

PROCUREMENT OF WEAPONS AND TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Army National Guard M2 Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicle upgrades

The committee notes that the Army intends to maintain two versions of the M2 Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicle (IFV) for the foreseeable future, with the M2A3 equipping Active Duty armored brigade combat teams (ABCT) and the M2A2 Operation Desert Storm Situational Awareness variant in the Army National Guard.

While the committee understands the funding constraints that have led to this mixed fleet approach, the committee continues to be concerned about the potential divergence in capability between Active Duty ABCTs and Army National Guard ABCTs. Therefore, the committee encourages the Army to continue to work toward a pure fleet approach to M2 Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicles in the Army. However, if funding is not available for that goal, the committee encourages the Army to continue to modernize M2 Bradley IFVs in the Army National Guard to the maximum extent possible.

M240 medium machine gun modernization

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the Army's long-term sustainment strategy and life-cycle sustainment plans for the M240 medium machine gun. The committee appreciates the briefing provided by the Army regarding the sustainment of the industrial base for the M240 medium machine gun, but has concerns that industry was not consulted in the preparation of the sustainment plan. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology to develop a plan, with input from the M240 original equipment manufacturer, that would consider the advisability and feasibility of establishing an M240 recapitalization program, and provide the House Committee on Armed Services with a briefing on this plan, including its associated costs and timelines, not later than September 30, 2016. The committee expects this briefing to also detail the plans to ensure the sustainment of the domestic small arms industrial base, including both original equipment and spare parts manufacturers.

Multi-Role Anti-Armor Anti-Personnel Weapon System

The committee understands the M3 Carl Gustaf Multi-Role Anti-Armor Anti-Personnel Weapon System (MAAWS) 84mm recoilless rifle is a multipurpose, medium-range weapon system designed specifically to engage structural targets at ranges up to 500 meters, lightly armored targets at ranges up to 700 meters, and soft targets at ranges up to 1,000 meters. The committee is also aware that the Army has finalized a program of record for M3 MAAWS and is synchronizing program activities for Type Classification of combat and training ammunition, the M3 and lightweight M3A1 gun variants, as well as leveraging acquisition and logistics functions with U.S. Special Operations Command. The committee also notes the Marine Corps is procuring a similar system, which is the follow-on to the Shoulder Launched Multipurpose Assault Weapon (SMAW).

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on the MAAWS capabilities, including: whether size and weight issues continue to be a factor in combat effectiveness; capability to safely fire from enclosures; and the Army's assessment of current Marine Corps SMAW programs, and whether these systems could potentially meet Army operational performance requirements.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Ammunition industrial base investment strategies

The committee notes that the Army has reported that a steady-state funding of approximately $250.0 million per year is required to properly modernize and sustain the eight government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) Army Ammunition Plants (AAPs), as well as the government-owned, government-operated (GOGO) AAPs, many of which were built during World War II. The committee notes that the budget request actually exceeded this annual baseline investment across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee also notes, however, that despite this commitment, significant safety, environmental, and operational discrepancies exist among the four largest AAPs, which could require investments exceeding what is currently in the Army's long-term modernization plan for the ammunition industrial base. The committee is concerned about this discrepancy between documented need and planned investment. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to reevaluate its AAP funding investment model and the underlying recapitalization assumptions in order to determine a more accurate steady-state funding baseline for all GOCO AAPs and GOGO AAPs.

Small guided munitions acquisition strategy

The committee commends the Army for rapidly fielding small guided rockets for the AH–64D Apache Attack Helicopter in 2015. Furthermore, the committee understands the Marine Corps continues to qualify guided rockets on the AV–B Harrier, AH–1 Cobra attack helicopter, and UH–1 utility helicopter, while the Air Force is rapidly moving forward to qualify small guided rockets on the F–16 and A–10 platforms.

The committee notes that while not a replacement for heavier guided missile munitions, small guided rockets could provide an affordable precision guided weapon capability to prosecute targets that have been routinely engaged in recent years by heavier and more expensive guided munitions. The committee also recognizes that precision delivery of the munition does not always equate to lethality at the target, and encourages the Department of Defense to consider fielding the most capable and lethal warhead technology available to maximize capability on small guided rockets.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by August 31, 2016, on the joint requirements for small guided rocket munitions, the long term acquisition strategy for small guided rocket systems, the plans for maximizing lethality of these systems, the potential for integrating these systems on unmanned aerial systems, and to provide options to streamline the procurement and fielding of these critically needed systems across the military services.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Accelerate fielding of personal dosimeters

The committee remains concerned about the increasing chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) threats to our soldiers. Maintaining adequate modern protective equipment is of critical importance for the safety of U.S. forces in CBRN environments. Modern dosimeters also establish a legal dose of record for service members, which the services can track for safety and liability purposes. The committee remains concerned that shortfalls in fielding the most current radiation detection devices, specifically personal dosimeters, continue to exist, most notably within the Army National Guard force structure. To ensure our troops and domestic homeland first responders are provided with the best possible protection to monitor against nuclear exposure, the committee strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to expedite and complete the fielding of modern radiation detection equipment across the force to meet existing, critical requirements for personal dosimeters.

Army small-scale experimentation

The committee notes that senior Army leadership has expressed a desire to increase the amount of innovation and experimentation within the Department of the Army, and make Army acquisition faster and more responsive. The committee also notes that although large-scale Army experiments, such as the Network Integration Evaluation and Army Warfighting Assessment are beneficial, they take considerable time and resources to organize, conduct, and assess. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to consider the creation of smaller-scale, quicker-turn experimentation units and exercises focused on addressing Army Warfighting Challenges and near-term capability gaps with commercial and government off-the-shelf technologies.

Army tactical communications waveforms

The committee supports the Army's Non-Developmental Item (NDI) procurement strategy for software defined radios. Furthermore, the committee recognizes the critical role radio waveforms play in battlefield communications and network capability, and how an NDI procurement approach can save money and deliver communications technology rapidly to the warfighter. The committee encourages the Army to expand its NDI procurement policy to include new software technology for innovative commercial waveforms. The committee is further aware and interested in seeking more information about the Defense Technology Security Administration's (DTSA) consideration of polices that could lead to additional regulations regarding the export of software defined radios. The committee believes that both of these approaches have the potential to impact the availability of radios to warfighters.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army and the Director of the Defense Technology Security Administration to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than September 30, 2016, on the potential use of new radio waveforms for tactical communica-

tions that may be available via an NDI acquisition approach and the potential effects of U.S. government policy changes on this industrial sector and on the ability of warfighters and our international partners to access innovative radio technologies.

Bridge Erection Boat program

The committee is aware that the new XM30 Bridge Erection Boat (BEB), which will replace the 30-year-old legacy Mk II BEB platform, represents an essential readiness capability and an important part of the Army's incremental modernization efforts. The XM30 BEB will be fielded to Active Army, Reserve, and National Guard Multi-Role Bridging Companies (MRBCs) and used to transport weapon systems, troops, and supplies over water when permanent bridges are not available. The XM30 BEB will also provide MRBCs significantly enhanced capabilities for diving support, rafting transport, and patrols. The Army Acquisition Objective for the XM30 BEB is 379 vessels. However, the program currently remains in low-rate initial production with a transition to full-rate production expected during fiscal year 2017. Therefore, the committee continues to support this program and encourages the Secretary of the Army to program sufficient funds to support the Army Acquisition Objective for the XM30 BEB and to provide a more efficient funding profile that avoids large variations in quantity ordering.

Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Response Enterprise Information Management System

The committee is aware that the National Guard Bureau Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams (CST) currently field a system, the CST Information Management System (CIMS), to provide a common operating picture, promote information sharing and real-time collaboration in an emergency situation, and support the CST mission of assisting and advising first responders and facilitating communications with other Federal resources. The committee is also aware that the CIMS system is being modified to establish an enterprise-capable tool, referred to as the National Guard Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Response Enterprise Information Management System 2018+ (NG CIMS 2018+), that will expand the capabilities of the CIMS to support the other National Guard Bureau forces, such as the Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High-Explosive Enhanced Response Force Package and Homeland Defense Response Force units.

The committee believes it is important that this enhanced CIMS capability be fielded quickly and efficiently by utilizing prior investments to expand and enhance communication capability. The committee is aware of the plan to develop and establish the NG CIMS 2018+ through a multi-phase approach, including establishing initial operational capability in fiscal year 2016 and proving full operational capability in fiscal year 2018. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by December 1, 2016, detailing the status of the development of the NG CIMS 2018+ tool to date, as well as a description of the progress on providing the initial operational capability and an update on the

future plans and milestones to establishment of full operational capability.

Ground mobility vehicle

The budget request contained $4.9 million for 10 low-rate production ground mobility vehicle (GMV) systems and associated test and evaluation activities.

The GMV provides "enhanced tactical mobility" for a 9-soldier infantry squad with their associated equipment to move quickly around the battlefield, and was initiated as an urgent operational need by the 82nd Airborne Division and endorsed by the 18th Airborne Corps and U.S. Army Forces Command. The current acquisition objective for GMV is 150 systems, broken out as 3 battalion sets of 50 systems each for infantry brigade combat team units in support of the global response force mission.

The committee understands the Army is conducting an analysis of alternatives that should be complete in June 2016. The committee is aware that current market research has identified several possible vendors, and the Army has identified that the solution will most likely be a commercial/non-developmental item with procurement based on best value, full and open competition. According to the current acquisition schedule, a low-rate production contract award is scheduled for fourth quarter fiscal year 2017, with the first unit equipped by third quarter fiscal year 2019.

The committee remains concerned about this timeline. The committee encourages the Army to develop ways to accelerate and streamline this acquisition in order to more rapidly address the critically urgent operational need as stated by the 82nd Airborne Division.

High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle ambulance recapitalization

The committee recognizes the tactical importance of the High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV) fleet and the enduring requirement to maintain a capable HMMWV fleet supporting multiple relevant mission roles for Active and Reserve Component units. The committee notes that Congress has provided an additional $520.0 million over the past 3 years to address unfunded modernization requirements for the Army Reserve (USAR) and Army National Guard (ARNG) HMMWV fleets.

The committee also recognizes the critical medical ground evacuation mission role provided by the HMMWV ambulance variant. The committee is concerned that the Army's current fleet of Active Component HMMWV ambulances are now on average 27 years old, exceeding the expected useful life of the vehicle by 12 years. The committee also understands the Army does not have a fully funded reset, recapitalization, or replacement plan in place for the entire HMMWV ambulance fleet. The committee is aware of the successful effort already underway to modernize the HMMWV ambulance fleet for the ARNG and USAR through new production vehicles, the M997A3 variant. The committee believes the Army should consider a similar effort for the Active Component. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to develop an acquisition strategy to modernize the current fleet of HMMWV ambulances for the Active Component and to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed

Services of the House of Representatives by March 1, 2017, on the details of this acquisition strategy.

Material handling equipment modernization strategy

The committee is concerned that the budget request did not include funding for the Rough Terrain Container Handler (RTCH), a material handling equipment system considered vital and critical to Department of Defense expeditionary logistics. The committee understands the RTCH system, along with other material handling equipment logistic systems, provides strategic capability to set the theater, strategic agility to the joint force, and maintains freedom of movement and action during sustained and high tempo operations at the end of extended lines of communication in austere environments. The committee is concerned by the number of RTCH systems that are combat worn, and notes there is neither a formal reset and recapitalization program for these systems, nor a long-term strategy to modernize a fleet that entered service in 2001. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to develop plans to recapitalize and modernize RTCH systems and other material handling equipment systems in a timely manner, as well as resource this effort across the Future Years Defense Program.

Mid-Tier Networking Vehicular Radio

The budget request contained $25.1 million in Other Procurement, Army, for procurement of Mid-Tier Networking Vehicular Radio (MNVR) systems.

The committee supports the goals of the MNVR program and believes that modernizing battlefield communications is a critical priority for the Army. The committee notes that the MNVR is intended to provide the terrestrial backbone for the Army's tactical network, connecting lower-echelon radios, like Manpack and Rifleman radios, with the upper tier at the brigade and battalion level. This terrestrial backbone is designed to provide a critical capability to the Army, and reduces reliance on satellite communications for command and control capability. The committee is aware that the MNVR radio has completed initial test activities and is expected to move to full-rate production after testing in the summer of 2016. The committee encourages the Army to maintain its testing schedule and, if testing proves successful, its production schedule in order to meet fielding requirements.

The committee recommends $25.1 million, the full amount requested, in Other Procurement, Army for MNVR systems.

Tactical Communication and Protective System

The budget request contained $3.6 million for 983 tactical communication and protective hearing systems (TCAPS) and 1,127 TCAPS-Lite systems.

The committee is aware that the Army has been updating standards pertaining to the TCAPS program, and understands the Army conducts annual assessments of technology to acquire the best that is available to meet Army requirements for hearing protection. The committee is aware that as a result of the annual relook of technology in 2014, the Army identified a TCAPS-Lite solution which would provide the same level of active hearing protection at an 85

percent reduction in unit cost for soldiers that do not have the need to connect to radios. The committee notes that TCAPS-Lite enables soldiers to communicate in combat environments while simultaneously providing active hearing protection from harmful steady-state and impulse noise. The committee supports the Army's current strategy to begin procurement of TCAPS-Lite starting in fiscal year 2016, and notes fielding is scheduled for the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2017. The committee encourages the Army to accelerate fielding of TCAPS-Lite, and expects the Army to resource TCAPS-Lite across the Future Years Defense Program.

The committee recommends $3.6 million, the full amount requested, for TCAPS and TCAPS-Lite.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Items of Special Interest

MQ–8 Fire Scout aircraft

The budget request contained $72.4 million for the MQ–8 Fire Scout program.

The committee is concerned that the budget request does not meet the minimum production rate of five aircraft per year. The committee believes that procuring only one aircraft per year significantly increases the aircraft cost per unit and will lead to a break in the production line. Specifically, the committee understands that the unit cost for procuring five aircraft will result in a $24.0 million per aircraft unit cost as compared to $72.4 million when buying one aircraft.

The committee recommends $119.9 million, an increase of $47.5 million, to purchase five aircraft for the MQ–8 Fire Scout program.

V–22 Osprey

The committee notes that in the 9 years since the establishment of an initial operational capability, the V–22 Osprey has provided the U.S. Marine Corps and the U.S. Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC) with a unique and revolutionary vertical lift capability due to its superior airspeed, range, and survivability. The operational tempo for both Marine and Air Force Ospreys has grown over the years and is expected to continue to increase as combatant commanders more fully exploit the attributes of the tiltrotor platform in helping to meet national security challenges posed by traditional nation-states and terrorist organizations. Recently, the U.S. Navy selected the Osprey to perform the carrier onboard delivery mission that will transform the concept of logistic support at sea. The committee understands that the Navy plans to begin their purchase of 44 aircraft beginning in fiscal year 2018. The committee also understands that U.S. Special Operations Command may have unmet requirements for additional attrition reserve CV–22 platforms that are not accounted for within current Department of the Air Force multiyear procurements (MYPs).

The committee notes that the first and second V–22 MYPs have generated approximately $1.25 billion in savings over year-to-year procurements, and that a third, and last, MYP is under consideration for fiscal year 2018. As this new procurement window opens in 2018, the committee encourages the Department of Defense, par-

ticularly the Department of the Air Force, to take advantage of this opportunity to generate further savings over year-to-year procurements. Should there be a plan for additional Ospreys to meet the increased demand, the committee encourages participation in the third MYP. The committee believes that the third MYP CV–22 unit pricing will be lower than independent year-to-year procurements in the future. Air Force participation would also help drive down unit pricing for the Department of Defense and partner nation aircraft.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2016, on the current operational tempo for V–22 aircraft, forecasted demand for the aircraft in the future, and any V–22 procurement strategies under consideration.

WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Items of Special Interest

Littoral Combat Ship Over-the-Horizon Missile

The budget request contained no funds for the Littoral Combat Ship Over-the-Horizon Missile.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy has decided to accelerate backfitting of the Over-the-Horizon missiles on Littoral Combat Ships to improve their lethality. The committee further notes that this funding would procure eight missiles and launcher installation, integration, and testing to allow outfitting of the LCS 3 and LCS 5 in fiscal year 2017 prior to their next deployment. Finally, the committee notes that this element was included in the Chief of Naval Operations' Unfunded Priorities List.

The committee recommends $43.0 million, an increase of $18.1 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy, for procurement of 8 missiles, and an increase of $24.9 million in Other Procurement, Navy, for procurement, integration, and installation of a launcher.

Tomahawk Block IV

The budget request contained $186.9 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy for procurement of 100 Tomahawk missiles, which are 98 missiles below the minimum sustaining rate. The budget request would also terminate Tomahawk Block IV procurement beginning in fiscal year 2018.

The committee is concerned by the Secretary of the Navy's recommendation to terminate procurement of the Nation's only long-range, surface-launched land-attack cruise missile production capability prior to finalizing concept development of the Next Generation Land Attack Weapon, which is not planned to be operationally fielded until 2024 at the earliest. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the capability to recertify current inventory Block IV Tomahawk missiles could be put at risk if the Secretary of the Navy decides to shutter the Tomahawk Block IV production line in fiscal year 2018. The committee is concerned that the Navy is well below necessary categories of inventory requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends $262.9 million, an increase of $76.0 million, in Weapons Procurement, Navy for procurement of 198 Tomahawk missiles and to reduce risk to the Toma-

hawk missile industrial base. The committee supports continuing the minimum sustaining rate of Tomahawk Block IV to fully satisfy inventory requirements and bridge transition to Tomahawk Block IV recertification and modernization.

SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY

Items of Special Interest

Arleigh Burke-class destroyer

The budget request included $3.21 billion for two *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers.

The committee notes that the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114–113) included $1.00 billion for a third *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyer in fiscal year 2016 but these funds are insufficient to procure the entire ship. The committee also notes that the Chief of Naval Operations included $433.0 million on his fiscal year 2017 unfunded requirements list in order to fully fund the balance of this *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyer.

Therefore, the committee recommends $3.64 billion, an increase of $433.0 million, for procurement of an additional *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyer.

Cruiser replacement strategy

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy's reluctance to implement congressional direction regarding modernization of the guided missile *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers is jeopardizing the long-term viability and recapitalization of these ships. Specifically, the committee is concerned that the Secretary's request to obviate the "2–4–6" cruiser modernization plan is hindering efforts to develop a replacement capability for these cruisers, which the Navy has assessed will begin to retire in 2035. The committee supports the Navy's Future Surface Combatant Capability Based Assessment that has been proposed for funding in Cross Platform System Development Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Navy PE 0603563N. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, regarding the overall timeline to develop a replacement strategy for the *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers in accordance with the retirement timelines included in the "2–4–6" cruiser modernization strategy.

CVN–81 advance procurement

The budget request contained no funds for advance procurement associated with the CVN–81 Carrier Replacement Program.

The committee believes that the *Ford*-class carrier replacement program is tracking to deliver more efficiently with each proceeding aircraft carrier. For example, the committee is anticipating a savings of over $1.40 billion between CVN–78 and CVN–79. The committee notes the second year of advance procurement for CVN–80 has been included in the budget request. While the committee believes that a more efficient learning curve will be obtained with CVN–80 that will provide more savings, the committee also believes additional savings could be obtained by procuring economic order quantity material for CVN–80 and CVN–81.

Therefore, the committee recommends $263.0 million for advance procurement associated with CVN–81 Carrier Replacement Program in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, to procure CVN–81 economic order quantity material.

Expeditionary Mobile Base ship

The committee notes that the flexible capabilities of the recently-renamed *Expeditionary Mobile Base* (ESB, formerly AFSB) class of ships are increasingly important to Navy and Marine Corps leaders and planners, as is the attractive affordability of this platform. USNS *Lewis B. Puller*, the first ESB, was delivered in 2015 and represents a flexible platform for a wide-range of missions, including U.S. Marine Corps Special Purpose Marine Air Ground Task Force-Crisis Response (SPMAGTF–CR) and special operations. Three AFSB–ESBs have been funded to date, in addition to two Mobile Landing Platforms (MLPs), formally renamed Expeditionary Transfer Docks. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, as to how the procurement of additional ships of this class would provide multiple mission requirements around the globe including SPMAGTF–CR and special operations. The committee specifically requests additional analysis as to how this capability is integrated into the overall Navy force structure assessment.

Frigate

In December 2015, citing concerns with the Navy's balance between capability and quantity of platforms, the Secretary of Defense directed the Secretary of the Navy, among other actions, to procure 40 Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) and frigates, a reduction of 12 ships. In response to this direction, the Navy modified the LCS procurement and initiated acquisition of the frigate based on a modified LCS in 2018, a year earlier than planned in the Navy's budget request for fiscal year 2016. The committee notes that there is considerable uncertainty in the frigate program, as reported by the U.S. Government Accountability Office. The committee notes that over $8.00 billion in investment remains to procure the frigate. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2017, as to the following items relating to the frigate production:(1) Plans to develop and mature the frigate design prior to starting production;(2) The strategy for acquiring the frigate;(3) Realism of frigate cost estimates; and (4) Planned capability of the frigate and the degree to which it will meet the Navy's small surface combatant needs.

Landing Craft Air Cushion Service Life Extension Program

The budget request contained no funds for the Landing Craft Air Cushion (LCAC) Service Life Extension Program.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy budget request for fiscal year 2016 anticipated four craft from the Landing Craft Air Cushion Service Life Extension Program would be included in the budget request for fiscal year 2017, but due to budgetary constraints the craft were removed during budget deliberations. The committee is concerned about the Department of the

Navy's amphibious lift capacity and believes that additional service life extension of existing LCAC assets is warranted.

The committee recommends $80.3 million for the Landing Craft Air Cushion Service Life Extension Program.

Littoral Combat Ship

The budget request included $1.13 billion for two Littoral Combat Ships (LCS).

The committee notes that the Navy has entered into a block procurement contract with two shipbuilders that maximizes efficiency and minimizes costs for the LCS seaframe. Unfortunately, the committee also notes that the administration has not requested sufficient funding in fiscal year 2017 to take advantage of the competitive pricing, which could lead to a 20 percent increase in the unit cost.

Therefore, the committee recommends $1.51 billion, an increase of $384.7 million, for procurement of a third Littoral Combat Ship. The committee notes that the Navy completed a Force Structure Assessment based on projected threats and determined that 52 small surface combatants were necessary. Senior Navy officials reaffirmed the 52 small surface combatant requirement in testimony before the committee earlier this year. Therefore, the committee is perplexed by the administration's statements that sufficient forces are available to support a reduction in the numbers of the small surface combatants to 40 ships. The Department of Defense briefed the committee as to options that they would pursue to mitigate the lower number of small surface combatants. The committee was unimpressed with the depth of this review. The committee is not willing to take risks in warfighting requirements and remains supportive of the Department of the Navy's Force Structure Assessment.

LX(R) Dock Landing Ship Replacement Program

The budget request contained no funds for advance procurement associated with LX(R) Dock Landing Ship Replacement Program.

The committee notes that the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps have agreed to support the LX(R) as a derivative of the LPD–17 *San Antonio*-class hull form. The committee also notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114–113) both included $250.0 million to begin detailed design and construction of the LX(R) amphibious warship. The committee believes that it is imperative to continue the construction of LPD–17 class derivative in line with current construction efforts rather than the current Navy program of record of fiscal year 2020.

Therefore, the committee recommends $856.0 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, for construction of amphibious vessels.

Modular ship design

The committee notes that in recent decades the Department of the Navy has placed increased emphasis on commonality in combat systems, open architecture and common object software code, and derivative ship designs. The committee also notes that recent De-

partment of the Navy ship designs have incorporated elements of flexibility and modularity, such as the Littoral Combat Ship mission packages, CVN–78 flexible infrastructure, and DDG–1000 Electronic Modular Enclosures, although these remain specific to these ship classes. The committee believes that ship design is changing to realize life-cycle benefits in common and flexible fleet architectures. The committee also believes that modular, adaptable, and flexible ship designs can provide advantages in the domestic and export marketplace, facilitate use of off-the-shelf technology, incentivize innovation, and accelerate the fielding of new capabilities.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to increase commonality, modularity, scalability, and flexibility in future ship construction, modernization, and conversion plans across the fleet architecture. The committee encourages the Secretary to solicit input from the commercial and naval ship design communities to optimize best design practices.

Service Craft

The committee notes that the budget request for fiscal year 2017 included $65.2 million for "Service Craft," which consists of $39.0 million for one Auxiliary Personnel Lighter and $26.2 million for two Harbor Tugs. The committee is pleased to note the Department of the Navy is addressing the need for Auxiliary Personnel Lighter Berthing Barges and Harbor Tugs. The committee encourages the Navy to consider appropriate small business set-asides for these efforts to maintain the small shipyard industrial base.

Ship to Shore Connector

The budget request included $128.1 million for two Ship to Shore Connectors.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy budget request for fiscal year 2016 anticipated five Ship to Shore Connectors being requested to support an efficient construction build strategy in fiscal year 2017. However, the committee notes that this program was reduced in the fiscal year 2017 budget request because of budgetary constraints. The committee is concerned about the Department of the Navy's amphibious lift capacity and believes that additional Ship to Shore Connectors are warranted. The committee notes that an additional three Ship to Shore Connectors were also included in the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded requirements list.

Therefore, the committee recommends $293.1 million, an increase of $165.0 million, for procurement of five Ship to Shore Connectors.

Strike capability assessment from surface amphibious forces

The committee notes that the administration is assessing an "arsenal plane" as an option to expand the capabilities of existing aircraft. The committee is supportive of these inventive methods to better employ developing technologies with existing capabilities. The committee also notes that similar concepts could be employed on the surface Navy forces to augment a loss of land attack strike capability that will result with the retirement of the guided missile submarines. While the Virginia Payload Module (VPM) that is

being incorporated into the Block V *Virginia*-class submarines will partially offset the loss to the land attack strike capability, the committee notes the Navy will still realize a net loss of strike capacity with the retirement of these guided missile submarines. The committee also notes that the lack of flexibility within the Navy surface forces to reload at sea also complicates salvo responses. Finally, the committee notes that there is potential for some of our amphibious force assets to accommodate additional capabilities in terms of space, weight, and machinery capacity. The committee believes that the Secretary of the Navy should review other alternatives to manage the loss of naval strike capacity including an option that could include the addition of the MK 41 Vertical Launch System on the Landing Platform/Dock (LPD) hull form to support other naval combatants with an "engage on remote" capability. The committee also believes that additional strike capability from surface amphibious forces appears to be consistent with the Navy's pursuit of distributed lethality and complicates potential enemy targeting solutions of our forces.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2016, that includes an assessment of options to optimally provide strike and missile defense from naval amphibious forces. Such an assessment should include options to insert the MK 41 Vertical Launch System on an LPD hull form.

TAO(X) oiler shipbuilding program

The committee notes that the budget request seeks to execute a block buy for TAO(X) ships and includes $73.0 million in fiscal year 2017 Advance Procurement (AP) funding, as well as similar amounts in subsequent years to leverage the cost efficiency of a block buy for these required assets. The program's first ship was authorized in fiscal year 2016, and section 127 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) provided the Navy the authority for use of a block buy for the program. The committee further notes that the 1-ship-per-year TAO(X) procurement rate planned beginning in fiscal year 2018 will result in a lengthy period to fulfill the 17-ship requirement and will not optimally utilize the industrial base, which has the capacity to produce at least 2 ships per year. Accelerating this procurement may serve to reduce overall program costs and minimize the time that the Navy has to continue to operate single-hulled fleet oilers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees concurrent with the date on which the budget for fiscal year 2018 is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, on the potential benefits and program savings that could be achieved by increasing the program procurement rate to two ships per year as well as by taking continued advantage of block-buy procurement. The Secretary is further directed to report on the industrial base capacity to construct two TAO(X) fleet oilers per year.

Undersea Mobility for Special Operation Forces

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy has proposed the retirement of the guided missile submarines starting in the 2020s. The committee further notes that U.S. Special Oper-

ations Forces (SOF) significantly leverage the capabilities resident in these assets, and that a loss of this mobility capacity will significantly impact future clandestine undersea mobility operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to prepare a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2017. The report shall address the Navy's plan to continue to support clandestine SOF undersea mobility requirements. The Secretary's plan shall specify Department of the Navy's efforts to address the following elements: (1) sustaining the capability to deploy twin dry deck shelters; (2) deployment of a dry combat submersible from a low-or-no visibility transport; (3) enhanced lockout capabilities to support an expanded array of dive missions; and (4) maximizing berthing space for special operators to train underway.

The Secretary is encouraged to present multiple means of enhancing the Navy's support of SOF undersea mobility requirements, including potential designs for a SOF-optimized submarine based on the SSBN(X) class submarine to be built after the Sea-based Strategic Deterrence program has met all commitments to the nuclear triad. This report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

Virginia Class Submarine

The budget request included $1.77 billion for the Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement.

In fiscal year 2017, advance procurement is necessary to support procurement of long lead time materials and advanced manufacturing efforts for a total of four ships: the SSN800 and SSN801 (from the existing Block IV multiyear procurement contract) and the SSN802 and SSN803 (from the anticipated Block V multiyear procurement contract). It is anticipated that the Block V contract will include, for the first time, the Virginia Payload Module, a new hull section which contains four large-diameter payload tubes for increased Tomahawk missile capacity. The committee believes that additional funding is necessary to support advanced construction for the *Virginia*-class submarine program in fiscal year 2017 to maintain cost, schedule, and contractual requirements.

Therefore, the committee recommends $1.85 billion, an increase of $85.0 million, for the Virginia Class Submarine Advance Procurement.

Virginia class submarine industrial base capacity

The committee notes that since the end of the Cold War, the United States has produced an average of less than one attack submarine (SSN) per year. Over the next 20 years, submarine production is planned to average two submarines per year, and, for most of those years, one of the two submarines will be an Ohio Replacement ballistic missile submarine (SSBN), which is roughly two and a half times larger than the attack submarines currently under construction. The committee believes that this sustained annual submarine production workload at the nation's two nuclear shipbuilders and their vendor base will double from what it has been in the recent past. Managing this increase in production to be both affordable and executable in delivering critically needed capabili-

ties to the fleet will require careful planning and attention, as well as continued coordination with the carrier programs.

While SSBN requirements will be met under current shipbuilding plans, attack submarine force levels will fall below the Navy requirement of 48 SSNs in 2025, and reach a nadir of 41 attack submarines in 2030. The committee is concerned that this unprecedented shrinkage in undersea force structure will come at a time of growing demand for naval forces, particularly for the assured access and capabilities provided by submarines. The committee has received testimony from a wide range of military leaders and experts about the strain that the submarine force is under today, and the need to mitigate the projected reduction in the fleet. Given the increasing demand on undersea capabilities, the committee firmly supports the sustainment of the current two a year production rate of new attack submarines to include during the procurement years of Ohio Replacement submarines which begins in 2021.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2017, as to the submarine industrial base and the viability of producing additional attack submarines beyond the fiscal year 2017 shipbuilding plan in the 2017–2030 timeframe. This report should address the following specific elements:

(1) The capacity of the submarine shipyards and vendor base and factors limiting submarine production;

(2) The viability of adding SSNs to Navy shipbuilding plans;

(3) The impact of increasing attack submarine production during the 2017–2030 timeframe on Navy undersea force levels;

(4) The impact of increasing attack submarine production on overall Virginia and Ohio Replacement program costs and workload profiles; and

(5) Potential efficiencies and economies that might be achieved in increasing SSN production.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY

Items of Special Interest

Destroyer modernization

The budget request contained $367.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy for destroyer modernization.

The committee is concerned that the Secretary of the Navy has applied insufficient resources toward modernization efforts and that a dearth of capabilities will result when compared against needed capabilities outlined in the most recent Navy Force Structure Assessment. The committee notes that one destroyer combat system modernization, valued at $65.0 million, was included in the Navy Unfunded Requirements list.

Therefore, the committee recommends $432.8 million, an increase of $65.0 million, in Other Procurement, Navy for an additional destroyer modernization.

Joint Strike Fighter integration on amphibious ships

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy will begin deployments of the F–35B on amphibious ships in the near future.

However, the committee also notes that all the accompanying communication system upgrades necessary to fully utilize the F–35B capabilities have not been programmed to be fielded for the entirety of the amphibious force structure. The committee believes that limited amphibious ship communications system capability may limit the capabilities provided to the fleet by the F–35B. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, detailing F–35B integration for amphibious ships. This briefing should specifically include the F–35B deployment schedule, the proposed amphibious ship modernization plan, and the proposed integrated communications architecture that is being developed to support F–35B.

Navy Communications

The committee believes that Navy activities associated with underway replenishments, aircraft launch and recovery, fuel and ordnance handling and small boat operations represent some of the most hazardous operations conducted at sea and are increasingly difficult during conflict. The committee also believes that these activities are further complicated during Emissions Control (EMCON) operations when the Navy is responding to emerging threats. To address communications requirements when performing these activities, the committee notes that the Navy has initiated a phone distance line replacement program that allows the Navy to securely communicate using infrared light, enabling simultaneous data, video and voice communications in environments where communication would be impossible or undesirable. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to prepare a brief to the House Committee on Armed Services by August 1, 2016, that details implementation of a Phone Distance Line Replacement that could be used in EMCON environments.

Navy expeditionary combat patrol boat requirements

The budget request contained $43.7 million in Other Procurement, Navy, for standard boats.

The committee is concerned that the Department of the Navy has not fully defined its requirement for expeditionary combat patrol boats, which has led to an inconsistent acquisition strategy for the procurement of such boats. This inconsistent strategy prevents the government from taking advantage of stable procurement lines that provide the best pricing. It also fails to provide industry with the ability to make long-term planning decisions in order to provide the most competitive pricing.

The committee recommends $63.7 million, an increase of $20.0 million, for the acceleration of a request for proposals for the procurement of additional patrol boats in fiscal year 2017.

The committee also directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, concurrent with the date on which the budget for fiscal year 2018 is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, as to expeditionary combat patrol boat requirements to include the following elements:

(1) The number of expeditionary combat patrol boats required to carry out the naval strategy, National Military Strategy, and meet

joint and combined warfighting requirements relating to crisis response, overseas posture, and support to contingency operations;

(2) The annual funding necessary to procure the expeditionary combat patrol boats required by the naval strategy and National Military Strategy;

(3) The quantity of expeditionary combat patrol boats that are funded for procurement in the President's budget for fiscal year 2018 and in the current Future Years Defense Program;

(4) A long-range expeditionary combat patrol boat building plan for the Department of the Navy, through fiscal year 2022, that includes annual quantities of each type of patrol boat to be procured; and

(5) A detailed discussion of the risks associated with any deviation from the long-range expeditionary combat patrol boat building plan required in paragraph (4), to include the implications of such a deviation for the following areas: (a) warfighting requirements; (b) crisis response and overseas posture missions; and (c) contingency operations.

Ship's Signal Exploitation Equipment Program

The committee recognizes the importance of continued funding for the Ship's Signal Exploitation Equipment (SSEE) modification program that will continue development of an electronically steered multi-beam antenna array that can operate over a very broad frequency and transmit high power for multiple functions while maintaining a low radar cross-section. The Navy's SSEE program represents the latest technology advancement in Naval Information Operations. Threat evolution mandates higher power, frequency agility, wide band, lower weight, decreased maintenance and ease of shipboard installation and integration. The current and future protection of Navy sailors is dependent upon battlespace awareness and assessing hostile threats. Navy ships require wideband, multifunction antennas that can operationally support high power signals anywhere in the hemisphere of the ships' field of view. These ships are also required to have a low radar cross-section, and utilize antennas for more than one function. Current technology has provided those capabilities for the Navy but requires critical, threat-driven improvements to ensure ship and sailor safety. The currently deployed Naval Information Operations system provides wideband, high-power transmit capability using a dish antenna. However, this limited system can only produce a single beam at any given time, limiting operations in a multi-dimensional battlespace. SSEE fulfills an urgent fleet requirement to provide frequency extension and counter intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance enhanced capabilities. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to continue development and funding of the Ship's Signal Exploitation Equipment modification program.

PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS

Items of Special Interest

Marine Corps fielding of Enhanced Combat Helmet

The budget request contained no funding for procurement of Enhanced Combat Helmets for the Marine Corps.

The committee notes that in 2009 the Marine Corps received an urgent need statement for a helmet with enhanced ballistic protection from selected small-arms ammunition and fragmentation. Working in collaboration with the Army, the Enhanced Combat Helmet (ECH) was ultimately developed and deployed beginning in 2014. By utilizing the latest lightweight material technology, the ECH provides increased small-arms protection above what is currently provided by the Marine Corps' Lightweight Helmet and the Army's Advanced Combat Helmet. The committee understands that the Marine Corps has now deployed approximately 80,000 ECHs, but requires further funding to ensure the ECH is more broadly fielded to Marines. The committee also notes the Commandant of the Marine Corps has identified an unfunded requirement of $22.0 million for helmets in fiscal year 2017.

In addition, the committee notes that in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee indicated there was a need to ensure at least two vendors are capable of producing combat helmets, soft armor, and hard armor components in order to maintain competition for better body armor technology and retain surge capacity for a large-scale conflict.

The committee remains concerned that the Marine Corps has not more widely fielded the ECH due to funding limitations and that there remains a risk to the domestic advanced combat helmet industrial base. Therefore, the committee recommends $22.0 million, an increase of $22.0 million, in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps, for the procurement of additional Enhanced Combat Helmets for the Marine Corps and to address the unfunded requirement identified by the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mobile User Objective System capability

The committee notes that the Mobile User Objective System (MUOS) program has established a satellite constellation on orbit, but that only a limited number of communications terminals or radios carry MUOS waveform software. The committee is concerned about the delays in incorporating the MUOS waveform into Marine Corps and Air Force communications terminals. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to provide briefings to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by September 1, 2016, on their current plans for integrating the MUOS waveform upgrades and associated equipment for current radios. To the maximum extent possible, these briefings should include detailed projections for delivery schedules, and fielding schedules for such equipment.

Non-lethal ocular interruption capabilities

The committee continues to support the Department's efforts for accelerated development, fielding, and deployment of non-lethal technologies for both force application and force protection missions. The committee is encouraged by the Marine Corps' efforts to modernize and procure hail and warning, laser dazzlers, and other escalation of force systems. The committee recognizes that these materiel solutions allow personnel engaged in combat, stability and support, security, and force protection operations to employ visual technologies to non-lethally intercept and interdict personnel at safe standoff distances. These solutions provide commanders with a non-lethal hailing and warning capability applicable across the range of military operations to support Marine Corps missions when the minimization of civilian casualties and collateral damage is essential to mission success. The committee is concerned that the funding reductions over the past few years to both the Department's Non-Lethal Weapons program, and the services' procurements for non-lethal systems, will not be able to support the readiness need for escalation of force capabilities that may be needed for humanitarian relief efforts, non-combatant evacuation operations, and peacekeeping. The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2016, on actions being taken to ensure sufficient procurement of such equipment to meet projected operational needs. This briefing should include details on the programming, planning, and budgeting for procurement of hail and warning, and other escalation of force systems.

AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Items of Special Interest

A–10 aircraft

The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force plans for the F–35A aircraft, a fifth-generation multi-role fighter, to replace A–10 and F–16 aircraft. The committee further notes that mission sets for F–35A include, but are not limited to, missions currently performed by the A–10, which are primarily close air support (CAS), combat search and rescue (CSAR), and forward air controller-airborne (FAC–A). The Air Force has taken the equivalent of four A–10 squadrons out of service over the last 4 years, and only nine operational A–10 squadrons remain across the Active Duty and Air Reserve Components, while the A–10 is currently deployed to three overseas locations including the Republic of Korea, Europe, and for Operation Inherent Resolve against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant.

The committee also notes that the Department of Defense has made contradictory statements about the Future Years Defense Program for activation of F–35A units and divestiture of A–10 units. These contradictory statements, including the current plan to begin retiring more A–10s before there is a proven replacement for its capabilities, create uncertainty over the Department of the Air Force's ability to provide continuous CAS, CSAR, and FAC–A capabilities to the joint force.

The committee believes that the Department of the Air Force continues to suffer from capacity shortfalls in its fighter aircraft fleets, and that these shortfalls are being exacerbated by the near-term readiness challenges that are systemic across all the military services. As such, the committee believes that retiring any more A–10s without a proven replacement to its unique capabilities, or proof that the F–35A can replace the A–10's mission capabilities, is an unacceptable risk.

The committee understands the F–35 is scheduled to complete an initial operational test and evaluation (IOT&E) in fiscal year 2018 or in early fiscal year 2019. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would prohibit the retirement of A–10 aircraft until the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) provides a report to the congressional defense committees on the results of the IOT&E. The IOT&E would include, but would not be limited to, a comparison test and evaluation that examines the capabilities of the F–35A and A–10C in conducting CAS, CSAR, and FAC–A missions. This provision would also require the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the Secretary's views of the results of this IOT&E, which should include any issues or concerns from the DOT&E report, a path forward for addressing any deficiencies or corrective actions identified by DOT&E, and the near- and long-term strategy for preserving the Air Force's capabilities in CAS, CSAR, and FAC–A.

The committee believes that to ensure combat realism, the comparative testing should include, but not be limited to, both pre-planned and emergency divert missions to address effectiveness in realistic, complex ground firefight scenarios. These scenarios should include those in which enemy forces are in close proximity to friendly forces where the pilot is required to visually identify the target and friendly forces in day and night conditions; armored targets; scenarios requiring continuous weapons delivery, command and control (C2), extended time over target, and simulated collateral damage restrictions; deception scenarios with degraded visual environments; low-altitude employment, including "shows of force" and strafe; survivability from simulated direct hits by small arms fire, light anti-aircraft artillery, and man-portable air defense systems; scenarios in which simulated aircraft systems are damaged; scenarios conducted without joint tactical air controller or higher headquarters control to test CAS aircraft suitability for forward air controller-airborne deconfliction of fires; and scenarios including joint fires coordination and timing, including Joint Air Attack Team attacks with Department of the Army aviation assets and artillery deconfliction. CSAR missions should compare effectiveness in the rescue mission commander role, coordinating all aspects of an extended CSAR mission, including but not limited to: locating and protecting the isolated personnel with continuous firepower; controlling other fighters as FAC–A; coordinating electronic attack; intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance; aerial refueling; C2; and rescue vehicle escort. The committee notes that previous aircraft programs such as the F–22 also conducted comparison testing as part of IOT&E. The committee also notes that at a hearing held by the House Committee on Armed Services' Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on March 23, 2016, the Director of Oper-

ational Test and Evaluation testified that the cost of the F–35 and A–10 comparative testing would be between $3.5 million and $5.2 million, and that he was working to ensure that the F–35 and A–10 comparative testing is accomplished within the established budget for IOT&E.

Additionally, the committee expects that the Department of Defense will provide the report required by section 142 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) on time, and based on that report, the committee may take further action on options for an A–10 replacement program.

Aerial refueling recapitalization

The committee notes that the nation's ability to meet its air-refueling requirements must not be placed at increased risk while the Department of Defense executes its strategic aerial refueling recapitalization strategy.

Specifically, the committee notes that the Department is currently executing its KC–46A Pegasus acquisition program to replace a number of aging KC–135 Stratotankers and that KC–46As will eventually replace the KC–10 Extender fleet.

The committee strongly reiterates the importance of ensuring that the Department's execution of the phase-out and replacement portion of its aerial refueling recapitalization strategy does not compromise its ability to meet stated short- or long-term air-refueling requirements.

Air Force Command, Control, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C2ISR) Fleet

The committee is aware that the Department of the Air Force's critical manned C2ISR aircraft are high-demand assets facing low availability rates, end-of-life issues, and growing sustainment costs. The committee is supportive of the Air Force's plan to replace the JSTARS fleet with an affordable commercially available platform under a full and open competition. When recapitalizing the rest of the manned C2ISR fleet, the committee believes the Department of the Air Force should use a similar acquisition strategy as the one used with JSTARS, and consider a full and open competition. The term "C2ISR fleet" is defined as predominantly 707/C–135 platforms which are approaching end of service life. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing not later than September 1, 2016, on the Air Force's current plans for recapitalization of these aircraft.

Air National Guard F–16 mission training centers

The budget request contained $15.2 million for F–16 aircraft support equipment and facilities, but contained no funding for the procurement of additional F–16 mission training centers (MTC) for the Air National Guard.

The committee notes that an F–16 MTC allows pilots to train in scenarios that are either impossible or too expensive to conduct in home-station flying training, and believes that the MTC environment significantly improves F–16 pilot skill and readiness to perform actual combat missions with increased effectiveness. Each MTC includes high-fidelity simulator cockpits, instructor operator stations, a threat server, and briefing and debriefing capabilities.

The MTC is also capable of linking and integrating into geographically distributed high-fidelity combat and combat support training devices that include command and control and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems. This capability allows F–16 pilots at home stations to exercise and train at the operational and tactical levels of war, as well as conduct networked unit-level training, in large force employment scenarios with other Air Force aircraft integrated into the distributed mission operating architecture.

The committee understands that F–16 MTCs are currently planned for Hill Air Force Base (AFB), Utah; Shaw AFB, South Carolina; and Holloman AFB, New Mexico. The committee further understands that other F–16 pilots based in the United States would be required to travel to one of the three MTC locations to take advantage of its capabilities, and believes an additional MTC would avoid travel costs and make the F–16 block MTC more accessible to Total Force F–16 pilots, enabling the Air Force's current state of low readiness for full-spectrum combat capability to more quickly recover.

Therefore, the committee recommends $40.0 million, an increase of $24.8 million, in F–16 aircraft support equipment and facilities for the procurement and installation of an additional F–16 MTC for the Air National Guard and utilization by all Total Force F–16 pilots.

Aircraft urethane sealant upgrades

The committee notes that the KC–135 and B–52 fleets experience chronic leaks primarily in the wing cavities. Current wet cavity sealing technology is specified for polysulfide. The committee understands that polysulfide becomes brittle over a short period of time and cracks, which results in repeated removals and replacements of the material to try to repair leaks, or more commonly maintainers add more polysulfide sealant over the cracked material and significantly increase the aircraft weight.

In order to better assess this issue, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a study into the value of using the polyurethane Integral Fuel Tank sealant to correct chronic leaks in KC–135 and B–52 military aircraft, and brief the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2016, on the results of the study. The study should include an evaluation of the long-term savings in maintenance and operating costs using dollars per pound per flight hour.

B–21 bomber

The committee received independent testimony stating that the Air Force should procure between 174 and 205 B–21 bombers to ensure that enough aircraft are available to meet combatant commander, training, test, back-up inventory, and attrition reserve requirements. Additionally, the Global Strike commander indicated that the previously announced 100 B–21 bombers should be treated as the lower limit of the total required number.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2017, that estimates the number of B–21 bomber aircraft needed to meet the combatant commander requirements. The report, which

may include a classified annex, shall include the following elements:

(1) A detailed explanation of the strategy and associated force sizing and shaping constructs, associated scenarios and assumptions used to conduct the analysis;

(2) A range of numbers to meet requirements for B–21 bombers given best case and worst case assumptions and the associated risk based on Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff risk management classifications; and

(3) A detailed transition plan that integrates the B–21 into the current bomber fleet through 2040.

B–21 Development Progress Matrix

The committee notes that the Air Force, through the Rapid Capabilities Office (RCO), entered into a contract for the Engineering, Manufacturing, and Development (EMD) phase associated with the B–21 bomber. The committee is pleased to see progress on this program and believes that this program has stable requirements in place. However, the committee is concerned that, given the length of time associated with the EMD phase and the amount of resources planned for this phase, the congressional defense committees need an improved ability to track annual progress and cost throughout the development. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit an initial B–21 Development Progress Matrix to the congressional defense committees, concurrent with the budget request for fiscal year 2018 that includes. The matrix should provide milestones and metrics for measuring progress made in technology, design, software, manufacturing, testing, and product reliability maturity in relationship to the resources that are planned and expended. The committee may consider requesting annual updates to the matrix in the future.

Basing priorities for future Air National Guard Modular Airborne Firefighting Systems missions

The committee is concerned about the current positions of Modular Airborne Firefighting Systems (MAFFS) that are operated by Air National Guard (ANG) C–130s. As shown in the National Guard Bureau's brief to the committee on MAFFS, there is a current gap in northwest States based on the current allocation of existing MAFFS unit locations. Additionally, the committee understands that the year 2015 was one of the most devastating fire seasons on record and, according to the National Interagency Fire Center, the most destructive forest fires occurred in the northwestern States of Montana, Oregon, Idaho, and Washington. One of the most important factors for fire suppression in high-density forested areas is the ability to contain forest fire immediately before the fire grows to catastrophic size. The committee believes that MAFFS units should be located in areas that have the ability to rapidly respond to areas with a high propensity for high-density forest fires.

The committee concurs with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service recommendations that the location of MAFFS units should be in close proximity to fire-prone States, not located on the East Coast. The committee believes that these recommendations would be able to prevent a repeat of the 2015 fires

season where over $1.70 billion was spent by the USDA Forest Service alone for fire suppression.

The committee believes that when making future basing decisions with regard to MAFFS units, the Air Mobility Command should consider geographical gaps of MAFFS units, and give preference to areas that are prone to high-density catastrophic forest fires.

Battlefield Airborne Communications Node

The committee notes that since its fielding, the Battlefield Airborne Communications Node (BACN) system has provided critical communications and information-sharing capability between different tactical data and voice networks in support of operations in the Republic of Iraq, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, Libya, and other areas. The BACN program continues to act as a critical communications gateway and data relay, flying on EQ–4B and E–11A aircraft in support of Operation Freedom's Sentinel throughout the United States Central Command's area of responsibility and elsewhere in support of joint urgent operational requirements.

In addition, the committee recognizes the Department of the Air Force's efforts to establish a program of record, and continues to believe that doing so is important to preserve previous investments and operational experience to meet ongoing operational requirements. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to continue the planning and establishment of a BACN Program of Record, while continuing to meet ongoing warfighter requirements in theater. In addition, the committee encourages including modernization planning in support of anticipated future requirements across multiple theaters. This would ensure that this capability is maintained in the Department of the Air Force for the long term to support joint operational communications, fifth-generation aircraft communications, combat cloud, and data networking requirements.

C–130H Modernization

The budget request contained $9.2 million for C–130 modernization for the Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) Increment 1 program. This program will provide the mandated radios, Automated Dependent Surveillance Broadcast (ADS–B) Out and enhanced Mode S capabilities necessary to operate in international airspace by the year 2020. The committee fully supports this request and is committed to ensuring the long-term viability of the C–130H aircraft in the Air Force's Regular, Guard, and Reserve Components until they reach their expected service life or are recapitalized. By most estimates, with proper avionics upgrades, the roughly 172-aircraft C–130H fleet is viable until at least 2040.

However, AMP Increment 1 only addresses 4 of the 12 Communication, Navigation, and Surveillance/Air Traffic Management compliance mandates and does not resolve the cockpit avionics obsolescence that limits the long-term viability of the aircraft. The planned follow-on AMP Increment 2 effort will replace the current cockpit with a modern digital "glass cockpit." This will allow the Air Force's fleet to be supported well into the future, resolve diminishing manufacturing sources, and increase mission availability. It will also provide upgraded Automatic Flight Control System capa-

bilities to take advantage of more efficient airspace management capabilities, and eliminate some maintenance and readiness issues.

The committee is aware of commercially available, non-developmental Increment 1 and Increment 2 solutions for C–130-derivative aircraft. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to fully pursue full and open competitions for both the Increment 1 and Increment 2 programs. The committee is encouraged by the Air Force's renewed commitment to upgrading C–130H aircraft and expects both AMP Increments 1 and 2 to continue to be fully funded in future budget requests.

In addition to avionics upgrades, the committee continues its strong support for C–130H propulsion and propeller system upgrades. The committee believes that these upgrades will provide cost savings through increased fuel efficiency and reduced maintenance requirements.

The committee recommends $81.7 million, an increase of $72.5 million, for C–130H propulsion and propeller system upgrades.

C–130J Hercules aircraft

The budget request contained $146.0 million for the C–130J program. The committee is concerned by the Air Force plans to procure only two C–130Js in fiscal year 2017.

The committee is concerned that the Air Force reduced two C–130J aircraft from the President's budget request due to fiscal constraints. These reductions have also put the initiation of Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve C–130H-to-J fleet recapitalization at increased risk. The committee notes that the Active Duty combat delivery fleet has essentially completed its replacement of legacy C–130H aircraft with the C–130J. Likewise, it is noted that the Air Force Special Operations Command and U.S. Marine Corps, including the U.S. Marine Corps Reserves, are also well on their way to C–130J recapitalization completion.

The committee recommends $417.5 million, an increase of $271.5 million, for the procurement of three additional C–130J aircraft.

C–40A Clipper aircraft

The budget request contained no funds for the Navy and Marine Corps C–40A program.

The committee notes that the Navy has stated that it has a warfighting requirement of 23 C–40A aircraft with a fiscally constrained inventory objective of 17 aircraft that will provide adequate capacity at acceptable risk. The current fleet inventory is 14 aircraft with 1 on order. The addition of two aircraft will complete the minimum inventory objective. This will allow the Navy to better execute the Navy Unique Fleet Essential Aircraft mission and provide combatant and component commanders with short-notice, quick response, intra-theater air logistics support, as well as direct support of fleet requirements. While the Navy has recapitalized its fleet of C–9B aircraft, the Marine Corps is still operating two aging C–9B aircraft that are the only two in the Department of the Navy inventory, which greatly increases their maintenance and sustainment costs. The procurement of two C–40A aircraft for the Marine Corps would allow them to provide critical, reliable, highly flexible airborne logistics capabilities to deployed Marine Air-Ground Task Forces. Finally, the committee notes that these four

aircraft were included in the Chief of Naval Operations' and the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list.

The committee recommends $415.0 million for the procurement of four aircraft for the Navy and Marine Corps C–40A program.

Demonstration of high performance unmanned jet aircraft

The committee is encouraged by the success of recent system demonstration flights at the Navy test range at China Lake, California, of unmanned aerial systems (UAS) capable of tactical speeds and maneuverability, coupled with substantial autonomy and multi-aircraft collaboration.

The committee notes that legacy UAS continue to rely heavily on human operators, and it supports ongoing research to develop a more seamless human-machine environment. The committee also recognizes the potential force multiplier effects provided by a UAS with fighter-like performance operating collaboratively with manned aircraft, specifically in support of the suppression of enemy air defenses.

Furthermore, the committee notes that the characteristics of this advanced capability are consistent with those the Navy has identified for acquisition through use of rapid prototype development and experimentation in order to explore and expedite innovative operational concepts to the fleet.

As such, the committee believes the Navy should pursue an industry-developed low-cost, reusable, penetrating, unmanned semi-autonomous tactical combat aircraft capable of being launched from multiple platforms and performing a broad range of missions in a nonpermissive environment, to include electronic attack, and encourages the Navy to demonstrate the capability at an exercise no later than fiscal year 2017.

E–8C prime mission equipment diminishing manufacturing sources kits

The budget request contained $6.2 million for E–8C modifications, but included no funds for prime mission equipment diminishing manufacturing sources (PME–DMS) kits.

The committee understands that PME–DMS kit procurement and installation is a top issue for E–8C fleet viability, and is required to maintain the E–8C's net-centric warfighter capabilities, including the ground moving target indicator and battle management command and control, as specified in the operational requirements document. Of the fleet of 16 operational E–8C aircraft, the committee notes that only 14 aircraft have been budgeted to receive PME–DMS kits, and the committee believes that all 16 aircraft should be configured with the PME–DMS kit so that all operational E–8C aircraft are maintained in the most up-to-date configuration.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $23.7 million, an increase of $17.5 million, for E–8C modifications, for procurement of two PME–DMS kits.

EC–130H Compass Call recapitalization

The budget change request contained $165.7 million across multiple appropriations for the Air Force's Compass Call program.

The committee received a letter from U.S. Air Force requesting a technical adjustment to the fiscal year 2017 budget request and a new start authorization to re-host the EC–130H Compass Call mission equipment onto a new platform. The U.S. Air Force stated that the only option that does not require development and/or certification work is a Gulfstream G550 Conformal Airborne Early Warning airframe, which will be designated the EC–37B.

While the committee supports the Air Force's need to accelerate fielding a replacement aircraft that meets its requirement, the committee is concerned about the U.S. Air Force's 10-year acquisition strategy that acquires one EC–37B per year and results in a 6-year period where the Air Force is operating a mixed fleet of EC–130s and EC–37Bs. The committee does not believe this is the most efficient or cost effective way to cross-deck the capability. The committee encourages the Air Force to optimize the divesture of the EC–130s and accelerate the fielding of the EC–37B.

The committee recommends $165.7 million in PE 27253F for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force; Research Development Test and Evaluation; Operations and Maintenance; and Operations and Maintenance, Overseas Contingency Operations, for the Compass Call program.

F–22 production restart assessment

The committee notes that production of the F–22 fifth-generation tactical aircraft concluded in 2009, and notes 187 aircraft were produced, far short of the initial program objective of 749 aircraft, as well as the Air Combat Command's stated requirement of 381 aircraft. The committee also understands there has been interest within the Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense, and Congress in potentially restarting production of the F–22 aircraft. In light of growing threats to U.S. air superiority as a result of adversaries closing the technology gap and increasing demand from allies and partners for high-performance, multi-role aircraft to meet evolving and worsening global security threats, the committee believes that such proposals are worthy of further exploration.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to conduct a comprehensive assessment and study of the costs associated with resuming production of F–22 aircraft and provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than January 1, 2017, on the findings of this assessment. The committee expects the report to be unclassified, but may contain a classified annex. Further, the committee directs that the assessment and report consider and address the following:

(1) Anticipated future air superiority capacity and capability requirements, based on anticipated near-term and mid-term threat projections, both air and ground; evolving F–22 missions and roles in anti-access/area-denial environments; F–15C retirement plans and service-life extension programs; estimated next-generation aircraft initial operating capability dates; and estimated end-of-service timelines for existing F–22As;

(2) Estimated costs to restart F–22 production, including the estimated cost of reconstituting the F–22 production line, and the time required to achieve low-rate production; the estimated cost of procuring another 194 F–22 aircraft to meet the requirement for 381 aircraft; and the estimated cost of procuring sufficient F–22 aircraft

to meet other requirements or inventory levels that the Secretary may deem necessary to support the National Security Strategy and address emerging threats;

(3) Factors impacting F–22 restart costs, including the availability and suitability of existing F–22A production tooling; the estimated impact on unit and total costs of altering the total buy size and procuring larger and smaller quantities of aircraft; and opportunities for foreign export and partner nation involvement if section 8118 of the Defense Appropriations Act, 1998 (Public Law 105–56) prohibiting export of the F–22 were repealed;

(4) Historical lessons from past aircraft production restarts; and

(5) Any others matters that the Secretary deems relevant.

F–35 Lightning II aircraft program

The F–35 Lightning II is the Department of Defense's largest acquisition program, which will eventually deliver 2,443 F–35 aircraft to the Departments of the Navy and Air Force. The committee believes that the F–35 will form the backbone of U.S. air combat superiority for decades to come, replacing or complementing the legacy tactical fighter fleets of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps with a dominant, multi-role, fifth-generation aircraft capable of projecting U.S. power and deterring potential adversaries. The committee notes that for the F–35 program's international partners and foreign military sales customers, who are participating in the program, the F–35 will become a cornerstone for future coalition operations. The committee believes that the F–35 will help to close a crucial capability gap that will enhance the strength of our security alliances. Therefore, the committee continues its strong support of this crucial aircraft development and procurement program.

The F–35 Lightning II program is approximately 80 percent through its flight test program which is planned to be completed in the first quarter of fiscal year 2018. At a hearing held by the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces of the House Committee on Armed Services on March 23, 2016, the F–35 Program Executive Officer (PEO) testified that the F–35 program is executing well across the spectrum of acquisition. However, the committee notes that the F–35 PEO has identified the software development for the final development software block, known as block 3F, as an area with some risk remaining that could result in a 4-month delay in delivery of software block 3F. This delay will not affect the Department of the Navy's initial operational capability for the F–35C in 2018. At that hearing on March 23, 2016, the F–35 PEO also identified the next version of the autonomic logistics information system (ALIS) as an area with some schedule risk. The Government Accountability Office's Director of Acquisition and Sourcing Management, who also testified at that hearing, likewise identified both completion of software block 3F and ALIS as risk areas. Accordingly, the committee continues to closely monitor both software progress and ALIS development.

Looking toward the future, the committee is concerned about plans for F–35 sustainment. Consequently, elsewhere in this Act the committee includes a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on the F–35 Lightning II aircraft program's sustainment support structure.

MQ–9 production funding in Future Years Defense Program

The budget request contained $575.6 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for MQ–9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems (UAS).

The committee supports the President's budget request for fiscal year 2017. However, the committee is concerned that there is no additional funding for procurement of additional MQ–9 UAS in the Future Years Defense Program. The committee notes that the Air Force recently announced a plan to increase intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capacity through a $3.0 billion plan that includes basing expansions, increased manning, and procurement of additional MQ–9s. The committee understands that this plan may include establishment of up to 9 additional squadrons and 3,500 more personnel. Given this expansive new plan to increase ISR capacity, the committee encourages the Air Force to reconsider its Future Years Defense Program projections for the MQ–9 to ensure it includes the appropriate amount of new systems to support planned growth in ISR capacity.

The committee recommends $575.6 million, the full amount requested, in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for MQ–9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems.

Reporting requirement for C–130H recapitalization and modernization

The committee notes that the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard, as well as the Special Operations Command, U.S. Marine Corps, and U.S. Coast Guard, are all well on their way to recapitalize their legacy C–130Hs with the newer, more cost effective, and more operationally capable, C–130Js. The Air Force has stated that some C–130H units within the Guard and Reserve will be modernized with upgraded avionics, while others will be recapitalized with C–130Js. What remains unclear at this point is which units will be modernized and which ones will be recapitalized.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2017, on C–130H recapitalization and modernization that shall include the following elements:

(1) C–130H to C–130J recapitalization timeline by unit for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve;

(2) C–130H Avionics Modernization Program Increment 1 and Increment 2 fielding timeline by unit for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve; and

(3) C–130H propulsion system upgrades: T56 3.5 engine modification, NP 2000 8-bladed propeller, and electronic propeller controller system, timeline by unit for the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve.

UH–1N replacement program

The budget request contained $14.1 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, and $18.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the UH–1N replacement program. The UH–1N replacement program would replace the Department of the Air Force UH–1N fleet by acquiring a non-developmental commercial or U.S. Government vertical lift aircraft.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee noted that the current UH–1N aircraft fleet fails to meet speed, range, payload, and defensive system requirements. The committee also noted that modifications to the existing fleet will not enable the UH–1N to meet mission requirements, and that the Department of the Air Force was assessing requirements for the UH–1N replacement, conducting market research, and developing UH–1N replacement acquisition alternatives. Since last year, the committee learned that nuclear weapons surety studies have highlighted a critical requirement for the replacement of the current fleet of UH–1N helicopters supporting the nuclear mission. However, while the committee notes that there is no validated Joint Urgent Operational Needs Statement (JUONS) associated with this requirement, the committee understands that a JUONS only applies to situations where U.S. military forces are actively engaged with enemy forces. Nevertheless, the committee believes that replacement of the helicopters performing the nuclear mission is now an urgent need based, in part, on the warning of the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command in an August 6, 2015, Memorandum to the Deputy Secretary of Defense and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In recent hearing testimony, Air Force officials stated that, in response to the concerns of operational commanders, the Air Force was considering a range of options to more quickly address the requirement for UH–1N replacement aircraft. The committee understands that these options include deployment of existing units to provide additional capability through a formal Request for Forces to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and a possible use of an Economy Act (31 U.S.C. 1535) decision, based on an "urgent and compelling need," to procure UH–60M Black Hawk helicopters through the Department of the Army. The committee notes that in this case, an Economy Act decision to opt out of a competition would potentially allow for a sole-source contract award exceeding $1.5 billion in value. However, the committee recognizes that the Secretary of the Air Force may proceed with such a non-competitive award if the Secretary determines the statutory requirements for doing so are met. The committee assumes that, if an Economy Act decision is made, procurement of the UH–60M aircraft could begin in fiscal year 2017, which would require more funding than requested in the budget request.

Therefore, the committee recommends $14.1 million, the full amount requested, in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force, and $98.3 million, an increase of $80.0 million, in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force, for the UH–1N replacement program. The committee expects these additional funds to be used to accelerate the program's schedule if an Economy Act decision is made to procure UH–60M Black Hawk helicopters in lieu of conducting a competition.

U.S. Air Force combat search and rescue

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, the committee encouraged the Department of Defense to adopt concurrent and balanced fielding of new equipment between the Active Compo-

nent (AC) and Reserve Component (RC). The committee believes that in many cases, concurrent and balanced fielding can better integrate AC and RC units and help ensure the RC remains an operational reserve. Furthermore, the committee notes that many major defense acquisition programs have followed concurrent and balanced fielding, including the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter.

The committee understands that the Air Force intends to field refurbished and upgraded HH–60G operational loss replacement (OLR) aircraft to RC combat search and rescue units in fiscal year 2018, and that these same units will receive new HH–60W combat rescue helicopter aircraft in the fiscal year 2027 to 2029 timeframe. The committee supports the plan to provide these OLR aircraft to RC units as soon as possible. However, the committee is concerned that there does not appear to be a plan to concurrently field the HH–60W to both AC and RC units, and that there is a potential 10-year gap between RC units receiving HH–60G OLR aircraft and the new HH–60W aircraft.

Additionally, the committee understands that the Department of the Air Force is undertaking an ongoing review to determine whether primary responsibility for combat search and rescue (CSAR) will remain with Air Combat Command or be moved to Air Force Special Operations Command. The committee notes the importance of the CSAR mission as the primary personnel recovery method for service men and women in extremis, as well as the complex nature of these operations that often require multi-service, dedicated, and fully trained forces. As the Air Force reviews this mission, the committee encourages an analysis of current and anticipated geographic combatant commander requirements and whether current force structure is capable of meeting those requirements with existing HH–60 and V–22 platforms.

To address committee concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force and relevant subordinate commands to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than September 1, 2016, on Department of the Air Force plans for fielding the HH–60W to the AC and RC, and the status of the ongoing review for responsibility for the CSAR mission.

U.S. Marine Corps C/KC–130 digital interoperability

The committee recognizes the importance of the Marine Corps' efforts to achieve Digital Interoperability (DI) as outlined in the 2016 U.S. Marine Corps Aviation Plan and is supportive of those efforts. The committee also understands that the integration costs to incorporate many new DI technologies across all of the U.S. Marine Corps aviation platforms is unaffordable given current and projected resources. The committee believes the Marine Corps should leverage as much government-owned technology as technically feasible before making investments in costly systems or developmental technology.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to accelerate the integration and testing of existing interoperability capabilities for the C/KC–130, such as TACPOD, which is an existing government-owned, government-tested asset. TACPOD is a mature technology that has been tested to a Technology Readiness Level 8 and could potentially augment existing C/KC–130 interoperability capabilities with minimal integration efforts. Further,

such capability could provide the Marine Corps' C/KC–130 expanded mission capability, specifically in support of the Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force-Crisis Response mission.

PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE

Items of Special Interest

25 millimeter ammunition for the F–35 program

The committee recognizes the critical role that the F–35 will play in both air-to-air and air-to-ground combat capability, and believes that the 25 millimeter gun will be a critical part of the F–35's overall weapons lethality. Consequently, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to consider all ammunition solutions to meet the lethality requirement for the F–35's 25 millimeter gun.

To further the committee's understanding of the Department's F–35 25 millimeter ammunition plans, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. House of Representatives by August 1, 2016, on the requirements and acquisition strategy for 25 millimeter ammunition.

OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE

Items of Special Interest

Civil engineers construction, surveying, and mapping equipment

The budget request contained $6.8 million for base procured equipment. Of this amount, no funds were requested for modernization of equipment used by base civil engineer units or Red Horse squadron (RHS) engineer units.

Red Horse squadrons provide the Air Force with a highly mobile civil engineering response force to support contingency and special operations worldwide. In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee noted that approximately 66 percent of existing engineering equipment is known to be discontinued, with some individual components ranging as high as 94 percent; therefore, maintenance requirements for this legacy equipment could potentially be cost prohibitive. The committee is concerned that the long-term replacement and modernization strategy for legacy engineering equipment remains under-resourced across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee believes additional funds would help to accelerate the modernization of legacy civil engineering equipment, and expects these funds would be obligated under full and open competition to provide the best-value equipment to Air Force base civil engineer units and RHS units.

The committee recommends $11.8 million, an increase of $5.0 million, to competitively procure modernized engineer equipment and address any unfunded requirements.

PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE

Items of Special Interest

Replacement of MH–60M for United States Special Operations Command

The budget request contained $6.4 million for MH–60M Block Upgrades in PE 116048BB, Rotary Wing Upgrades and Sustainment. The committee understands that an MH–60M within U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) sustained heavy damage, with main rotor strike, after a hard deck landing off the coast of Okinawa aboard United States Naval Ship Red Cloud. The Army Aviation and Missile Life Cycle Management Command determined the aircraft to be a total loss, based on the estimated cost of damage. The committee understands that an additional $18.6 million is needed for special operations-peculiar modifications to a replacement MH–60M aircraft being provided by the U.S. Army. This additional aircraft with modifications would restore USSOCOM to a basis of issue of 72 MH–60M aircraft. Therefore, the committee recommends $25.0 million, an increase of $18.6 million, for MH–60M Block Upgrades in PE 116048BB, Rotary Wing Upgrades and Sustainment.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 101—Authorization of Appropriations

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

SUBTITLE B—ARMY PROGRAMS

Section 111—Multiyear Procurement Authority for AH–64E Apache Helicopters

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into one or more multiyear contracts for AH–64E Apache helicopters beginning in fiscal year 2017, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code.

Section 112—Multiyear Procurement Authority for UH–60M and HH–60M Black Hawk Helicopters

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to enter into one or more multiyear contracts for UH–60M and HH–60M Black Hawk helicopters beginning in fiscal year 2017, in accordance with section 2306b of title 10, United States Code.

Section 113—Assessment of Certain Capabilities of the Department of the Army

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff of the Army, to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2017, of the ways, and associated costs, to re-

duce or eliminate shortfalls in responsiveness and capacity of the following capabilities:

(1) AH–64-equipped Attack Reconnaissance Battalion capacity to meet future needs;

(2) Air defense artillery (ADA) capacity, responsiveness, and the capability of short range ADA to meet existing and emerging threats (including unmanned aerial systems, cruise missiles, and manned aircraft), including an assessment of the potential for commercial-off-the-shelf solutions;

(3) Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear capabilities and modernization;

(4) Field artillery capabilities and the changes in doctrine and war plans resulting from the memorandum of the Secretary of Defense dated June 19, 2008, regarding the Department of Defense policy on cluster munitions and unintended harm to civilians, as well as required modernization or munition inventory shortfalls;

(5) Fuel distribution and water purification capacity and responsiveness;

(6) Army watercraft and port opening capabilities and responsiveness;

(7) Transportation (fuel, water, and cargo) capacity and responsiveness;

(8) Military police capacity; and

(9) Tactical mobility and tactical wheeled vehicle capacity and capability, to include adequacy of heavy equipment prime movers.

SUBTITLE C—NAVY PROGRAMS

Section 121—Procurement Authority for Aircraft Carrier Programs

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

Section 122—Sense of Congress on Aircraft Carrier Procurement Schedules

This section would provide the sense of Congress that the Secretary of the Navy's schedule to procure 1 aircraft carrier every 5 years will reduce the overall aircraft carrier inventory to 10 aircraft carriers, a level insufficient to meet peacetime and war plan requirements. The section also recommends that the Secretary begin construction for the Ford-class aircraft carrier designated CVN–81 in fiscal year 2022 and align advance procurement activities with this accelerated programming.

Section 123—Design and Construction of LHA Replacement Ship Designated LHA 8

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into and incrementally fund a contract for design and construction of the LHA Replacement ship designated LHA 8.

Section 124—Design and Construction of Replacement Dock Landing Ship Designated LX(R) or Amphibious Transport Dock Designated LPD–29

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into and incrementally fund a contract for design and construction of the replacement dock landing ship designated LX(R) or the amphibious transport dock designated LPD–29.

Section 125—Ship to Shore Connector Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the procurement of up to 45 Ship to Shore Connector vessels.

Section 126—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Littoral Combat Ship or Successor Frigate

This section would prohibit the Department of the Navy from selecting a single contractor for the Littoral Combat Ship or frigate program until the Secretary of the Navy certifies to the congressional defense committees that such a selection of a single contractor is conducted using competitive procedures and is performed for the purpose of constructing a frigate class ship.

SUBTITLE D—AIR FORCE PROGRAMS

Section 131—Elimination of Annual Report on Aircraft Inventory

This section would strike the requirement from section 231a of title 10, United States Code, for the Secretary of Defense to deliver an annual report on the military services' aircraft inventory to the congressional defense committees.

Section 132—Repeal of the Requirement To Preserve Certain Retired C–5 Aircraft

This section would amend section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to terminate the requirement for the Secretary of the Air Force to continue to preserve certain C—5 aircraft in a storage condition that would allow a recall of retired aircraft to future service in the Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, or Active Force structure.

Section 133—Repeal of Requirement To Preserve Certain Retired F–117 Aircraft

This section would amend section 136 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) by striking subsection (b), which would remove the requirement that certain F–117 aircraft be maintained in a condition that would allow recall of those aircraft to future service.

Section 134—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Retirement of A–10 Aircraft

This section would prohibit funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017, for the Department of the Air Force to retire, prepare to retire, or

place in storage any A–10 aircraft. This section would also maintain a minimum of 171 A–10 aircraft designated as primary mission aircraft inventory, and prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from making any significant reductions to manning levels with respect to any A–10 aircraft squadron or division until the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, and the Secretary of the Air Force, submit reports to the congressional defense committees on the results and findings of the initial operational test and evaluation of the F–35 aircraft program, as well as the comparison test and evaluation that examines the capabilities of the F–35A and A–10C.

Section 135—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Retirement of Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System Aircraft

This section would prohibit retirement of Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System aircraft in fiscal year 2018.

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

Section 141—Termination of Quarterly Reporting on Use of Combat Mission Requirements Funds

This section would amend the quarterly report requirement in section 123 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), to sunset the requirement for such reports on September 30, 2018.

Section 142—Fire Suppressant and Fuel Containment Standards for Certain Vehicles

This section would require the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, and the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, to establish and maintain policy guidance regarding the establishment of, and updates to, fire suppressant and fuel containment standards that meet survivability requirements across various classes of vehicles, including light tactical vehicles, medium tactical vehicles, heavy tactical vehicles, and ground combat vehicles for the Army and Marine Corps. This section would also require the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, that contains policy guidance for each class of vehicle including armor, fire suppression systems, self-sealing material and containment technologies, and any other information as determined by the Secretaries.

The committee believes that operational performance requirements should be based on the vehicle type, mission, and employment. The committee notes that inclusion of fire suppression in performance specifications should be by vehicle design and risk driven.

Section 143—Report on Department of Defense Munitions Strategy for the Combatant Commands

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2017, a report on the munitions strategy for each of the United States combatant commands. It shall include an identification of munitions require-

ments, an assessment of munitions gaps and shortfalls, and necessary munitions investments. Such strategy shall cover the 10-year period beginning with 2016.

The committee notes that section 1254 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) required the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the munitions strategy for the U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM). The committee has reviewed this report and commends the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in their detailed assessment. As the Secretary completes the broader report on the munitions strategy for the combatant commands required by this section, the committee expects the Secretary only to provide updates where necessary to the munitions strategy of USPACOM previously submitted pursuant to Public Law 113–291.

Section 144—Comptroller General Review of F–35 Lightning II Aircraft Sustainment Support

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an analysis of status of and approaches considered in the sustainment support strategy for the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter program. This section would also require the Comptroller General to submit a report of the analysis to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2017. The committee encourages the Comptroller General to consider best practices for contractor logistic support during the conduct of this review.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, ARMY

Items of Special Interest

Armored vehicle fuel tank and bladder safety

The committee notes that armored vehicles carry a significant amount of fuel, which can become a hazard to the crew in combat. The committee commends the work that the Army has done to improve crew safety, including the development of technologies that reduce risk of fuel spills when a fuel tank is punctured or ruptured, and efforts to render fuel inert where possible. Such efforts may reduce catastrophic injuries to soldiers.

However, the committee is aware of self-sealing polymers and other materials with self-healing capabilities that, combined with passive fire suppression blankets, may provide additional safety to crews within armored vehicles. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by March 1, 2017, on candidate technologies that could be used to improve the fuel containment and safety capability of legacy armored vehicle platforms and armored vehicle platforms currently in development.

Army advanced body armor research and development

The committee has consistently supported the need to provide soldiers with the most advanced body armor. The committee believes that body armor, which provides desired protection levels at the lightest possible weight, ensures greater soldier survivability and reduces injuries, while improving mission performance and effectiveness. The committee is aware that the Army's Soldier Protection System (SPS) program is seeking to reduce the weight of body armor by 10 percent, while maintaining or improving current ballistic capabilities, and would use a more holistic and systems-based approach to developing an integrated personal protective equipment kit for soldiers. The committee supports the Army's SPS effort. However, the committee believes that even as manufacturers are developing hard body armor components that achieve SPS requirements, it is also important that research and development continue on hard body armor components with even greater capabilities. The committee also believes this effort should be resourced and programmed in order to ensure that more dramatic improvements are readily available for soldiers in the near future, given the emerging threats in the global environment.

Specifically, the committee believes that a goal of doubling the current SPS requirement (a 20 percent reduction in weight while maintaining or improving current ballistic capabilities) would ensure that soldiers have the most advanced hard armor possible to better address emerging and future threats. Such an improvement will require a holistic approach to improving body armor; therefore, the committee believes that a new research and development project should be established by the Army that allows qualified manufacturers to compete to study new materials, manufacturing technologies, assembly processes, ballistic impacts, predictive modeling, and crack sensor technologies. In addition, the committee believes that such a program will also encourage body armor manufacturers to investigate high-risk technologies and processes, which are likely essential for ensuring that such a change in capability is possible.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than September 30, 2016, on the advisability and feasibility to the Army of establishing such a research and development project. The briefing should also include an estimate for any additional funding needed in fiscal year 2017 to establish such a research effort.

Army network integration evaluations and army warfighting assessments

The committee acknowledges the importance of the Department of the Army's Network Integration Evaluation (NIE) exercises conducted at Fort Bliss, Texas, and White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico. The committee notes that, through this program, the Army has been able to test equipment in a realistic battlefield environment in the hands of soldiers, and the Army has been able to save billions of taxpayer dollars after the NIE proved that several programs were not operationally effective. The committee also acknowledges the importance of the new Army Warfighting Assessments (AWA), also currently planned to occur at Fort Bliss and

White Sands Missile Range. The committee believes that these exercises help the Army to shape requirements for Army acquisitions, create new capabilities from existing technology, and promote interoperability between service branches and U.S. allies.

The committee acknowledges the investments already made in the Brigade Modernization Command and Fort Bliss, Texas, for the NIE and AWA missions. The committee also acknowledges that both the NIE and AWA should be, if possible, brigade-level exercises to ensure mission command requirements are met, and that any systems tested will be fully capable of deployment at the brigade level. The committee believes that the most efficient method for conducting the NIE's and AWA's is to assign a dedicated brigade to the NIE and AWA missions. However, the committee understands that the Army must use all available force structure to meet current demands for forces to support combatant commanders. The committee encourages the Army to continue to pursue both the NIE and the AWA, so that the Army can continue to save money, fully utilize its previous investments, adequately test and shape its acquisition programs, and maintain technological superiority.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than September 1, 2016, on the Army's long-term plans and budget figures for conducting NIE and AWA events. This briefing should also include any data available on cost savings the Army has accrued due to past NIE and AWA events. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to determine the most cost effective means to execute the NIE and AWA missions, and to provide this information as part of the long-term plans in the aforementioned briefing.

Blast mitigation technologies for combat and tactical vehicles

The budget request contained $122.1 million in PE 63005A for Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology, but contained no funding for active blast mitigation technology development and demonstration.

The committee understands that active blast mitigation systems are designed to detect and react to underbody blast events encountered by combat and tactical vehicles, and notes that the Army performed tests on two prototype vehicles equipped with active blast mitigation systems in 2015. In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee directed the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the results of testing on blast mitigation technology that could detect and autonomously respond to underbody explosive incidents. The briefing indicated that "based on limited testing, the incorporation of active blast mitigation technology could reduce injuries, reduce the forces and damage to other vehicle technologies, and may avoid costly retrofits to the legacy vehicle fleet when upgrading to meet increasing blast threats." The committee believes that given these promising test results, the Army should continue to evaluate this technology and that additional testing and analysis of this technology using a variety of vehicle platforms is justified.

The committee notes that while the Army is encouraged by this technology, no funding for it is programmed in the Future Years Defense Program. The committee encourages the Army to continue its evaluation of this technology, and if funds are not available, the committee expects the Army to reprogram the necessary funds to continue these tests and demonstrations on additional vehicle platforms.

The committee recommends $122.1 million, the full amount requested, in PE 63005A for Combat Vehicle and Automotive Advanced Technology.

Helicopter seating systems

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee expressed concern over outdated requirements and standards for helicopter seating systems (HSS). Specifically, the committee noted that there appeared to be a lack of ergonomic design considerations, a detailed understanding of long-duration seat vibration on the body, and a lack of appropriate anthropomorphic data incorporated into helicopter seating system requirements. In response, the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, provided a report to the committee on February 10, 2016, addressing these issues. The report confirmed many of the concerns expressed by the committee.

The committee understands that the Department of Defense and the Army are studying current HSS designs and have identified a need to improve current systems. The committee is aware that the Joint Aircraft Survivability Program Office and the Army are now identifying and developing new technologies in order to mitigate or eliminate deficiencies in current HSS performance. The committee believes the Department should accelerate development of new technologies that could provide increases in force protection and survivability, as well as reduce potential long-term disability issues for aviators. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by January 15, 2017, on current HSS research and development programs.

Improved refrigeration and cooling technology

The committee supports continued research and development to improve efficiency and reduce costs of the equipment used to store food for U.S. service members stationed overseas. In locations not on a permanent installation, food is typically stored in large refrigerated container systems. The conventional technology powering these systems can be incredibly maintenance-intensive and expensive due to fuel costs. Reliance on fuel also increases personal safety risks to U.S. forces that have to transport this fuel to remote and austere locations. Therefore, the committee encourages additional investment to improve efficiency, reduce cost, and reduce risk associated with current systems.

Improved Turbine Engine Program

The budget request contained $126.1 million in PE 67139A for the Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP).

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

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2017 budget request reflects an increase over last year's projection, which is an indication of the Army's support for this capability. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2017, on potential options to accelerate the development and fielding of the engine so that the benefits can be realized sooner than currently planned.

The committee recommends $126.1 million, the full amount requested, in PE 67139A for the ITEP program.

Land-Based Anti-Ship Missile program

The committee understands the U.S. Army Aviation and Missile Research, Development, and Engineering Center is developing concepts and technologies to enable the U.S. Army to conduct land-based offensive surface warfare. This includes adapting existing Army and Marine Corps High Mobility Artillery Rocket Systems and Multiple Launch Rocket System missile systems for this land-based offensive surface warfare capability. The committee supports the Army's Land-Based Anti-Ship Missile (LBASM) effort and understands the Army has programmed funding across the Future Years Defense Program in order to continue to integrate and demonstrate this capability through live-fire testing.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army, or the appropriate designee, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, on the LBASM concept development effort, to include schedule and funding requirements.

Lightweight metal matrix composite technology for combat and tactical vehicles

The committee understands the U.S. Army Tank Automotive Research Development and Engineering Center (TARDEC) continues to invest in applied research, development, and demonstration programs for advanced materials technology to reduce the weight of component parts for combat and tactical vehicles. The committee supports this "lightweighting" technology development effort and is particularly encouraged by the versatility and broad application that metal matrix composite (MMC) technology could provide in reducing the weight of components and parts for military vehicles. The committee is aware that MMC technology could potentially increase the service life of drivetrains, braking systems, wheel ends, motive components, and other parts and assemblies by three to four times that of traditional steel components. The committee notes that substitution of traditional steel with MMC material

technology is increasing due to greater demand for lower weight and costs for parts and components. The committee expects TARDEC to continue to resource, develop, and test advanced MMC technology and MMC manufacturing processes for military ground vehicles.

Lithium ion super-capacitors

The committee notes recent investments made by the Department of the Army in the energy technology lithium ion super-capacitors have resulted in notable achievements and technological advances. The committee is aware that continued research and development on lithium ion super-capacitors could potentially produce a hybrid lithium ion battery (LIB)/lithium ion capacitor (LIC) and is aware of the Army's interest in utilizing this hybrid as a possible replacement for the current 12V lead acid battery due to its limited operational temperatures and a high rate of failure in the field. The committee notes results to-date with both lithium ion capacitors (LIC) and with this promising new hybrid LIC/LIB technology, and encourages the Department of the Army to continue to pursue and to invest in these important technologies.

Long Range Precision Fires

The committee understands the Long Range Precision Fires (LRPF) program is being developed to field a new surface-to-surface missile system that can attack a broad spectrum of targets up to 499 kilometers in range. The LRPF program would be a replacement for the legacy Army Tactical Missile System that would be considered non-compliant with current Department of Defense policy regarding cluster munitions and unintended harm to civilians. The committee understands the current notional schedule has the program entering the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) phase in fiscal year 2020.

The committee supports the LRPF program and concurs with the analysis of alternatives completed in 2015 that recommended a new missile solution to meet LPRF requirements. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to develop ways to potentially accelerate the EMD phase of the program, and to fully fund the overall program to support its planned acquisition strategy.

Long-range Army surface-to-air missile capability

The committee notes that the Army's current surface-to-air missile (SAM) systems have significantly less range against aircraft targets than many foreign threat systems, including the SA–20 Gargoyle, SA–21 Growler, and HQ–9. The committee also notes that over time, these weapon systems may proliferate around the world. The committee is concerned that this over-match by potential adversaries may place U.S. forces at significant risk in combat scenarios against near-peer military forces equipped with advanced fifth generation aircraft armed with precision-guided standoff weapons. The committee is also concerned that this over-match may place an excessive burden on U.S. tactical fighter aircraft operating in a defensive counter-air role. The committee believes that longer-range U.S. Army SAM capability may provide a significant upgrade to the overall U.S. military's ability to defend friendly airspace against advanced aircraft threats and deter potential adver-

saries. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. House of Representatives not later than September 1, 2016, on the potential requirement for longer-range Army SAM systems in the future, including the potential upgrade of current systems or an entirely new system.

Modular Handgun System

The committee understands the Modular Handgun System (MHS) is projected to be a non-developmental item, commercial-off-the-shelf replacement handgun for the current M9 pistol. In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee noted its continued support for the MHS program, as well as the need to modernize small arms through new procurements and incremental product improvement programs. The committee continues to support the MHS program and understands the program remains on cost, on schedule, and is under source selection. The committee understands the Chief of Staff of the Army is conducting a review of the program, consistent with new authorities provided in section 802 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

The committee is aware of the Chief of Staff of the Army's concerns regarding the extended length and cost of the required test and evaluation program, and also the overly complex performance requirements. For example, the committee understands that the final request for proposals was an extensive document, reaching 351 pages, but the technical specifications required for the handgun system were only 39 pages. The committee encourages the Army to continue to work to develop ways to streamline the existing test program in order to accelerate fielding of this capability to the warfighter.

The committee is also aware that the Army has not officially updated the small arms capability based assessment (CBA) used since 2008 to identify requirements and capability gaps for small arms. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Chief of Staff of the Army, to update the small arms CBA from 2008, and to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, on the results of the update. The committee does not believe this update would have any programmatic or schedule impacts to the MHS program, and expects that if impacts to the MHS program should occur, these would be a product of any potential outcomes resulting from the Chief of Staff of the Army's ongoing review of the program.

Next generation signature management technology

The budget request contained $75.0 million in PE 64804A for Logistics and Engineer Equipment-Engine Development, but contained no funding for the continued development of next generation signature management camouflage systems for military vehicles and shelters.

The committee is encouraged by recent research and the approval of the updated requirements document for next generation signature management systems. In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2016, the committee noted the importance of this low cost defensive capability against current and emerging threats, particularly in Europe, and encouraged the Department to accelerate development, procurement, and fielding of this advanced camouflage net system to meet warfighter requirements. The committee is aware of the high demand for this capability by forward deployed units, most notably by U.S. Army Europe, U.S. Army Alaska, 2nd Cavalry Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division, 10th Mountain Division, and U.S. Special Operations Command. The committee believes the Army requires additional funding in fiscal year 2017 to continue accelerated development of its next generation signature management camouflage net systems to ensure continued overmatch against advanced sensor threats.

The committee recommends $86.1 million, an increase of $11.1 million, in PE 64804A for Logistics and Engineer Equipment-Engine Development for the continued accelerated development and testing of next generation signature management camouflage net systems to address the operational needs of the warfighter.

Personal protective equipment development for female soldiers

The committee is aware that recent determinations by the Secretary of Defense have opened all combat positions to female warfighters. The committee is concerned that currently available items of personal protective equipment (PPE) and organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE) do not meet the specific and unique requirements for female combat troops. These items of equipment continue to overly burden all combat troops with excessive weight.

The committee believes that the new Department of Defense policy presents an opportunity for the military services to focus on the "warfighter as a system" and properly address the unique needs of female service members through a holistic acquisition strategy. The committee notes that the Army is currently developing a complete Soldier Protection System (SPS) to provide soldiers with modular, scalable, and mission tailorable protection to reduce weight and increase mobility, while optimizing protection. The Army has set an overall weight reduction goal of 10 percent for SPS. The committee supports the SPS effort and expects the program to consider the unique physical requirements of female service members.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, that outlines the plans to provide PPE and OCIE developed specifically for female service members. The briefing should include, but not be limited to: (1) plans for programming, budgeting, requirements, and procurement of female specific equipment including helmets, combat clothing, body armor, footwear, and other critical safety item equipment categories, and (2) detailed plans on integrating commercially available materials and advanced product design to reduce the load for all service members.

Review of ballistic testing policy for body armor

The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to reevaluate the February 2009 policy instructing the Army Test and Evaluation Command to conduct all body armor first article and lot acceptance tests. The committee notes this policy may have resulted

in significant program costs, and in turn schedule delays from inadequate capacity at the Government test centers. The committee encourages the Army to assess how it can better use independent testing facilities to improve efficiency, timing, and costs associated with ballistic test and evaluation.

Small Unit Support Vehicle

The committee notes that the Army family of Small Unit Support Vehicle (SUSV) fleet is used by Army units that train and operate in extreme cold weather conditions, and that it provides those units with unique capabilities not found elsewhere in the Army. In addition, while the committee is aware of the Army's effort to refurbish some of the fleet, the committee notes that legacy SUSVs are beyond their economic useful life, and have become increasingly difficult to maintain. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. House of Representatives not later than September 1, 2016, on the potential requirement for a replacement to the SUSV fleet. The briefing should include potential options for increasing the capability beyond the current vehicles, such as additional carrying capacity, armament, and survivability.

Telemedicine capabilities

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is developing capabilities that would provide telemedicine and remote physiological monitoring for casualty care of deployed forces. The committee recognizes that such telemedicine capabilities can provide useful reach-back support for complex injuries, especially for sensitive organs where combat medics and surgeons may not have in-depth specialty training, such as ophthalmic injuries. However, the committee notes that the military services lack an effective telemedicine system that communicates patient information and condition across the entire continuum of care beginning at the point of injury and continuing until arrival at a medical care facility.

The committee encourages the Department to continue to experiment with and examine ways to utilize emerging telemedicine capabilities to allow for consultation with outside experts or specialty institutions to provide soldiers on the battlefield with access to high-quality care for complex and difficult injuries, such as ophthalmic or cranial injuries. Further, the committee believes the Department should examine existing technology and requirements for in-transit telemedicine capabilities to determine how best to leverage best-of-breed existing capabilities to support current needs. Additionally, the committee supports the idea of partnering with subject matter experts in order to provide direct, real-time consultation between geographically dispersed military and civilian medical personnel; this would support complex diagnostic and surgical problems, as well as allow conferencing for complicated, but less urgent patient management decisions, and virtualized training and continuing medical education.

Vehicle active protection systems

The committee is encouraged by the Army's current strategy for vehicle active protection system (APS) tests and integration. The

committee believes this strategy will allow the Army to better address the threats posed by the growing proliferation of anti-tank guided missiles and rocket-propelled grenades. The committee is aware of the importance of vehicle APS capabilities for forward-deployed units, specifically those units in the U.S. European Command area of operations. The committee supports this effort and encourages the Army to expedite deployment and fielding of vehicle APS technology on ground combat vehicles that will form an essential element of the European Reassurance Initiative.

The committee notes that the Army plans to conduct demonstration testing of mature vehicle APS capabilities on the Abrams main battle tank, the Bradley fighting vehicle, and Stryker combat vehicle. The committee encourages the Army to analyze options for incorporating vehicle APS solutions on additional vehicles, including the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle, and to identify the APS solutions that are best suited for deployment on lighter-weight combat and tactical vehicles.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by March 1, 2017, on the status of plans to deploy and integrate mature vehicle APS technology on deployed ground combat vehicles.

Warfighter Technology

The committee is aware of the work being done by the Warfighter Technology directorate of the Natick Solider Research, Development, and Engineering Center in improving the protection, survivability, mobility, and combat effectiveness of the U.S. Army. The committee supports the research and development in areas of advanced ballistic polymers for body armor, fibers to make uniforms more fire resistant, and lightweight structures for advanced shelters benefiting all ground troops. In order to ensure the Army remains at the cutting edge of technology in these critical areas, the committee urges continued consistent investment in improving warfighter capabilities.

Weight reduction for personal protective equipment

The committee supports the efforts of the Army and the Marine Corps to reduce the weight of personal protective equipment (PPE) and organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE). However, the committee remains concerned that the military services are not capitalizing on the commercial industry's investments in textile materials to reduce the load carriage systems for ground combat forces.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, to conduct a market survey and analysis of the commercial sectors' technology and products that could be applied to current weight reduction initiatives for PPE and OCIE. The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, which summarizes the findings of the market survey.

Additionally, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by April 1, 2017, that reviews the efforts of the Army

and the Marine Corps to reduce weight for PPE and OCIE. The report should identify the services' current weight reduction initiatives, establish a baseline for future evaluations, and assess the effectiveness of current efforts. The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, NAVY

Items of Special Interest

Advanced Low Cost Munitions Ordnance

The committee continues to support development of the Advanced Low Cost Munition Ordnance (ALaMO). The ALaMO is a guided 57mm projectile, with fire-and-forget capability that requires no Littoral Combat Ship fire control system changes to counter threats against small boat swarms, unmanned aerial systems, and other emerging threats.

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by August 30, 2016, on achieving the objective of an initial operational capability decision in 2019. The briefing should also include, but not be limited to, an evaluation of the current funding profile of this program across the Future Years Defense Program, as well as discuss potential courses of action to accelerate or streamline the current program strategy.

Aegis radar solid state improvements

The budget request contained $85.9 million in PE 64501N for Advanced Above Water Sensors.

The U.S. Navy has 90 destroyers and cruisers in the fleet which are equipped with the Aegis Weapon System. The heart of the system is the AN/SPY–1, automatic detect and track, multifunction phased-array radar. The existing Aegis SPY–1 radar system is based on dated technology vacuum electronic device components, such as cross field amplifiers and travelling wave tube transmitters. Each Aegis destroyer has over 70 microwave vacuum tubes in the transmitter. The current technology in the Aegis SPY–1 radar has the highest failure rate of components in the ship's radar system.

The committee believes that there are newer, more efficient transmitters available that provide significant performance advantages in terms of very low out of band emission, very low phase noise, higher clutter improvement factor, increased range and Electronic Counter-Countermeasures capability. Specifically, additional funding could provide prototype hardware to further research and field a replacement to outdated transmitters currently in place. The U.S. Navy's DDG–51 and CG–47 fleet face operational affordability, fleet readiness, and sustainment cost challenges. Repair and maintenance of this system requires shutdown for several hours every 1 to 2 days, and on some occasions has required outside contractor support to repair and maintain. It is estimated that operational maintenance cost to maintain these radars to the required operational readiness standards is up to $1.0 million per year, per ship.

An upgrade to a solid state transmitter could achieve 10 times better reliability while reducing the operations and maintenance cost by 90 percent.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $105.9 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 64501N for Advanced Above Water Sensors.

Aircraft carrier design

The budget request contained $30.1 million in PE 64567N to support improved affordability for new construction aircraft carriers by providing additional design for affordability support.

The committee supports continued efforts by the Department of the Navy and the shipbuilder to better manage total ownership costs and reduce manning requirements and believes additional efforts will result in additional CVN 80/81 cost savings.

The committee recommends $50.1 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 64567N for new construction aircraft carrier affordability initiatives.

Alternative energy programs

The committee is aware of the Department of the Navy's Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation efforts on operational energy programs. These investments include targeted efforts aimed at reducing fuel consumption to extend the range of aviation platforms, developing new propulsion systems for unmanned underwater vehicles, testing and qualifying alternative fuels, improving ship hull hydrodynamics, and improving energy storage capabilities. The committee remains supportive of cost-efficient alternative energy investments aimed at enhancing combat capabilities, strengthening mission assurance, and reducing operating costs for the Department. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of the Navy, when prioritizing investments in alternative energy, to continue focusing on technologies that achieve these objectives.

Amphibious Ship Replacement Program

The budget request contained $6.3 million in PE 64454N for the Amphibious Ship Replacement Program (LX(R)).

The committee is concerned about the ability of the Marine Corps to project amphibious warfare power in a contested environment because of limitations associated with the amphibious ship force structure. The committee remains committed to ensuring sufficient funds are available to accelerate the programmed construction of the Amphibious Ship Replacement Program.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $25.3 million, an increase of $19.0 million, in PE 64454N for LX(R).

Automated testing

The budget request contained no funding in PE 63597N for the automated test and analysis program.

The committee is aware that the Navy's Automated Testing and Analysis (ATA) program was established to expand the use of automated test methods currently in use by the Navy, such as Automated Test and Re-Test, and adds new methods of testing, promotes the use of automated test technologies, and standardizes

automated test practices, methods, and tools. In addition, funding supports the development of enterprise level strategies to apply ATA technology to a broad range of software-intensive acquisition programs. However, the committee is concerned that this program was not funded in the fiscal year 2017 budget request, and does not believe that the Navy has an effective strategy for how to best utilize these technologies. Without that, the committee fears that the Navy will not have a manner to measure the effectiveness of these efforts, or to understand the full requirement across the Navy enterprise.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the status of this program by July 1, 2016. This update should include the current schedule for development, projected use of these tools and requirements across the Future Years Defense Program, and efforts to extend the use of these tools to other service, agency, and interagency partners. This briefing should also identify a set of metrics for assessing the programs efforts, including quantitative goals for the reduction of time and improvements in the quality of tested software across the Navy enterprise.

The committee recommends $8.0 million, an increase of $8.0 million, in PE 63597N to support and expand automated testing practices and capabilities across the Navy, and where relevant, with other service and interagency partners.

Autonomous Undersea Vehicles

The committee notes that the Chief of Naval Operations provided a comprehensive assessment of the desired capabilities of Autonomous Undersea Vehicles projected to 2025 in the February 2016 report to Congress entitled "Autonomous Undersea Vehicle Requirement for 2025." The committee also notes that the Department of the Navy is performing a gap analysis of autonomous undersea vehicle requirements "to determine the inventory requirements of 2025 and beyond." In addition, the committee is aware that the Secretary of the Navy is developing an Unmanned Systems roadmap strategy in 2016 to help inform future inventory requirements and investment decisions.

The committee remains interested in maintaining a significant peer advantage in the undersea domain and believes autonomous undersea vehicles represent an asymmetric opportunity to leverage atypical capabilities. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, concurrent with the date on which the budget for fiscal year 2018 is submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, that details the Unmanned Systems roadmap strategy and the program objective memorandum 2018 investment strategy to obtain such a capability.

Briefing on advanced flight control software for carrier landings

The committee is aware that the Department of the Navy has performed flight tests with advanced flight control software for the F–35, F/A–18 E/F Super Hornet and E/A–18G Growler. This software, Maritime Augmented Guidance with Integrated Controls for Carrier Approach and Recovery Precision Enabling Techniques (MAGIC CARPET) will help aviators maintain constant guide slope

throughout approach. The committee is supportive of the Navy's efforts to reduce the workload on pilots and landing signal officers (LSO) associated with performing a carrier landing. And by increasing the automation of these operations, MAGIC CARPET could allow the Navy to achieve savings without harming readiness by safely reducing the training associated with certification for carrier operations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to brief the House Committee on Armed Services no later than September 30, 2016, on MAGIC CARPET software development, flight testing, the impact on pilot and LSO workloads, potential reduction in training missions and associated savings, and a notional timeline for delivery to the fleet.

Common mount for electromagnetic railgun

The budget request contained $96.4 million in PE 63114N for power projection advanced technology. Of this amount, $15.4 million was included for the Navy's electromagnetic railgun prototype.

The committee remains supportive of the Navy's program for developing and deploying an electromagnetic railgun. The committee recognizes the growing imperative for the Navy to field this type of weapon, not only to increase capabilities for naval surface fire support and ballistic missile defense, but to also decrease the cost exchange model when comparing the railgun to conventional missiles or guns. However, the committee is increasingly concerned that the shift in emphasis to the hypervelocity projectile by the Strategic Capabilities Office has left the Navy with a funding gap in developing the requirements and design for a common mount, which is a necessary prerequisite to getting this capability into operational use. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2017, on the plan and milestone schedule for demonstrating and deploying a common railgun mount for sea- and land-based applications.

The committee recommends $106.4 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63114N to support the development of a common mount for the sea-based and land-based electromagnetic railgun.

Deployable and interoperable communications

The committee recognizes the critical and lifesaving role of enhanced and reliable communications systems in the battlespace. The committee commends the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Systems Command for working to test and evaluate deployable, manportable Fourth Generation Long-Term Evolution (4G LTE) and 4G LTE Advanced (LTE–A) capabilities with the ability to integrate with other multimedia communications systems that are based on commercially available technology, and demonstrated interoperability in a multiservice and multiagency context. The committee encourages the Marine Corps Systems Command to find opportunities to further evaluate and experiment with such technology to better understand the performance characteristics in real-world and field exercise situations.

F/A–18 fleet physiological event rate

The committee notes with concern the increasing rates of physiological events (PE) experienced by F/A–18 pilots over the past 5

years. In fiscal year 2015, PE events experienced by F/A–18 pilots averaged no less than 28 incidents per 100,000 flight hours across 3 F/A–18 platforms. Of concern to the committee is whether this rate is an indicator that the Navy's efforts to address the problem are ineffective, or reflects an increase in reporting by aircrew. While these PE events cover a wide range of potential causal factors, the committee notes that the potential for aircraft mishap caused by a lack of oxygen or contamination of the on-board oxygen generation system (OBOGs) is real and should be addressed. The committee acknowledges and supports the Department of the Navy's establishment of PE teams to work with industry partners to collect, examine, and test potential solutions.

While the committee recognizes that there has not yet been a confirmed loss of an aircraft or pilot due to these events, and that physiological events experienced by F/A–18 pilots appear to be occurring at a rate lower than those experienced by the F–22 fleet from fiscal years 2010–14, the committee remains concerned about the apparent increasing F/A–18 physiological event rate, which poses risk to pilots and fleet operations. As a result, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would establish an independent review of the Navy's efforts to date to address this issue, with a report date of December 1, 2017.

In addition, the committee notes that two critical elements of the Air Force's effort to reduce the rate of similar events in the F–22 fleet included changes to pilot flight equipment and the installation of an automatic backup oxygen system (ABOS). The ABOS could provide an increase in backup oxygen supply as compared to the installed manual backup oxygen carried in F/A–18 aircraft. The committee acknowledges that the F–22 system was already an existing design, and that in contrast the Navy would have to study and design an automatic system, working with the F/A–18 contractor. The committee believes that no one fix is likely to address all the issues causing physiological events. Given the in-depth research and mitigation efforts that the Navy is conducting, the committee believes that examination of the feasibility of design and installation of an ABOS of some kind in F/A–18 aircraft may be an important element to reduce the rate of incidents and preserve pilot confidence in the aircraft's overall life support system. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a detailed engineering and cost analysis on the potential installation of an automatic backup oxygen system in the F/A–18 fleet, and to provide a report, not later than March 15, 2017, to the congressional defense committees on the findings and conclusions of this analysis.

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

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee noted "that current surface Navy gunnery requirements are outdated and that new technologies such as railgun and directed energy weapons are nearing readiness for technology transition." The committee referenced the Advanced Naval Surface Fires (ANSF) initiative and noted the ANSF was assessing options for providing a near-term 5-inch guided munition capability. The com-

mittee understands this capability would provide for improved and extended-range naval surface fire support. The committee continues to support the need for this precision guided capability and is also aware of the Hypervelocity Gun Weapon System (HGWS) program that is currently under consideration by the Strategic Capabilities Office (SCO). The committee notes the HGWS program would "flip the cost equation using conventional guns to defend forward bases against raids of advanced cruise and ballistic missiles'" and believes there could be applications for use in 5-inch gun systems for naval surface fires support. The committee is encouraged by the development of both of these initiatives and expects the Navy and SCO to coordinate on these capabilities. The committee also expects the Navy to proceed forward with an accelerated development and acquisition strategy for this needed capability that is consistent with acquisition reform principles.

Integrated surveillance system

The committee believes that the ability to obtain acoustic intelligence on foreign submarines is a critical national security need. The committee is aware of ongoing research and development efforts within the Office of Naval Research to develop and demonstrate the technology to enable autonomous installation of passive acoustic arrays that would support the Navy's littoral undersea surveillance needs in detecting and reporting submarines. These technologies would provide the capability to autonomously classify and report on a variety of specific submarine targets of interest. The committee encourages the Office of Naval Research to continue research and development efforts to satisfy urgent requirements of the combatant commanders for additional maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities.

Joint metallurgical technology for combat and tactical vehicle hulls

The committee notes that in-service cracks are developing in the armor hull structures of Marine Corps and Army heavy tactical vehicles, to include mine resistant ambush protected vehicles (MRAPs) that were constructed from MIL–A–46100 High Hard Armor Steel. The committee believes the military services should consider resourcing a joint metallurgical technology program to develop solutions which provide reasonable, cost effective solutions to help repair and mitigate these types of cracks. The committee anticipates that this program would help to identify, develop, and evaluate potential alternatives, models, processes, and procedures to eliminate the cracking issue in the current fleet of MRAPs and newly acquired tactical vehicles, as well as to help to reclaim lost legacy vehicle assets as a result of severe cracking in vehicle hulls.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, or their appropriate designees, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, on the advisability and feasibility of pursuing metallurgical technology to address vehicle hull cracks and repair for combat and tactical vehicles.

Marine Corps unmanned rotary utility aircraft

The committee recognizes the successful deployment in Afghanistan of the K–MAX CQ–24A unmanned rotary utility aircraft. The

committee encourages the Marine Corps to continue to explore this capability by implementing a program to provide the CQ–24A with multi-mission upgrades, especially those that provide improved intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities and greater range. If additional test activities show promise, the committee also encourages the Marine Corps to establish a program of record in fiscal year 2018 for CQ–24A.

MH–60R/S multi-mission helicopter programs

The budget request contained $49.3 million in PE 72207N for depot maintenance systems development, and $11.0 million for the MH–60 service-life assessment program, but contained no funding to support defining a MH–60 mid-life upgrade.

The committee understands that the Department of the Navy's fleet of MH–60 helicopters are rapidly approaching currently approved service-life limits due to high fleet demand and operations tempo. Based on the current MH–60 utilization tempo, the MH–60 fleet could exceed its useful service-life prior to the future vertical lift aircraft achieving initial operational capability in 2034, creating a significant helicopter inventory gap within the Department of the Navy.

The committee notes that the Department of the Navy is preparing to conduct a MH–60 service-life assessment program (SLAP) that will evaluate the rotorcraft's aircraft structures and sub-systems to identify the critical structures, components, and sub-systems that can achieve extended service-life limit goals. However, the committee is concerned that the SLAP will not include an assessment to determine the requirements for a mid-life upgrade that would keep the rotorcraft relevant by mitigating obsolescence issues and enhancing the rotorcraft maneuvering performance and mission systems. Rotorcraft mid-life upgrades could include such items as next-generation rotor blades and tail rotor, digital automated flight control system, and mission systems hardware and software improvements to increase lethality and combat effectiveness.

Therefore, the committee recommends $54.3 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 72207N for MH–60S and MH–60R fleet mid-life upgrades. The committee also directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, that assesses and defines which MH–60S and MH–60R rotorcraft systems, sub-systems, mission systems, and avionics should be included in a mid-life upgrade to mitigate obsolescence issues and enhance the MH–60 fleets from both maneuvering performance and combat capability perspectives. The committee also expects the Secretary of the Navy to integrate the mid-life upgrade plan into the MH–60S and MH–60R service-life extension program that is scheduled to commence in 2023.

Non-imaging millimeter wave radar technology

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has invested significant funding over the last 10 years for development, testing, and deployment of low-power, non-imaging millimeter wave radar technology for safely detecting concealed threats under clothing, such as suicide vests, weapons, or other contraband, at stand-off distances of up to 100 meters. Most recently, the Depart-

ment invested to reduce the size, weight, and power of the system by 50 percent while also enhancing its operational capabilities. The result of this investment is a prototype system that exceeds desired requirements, reducing the size, weight, and power by 80 percent, and decreasing acquisition costs by 25 percent. However, the committee notes that no additional funding has been identified by the Department to complete the prototype to the point where it would be ready for testing in an operational environment, or any form of military user assessment. The committee believes that this technology has the potential to not only enhance force protection at U.S. military bases and embassy checkpoints in high threat regions around the world, but it could also be used in public settings to protect against terrorist attacks domestically. The committee encourages the Department to continue to invest in the development of this prototype to the point where it could be evaluated for military utility in a suitable operational environment.

Ocean warfighting environment applied research

The committee believes that superiority in undersea and maritime environments depends on rapid access and application of the latest science and technology to ever-changing mission sets. The committee understands the importance of basic research on the natural sea environment that can be transformed into technological developments that provide new or enhanced warfare capabilities for the battlespace environment by measuring, analyzing, modeling and simulating, and applying environmental factors. The committee supports the use of natural environmental applied research for all fleet operations and for current or emerging systems. This information is also used to provide timely information about the natural environment for all fleet operations. The committee urges the Secretary of the Navy to continue research efforts into the natural sea environment to support technological developments that contribute to meeting top joint warfare capabilities.

Service life extension program for Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research

The budget request contained $42.6 million in PE 62435N for the Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research program.

For academic research, the Navy operates and maintains Auxiliary General Purpose Oceanographic Research (AGOR) vessels, and these vessels require a mid-life overhaul. The committee notes that funding provided to date does not fully support all of the items that the Navy has determined are necessary to fully extend the life of these AGOR ships to 40–45 years.

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

meteorological data, that supports Navy, national, and international scientific goals.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $74.6 million, an increase of $32.0 million, in PE 62435N for Ocean Warfighting Environment Applied Research, to procure the third major overhaul in the class of three AGORs. The committee notes that the inclusion of this authorization of appropriations is predicated on the Navy's use of merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, or on competitive procedures, to conduct these overhauls.

Submarine acoustic warfare development

Considering the increasing and evolving undersea threats, the committee believes the Department of the Navy must continue to develop next generation countermeasures, including a mix of internal and external expendable acoustic countermeasures, to maintain and improve the survivability of all U.S. submarine classes in response to torpedo attack. While the committee acknowledges that the budget request for fiscal year 2017 included an increase of $3.4 million to stabilize the Next Generation Countermeasure Program and associated Submarine Acoustic Warfare System research and development efforts, the committee supports the planned requirement for a fully capable, reactive, and mobile device constrained in size to 3 inches in diameter and 39 inches in length. However, the committee is concerned that the current next generation countermeasure requirement requires a single 3-inch device to be launched from both internal and external launchers, despite the fact that the latter currently deploys a 6-inch device. The committee urges Navy officials to consider a more diversified approach that allows for a next generation, 6-inch externally launched countermeasure, as well as an enhanced Acoustic Device Countermeasure (ADC) MK2 device for internal launch, which could be fielded sooner and at a much more affordable cost than the Navy's current plan.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2016, on the Navy's plan to achieve the most cost effective and advanced torpedo defense capability for its submarine fleet. The briefing shall include, but not be limited to: the rationale underpinning the Navy's plan to focus on smaller devices that require adaptation to launch from external tubes, with specific attention paid to the inherent limitations of internally launched countermeasures; a detailed description of plans to incrementally enhance existing internal countermeasures, such as ADC MK2; any plans to develop a fully capable 6-inch next generation countermeasure, with mobility and communications capabilities, to be launched from external launchers; and an assessment of risk and unit production costs of each of the three aforementioned program sets.

UCLASS, CBARS, RAQ–25, MQ–25, MQ–XX

The committee is encouraged that the Department of Defense has completed its review of the Unmanned Carrier Launched Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) program and has decided to move forward with a slight variation that will include airborne tanking as an additional requirement. While this new capability was not

identified as a requirement in the UCLASS Initial Capabilities Document (ICD) or the draft Capabilities Development Document (CDD) that had been previously validated by the Chief of Naval Operations, the committee recognizes the need for the enhanced capability and the positive impact it could have on the overall Carrier Air Wing (CVW). A requirement that was included in both the UCLASS ICD and CDD was the need for persistent, carrier-based intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance (ISR) and precision strike. Furthermore, as stated in the Carrier Based Aerial Refueling System (CBARS) budget documents, "The CBARS requirements are aligned with the UCLASS which highlights the need for a persistent, carrier-based ISR, and precision strike asset." The budget documents go on to note in the Air Segment Product Development description that the unmanned vehicle will be "capable of aerial refueling (give) and persistent Intelligence Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) operations with future precision strike."

The committee is concerned that while the follow on program continues to leverage the UCLASS ICD as its requirements justification and seems to have clear justification for the need for this platform to possess a precision strike capability, the final Request for Proposals that goes to industry may not include this as a required capability. The committee believes that, should this be the case, the Navy may be excluding a critical capability and precluding future growth in a platform that will likely be integrated into the carrier air wing for the next 30 years. In order to stay consistent with the requirements of the UCLASS ICD, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that precision strike is a requirement of any follow-on platform that attempts to leverage the UCLASS ICD.

Additionally, the committee notes that the Joint Explanatory Statement to Accompany S. 1356, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Committee Print No. 2) indicated that the Navy should develop a penetrating, air refuelable, unmanned carrier-launched aircraft capable of performing in a non-permissive environment. The committee continues to believe that the effectiveness of the carrier and its air wing would be enhanced by the development of an unmanned carrier-based aircraft capable of penetrating in non-permissive environments and conducting strike. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to pursue the development and fielding of this capability.

Finally, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2017, on the Navy's carrier based unmanned aircraft acquisition program(s). The report shall include the following:

(1) The Navy's requirements and acquisition strategy for the program(s), including whether the strategies are consistent with acquisition management best practices identified by the Comptroller General;

(2) The extent to which the program(s) have established and are meeting cost, schedule, and performance goals, including test plans and progress;

(3) The extent to which critical technologies are mature; system and subsystem designs are stable; and manufacturing processes are

understood and have demonstrated capability to efficiently produce reliable, high quality systems; and

(4) Any additional matters that the Comptroller General considers appropriate to fully inform the congressional defense committees of the status of relevant naval carrier based unmanned aircraft acquisition program(s).

Warfighter sustainment applied research

Warfighter exposure to extreme environments requires critical research that is funded to study and mitigate the effects of undersea stresses on human safety, resiliency, and performance. The Navy's Warfighter Sustainment Applied Research Medical Technologies Program is directed by the Office of Naval Research, and conducts important research in this field. Research in this area includes reducing decompression sickness, arterial gas embolism, preventing hyperbaric oxygen toxicity, and exploring other ways to optimize submariner health. The committee believes the health and well-being of the force is imperative and encourages the Department of the Navy to continue investments in this field.

RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION, AIR FORCE

Items of Special Interest

Adaptive engine transition program

The budget request contained $285.0 million in PE 64858F for the adaptive engine transition program (AETP).

The committee continues to support research and development in the next generation of turbine engine technology. AETP will mature fuel-efficient adaptive cycle engine technologies while reducing associated technical and manufacturing risks in preparation for next-generation propulsion system development for multiple combat aircraft applications. The committee understands that significant technical accomplishments have been achieved by the Air Force Research Laboratory through a previous program, known as the adaptive versatile engine technology program, and the current AETP. The committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to continue making the necessary investments in these critical technologies and engine architectures to maintain the Nation's technological superiority over potential advanced adversaries.

The committee is encouraged that the Department of the Air Force has requested funding to award multiple contracts in fiscal year 2017, and to continue adaptive cycle engine maturation and demonstration efforts as a precursor to entering into future engineering and manufacturing development programs.

The committee recommends $285.0 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64858F to continue the AETP program. The committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to initiate development planning efforts for transitioning these technologies into current and future combat aircraft systems.

Air Force directed energy initiatives

The committee is aware that the Department of the Air Force established a Directed Energy Weapons (DEW) Integrated Product Team (IPT) in March 2016 to focus on operationalizing directed en-

ergy (DE) technologies. In addition to addressing technology development risks through science and technology efforts, the IPT will focus on policy issues, establishment of kinetic concepts of operation, opportunities for prototypes and experimentation, limitations, constraints, transition milestones, and critical decision points for Air Force strategic investment from 2016 to 2036. In addition, the DEW IPT will identify required test capabilities and acquisition infrastructure to support operationalizing DE. This information will be formalized in an Air Force DE Flight Plan.

The committee supports the effort to operationalize DE and recognizes the challenges, specifically the integration of DE on airborne platforms and resolution of policy issues, in achieving this goal. The committee understands that in producing the Air Force DE Flight Plan, initial concepts may prove unfeasible or not conducive to the overall Air Force Strategic Plan. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by July 15, 2016, on the establishment of the IPT and efforts and progress to date. The briefing should include a discussion of any DE requirements as identified by U.S. Air Force Special Operations Command, including any AC–130 gunship requirements, such as those included in the unfunded priorities list submitted to the committee. Finally, the committee expects to be provided a copy of the Air Force DE Flight Plan upon its completion in October 2016.

Air traffic control and landing systems

The budget request contained $9.8 million in PE 35114F for development of air traffic control and landing systems. Of this amount, $5.0 million was requested for development of a next generation air transportation system (NextGen ATS).

NextGen ATS is an interagency effort designed to enable the transition from a ground-infrastructure dominated air traffic management capability for the U.S. national airspace system to a capability that leverages advances in performance-based navigation, non-radar based surveillance services. NextGen ATS would also transition from solid-state analogue voice communications to networked digital voice and data exchange. As part of this effort, the committee notes that the Air Force Flight Standards Agency will continue efforts to examine new civil air traffic control and landing system technologies that may have military utility, such as a remote virtual air traffic control tower capability. A remote virtual air traffic control tower system would integrate high-definition cameras providing 360 degree field of view, surveillance and meteorological sensors, microphones, signal light guns, and other devices for deployment at an airport. Inputs from these sensors could be transmitted via data network to a remote tower center to be displayed in real time where a controller would have the tools, in addition to live video, to operate the airport in a similar manner as if located in a traditional air traffic control tower. The committee believes that a remote virtual air traffic control tower capability could provide a cost-effective alternative to traditional fixed-base air traffic control towers. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of the Air Force to conduct an operational utility evaluation of the virtual air traffic control tower capability in fiscal year 2017 to determine whether such a system could be an alter-

native to current air traffic control facilities for fixed-base and expeditionary operations.

The committee recommends $9.8 million, the full amount requested, in PE 35114F, for development of air traffic control and landing systems.

Deployable air traffic control

The committee recognizes the important research and development work the Air Force conducts to support air traffic control and landing systems that enable their ability to deploy and operate worldwide. The committee notes that a portion of that work has been focused on developing a Deployable Radar Approach Control system. The committee believes such a system will not only allow Air Force units to be rapidly deployable or recoverable in austere and denied environments, but that it is also a critical component in Department of Defense capabilities for humanitarian assistance and disaster response scenarios. Additionally, as noted elsewhere in this report, the committee understands remote tower systems can provide a cost-effective alternative to traditional fixed-based air traffic control towers.

However, the committee is concerned that current efforts do not adequately address future air traffic control tower requirements, or how capabilities for fixed and deployable air traffic systems might be rationalized. The Air Force operates air traffic control towers at approximately 90 fixed installations and deploys air traffic control services in support of contingency operations and crisis response under the Defense Support to Civil Authority mission. Aging infrastructure and obsolete mobile systems will be a great challenge to the Department. These challenges are compounded by the growing need to be able to rapidly reconstitute airfields that are held at risk by cruise and ballistic missile threats in foreign theaters. Thus, the ability to provide deployable air traffic control has the potential to contribute to deterrence, and supports the ability to convincingly project power.

Recognizing the cost and operational benefits from this kind of research and development, the committee encourages the Air Force to explore opportunities, including through experimentation and concept development, to leverage this technology in order to address the range of challenges facing the Air Force. In addition to understanding the potential savings in construction and manpower, the committee encourages the Air Force to find experimentation or exercise venues to better understand how such technology might contribute to new and innovative warfighting concepts for the future.

High efficiency heat exchangers

High efficiency heat exchangers are becoming increasingly necessary for engines and aircraft, such as the F–35, that generate more heat as more advanced capabilities, and thus increased weight, are added to the platform. The committee is aware that current thermal management systems (TMS) may be limited by traditional manufacturing processes, and that additive manufacturing is crucial to next-generation TMS. Therefore, the committee encourages the Air Force to make investments in additive manufactured TMS.

Human-machine teaming

The budget request contained $111.6 million in PE 62202F for human effectiveness applied research.

The committee notes that autonomy research is a significant component of the Department of Defense's new third offset strategy, and will likely provide a decisive future warfighting advantage to U.S. forces. The integration of manned and unmanned aerial systems appears prominently in future concepts for next-generation air dominance, but will continue to rely heavily on human operators and their abilities to take on increasingly cognitive loads. The committee has supported increased funding in the past for ongoing research to develop more comprehensive methods to train and rehearse warfighters for a more realistic and seamless human-machine autonomous command and control environment. The committee encourages the Air Force to continue to pursue improved continuous learning strategies for airmen and mission performance by creating, blending, and personalizing Live, Virtual, and Constructive simulation environments.

The committee recommends $116.6 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 62202F to expand research in human-machine teaming.

Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System recapitalization

The budget request contained $128.1 million for the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) recapitalization program.

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2017 budget request projects a delay of at least 1 month in the engineering and manufacturing development (EMD) contract award, from the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2017 to the first quarter of fiscal year 2018, and a 1-year delay in Initial Operational Capability (IOC) from fiscal year 2023 to 2024 in the recapitalization of the JSTARS fleet. The committee believes JSTARS recapitalization offers significant advantages: it will decrease the logistics footprint, reduce sustainment costs, increase operational flexibility, and extend operations into anti-access/area denial environments. The committee recognizes that the overall delay is a consequence of: (1) a delay in the milestone A decision; and (2) analysis conducted by both the Department of the Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense that indicates the EMD schedule will require 4 to 5.5 years.

The committee supports and understands the need for a technology maturation and risk reduction (TMRR) phase as part of the JSTARS recapitalization program, as a means to decrease cost, schedule, and performance risk prior to entering the EMD phase. The committee understands that the Air Force's acquisition strategy includes considering two radar alternatives as part of the TMRR phase. The committee believes that the TMRR phase is the appropriate place to pursue such a strategy. However, the committee also believes that pursuing multiple radar technologies concurrently within the program of record into the follow-on development phase would be inconsistent with the committee's acquisition reform initiatives. The committee expects the Air Force to down select to one radar solution as part of the EMD phase in order to ensure the program does not continue to be delayed. If the Air Force believes that alternative radar capabilities should be pursued for

risk mitigation or capability enhancements in the future, the Air Force should pursue such an approach outside of the program of record with the ability to incrementally integrate in the future if necessary.

The committee has continually expressed concern that a protracted acquisition program will result in a multiyear capabilities gap, which will leave combatant commanders without an acceptable level of ground moving target indicators and battle management command and control capability. The committee also believes that the use of existing technology combined with a commercially available jet aircraft can result in a significantly faster acquisition program. The committee notes this approach would be consistent with current acquisition reform policies that direct a more streamlined and incremental approach for major defense acquisition programs. While the committee understands that the Department of the Air Force is conducting a study to determine the E–8's widespread airframe fatigue risk, which will be complete in March 2017, the committee notes that under the most optimistic scenarios, the Department can expect a shortfall of 10 JSTARS aircraft in its fleet of 16 operational aircraft by late fiscal year 2025.

Accordingly, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to develop a plan, including incentives in the JSTARS recapitalization EMD and procurement contracts, to accelerate the development, procurement, and fielding of JSTARS recapitalization program. In addition, the committee believes the Air Force should program necessary funds in its future budget requests to accelerate the JSTARS recapitalization program in the Future Years Defense Program, and to eliminate the delay in delivering initial operational capability. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than December 1, 2016. The briefing should include one option that would accelerate the IOC to fiscal year 2022, and a second option that would accelerate the IOC to fiscal year 2023.

The committee recommends $128.1 million, the full amount requested, for the JSTARS recapitalization program.

KC–46 aerial refueling tanker aircraft program

The budget request contained $261.7 million in PE 65221F for KC–46 tanker development.

The committee continues its long-standing support of the KC–46 tanker aircraft program. The committee notes that the program has had no engineering change proposals and program officials have stated that they do not expect any engineering change proposals for the remainder of the fiscal year. The committee also notes that the program has not incurred any additional or unexpected test support costs. Because the program continues to demonstrate stable requirements and has had no requested engineering change proposals or test support cost growth, the Government Accountability Office identified $140.0 million of the remaining $170.0 million set aside in fiscal year 2016 for unknown risks as excess funds that could be used to offset fiscal year 2017 risk mitigation.

Therefore, the committee recommends $121.7 million, a decrease of $140.0 million, in PE 65221F for KC–46 tanker development.

MQ–9 automatic takeoff and landing capability

The budget request contained $151.4 million in PE 25219F for development of MQ–9 capabilities, but contained no funding for development of the MQ–9 automatic takeoff and landing capability (ATLC).

MQ–9 ATLC is a software-based autopilot system for takeoff and landing operations for MQ–9 aircraft. The committee understands that the system will allow takeoffs and landings at full operational limits, and provide auto-abort and divert capabilities not currently resident in the MQ–9. The committee further understands that initial MQ–9 ATLC development efforts began in 2011 and ran through 2013 with a total of 146 test landings, but that due to higher priorities, no additional testing has occurred since then. The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force currently plans to restart development of the MQ–9 ATLC in fiscal year 2018, but understands that acceleration of this effort will facilitate the transition away from line-of-sight operations for takeoffs and landings, improve operational flexibility by providing ability to land at divert fields, prevent the loss of aircraft due to loss of the command and control link, and increase takeoff and landing operational capability in conditions of poor visibility.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $35.0 million in PE 25219F for development of the MQ–9 ATLC.

Additionally, the committee notes some Department of Defense organizations use contractor support for unmanned aerial system (UAS) takeoff and landing operations when forward deployed, and believes that the Department of the Air Force should consider contractor support for its MQ–9 takeoff and landing operations to mitigate the demand on Department of the Air Force personnel assigned to the UAS career field. Consequently, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, not later than November 1, 2016, on contractor support to UAS takeoff and landing operations.

MQ–9 unmanned aircraft vehicle tactical datalink integration

The budget request contained $151.4 million in PE 25219F for the research and development of the MQ–9 unmanned aircraft vehicle, but contained no funding to develop and integrate a tactical datalink capability onto the platform.

The committee notes that the MQ–9 aircraft lacks the means to establish and maintain direct tactical datalink (TDL) communications with command and control, tactical agencies, and other TDL users. The committee understands that TDLs are critical capabilities used to share aircraft position, targeting data, sensor points of interest, cursor-on-target data, and target-track information derived from various intelligence sources via an airborne network of manned and unmanned aircraft. The lack of TDL single-point reception and transmission capability on board an aircraft can delay prosecution of the kill chain, impact supported commanders' time-sensitive decision-making processes, and pose an unnecessary safety issue with regard to aircraft position and airspace deconfliction. Current MQ–9 TDL communication and information transfers are not routed directly through the existing airborne TDL network, but instead are routed through multiple ground-based servers outside

of the remotely piloted aircraft architecture. This method of TDL data routing causes significant delays of critical information, such as aircraft position and targeting data. An aircraft TDL radio is needed by MQ–9 operators that is compatible with all current datalink architectures in both domestic and combat areas of responsibility. The TDL radio and system should include provisions for consistent, reliable, timely, and unrestricted TDL communications, and have open architecture to allow for growth and advances in the TDL technology.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of $14.0 million in PE 25219F for the development, non-recurring engineering, and integration of a tactical datalink capability onto the MQ–9 platform. This funding increase directly supports a capability requirement validated in the MQ–9 capability development document, and directly supports a "critical requirement" identified as an MQ–9 capability shortfall by the Air National Guard.

Open architecture Distributed Common Ground System

The committee is aware that the Air Force has been pursuing an effort to modernize its version of the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) by implementing an open architecture version. The committee is generally supportive of increasing uses of open architecture approaches for system development, as well as of this effort specifically. The committee believes that open architecture has the potential to increase flexibility and agility for both development and deployment of DCGS capabilities, as well as potentially faster development and integration of applications.

However, the committee is concerned that the current program is not well organized to accept these open architecture modifications. The 2015 Annual Report of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) found that the current version of the program lacks current requirements and architecture documents, a rigorous and comprehensive software problem tracking and reporting procedure, and an accurate description of the architecture and interfaces for the Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP). Without remediating these problems, the committee is concerned that the program will be unable to fully move to an open architecture baseline. Additionally, for the open architecture development effort, the committee believes that there is insufficient documentation in specific program milestones, and that it remains unclear how the Air Force will effectively leverage an open architecture without additional changes in contracting strategy for applications running on the new architecture.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by January 9, 2017, on the roadmap for development and fielding of the open architecture version of the Distributed Common Ground System for the Air Force. The roadmap should include:

(1) A plan for achieving an open architecture, including identification of key milestones and decision points;

(2) A timeline for addressing the recommendations of the 2015 DOT&E Annual Report, including the updating of requirements and architecture documents, a process for documenting and re-

dressing software and cybersecurity problems, and an update of the TEMP; and

(3) Recommendations for updating the acquisition strategy and contracting mechanisms for open architecture components of the updated DCGS system.

Precision metrology tools

The budget request contained $126.2 million in PE 62102F for materials research and development.

The committee recognizes that metrology, or the development of precise measurement tools, is an important aspect of materials research. As the ability to manipulate materials at the subatomic scale, and to generate new and novel materials from computational design, continues to advance, it will also require further development of precision measuring tools. The committee encourages the Air Force to explore new and novel methods to develop and provision for these tools, including through public-private partnerships to develop, field, and maintain cutting-edge metrology systems.

Therefore, the committee recommends $131.2 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 62102F to support the development of advanced, precision metrology tools to support enhanced materials development work of the Air Force and its partner organizations.

Reusable hypersonic vehicle structures development

The budget request contained $122.8 million in PE 62201F for aerospace vehicle technologies.

The committee understands that hypersonic vehicles are a significant area of investment for both the Air Force and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), and have the potential to provide game-changing capabilities for the Department of Defense. The committee is aware that the Department's third offset strategy includes additional investments that will support accelerating development, testing, and fielding of hypersonic capabilities. The committee believes that such investments are critical to posturing the Department for the future warfighting environment. However, the committee is concerned that the emphasis on strike technologies has resulted in little investment to cover the research needs for reusable hypersonic vehicles. The committee is aware that past efforts, such as the Hypersonic Test Vehicle-2 flight tests, illustrate the need to better characterize the aerothermal effects on flight bodies. The committee believes that if the Department intends to develop reusable hypersonic platforms, there is a need to invest in the near term to do the characterization and materials research needed to support those future missions.

The committee recommends $127.8 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 62201F to support the development of reusable hypersonic vehicle structures.

Silicon carbide for aerospace power applications

The budget request contained $94.6 million in PE 63216F for aerospace propulsion and power.

The committee notes that recent research in aerospace power electronics has concentrated on fundamental materials, devices, and power-handling capability. The committee believes that the Air Force should look for opportunities to accelerate the development

of actual components to go into aircraft electrical systems, especially very high-current silicon carbide power modules. The committee recognizes that the increasing sophistication and energy requirements for new systems, like avionics, computing, sensors, and even high-energy lasers, will place increasing demands on the power architectures available to the constrained size and weight of aircraft. The committee also believes that such advances will have beneficial effects when applied to legacy, as well as future generation, air platforms.

The committee recommends $99.6 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 63216F to support the development of application-specific power circuit development using silicon carbide modules.

T–X program

The budget request contained $12.4 million in PE 65223F for advanced pilot training, also known as the T–X program.

The Department of the Air Force's current advanced jet trainer aircraft, the T–38C, initially entered the Air Force inventory in 1961. The average age of the fleet is 50 years old, with an average of over 16,000 flight hours on each aircraft. Although the T–38C fleet has undergone costly structural life extensions and avionics upgrades, the committee believes that the aircraft is unable to address the training gaps that have grown with the introduction of fourth and fifth generation fighter aircraft. The committee also believes that the T–X aircraft and its associated ground-based training system, collectively known as the advanced pilot training family of systems (APT FoS), will affordably address training gaps that have been identified by the Air Education and Training Command, ensuring that student pilots have the necessary skills to fly and employ current and future advanced combat aircraft. The committee notes that initial operating capability for the APT FoS is planned for 2024, and understands that full operational capability is scheduled for 2029.

The committee also understands that the costs of sustaining the T–38C fleet are growing even as aircraft availability is decreasing, and that the T–38 was originally intended to undergo replacement in the mid-1990s. Therefore, the committee believes that any delay to the APT FoS program will place the Department of the Air Force combat readiness at risk, and that maintaining or accelerating the current APT FoS program schedule is required to ensure safe and effective training of Department of the Air Force combat pilots.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $12.4 million, the full amount requested, in PE 64233F to continue the T–X program. The committee also directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than November 1, 2016, on plans to fairly evaluate the Advanced Pilot Training Family of Systems design solutions that are based off of newly designed aircraft and existing aircraft, and potential options to accelerate the T–X program.

Technology transfer

The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to facilitate the transfer of laboratory-generated technology to industry partners for military and commercial use. Increased resourcing by Congress to transfer technology programs executed by the Air

Force Research Laboratory has progressed, resulting in speeding up the flow of intellectual property from the laboratory and the launch of new companies based on laboratory technologies. This includes the formation of high growth potential technology startups with the promise of making gains for both the military and commercial sectors. The committee encourages the Air Force to continue to facilitate the timely transfer of intellectual property. Facilitating such transfers allows for significant advances in critical mission areas and provides the necessary resources in future budget requests for a robust program.

Wide-area motion imagery

The budget request contained $3.8 million in PE 35206F for development of airborne reconnaissance systems, but contained no funding for development of wide-area motion imagery (WAMI) beyond line-of sight (BLOS) capabilities. The committee notes that persistent day and night WAMI capability is considered by operational commanders to be a critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance program for combat units, and has contributed to saving U.S. and allied soldiers' lives.

The committee understands that a recently validated joint urgent operational need (JUON) requires the development of WAMI BLOS capabilities.

Accordingly, the committee recommends $18.8 million in PE 35206F, an increase of $15.0 million, for development of WAMI BLOS capabilities.

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

Items of Special Interest

Academia and university affiliated research center support for chemical and biological defense

The committee understands the dynamic and ever-expanding chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) threats, and is aware of the defensive capabilities that the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense program (CBDP) develops to stay ahead of the evolving threat. The broad portfolio of the CBDP includes support for early warning through the development of biosurveillance and advanced diagnostics, avoiding, preventing, and preparing for surprise through technology development. These technologies address non-traditional agents and synthetic biology, and integrated, layered defense through investing in medical countermeasures, protective equipment, detectors and sensors, and hazard mitigation. The committee supports ongoing efforts of the Department of Defense to ensure that currently available and cutting edge technologies are harnessed to provide improved capabilities in the future.

The committee also understands the critical role of the Department of Defense in the larger U.S. Government efforts to addressing CBRN threats, as shown by the Department of Defense's role in the recent Ebola crisis. The committee encourages prioritizing and aligning investments in CBRN countermeasures, including medical ones, among all of the Federal stakeholders to ensure that effective countermeasures are developed to meet both military and

civilian needs, and to prevent potential duplication of efforts. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to leverage a broad set of partners to meet these needs, including academia and university affiliated research centers (UARCs). The committee supports utilizing the engineering and technology capabilities provided and established within academia and UARCs, and recommends that the Department of Defense increase efforts to ensure that the capabilities at these organizations are coordinated with the broad CBRN priorities within the Department of Defense, and with the larger civilian priorities through the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise. The committee also recommends that the Department of Defense increase coordination of the Advanced Development and Manufacturing facility with the capabilities available in academia and at UARCs to ensure efficient and rapid development of medical countermeasures to the evolving CBRN threats.

Additive manufacturing

The committee recognizes the important developments occurring in the area of additive manufacturing, also known as 3D printing. Like any new technology discipline, the Department of Defense should stay actively involved in this community to understand and develop a better appreciation for both the opportunities it could provide, as well as the threats it could pose in the hands of a resourceful adversary. As the technology becomes more mature, and the cost for such equipment continues to drop, the committee expects the Department to find new and novel ways to utilize this technology for military uses. The committee also encourages the Department to leverage existing organizations, such as the National Additive Manufacturing Innovation Institute, as well as expand that community to include other universities, non-profit research institutes, and other industry partners to expand the state of the art for the use of additive manufacturing technology.

Alternative solutions to multidrug resistant bacteria

The rise in infections caused by multidrug resistant (MDR) bacteria represents a serious threat to public health and poses a great challenge to the care of wounded military personnel. These infections prolong hospitalization, and in some, can lead to increased limb loss, sepsis, and death. Since some MDR bacteria are becoming increasingly resistant to antibiotics, researchers are working to develop alternative solutions, including engineered bacteriophage (phage) that can be standardized, manufactured, and administered similar to antibiotics.

The committee is aware of the Department of Defense's on-going efforts to develop countermeasures to MDR bacteria that leverage the whole-of-government anti-microbial resistant investments. The committee encourages the Department to continue its efforts to work with key stakeholders to develop and deploy alternative treatments, particularly phage therapy, against MDR bacteria.

Better Gender Reporting in Grantmaking

The committee is aware recent research illustrates women continue to face challenges in educational and career advancement in science, technology, mathematics and engineering (STEM) fields. In

a December 2015 report entitled "Women in STEM Research" the United States Government Accountability Office (GAO) determined, through analysis of available but limited data, there were discrepancies in the number of grants awarded to women and men at the Department of Defense within certain components. The committee notes this differentiation in success rates does not mean the Department is using discriminatory practices when awarding grants. The committee further acknowledges GAO reported the lack of data available to analyze limited their ability to gauge the success rates of men and women.

The committee believes the lack of complete award data containing demographic information at certain Department agencies and components impacts the ability to fully evaluate and understand if the most qualified individuals are being funded, regardless of demographics. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than January 1, 2017, on improving data collection efforts within the Department in order to provide complete and analyzable records for grant awards.

Broad-spectrum antiviral drug modeling

The committee understands the importance of developing efficient and effective countermeasures against a growing list of lethal pathogens, many of which have different variants. The committee is supportive of efforts to develop broad-spectrum antiviral drugs that can be used against many different pathogen threats. The committee further believes that rapid development of these drugs can be improved by using modeling software of the drug/virus interaction to perform high throughput screening of potential candidate drugs, leading to decreased development time. After candidate drugs have been identified, it is also important to establish partnerships with biosafety level 4 facilities to allow testing of the efficacy of these drugs. The committee understands that partnerships with not-for-profit 501C3 applied research facilities can provide unique capabilities and expertise throughout the drug development process.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2016, on the current and planned use of drug/virus interaction modeling software for high throughput screening of potential small molecule drugs. The briefing should also include a list of the current and potential partnerships with not-for-profit 501C3 applied research facilities, and the potential for partnerships between these 501C3 applied research facilities and the Department of Defense Advanced Development and Manufacturing facility.

Cellular and broadband signals exploitation

The committee is aware of the United States Special Operations Command's (SOCOM) ongoing efforts to utilize commercial technology to conduct cellular and broadband survey, active interrogation, and directional finding capabilities from unmanned aerial systems. Such capabilities have been highly successful in prosecuting operations to find, fix, and finish enemy combatants and other high-value targets on the battlefield. The committee believes there

will be a continuing need as such missions are prosecuted in the future. The committee encourages SOCOM to expedite the integration, testing, and limited fielding of such cellular and broadband signature exploitation capabilities for future missions.

Comptroller General review of commercial practices for trust in microelectronics

The committee remains concerned with the Department of Defense's ability to ensure access to cutting-edge microelectronics with the requisite level of verifiable trust incorporated. The committee recognizes that the Department's ability to provide superior capabilities to the warfighter is dependent, in part, on its ability to incorporate rapidly evolving, leading-edge microelectronic devices into its defense systems, while also balancing national security concerns. Currently, the Department processes for ensuring trust rely on assessing the integrity of the people and processes used to design, generate, manufacture, and distribute national security critical microelectronics. For over a decade, the Department has relied on a single domestic source for trusted leading edge microelectronics.

However, due to market trends, supply chain globalization, and manufacturing costs, the Department's future access to U.S.-based microelectronics sources is uncertain. As such, the Department is considering various potential approaches that would allow it to access commercial non-trusted sources in the global microelectronics marketplace, while still ensuring trust. Given the Department's reliance on a single source for trusted leading-edge microelectronics, and the dwindling number of domestic microelectronics manufacturers on which the Department can rely, the committee believes that there should be a better understanding of what trust capabilities exist and are in use by the commercial marketplace.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 30, 2017, that evaluates how selected commercial microelectronics businesses ensure trust. As part of this evaluation, the Comptroller General should address the following:

(1) How do selected commercial companies incorporate trust into their leading-edge microelectronics, including techniques to protect intellectual property and prevent malicious content in devices?

(2) To what extent could the Department of Defense leverage these practices, and what are the challenges associated with implementing these practices for defense systems?

Counter-unmanned aerial systems roadmap

The committee believes that the proliferation of unmanned aerial systems (UAS), particularly small hobby systems that can be bought commercially, pose a significant challenge to the Department of Defense's capabilities to detect, track, and neutralize such threats. The committee is aware that the Army has conducted a technology red team to understand how such systems might be used against U.S. forces, focusing on potential adversarial employment and methods for avoiding detection. The committee is also aware that there has been some preliminary development of counter-UAS capabilities, and that organizations, from the Com-

bating Terrorism Technology Support Office and the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization, are investigating technology solutions.

However, the committee is increasingly concerned that such efforts are not adequately coordinated, and have focused on near-term capabilities without taking a long-term, integrated view to developing countermeasures. The committee is also concerned that the current focus does not provide an adequate variety of tools and technologies available at the tactical unit level to detect, track, and neutralize small UAS threats. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a technology roadmap for addressing gaps to counter the potential threats from terrorist or state actor uses of small UAS technology, with an emphasis on technology to support tactical level units, and fixed, high-value defense assets. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2017, on this roadmap.

Department of Defense medical countermeasures Advanced Development and Manufacturing facility roadmap

The committee understands the importance of maintaining a broad portfolio of medical countermeasures, including therapeutic and pre-treatment efforts, to address high priority threats to the warfighter. The committee also understands the challenges faced by the Department of Defense medical countermeasure development due to the low quantities procured and other acquisition challenges. The committee is aware of and has been monitoring the Department of Defense Advanced Development and Manufacturing (ADM) capability, which includes a dedicated facility to support the development, licensure, and manufacturing of medical countermeasures. This facility is planned to achieve full operational capability by the end of fiscal year 2016. The committee is also aware of complementary capabilities provided by the Department of Health and Human Services Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA) Centers for Innovation in Advanced Development and Manufacturing.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) required the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the Department of Defense ADM that included cost-benefit analysis of the manufacturing and construction of the facility. The committee continues to be concerned about the potential for long-term operations and maintenance sustainment costs of the Department of Defense ADM facility, and about the possibility for duplication of efforts between the Department of Defense ADM facility and the Department of Health and Human Services ADM facilities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop and submit a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2016, on the sustainment of the Department of Defense ADM facility. The report should include an estimate of sustainment costs and a roadmap for planned work at the Department of Defense ADM facility over the next 10 years, as well as details on the planned business model for ensuring continued sustainment of the facility. The roadmap should also address partnerships and use of complementary capabilities between the Department of Defense ADM and the Department of Health and Human Services BARDA

Centers for Innovation in Advanced Development and Manufacturing.

Desalination technology

The committee is aware the Department of Defense has made advances in desalination technology over the last 15 years in support of large numbers of deployed forces in the Middle East. The committee recognizes that the inability to access clean water is a factor in destabilization around the world. The committee believes sharing desalination technologies with appropriate agencies, like the Department of State, to ensure advances are leveraged in development efforts is an important tool for stability and conflict avoidance. Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2017, on recent advances in desalination technologies, and how those advances have been shared with other U.S. Government agencies.

Explosive Ordnance Disposal equipment technology upgrades

The budget request contained $73.0 million in PE 63122D8Z for Combating Terrorism Technology Support (CTTS). Of this amount, $5.7 million was requested for Improvised Device Defeat and Explosive Countermeasures.

The committee notes that conventional Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) units across the military services require upgraded equipment and technology enhancements, particularly for routine inspection and search activities. The committee believes that conventional Joint Service EOD units would benefit from rapid acquisition of EOD equipment, which have high-definition resolution and encrypted signals, among other upgraded capabilities. The committee understands that the Department of Defense canceled the Explosive Ordnance Disposal/Low Intensity Conflict program element which formerly developed and delivered Joint Service EOD advanced capabilities. The committee understands the CTTS program will absorb this mission area within the Improvised Defeat Device and Explosive Countermeasures subgroup activity.

The committee recommends $85.0 million, an increase of $12.0 million, in PE 63122D8Z for EOD equipment upgrades. Further, the committee encourages the Director of the CTTS program to prioritize the increased funding toward delivering advanced capabilities for conventional Joint-Service EOD units.

Foundational Intelligence Modernization

The foundational intelligence analytic mission is critical to enabling combatant command situational awareness and mission planning activities. The committee understands the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) has initiated the Foundational Intelligence Modernization Program (FIM) to revolutionize the tools required for this mission. FIM consists of highly automated capabilities and infrastructure including database transformation, system analysis features, and other advanced products. The committee supports the effort to achieve more effective analytic capabilities required to process, exploit, and disseminate intelligence information, and encourages DIA to utilize commercial-off-the-shelf products, when appropriate, to fulfill the requirement.

Future Vertical Lift

The committee recognizes that incremental improvements or upgrades to current Department of Defense rotorcraft will not fully meet future joint service operational requirements. With the exception of the V–22 Osprey, all U.S. rotorcraft deployed in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan were designed during or before the Vietnam War. The committee continues to support the development of future vertical lift aircraft and encourages the Department to expand the prototyping program. Future Vertical Lift (FVL) is a joint program, with support from the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Special Operations Command, and Coast Guard.

The committee understands that a key aspect of the FVL program is the Army's Joint Multi-Role (JMR) Technology Demonstrator. The JMR program includes related research on next-generation rotors, drivetrains, engines, sensors, and survivability that all feed into the FVL program. The committee notes that fiscal year 2017 is a critical year for technology development, with first flights of two demonstrator aircraft. Furthermore, wind-tunnel testing and other key milestones will reduce risk for the program of record and inform the FVL analysis of alternatives, which is expected to occur in the second half of 2017. However, the committee is concerned, due to the current resource constrained environment, that current funding levels are inadequate.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2017, on the status of both the prototype air vehicle demonstrations and supporting initiatives. The briefing should include potential options and required resources for accelerating the FVL program.

Handheld explosive and chemical detectors

The committee understands the importance of U.S. military personnel having sufficient handheld explosive and chemical weapons capabilities available to detect both conventional and homemade explosive and chemical threats. Traditional detection methods are less effective for homemade explosives (HMEs) and munitions grade chemical warfare agents (CWAs) containing impurities. Providing detectors to the U.S. military that can meet the growing threat of HMEs and CWAs is important to reducing the risk of U.S. soldier and civilian casualties in areas such as the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, as well as the risk of terrorist attacks on the United States.

The committee is aware of new raman laser technologies that may provide improved detection capabilities, which could be used to detect both HMEs and CWAs. The committee supports evaluation of this technology to meet critical detection requirements.

High-speed aerothermal effects

The committee recognizes that the development of hypersonic technologies will be a significant contributing factor to future military technological superiority. The development of hypersonic technologies by our adversaries continues at a rapid pace and represents a significant emerging threat. As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee believes that the Department of Defense

should be examining reusable hypersonic flight structures, in addition to the strike systems that are currently being pursued. The committee is aware that past efforts, such as the Hypersonic Test Vehicle-2 flight tests, illustrate the need to better characterize the aerothermal effects on flight bodies, and fiscal constraints cannot support learning such lessons through expensive trial and error. The committee encourages the Department to examine opportunities to better conduct aerothermal effects testing, and development for supporting thermal protection systems. Any efforts that the Department pursues should look to address manufacturability, risk reduction and maturation, and coordination with interagency partners and industry.

Human systems integration activities

The committee is concerned that military service personnel are required to use systems that are inadequate to their physical, behavioral, and cognitive needs. The committee recognizes that senior service leadership encourages the use of human systems integration research and development methods in response to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). Despite this, human performance research is not routinely transitioning to defense acquisition programs. Also, with no specifications required for human systems integration in acquisition programs, Requests for Proposals seldom include evaluation criteria for it, and it is ignored by program managers. Nevertheless, the committee notes that individual and team performance is the foundation of an effective military force. Ensuring that systems account for human performance abilities can make acquisitions more cost-effective, strengthen force protection, reduce potential for re-engineering, and cut time and costs of training and re-training, among many other benefits. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to examine Department of Defense policies related to human systems integration within defense acquisitions and to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee by February 15, 2017, on the findings and recommendations necessary to improve inclusion of human system integration research in acquisition programs.

Hydrocephalus research

The committee is concerned that some of the estimated 294,000 service members who have sustained a traumatic brain injury in Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom are at higher risk for developing hydrocephalus in the future. The committee recognizes that hydrocephalus, an increased accumulation of fluid in the brain, often has a delayed onset and can easily be misdiagnosed as dementia or other aging related diseases. Given that there is currently no cure for hydrocephalus, and current treatment options are limited and have high failure rates, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to increase its investments in hydrocephalus research.

Hyperspectral imaging technology

The committee recognizes the importance of stand-off hyperspectral imaging (HSI) technologies for the detection of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and explosive constituent chemi-

cals and other materials used in the manufacture of IEDs such as nitrates, nitrites, phosphates, and ammonia. Therefore, the committee encourages development of new and emerging HSI technologies—these technologies include those that utilize coherent spectral imaging technology to provide real-time detection hardware and software for situational awareness, and provide a complete automated target detection capability to enable end users tasked with vital threat identification capability for time-sensitive responses. The committee further encourages development of these capabilities with manufacturers that have demonstrated airborne sensor hardware and software development.

Immersive operator control stations

The committee recognizes the importance and usefulness of current and next-generation immersive operator control stations (IOCS) technologies. These technologies significantly decrease the burden on operators for unmanned systems and reduce training time. IOCS technologies also allow for decreased operation and maintenance costs while maximizing mission effectiveness and safety. Therefore, the committee supports advancement of next-generation IOCS that includes scalable architecture and designs to better meet the current and future needs of the Air Force, Navy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and other agencies.

Incentives for increasing private sector medical countermeasures development

The committee is aware of the importance of medical countermeasures, including prophylactics, pre-treatments, diagnostics, and therapeutics, to protect the warfighter from chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats. The committee is also aware of the difficulty in engaging industry partners to develop medical countermeasures due to the low profitability, lengthy process, and costs for doing this contract work for the Government. The committee recognizes that strategies and incentives should be developed to stimulate private sector medical countermeasures development. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, on potential incentives that would improve private sector, academia, non-profit, and other organization participation in medical countermeasures development. The briefing should identify any incentives that would require additional congressional authorities.

Interagency unmanned aerial system research

The committee notes that important progress has been made toward integrating unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) into the National Airspace System. Focus areas for the committee continue to be the development of sense and avoid systems, airworthiness certification, and safe integration of UAS into the National Airspace System. The committee recognizes that resolution of these issues continues to require a collaborative effort between the Department of Defense, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Provisions in previous National Defense Authorization Acts have encouraged collaboration among those three organizations, including section

1052 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), and section 1087 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). Through this collaboration, the committee believes that the Department of Defense can benefit from sharing human performance data and advanced sensor technology for applications in a civil environment, including next-generation integration, development of minimally manned large cargo aircraft systems, optionally piloted systems, and highly integrated UAS sensor systems and control stations. The committee understands that the Department of Defense and NASA will develop airworthiness certification processes for these advanced capabilities, which the committee believes will facilitate FAA development of civil standards, and increase the number of commercial products available to the Department of Defense, all while improving the competitiveness of the U.S. aviation industrial base.

Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department of Defense, the FAA, and NASA to continue collaborative efforts to solve UAS research issues.

Intestinal mucosal barrier research to address chemical and biological threats

The committee is aware of the breakdown complications of the intestinal mucosal barrier associated with nuclear, chemical, and biological threats. The intestinal mucosal barrier is believed to play a key role in severe medical conditions that occur following trauma, burns, and chemical and biological exposures by containing digestive enzymes within the intestine. The breakdown of the intestinal mucosal barrier may influence a range of serious health conditions after a trauma when the digestive enzymes leak through the intestinal mucosal barrier, initiating shock and organ failure. The committee encourages the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense program to evaluate establishing research activities regarding the intestinal mucosal barrier to investigate alternative therapeutic treatments to respond to a broad spectrum of chemical and biological agent exposure.

Laboratory Quality Enhancement

The committee is aware that the Laboratory Quality Improvement Program, later renamed the Laboratory Quality Enhancement Program (LQEP), was chartered in 1994 to propose initiatives for improving Department of Defense laboratories. Over time, the primary focus on this effort has been on the personnel panel, which has proposed many valuable ideas for sustaining and improving the laboratory workforce.

However, the committee believes that the LQEP has not been utilized to its full potential, in part because of the organization mismatch in its reporting chain, as well as the sole focus on personnel issues, and the lack of direct participation from the laboratory directors. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would codify and expand the roles and responsibilities of the LQEP to ensure its sustained attention on these issues. The committee believes codification of LQEP will provide an instrument to support both Department needs for ideas to sustain and grow the technical community in the Department of Defense, as well as

provide a vital link and demand signal within the congressional oversight committees, which is necessary to carry out any recommendations requiring statutory modification.

Furthermore, the committee believes that by including representation from the laboratory directors and the operational community in these panels, LQEP can be an even more effective tool for recommending changes to Department processes and regulations. For example, by including the installations and facilities management community into the facilities panel, participants can better navigate existing processes, while also identifying areas or issues where existing processes are insufficient to the needs of the laboratory community.

Low Energy Nuclear Reactions (LENR) Briefing

The committee is aware of recent positive developments in developing low-energy nuclear reactions (LENR), which produce ultra-clean, low-cost renewable energy that have strong national security implications. For example, according to the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), if LENR works it will be a "disruptive technology that could revolutionize energy production and storage." The committee is also aware of the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency's (DARPA) findings that other countries including China and India are moving forward with LENR programs of their own and that Japan has actually created its own investment fund to promote such technology. DIA has also assessed that Japan and Italy are leaders in the field and that Russia, China, Israel, and India are now devoting significant resources to LENR development. To better understand the national security implications of these developments, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing on the military utility of recent U.S. industrial base LENR advancements to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 22, 2016. This briefing should examine the current state of research in the United States, how that compares to work being done internationally, and an assessment of the type of military applications where this technology could potentially be useful.

Minority-serving institutions and minority-owned businesses

The committee recognizes the near-term, mid-term, and long-term impact that science and technology collaboration has on our warfighting capabilities and overall defense posture. Industry, academia, other non-governmental organizations, and Defense Department research, development, and prototyping entities, such as the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, all play a critical role in advancing national security. The committee is aware of the Department's efforts to harness the talent and innovation taking place in minority-owned businesses, veteran-owned businesses, small businesses, and minority-serving institutions such as Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Hispanic-Serving Institutions. The committee encourages the Department to continue to collaborate with minority-serving institutions and minority-owned businesses. Additionally, the committee urges the Department to increase opportunities for partnerships in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education programs, research and development efforts, and other areas across the Department's science and technology enterprise.

Monoclonal antibody therapeutics

The committee is aware of the recent work by the Department of Defense Chemical and Biological Defense Program in developing monoclonal antibody therapeutic drugs to treat the Zaire strain of the Ebola virus. The monoclonal antibody development by the Department of Defense was incorporated into the ZMapp therapeutic for Ebola that was used experimentally to treat some people with Ebola virus disease during the 2014 West African Ebola outbreak, and is currently undergoing further development. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue research into monoclonal antibody therapies for use as medical countermeasure to other biological agents, including diseases such as smallpox or the Sudan strain of Ebola.

MQ–9 anti-icing capability

The committee notes that an anti-icing capability for the MQ–9 unmanned aerial system has been pursued by the Department of Defense, and specifically U.S. Air Force Air Combat Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, and U.S. Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC). However, the committee is concerned that a lack of capability prioritization and technical issues have delayed initial fielding times.

The committee notes that a recent Laboratory Innovation Crowdsourcing (LINC) requirement solicited by the Department's Combating Terrorism Technology Support Office (CTTSO) stated that, "The current MQ–9 was fielded without the exact understanding of how it was affected by icing." The report continued that, "Due to the lack of data, the Air Force imposed conservative flight restrictions in order to reduce the risk to the weapons system . . . AFSOC is interested in the development and testing of innovative de-ice technologies that allow the MQ–9 to cruise in light icing and visible moisture." This LINC initiative solicited by CTTSO for outside approaches reinforces the committee's belief that the Department's current approach to satisfying this operational requirement is disjointed and uncoordinated.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Commander, U.S. Air Force Air Combat Command and the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. House of Representatives not later than October 1, 2016, on the Department's efforts to field an anti-icing capability for the MQ–9. This briefing shall be in classified form as required.

Nanomaterials in Combat Systems

The committee is aware that nanomaterials are being incorporated with increasing frequency in many commercial products and processes because of their ability to make materials stronger, lighter, more durable, more reactive, more porous, or more conductive, among other things. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense has been leveraging that commercial research, as well as investing in other areas with specific defense-related applications. The committee believes that the Department should be pursuing additional opportunities to transition that research into military combat systems. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services

by March 1, 2017, on the potential military applications of nanomaterials in combat systems. The briefing should outline the use of emerging technology with nanomaterials to identify areas where possible enhancements or improvements to equipment used by each of the service branches might be possible.

Non-destructive counterfeit parts detection tools

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has made significant progress since 2012 to reduce the risk of counterfeit electronic parts entering into the Department's weapon systems' supply chain. However, the committee recognizes that much work remains to improve the Department's ability to identify and mitigate such risks. Although responsibility for eliminating risk of counterfeit parts belongs to industry suppliers to the Department of Defense at all tiers, the committee encourages the Department to be proactive about identifying, developing, and validating independent tools that defense suppliers could easily use to rapidly identify counterfeit electronics in the supply chain accurately and at low cost. The committee believes that the Department should evaluate the need to identify or develop best-of-breed, non-destructive counterfeit parts detection tools that it can use, or that could be made available to defense industrial base suppliers, to support the overall mission of ensuring the integrity of electronic components of defense weapon systems.

Prioritization of joint test activities

The committee recognizes that developmental and operational test and evaluation activities are critical steps in research and development programs. Joint programs can be especially complex, and thus substantially more difficult to manage, with competing demands for resources, personnel, service priority, and the need to coordinate over multiple bureaucracies. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense does not adequately prioritize research and development projects; unfortunately, there are instances when expensive projects from one military department may receive a low priority for testing time and resources at facilities operated by different military departments.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Test Resource Management Center to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on the policies and processes for coordinating test and evaluation resources for joint and multi-service research and development projects. The briefing should include recommendations for improving the Department's ability to make cross-service prioritization decisions related to test and evaluation facilities for joint and multi-service programs.

Program intermediary agreements

The committee recognizes that Partnership Intermediary Agreements (PIAs), as defined in section 3715 of title 15, United States Code, have been useful tools for the Department of Defense to engage with and leverage small and non-traditional businesses. As the Department continues to expand its efforts to seek out, assess, and engage non-traditional small business vendors in the Department of Defense's development and acquisition efforts, the committee believes that PIAs could be more effectively used as a tool

for engaging this community. For example, the committee is aware that a PIA was used by the commander of U.S. Special Operations Command to establish its SOFWERX initiative, which the committee views as a rapid, highly effective, and highly cost-effective way of engaging with the vendor community to meet special operations forces capability needs. The committee encourages the Department to examine new and innovative ways to use PIAs, such as providing technology assessments or design reviews to understand manufacturability, fitness for use, material availability, and other assessments that can reduce development cycle times.

Ribonucleic acid technology research

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense faces significant challenges with infectious diseases, which hospitalize more service members each year than those wounded in combat. Effective prevention and rapid treatment are key elements in controlling outbreaks of infectious disease. The committee is encouraged by the progress the Department has made to address the treatment for infectious diseases that can benefit our warfighters, as well as affected civilian communities throughout the world, based on techniques utilizing ribonucleic acid that would be delivered directly to the body to produce a desired antigen or specific antibody. The committee encourages the Department to continue its research in this area and to look for further applications of this technology, which could lead to the ability to rapidly and inexpensively produce antigens and antibodies via chemical synthesis.

Rotorcraft degraded visual environment

The committee notes that the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2015 (division C of Public Law 113–235) appropriated an increase of $20.0 million above the budget request for the development or procurement of a degraded visual environment (DVE) system for rotorcraft programs. The committee is aware of the challenges that the military services face in regards to operating rotary winged aircraft in austere environmental conditions, including brown-out landings and marginal weather, while operating in difficult terrain. According to the Army, degraded visual environment conditions contribute to approximately 25 percent of its rotary wing mishaps. The committee notes that the Army's Special Operations Command (SOCOM) has made DVE a top priority, and that the Army is looking at leveraging the work that SOCOM has already performed in order to accelerate this capability across Army rotorcraft programs.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, that includes an update on Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force plans to integrate DVE capabilities into their respective rotorcraft and tilt-rotorcraft programs.

Secure cellular communications for senior leaders

The budget request contained $14.0 million in PE 33126K for long haul communications, including for the development and fielding of senior leader communications and mobility systems.

The committee is aware that the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) is responsible for developing, fielding and sus-

taining senior leader communications systems for the Department of Defense, the President and other senior leaders throughout the executive branch. This includes the Department's mobility program, which seeks to leverage commercial carrier infrastructure to provide entry points for both classified and unclassified wireless capabilities. The committee understands that in fiscal year 2017, DISA plans to continue testing and evaluation of mobile device management capabilities, and full deployment of the Device Mobility Classified Capability. The committee is concerned that the current fielding plan is not being fully implemented with the priority such capabilities require. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of DISA to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Service and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on the status of this program by July 1, 2016. This update should include the current schedule for development, identification of the requirement for the needed number of devices, and the fielding schedule to users for the next 24 months. This briefing should also address any funding challenges, or policy impediments to fielding that satisfies the full articulated requirement.

The committee recommends $19.0 million, an increase of $5.0 million, in PE 33126K to support the development and implementation of a top secret secure voice cellular solution for senior government leaders.

Small turbine engines for missile programs

The committee understands the critical importance of small turbine engines in missile programs, and believes that continued innovation in this technology will help the United States to better maintain its technological edge in the area of precision guided missile systems. In order to encourage innovation, the committee supports robust competition in this area. While foreign competition does exist, the committee believes that the United States needs to retain a technology leadership role in this strategic technology sector. The committee notes that small turbine engines are in many ways more challenging than large turbine engines because of high rotational speeds, limited volume for combustion, larger leakage paths relative to the size of the turbomachinery, storage requirements, and on-wing starting requirements. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to explore ways to create additional competition among domestic suppliers in the area of small turbine engines, and in particular small turbine engines for missile programs.

Social media analysis cell

The budget request contained $148.2 million in PE 63648D8Z for joint concept technology demonstrations (JCTD).

The committee is aware that the mission of the Joint Concept Technology Demonstration program is to support the identification, development, and demonstration of forward looking concepts to satisfy multiservice and combatant command priorities through rapid prototyping and experimentation. The JCTD program has a track record of exploring new concepts and technologies at low risk, but with major payoff to testing these concepts without the risks and cost associated with new acquisition programs. In addition to providing some limited residual capability for users, JCTDs can be

useful in informing requirements and reducing the risk for future, follow-on acquisition efforts.

The committee further notes that an area of growing concern is the monitoring and assessment of adversarial propaganda and misinformation, which can be highly effective at masking the intent and activities of adversarial actors. The committee is concerned that there has been limited application of new technologies or concepts in this space, especially in the use of ever-increasing data from social media sources that can be leveraged to amplify and inform other warning, force protection and battlespace awareness activities of the Department of Defense. The committee believes that the use of social media analysis capabilities should be explored in a relevant operational environment to experiment and determine the possible value to military operations.

Therefore, the committee recommends $158.2 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63648D8Z to demonstrate technologies and concepts for a social media analysis capability to support the needs of the Commander of U.S. European Command.

Strategic Capabilities Office

The budget request contained $844.9 million in PE 64250D8Z for development activities of the Strategic Capabilities Office (SCO).

Created in 2012 by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, SCO has the mission to identify, analyze, demonstrate, and transition game-changing applications of existing and near-term technology to shape and counter emerging threats. SCO is comprised of a relatively small number of personnel and relies on other program office personnel and resources to execute its mission. The committee appreciates the nature of SCO's mission and sustained leanness of the organization; however, the committee notes the budget for SCO has grown exponentially each fiscal year. For example, the fiscal year 2017 budget request is nearly double the request for fiscal year 2016.

The committee is concerned that such rapid budget growth may bring with it some risks, including the demands on SCO's small staff, demands on other Department of Defense personnel, and impact of SCO decisions on existing programs. For example, the committee is aware of SCO's inclusion on the electromagnetic railgun development, and subsequent reprioritizing of its planned investment in that program for fiscal year 2017, resulting in a funding gap that could not be covered by the program office.

Additionally, the committee remains concerned that the transition of technologies from SCO has not been adequately captured and conveyed to the oversight committees. The report required by the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 has not been delivered and is now almost 6 months late. In order to support prudent use of taxpayer resources, and to ensure proper oversight of these activities, the committee believes this report should be provided and concerns addressed before supporting full funding of planned activities.

Therefore, the committee recommends $804.9 million, a decrease of $40.0 million, in PE 64250D8Z for development activities of the Strategic Capabilities Office.

Technology enablers for directed energy weapon systems

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has made significant advances in the development and operational demonstration of directed energy weapons systems. Each military department has demonstrated a marquee program in this area, such as the Navy's Laser Weapon System deployed on the USS *Ponce*, the Army High Energy Laser Mobile Demonstrator, and the Marine Corps' Ground Based Air Defense System. Along with technology demonstration activities like the Robust Electric Laser Initiative and the High Energy Liquid Laser Area Defense System, each of these programs demonstrated the increased power output and power on target necessary to develop a militarily useful directed energy weapon.

However, as the Department has made progress in raising the power levels of these systems, it has also demonstrated the need for emphasis on development in other technology areas necessary to realize the full potential of laser weapons. For example, higher power output requires improved beam control to engage targets at greater distances, as well as better thermal management systems to dissipate the increased heat load. As the Department has been overcoming foundational technical challenges, new challenges have emerged that will impact the operational uses for directed energy weapons.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, in coordination with the research components of the military departments and the High Energy Laser Joint Technology Office, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 20, 2017. This briefing should provide a roadmap for enabling technologies, including:

(1) Beam directors and adaptive optics, including deformable mirrors;

(2) Thermal management needs and capabilities;

(3) Integration challenges with fire control systems, including potential future needs for fire control for laser systems;

(4) Power architectures and power electronics needs;

(5) Facilities and test range capabilities; and

(6) Other areas as deemed by the Secretary.

Third Offset Strategy

The committee supports the Department of Defense Third Offset Strategy development efforts. As the Deputy Secretary of Defense has described it, the Third Offset Strategy is focused on strengthening conventional deterrence against great powers through targeted technology investments and new operational and organizational constructs.

The committee is encouraged by the Department's technology investments, including those within the Strategic Capabilities Office (SCO) that adapt existing weapon systems in new ways to get game-changing capabilities into the field more quickly. These efforts align well with the committee's acquisition reform initiatives discussed elsewhere in this Act. The committee is also encouraged by the Department's increased emphasis on wargaming and on strategic initiatives to better understand Russian and Chinese military thinking.

The committee believes that the Third Offset Strategy effort is a useful vehicle for focusing the Department on how to deter and counter the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China. Much of this focus has been on technology; however, the committee also believes that further attention must be given to strategic thinking about deterrence, including the relationship between conventional and nuclear deterrence, and the relationship between deterrence and assurance.

The committee encourages the Secretary to review the Department's ability to support rapid decision making and agile force employment, as the committee recognizes that future near-peer conflicts are likely to unfold faster, across multiple regions and warfighting domains. The committee also encourages the Secretary to engage the military services as it recognizes that, for the Third Offset effort to be successful, the military services must embrace it.

Lastly, the committee is concerned about any Third Offset efforts that distract from the primary focus on deterring Russia and China. While the committee acknowledges the benefits of Silicon Valley outreach for technology innovation, particularly through the Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUx), it believes that such commercial technology will not provide an enduring warfighting advantage over near-peer adversaries.

Transition of biosurveillance prototype

The committee understands the importance of biosurveillance tools at U.S. military installations throughout the world to provide installation commanders with early, high-confidence detection and increased situational awareness. The committee is aware of the recent efforts by the Department of Defense to develop a 3-year advanced technology demonstration of biosurveillance technology for deployment on the Korean Peninsula, known as the Joint U.S. Forces in Korea Portal and Integrated Threat Recognition (JUPITR).

The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to rapidly integrate, test, and demonstrate cutting-edge technologies to develop strengthened biosurveillance capabilities to meet these critical force protection needs. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to use advanced technology demonstrations to rapidly integrate and evaluate emerging technologies in biological and chemical defense. The committee also encourages the Department of Defense to leverage the advanced technology demonstration efforts to quickly field JUPITR to the U.S. Forces Korea, and to ensure that relevant technologies from JUPITR are transitioned into programs of record. The committee recommends that the Department of Defense collaborate with other U.S. Government partners, including the Department of Homeland Security, to share the results of the JUPITR demonstration with relevant programs implementing biosurveillance to meet homeland security requirements.

Treatment of traumatic brain injury

The committee is aware of the magnitude of traumatic brain injuries (TBI) sustained by service members, both in deployed and non-deployed environments. TBI accounts for approximately 20 to 25 percent of documented combat casualties in the wars in the Re-

public of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee continues to support the Department of Defense's many efforts to investigate the mechanisms of traumatic brain injuries and develop mitigation/prevention strategies. The committee is aware that pre-clinical research has recently demonstrated that induced therapeutic hypothermia is a promising neuroprotective strategy for treating TBI by effectively reducing increases in intracranial pressure and cellular damage caused by injury/trauma. The committee encourages the Department to continue their diverse TBI research programs, and supports the development and deployment of technologies that can be used to provide additional TBI treatments, including induced therapeutic hypothermia, to our service members. Further, the committee remains concerned about the long-term effects of TBI, particularly multiple occurrences of TBI, on members of the Armed Forces. Peer-reviewed research has demonstrated a link between multiple traumatic brain injuries and the onset of dementia, and has suggested a link to Alzheimer's disease later in life. The committee understands that the Department of Defense has undertaken research to investigate the relationship between traumatic brain injury and Alzheimer's disease. The committee commends this effort and encourages the Department to continue funding such projects.

United States-Israel Anti-tunnel cooperation

The committee notes that section 1606 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) authorized a new, joint United States-Israel anti-tunneling program to protect United States and Israel forces from terrorist attacks.

The Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low-Intensity Conflict stated during a March 1, 2016, House Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing that the U.S. and Israel plan to execute 17 counter-tunnel projects for tunnel detection, tunnel mapping, and intelligence collection. At the same hearing, the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command stated that the subterranean threat is used by terrorists, but also affects other mission areas. The committee continues to support this program; however, the committee is aware that none of the funds authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2016 have been executed as of April 27, 2016.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than June 30, 2016, as to the status of United States-Israel anti-tunnel cooperation, including:

(1) The status of the Memorandum of Agreement;

(2) The full plan for project development;

(3) The current plan for expenditure of funds, including an identification of entities that will be receiving or have received funds; and

(4) A clarification of future requirements.

Unmanned advanced capability combat aircraft and ground combat vehicles

Section 220 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) mandated a

goal, regarding unmanned advanced capability combat aircraft and ground combat vehicles, that by the year 2010, one-third of the aircraft in the operational deep strike force fleet would be unmanned, and that by year 2005, one-third of the operational ground combat vehicles would be unmanned.

Congress subsequently requested reports outlining the Department's progress towards achieving these goals in 2006 and 2008. The committee notes that there has been no update provided by the Department since 2008.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, no later than September 15, 2016, on the Department's progress in meeting the congressionally mandated goal. The briefing shall include an assessment of progress towards meeting the goals identified for the subset of unmanned air and ground systems established in section 220 of Public Law 106–398, as well as an assessment of existing, viable unmanned ground vehicle technologies that can be economically used for making significant progress toward the achievement of the 2001 goal within the next 5 years.

U.S. Special Operations Command rapid prototyping and SOFWERX initiative

The committee notes that the SOFWERX initiative and facility within U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) creates a forum for accelerating the delivery of innovative capabilities to U.S. Special Operations Forces (USSOF) by engaging industry, academia, and Government laboratories, as well as hosting innovation and rapid prototyping sessions designed to overcome seemingly intractable problems. The committee notes that these sessions have started to refine and inform current and future USSOF requirements, as well as acquisition and engineering decisions, while increasing the potential to field capabilities faster. The committee applauds this revolutionary approach, which was established by USSOCOM in September 2015 using a Partnership Intermediary Agreement, as defined within section 3715 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee understands that each project within the SOFWERX facility is funded via related research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) programs, including $0.5 million funded by the Tactical Assault Light Operator Suit effort, and an additional $2.0 million for fiscal year 2016 within PE 1160402BB, Advanced Technology Demonstrations. For fiscal year 2017, the committee notes that USSOCOM expects to spend $2.5 million from the Operations and Maintenance, Defense-Wide account for SOFWERX facility and support, although RDT&E efforts are not defined. While these initial investments for SOFWERX appear to be low-dollar thresholds, the committee encourages USSOCOM to seek cost-sharing agreements and cost-saving measures with other Department of Defense entities, such as those within each military service, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or other non-traditional funding sources when appropriate. The committee encourages USSOCOM to limit growth and overhead of this initiative to ensure affordability across the Future Years Defense Program, and expects to be kept fully and currently informed of the many initiatives expected to spiral from SOFWERX. The committee

also expects to be informed of how USSOCOM is sharing technological advances and lessons learned about incentivizing innovation across the Department. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2016, on SOFWERX and associated RDT&E efforts.

Utilization of electromagnetic spectrum

The committee is aware of and encouraged by Department of Defense efforts to better utilize the electromagnetic spectrum (EMS) to meet both current and future requirements. The 2014 Department of Defense EMS Strategy and efforts by the Defense Information Systems Agency recognize that appropriate spectrum utilization is critical to efficient operations across all warfighting domains. To meet these challenges, the Department has appropriately set objectives that expedite the development of technologies that allow spectrum sharing, increase spectrum efficiency gains, and access wider frequency ranges. The committee is also aware that pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–72), $500.0 million in spectrum relocation fund proceeds were made available to all Federal agencies for activities intended to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of spectrum use. The committee encourages the Department to utilize this and other funding to develop and deploy EMS mitigating technology, such as solid state transmitters, which have the potential to address known spectrum sharing and spillage issues with Navy radar systems.

V–22 defensive weapons integration analysis

The budget request contained $174.4 million in PE 64262N for V–22 research and development, but contained no funds for development and integration of defensive weapon systems.

The committee notes that various models of the V–22 support tactical airlift requirements for special operations and general purpose forces of the Department of Defense. However, the committee is concerned that given the emerging flexibility the V–22 has exhibited in multiple contingency and training operations, the aircraft may be unintentionally limited by its lack of defensive weapons and having to rely upon other airborne armed assets to provide escort during tactical airlift infiltration and exfiltration operations. The committee understands that options may exist to develop and integrate defensive weapons capability onto V–22 platforms, but the Department has not coalesced in deriving mutual requirements that could satisfy each of the services within the Department that utilize the capabilities of the V–22.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Secretary of the Navy and the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, that specifies all requirements for V–22 defensive weapon capabilities within the Department of Defense, and provides an analysis of viable alternatives that could be implemented to fulfill those requirements. The analysis should examine alternatives that could ensure a full, fair, and open competition among qualified vendors that utilizes an expedited timeline, encouraging innovation, affordability, and enhancing the versatility of the V–22.

Vector geo-location technologies for Special Operations Command

The committee recognizes that the Joint Threat Warning System (JTWS) provides credible threat warning and intelligence information to special operations forces (SOF) that is key to providing enhanced situational awareness, force protection, and time-sensitive intelligence for targeting to supported SOF elements. The committee is concerned that the current JTWS-Air Variant System provides Precision Geo-location (PGL) coverage only in the very high frequency (VHF)/ultra high frequency (UHF) bands, and does not provide PGL coverage in the high frequency (HF) band, a band being increasingly utilized globally to target and compromise SOF missions. The committee is concerned that traditional geo-location techniques do not provide time-critical, instantaneous, and accurate results, and often require the use of two or more SOF aircraft.

The committee understands that a new technology, called Vector Geo-location (VGL), has been successfully demonstrated in the HF band in a single airborne platform. Although one of the prototypes was capable of operating in a tri-band mode, it has not been demonstrated in the VHF or UHF band due to insufficient development of calibration techniques in those bands. The committee is encouraged by these results and believes that the U.S. Special Operations Command should continue to develop VGL technologies for use in all three bands, including completing development of calibration techniques in the VHF/UHF bands, ruggedizing the system, and completing final flight testing.

OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE

Items of Special Interest

Range capabilities for emerging advanced technologies

The committee recognizes that the Major Range and Test Facility Base (MRTFB) is a critical component to military technological superiority, and key to ensuring U.S. warfighting capability. This designated core set of Department of Defense Test and Evaluation (T&E) infrastructure, and its associated workforce, is a critical capability to be preserved in order to conduct necessary T&E analyses to support the Department's acquisition process. The committee recognizes that the MRTFB must remain sized, operated, and maintained to preserve core, governmental T&E capabilities, but should also be developed over time to meet future technology needs of the Department.

The committee is concerned that due to the increased need for protected airspace, as well as increasingly outmoded range technology, many test facilities are difficult to maintain. For example, the open-air test ranges of the MRTFB are not capable of supporting the full spectrum of development testing required for fifth and sixth generation weapon systems, including testing of hypersonic systems, which have been identified as critically important to the third offset strategy. These systems require significant increases in size of contiguous airspace availability, test tracking and data acquisition capabilities, and threat capabilities that exceed current ranges capabilities.

Across the military services, the gaps in range capabilities to meet evolving requirements are growing rapidly. The military serv-

ices are under pressure to manage modernization of range capabilities to budgets that do not always account for changing technology needs to meet future requirements. Additionally, it is anticipated that the need for increased use of the MRTFB's ranges with large airspace footprints will continue to increase, to support realistic training environments critical to readiness of operational forces. This presents the ranges with growing scheduling capacity challenges, pitting priorities for operational readiness of today's forces against priorities of fielding new system capabilities required to sustain air dominance into the future.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Test Resource Management Center (TMRC) to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on the results of a comprehensive assessment of MRTFB needs and investments to meet testing required for fifth and sixth generation aircraft and air armament, including hypersonic strike weapons. This assessment should include the projected requirements of operational forces and other users dependent upon these ranges. The briefing should also include the estimated costs to implement capabilities required to support current and projected future operations, and a plan for ensuring sufficient capacity through a MRTFB range investment plan. Additionally, the committee encourages the TRMC to use the results of this assessment to inform future budget certifications from the military departments and Department of Defense agencies.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 201—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation at the levels identified in section 4201 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 211—Laboratory Quality Enhancement Program

This section would require the establishment of a Laboratory Quality Enhancement Program (LQEP) to support the analysis and implementation of current policies, as well as make recommendations for new initiatives to support the improvement and enhancement of the Department of Defense's Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratories. This section would also place responsibility for LQEP under the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering (ASD(R&E)), and would modify section 1114(a)(2)(C) in the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to align management of the laboratory demonstration program with the ASD(R&E).

Section 212—Mechanisms to Provide Funds for Defense Laboratories for Research and Development of Technologies for Military Missions

This section would modify the authorities set forth by section 219 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as amended by section 262 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), to set the level of funding at 3 percent of funds available; eliminate the termination date for this authority; and allow certain federally funded research and development centers to utilize this authority.

Section 213—Notification Requirement for Certain Rapid Prototyping, Experimentation, and Demonstration Activities

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to provide written notification to the congressional defense committees within 10 days before initiating a rapid prototyping, experimentation, or demonstration activity using funds from PE 63382N.

Section 214—Improved Biosafety for Handling of Select Agents and Toxins

This section would direct the Department of Defense to implement several improvements for handling of select agents and toxins, as recommended from an Army 15–6 investigative report on the individual and institutional accountability for the shipment of viable Bacillus Anthracis from Dugway Proving Ground. This section would require the Department to implement a quality assurance and quality control program for any facility producing biological select agents and toxins, and for the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2017, on the potential consolidation of facilities that work with biological select agents and toxins. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2017, on the effectiveness and completeness of the Department of Defense's actions taken to address the findings and recommendations of the Army 15–6 investigation.

Section 215—Modernization of Security Clearance Information Technology Architecture

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and sustain a new security clearance information technology architecture to replace the legacy system of the Office of Personnel Management. Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense, Director of National Intelligence, and Director of the Office of Personnel Management to issue a governance charter to delineate responsibilities between organizations, as well as to review and revise as necessary the executive orders, statutes, and other authorities related to personnel security. This section would also require quarterly notifications to designated congressional committees until September 30, 2019.

Section 216—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction System Constellation

This section would prohibit the Department of Defense from obligating or expending any funds in fiscal year 2017 for research, development, and prototyping of the countering weapons of mass destruction situational awareness information system, known as "Constellation." This section would also require the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense, in consultation with the Director of the Defense Information Systems Agency, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2017, on the requirements and program plan for the Constellation system.

Section 217—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defense Innovation Unit Experimental

This section would limit the amount of authorized funds available to be obligated or expended for the Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUx) until the Secretary of Defense provides a report to the congressional defense committees on the charter for and the use of funds to establish and expand DIUx.

The committee is aware of the Department of Defense's efforts to increase outreach to and collaboration with sources of commercial innovation throughout the United States. The committee recognizes that commercial innovation is not only a significant driver for the economy, but also provides significant contributions to national security. The committee has been supportive of mechanisms for tapping into the nontraditional defense contractor community, which includes commercial start-ups and other companies that have not typically focused on the defense market. The committee notes that the administrative and regulatory barriers that are in place within the acquisition system often act as moats to keep these innovation players out, rather than a bridge into the national security sector.

The committee believes DIUx to be a helpful step in bridging those communities, but is concerned by the pinpoint focus on one geographic region, as well as the dedication of significant funding at such a nascent period in the development of this organization and the concept on which it was founded. The committee is concerned that outreach is proceeding without sufficient attention being paid to breaking down the barriers that have traditionally prevented nontraditional contractors from supporting defense needs, like lengthy contracting processes and the inability to transition technologies. Furthermore, the committee is concerned that the focus on this initiative is occurring without sufficient guidance, oversight, and coordination with and into the various laboratories, engineering centers, and existing state and local innovation centers that by necessity must also bridge into this community. The committee believes that focusing on laying a solid foundation for DIUx and its interaction with communities and the Department of Defense enterprise is critical to ensuring effectiveness, especially if such initiatives will be expanded to include other locations.

Section 218—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Tactical Combat Training System Increment II

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of 20 percent of the funds for the Tactical Combat Training System (TCTS) Increment II program until the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of the Air Force comply with section 235 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

Public Law 114–92 required the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a detailed report to the congressional defense committees by January 29, 2016, on the baseline and alternatives to the TCTS Increment II program of the Navy. The report was to include cost estimates and schedule comparisons, as well as a review of joint Department of the Air Force and Department of the Navy investment in live, virtual, constructive, advanced air combat training. The committee notes that failure to comply with this reporting requirement in a timely manner has impacted the committee's ability to conduct needed oversight on this program's acquisition strategy. The committee is aware the Navy expects to award an engineering and manufacturing development contract for TCTS Increment II in fiscal year 2016. The committee expects this award will be executed through full and open competition in order to allow for the maximum number of proposals.

Section 219—Restructuring of the Distributed Common Ground System of the Army

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to discontinue development efforts for any component of the Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) of the Army after Increment 1 where commercial software exists that is capable of fulfilling at least 80 percent of the system requirements. This section would also require a review of the acquisition strategy to ensure commercial software procurement is the preferred method to meet program requirements. This section would also prohibit the development of any capability for DCGS if such capability is available for purchase in the commercial market.

Section 220—Designation of Department of Defense Senior Official with Principal Responsibility for Directed Energy Weapons

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate a senior official already serving within the Department of Defense as the official with principal responsibility for the development and demonstration of directed energy weapons for the Department, as well as any other responsibilities set forth by the Secretary.

SUBTITLE C—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 231—Strategy for Assured Access to Trusted Microelectronics

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a strategy for developing and acquiring trusted microelectronics from various sources by 2020. This section would further require the Secretary to submit such a strategy to the congressional defense committees not later than 1 year after the date

of the enactment of this Act. The Secretary of Defense would also be required to certify by September 30, 2020, that the Department has implemented the recommendations of the strategy, and has created an assured means of accessing sufficient supply of trusted microelectronics.

Section 232—Pilot Program on Evaluation of Commercial Information Technology

This section would require the Defense Information Systems Agency to establish a pilot program to evaluate commercially available information technology tools to better understand and characterize their potential impact on Department of Defense networks and computing environments through prototyping, experimentation, operational demonstration, military user assessment, or other means to get quantitative and qualitative feedback on the commercial item.

Section 233—Pilot Program for the Enhancement of the Laboratories and Test and Evaluation Centers of the Department of Defense

This section would allow the Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force to jointly carry out a pilot program to demonstrate methods for the more effective development of research, development, test, and evaluation functions.

Section 234—Pilot Program on Modernization of Electromagnetic Spectrum Warfare Systems and Electronic Warfare Systems

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program on the modernization of spectrum warfare systems and electronic warfare systems.

Section 235—Independent Review of F/A–18 Physiological Episodes and Corrective Actions

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to establish an independent review team to review the Navy's data on, and mitigation efforts related to, the increase in F/A–18 physiological events since January 1, 2009. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2017, on the findings of the review team.

Section 236—Study on Helicopter Crash Prevention and Mitigation Technology

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with a federally funded research and development center to conduct a study on technologies with the potential to prevent and mitigate helicopter crashes.

Section 237—Report on Electronic Warfare Capabilities

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, acting through the Electronic Warfare Executive Committee, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report by April 1, 2017, on future electronic warfare concepts and technologies.

TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OVERVIEW

Due to the consistently high pace of operations, coupled with significant downsizing of some of the military services, the committee over the past several years has witnessed a disturbing decline in readiness of U.S. forces to meet their core missions. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have stated that rebuilding readiness is an overarching priority, and last year submitted to Congress plans for readiness recovery.

The committee is concerned that the relentless high operational tempo continues to challenge the military services' readiness recovery plans. The committee was alarmed to hear, in testimony before the committee this year, increasingly blunt warnings from Department of Defense officials about the impact this tempo is having on a smaller force with limited resources. While the military service chiefs claim they can adequately respond to the current requirement for forces, they warn that the risks in meeting the time-phased requirements of some critical operational plans have increased and will continue to increase over time as their forces shrink.

In order to address the Department's readiness concerns and mitigate at least some of this risk, this Act would provide additional budget authority for multiple unfunded priorities of the military departments, to include additions to all of the military services' training and maintenance accounts, particularly aviation readiness. Facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization accounts, an area the Department has underfunded for years, also would receive sizeable increases in funding.

This Act also would make several policy changes to enhance readiness and improve oversight. For example, it would provide shipyards, depots, and arsenals temporary direct and other hiring authorities to allow these facilities to quickly fill critical civilian manpower shortages. It also directs several assessments of the military departments' plans to build readiness, enhance exercises, and modernize training requirements.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

BUDGET REQUEST ADJUSTMENTS

Base Realignment and Closure Request for Fiscal Year 2019

The budget request included $3.53 million, in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, to support a request to conduct a new round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) to align infrastructure with planned force structure changes. The requested funds would be used to develop recommendations and to manage BRAC efforts.

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

Ship Repair Capability in the Western Pacific

The Asia-Pacific rebalance strategy has increased forward deployment of U.S. Navy forces in the Western Pacific region, including the homeporting of additional *Los Angeles* and *Virginia* class fast-attack submarines and a second submarine tender, as well as the deployment of additional ballistic missile destroyers and a near-permanent rotation of Littoral Combat Ship vessels in the region. However, the committee notes that dry-docking capabilities have not followed ship deployments. Dry-docking capabilities currently exist only in Hawaii and on the West Coast of the United States, requiring surface and subsurface vessels to be removed from the Western Pacific theater for at least an additional 2 to 3 weeks. The commander of U.S. Pacific Command testified in February 2016 that dry-docking capabilities in the Western Pacific are a matter of strategic importance and an operational necessity for Pacific Fleet. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of $9.5 million in Operation and Maintenance, Navy, Ship Depot Maintenance, to be applied to chartering a dry dock to meet maintenance requirements for the Western Pacific fleet.

ENERGY ISSUES

Alternatively Financed Energy Projects

The committee notes that the Department of Defense is the largest energy consumer in the Federal Government. According to the Department's 2015 Annual Energy Management Report, the Department spent $4.20 billion on facilities energy in fiscal year 2014. The Department has reported that its dependence on the commercial power grid leaves the Department vulnerable to service disruptions that can impact core military and national defense missions involving power projection. To mitigate the potential impacts to critical mission functions, the Department has leveraged a variety of authorities to diversify the supply of energy through renewable and alternative sources and improve energy security by addressing the threat of commercial grid disruption with on-site generating capacity and the development of microgrids.

The Department has increasingly used alternative financing arrangements to fund infrastructure related to renewable and alternative energy generation, energy efficiency, and energy security of military installations. These alternative financing arrangements rely on private capital of energy service companies to fund the upfront investment of such projects in lieu of using appropriated funds. Generally, the installation repays the cost of the project using appropriated funds based on the cost savings attributable to the energy project or on the utility rates paid by the Department. For example, in 2012 the Government Accountability Office reported in "Renewable Energy Project Financing: Improved Guidance and Information Sharing Needed for DOD Project-Level Officials'" (GAO–12–401) that a naval air station relied on an energy services company to use an energy savings performance contract to obtain private capital to fund installation of ground source heat pumps, and an Army base financed a wind turbine project using a utility energy services contract. The Government Accountability Office more recently reported, in "Energy Savings Performance Con-

tracts: Additional Actions Needed to Improve Federal Oversight" (GAO–15–432), that in more than half of the cases reviewed, contractors overstated the savings attributable to energy savings performance contracts.

The Government Accountability Office findings raise concerns about the financial performance of these projects and the extent of fiscal exposure the Department is experiencing by using appropriated funds in their budgets to repay contractors on these alternative financing arrangements. In order to better understand the extent of this exposure and any benefits obtained, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the extent to which the Department of Defense is effectively leveraging appropriations to repay developers for alternatively financed energy savings, efficiency, or generating capacity projects, and at a minimum answer the following questions:

(1) What energy savings, efficiency, or generating capacity projects have been financed with alternative financing arrangements since 2012 and what is known about the estimated value of the projects?

(2) What is known about the extent to which estimated savings or other efficiencies have materialized for these alternatively financed projects since 2012?

(3) How does the Department protect its financial interests by ensuring that the savings reported by the contractors in alternatively financed energy projects accurately reflect project financial and efficiency performance?

(4) Since 2012, what proportion of the installations' utilities budgets have been encumbered to repay contractors in energy savings performance contracts, utilities energy services contracts, or other alternative project financing and for how many years, and what has the trend been since that time?

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to submit the study results to the congressional defense committees by April 17, 2017.

Energy Assurance for Department of Defense

The committee notes the importance for the Department of Defense to have the ability to recover from utility disruptions that impact mission assurance on its installations. In a globally linked battlespace, the committee recognizes that a disruption to the electrical supply at an installation in the United States can impact core military and national defense missions involving power projection, defense of the homeland, or operations that are forward deployed. Therefore, the committee is supportive of efforts by the Department of Defense and encourages the Department to leverage and integrate existing authorities to ensure installations have resilient, available, reliable, and continuous power during disruptions to the electrical supply. Such actions and investments should prioritize facilities supporting mission critical functions and be done through an enterprise approach and in a manner that is cost-effective and based on assessed vulnerabilities.

Expeditionary Power Management Systems

The committee recognizes the unique requirements that the Department of Defense has for powering equipment and weapon systems operating in a deployed environment. Many of these systems rely on batteries as their sole source of power, which may require a deployed unit to carry numerous replacement batteries while out on mission, or rely on more frequent resupply to support an operation. The committee is aware that the services, particularly the Army and the Marine Corps, have been focused on the development and fielding of energy-related technologies aimed at extending range and endurance, increasing flexibility, resilience, and force protection, while enhancing mobility and freedom of action in a deployed environment. The committee is supportive of these efforts and believes the Department should continue to focus on cost-effective investments that enhance combat capabilities and strengthen energy resiliency.

Integration of Installation Energy Authorities

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has a variety of statutory authorities that can be used to fulfill the Department's installation energy needs, including authorities ranging from third-party financing to capital investment using appropriated dollars. The committee notes that the Department of Defense's Annual Energy Management Report, issued in May 2015, states that the Department's first priority for its energy program is supporting the ability of the Department to carry out the mission, focusing its efforts through three pillars: expanding supply, reducing demand, and adapting future forces and technology. While the committee supports the mission assurance priority, the committee is concerned that the initiatives being pursued by the Department have not fully integrated these three pillars into a unified line of effort. The committee encourages the Department to interpret and integrate its existing authorities to support a holistic approach, focusing on projects and initiatives that integrate efficiencies, generation, storage, and infrastructure modernization at military installations.

Marine and Hydrokinetic Technology

The committee commends the U.S. Navy's exploration of ocean renewable energy, including marine and hydrokinetic energy systems, and notes the value of investing in alternative energy research with potential operational and fiscal benefits. The Navy is encouraged to continue its support for development of marine and hydrokinetic technologies, including research, testing, and demonstration of maritime security systems, at-sea persistent surveillance and communications systems, and exploring opportunities to reduce the cost of energy and increase tactical energy security at coastal Department of Defense facilities and forward deployed assets. Further, the Navy is encouraged to support research, testing, and demonstration activities of marine and hydrokinetic energy systems at existing U.S. open ocean test facilities and Department of Energy designated National Marine Renewable Energy Centers, which are capable of scale and full-scale device testing.

Procurement of Alternative Fuels

The committee continues to believe that the procurement of alternative fuels for operational purposes by the Department of Defense should be pursued only when the fully burdened cost of such fuels is cost-competitive with conventional fuels. Most recently, section 311 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) codified this requirement, which was previously a non-binding policy of the Department. The committee is aware that prior to the enactment of Public Law 114–92, the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) awarded bulk fuel contracts for the Rocky Mountain/West Coast 2015 purchase program that included alternative fuel. While DLA has stated that procurement of this alternative fuel was cost-competitive with conventional fuels, the committee believes additional information is needed to understand how DLA determines how the price of a fuel is cost-competitive in compliance with the requirements of section 311 of Public Law 114–92.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee not later than March 1, 2017, that addresses, at a minimum, how DLA evaluates and determines whether an alternative fuel is cost-competitive with conventional fuels, what criteria are used to calculate the fully burdened cost of fuel, and how funds provided by the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture factor into DLA's analysis of whether an alternative fuel is cost-competitive. The briefing should also include the total amount of CCC funds that have been used by the Department of Defense to adjust the final laid down price of bulk fuel procurement.

Small Modular Reactors

The committee recognizes that nuclear power is a reliable alternative power source and understands that small modular reactors (SMRs) under development may also provide safe and reliable nuclear power sources for the Department of Defense. The committee believes that the use of SMRs could be useful in meeting the Department's energy assurance goals by helping ensure installations have resilient, available, reliable, and continuous power. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an evaluation of and provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2017, on the life-cycle cost effectiveness of using SMRs to power military installations through a commercial power supply arrangement. At minimum, the evaluation and report should address the economic feasibility of siting SMRs on the commercial electric grid and supplying power to military installations with peak power demands of 40 megawatts or greater and review the use of power purchase agreements needed to facilitate utility ownership of SMRs that supply power to those military installations. The Secretary should scope the evaluation as necessary to include the most practical and feasible military installations in question, and focus on those SMR technologies that are likely to become commercially available before 2025.

LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT ISSUES

Defective Spare Parts

The Department of Defense Inspector General (DODIG) found, in a report dated February 23, 2016, that Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) Aviation did not pursue and obtain appropriate restitution for a projected 269 stock numbers and at least $12.3 million in costs for which contractors supplied defective parts. The DODIG reported this occurred because DLA Aviation lacked sufficient controls and oversight. In addition, the DODIG found that defective parts were left unaccounted for in the Department of Defense supply system, negatively affecting warfighter readiness and safety.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the DLA plan to address problems identified in the February 2016 DODIG report and submit the report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2017. Specifically, the report should assess whether the plan includes sufficient controls and oversight to ensure DLA Aviation logistics and acquisition personnel:

(1) Coordinate to pursue restitution from contractors that provide defective parts, to the extent that such efforts are cost effective;

(2) Adequately search the Department of Defense inventory to identify and remove defective parts;

(3) Return defective parts to responsible contractors for replacement; and

(4) Track the status of defective parts shipped back to contractors and ensure that appropriate restitution is provided in the form of replacement parts.

Additionally, the committee directs the DLA Director to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than October 1, 2016, on a plan of action, with milestones, to improve DLA Aviation's process to identify defective spare parts and for requesting repair and replacement of the defective parts. The briefing also should include the results of DLA's review of all stock numbers with associated product-quality deficiency reports closed between January 2014 and November 2015 where DLA's investigation concluded that the contractor provided defective parts. The briefing should include how DLA focused on high-value items as well as mission-critical items and what actions are being taken to pursue appropriate restitution and remove all defective parts from the Department of Defense supply system.

Discrepancies in the Transportation of Hazardous Material

The committee remains concerned about documentation and packaging discrepancies in the Department of Defense's system for transportation of hazardous material. In the Department's response to Government Accountability Office (GAO) Report 14–375 ("DOD Needs to Take Actions to Improve the Transportation of Hazardous Material"), the Department reported that some Department of Defense personnel and commercial shippers lack experience and training on hazardous material documentation and packaging. For example, contracts do not specify when vendors must prepare hazardous material for air shipment or how to prepare required documentation and packaging, and they are not instructed to use a

standardized virtual shipping module website. GAO noted human error is the principal cause for inaccurate, incorrect, or incomplete hazardous material shipment documentation.

Therefore, the committee urges the Department to implement a uniform, commercially available automated solution that will enable hazardous material shippers to manage, document, and ship material to and from Department of Defense facilities in full compliance with regulations while minimizing delays, lost time, confusion, and paperwork. The automated solution system should be one that can be continuously updated with the latest regulations and allow shippers to store data including classification information, safety data sheets, and the emergency response guidebook. The committee notes that a commercially available automated solution could help shippers save time by storing contracts, auto-filling templates for shipped materials, and validating shipping forms for error-free transport and reception.

Enhanced Decision Analysis for Weapons System Sustainment

The committee supports the Navy's commitment to measure proficiency as a critical gauge of readiness through the use of enhanced decision analysis capabilities for weapons system sustainment such as the Readiness Cost Analysis Tool (RCAT) initiative. The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development, and Acquisition) to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by August 30, 2016, on the benefits gleaned from RCAT analysis. The briefing should include, but not be limited to, a statement of the current funding profile of this initiative as well as potential courses of action to accelerate or streamline the current strategy for further implementation of this initiative.

F–35 Sustainment

The committee recognizes the importance of the F–35 Lightning II Program as the future of tactical air for the Department of Defense. With total life-cycle costs estimated to be more than $1.2 trillion, just under $900.00 billion of those costs are estimated to come from the operation and support of the aircraft. In July 2015, the Marine Corps declared its F–35B aircraft both operational and deployable. However, the committee notes this declaration was made without meeting certain operational criteria required by the Marine Corps and without comprehensive deployability testing of the aircraft. The Marine Corps' deployment of its first squadron of aircraft to Marine Corps Air Station Iwakuni, Japan, in 2017, will be the first opportunity to prove operational concepts not only for the Marine Corps, but also global sustainment concepts for the Air Force and Navy, who will deploy the F–35 after the Marine Corps.

Given the significance of the F–35 program to the future of tactical air for the military, and the Department's need to operate and deploy the F–35 on a widespread basis in the coming years, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a preliminary briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the following factors, not later than January 17, 2017, with a report to follow. The briefing and report should review the

Department's ongoing F–35 deployment planning efforts and include:

(1) To what extent has the Department developed plans to support its initial F–35 deployment to Marine Corps Air Station Iwakuni, including those related to personnel, aircraft support equipment, infrastructure, and spare parts;

(2) To what extent will the Marine Corps' initial deployment to Marine Corps Air Station Iwakuni enable U.S. Pacific Command to meet its operational requirements;

(3) What challenges does the F–35 program face with its initial deployment to Marine Corps Air Station Iwakuni and to what extent does the Department have plans to measure success, challenges, and share lessons learned with the Air Force and Navy; and

(4) To what extent is F–35 support equipment, including the Autonomic Logistics Information System, prepared to deploy to overseas and austere locations.

Funding for Corrosion Control and Prevention

The committee has long supported the activities of the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight and the military departments' corrosion control and prevention executives in preventing and mitigating corrosion of the military equipment and infrastructure of the Department of Defense. One of the duties set forth in section 2228 of title 10, United States Code, for the director of the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight is to review the programs and funding levels proposed by the Secretary of each military department during the annual internal Department of Defense budget review process, as those programs and funding proposals relate to programs and funding for the prevention and mitigation of corrosion, and submit recommendations regarding those programs and proposed funding levels.

The committee is concerned that beginning with the fiscal year 2013 report to Congress, the Department no longer reported the number and costs of anti-corrosion projects submitted by the military departments to the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight that remained unfunded in the annual budget submission. Therefore, to ensure that Congress has the accurate and comprehensive information it needs to exercise its oversight responsibilities, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide in the annual corrosion budget report to Congress a more detailed explanation of the development of the Department of Defense's corrosion-related funding requirements.

Additionally, to enhance the Department's ability to make consistent and informed decisions in its management of the Technical Corrosion Collaboration (TCC) program in accordance with internal control standards, the committee directs the director of the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight to track and maintain accurate records that include funds used for the TCC program and retain such records in a format that can be easily examined to ensure that funding data will be accurately accounted for and reported in future reports, such as the annual budget report to Congress.

Implementation of Product Support Managers

Section 805 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) requires that product support managers (PSMs) be assigned to all major weapon systems and identifies key responsibilities for these individuals. PSMs are assigned to each major weapon system to help the Department of Defense ensure that it has effective sustainment strategies and processes to support the goals of maintaining its weapon systems' readiness and controlling costs throughout the life cycle of a system.

In April 2014, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported that the Department of Defense and the military services had taken steps to implement PSMs for major weapon systems, but certain aspects of the implementation process remain incomplete. For example, the Department does not fully know how, or to what extent, PSMs are affecting life-cycle sustainment decisions because it has not systematically collected and evaluated information on the effects PSMs are having on their assigned weapon systems. Also, the committee is aware of specific challenges the Army has faced in implementing PSMs, and GAO recommended that the Army needed to clarify the roles and responsibilities of certain personnel who support PSMs. This includes the reporting relationships of Army Materiel Command product support personnel assigned to Army weapon system program offices.

Given that operating and support costs historically account for about 70 percent of a weapon system's total life-cycle cost and the critical nature of the PSM in affecting life-cycle sustainment decisions, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the following and provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than February 1, 2017, on preliminary findings of the Comptroller General's evaluation and to submit a final report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on a date agreed to at the time of the briefing:

(1) How early and how often the Army and the other services are integrating PSMs into the development and acquisition of weapon systems;

(2) How the Army and the other services are integrating PSMs into the life-cycle management of weapon systems; and

(3) To what extent the Department of Defense and the Army have addressed GAO's prior recommendations concerning the implementation of PSMs, including measuring their impact on life-cycle sustainment decisions and clarifying PSM roles, responsibilities, and reporting relationships.

Integration of Operational Contract Support Matters in Joint Training Programs

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense recently conducted its third Joint Staff-sponsored Operational Contract Support (OCS) exercise. The committee applauds efforts by the Joint Staff Director of Logistics to advance senior-leader awareness of OCS and the need to integrate consideration of OCS into doctrine, policy, and strategic guidance. However, the committee is concerned that while the joint force commander is undeniably reliant on contract support to accomplish strategic and operational ends,

consideration of OCS, and its associated risks and benefits, has yet to be integrated into the organizational structure of the geographic and functional combatant commands. As a result, the commanders and their staffs lack the ability to integrate OCS requirements into operational plans, assess OCS readiness, and identify operational and strategic risks associated with reliance on contract support. Furthermore, exercise and training activities related to OCS have been focused on the acquisition and logistics communities, with little warfighter awareness, interest, or involvement.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to incorporate OCS matters (such as planning, requirements determination, risk analysis, contract support integration, readiness assessments, and contractor management) into all joint training programs designed to establish foundational competence in the conduct of campaigns and major operations. The committee believes that this directed focus on OCS in joint training programs will enable the joint force to leverage contract support to achieve operational and strategic effects and may reduce risks associated with reliance on contracting in contingency operations.

Item Unique Identification Policy Implementation

The committee is closely monitoring the Department of Defense's strategy for improving asset tracking and in-transit visibility and supports the Department's goal of enhancing asset visibility through item unique identification (IUID) and automatic identification technology (AIT)/automatic identification and data capture (AIDC) processes. The committee remains concerned, however, about the level of the Department's compliance with its own IUID policy as outlined in Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 8320.04 issued September 3, 2015. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to present a consolidated briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 1, 2016, regarding efforts to address the following responsibilities, as outlined in DODI 8320.04:

(1) The efforts of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to ensure IUID is integrated into acquisition programs;

(2) The efforts of the director of the Defense Logistics Agency to ensure their managed items identified as requiring IUID are appropriately marked and recorded in the Department of Defense IUID Registry;

(3) The efforts of the Deputy Chief Management Officer and the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer to integrate IUID policy and the Department of Defense IUID Registry into the Department of Defense Business Enterprise Architecture; and

(4) The efforts of the Secretaries of the military departments to identify focal points for IUID planning and implementation and efforts to ensure that service or agency managed items identified as requiring IUID are appropriately marked and recorded in the Department of Defense IUID Registry.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a legislative provision that would limit funding to the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) until the DMCA director provides a briefing to the congressional defense committees on the agency's plan to foster the adoption, implementation, and verification of the Department's re-

vised IUID policy across the Department and the defense industrial base.

Sustainment of Major Weapon Systems

The Department of Defense spends billions of dollars annually to sustain its major weapon systems in an effort to simultaneously support today's military operations and maintain the capability to meet future defense requirements. However, the committee recognizes that many of the Department's major weapon systems are aging and present sustainment challenges, including depot maintenance and supply support. For example, the Air Force is already operating many of its fighter and bomber aircraft well beyond their original designed service lives. Over the past several years, the Navy also has been confronted by serious sustainment challenges with the aging F/A–18 Hornet. The Army and the Marine Corps also have weapon systems, such as helicopters and amphibious assault vehicles that present similar sustainment challenges.

The Government Accountability Office currently conducts annual assessments of the Department's major defense acquisition programs, including information on the costs and schedule performance of selected major weapon systems. The committee finds these assessments invaluable in evaluating the Department's procurement of major weapon systems. The committee believes an examination of key aspects of the sustainment of selected major weapon systems would further complement this existing body of work.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Armed Services that evaluates:

(1) The condition of and sustainment strategies for selected major weapon systems;

(2) Major sustainment challenges affecting the condition of the selected major weapon systems;

(3) The Department's current and planned actions to address any identified challenges (for example, depot maintenance enhancements and efficiencies, supply support improvements, funding strategies); and

(4) Other related matters the Comptroller General deems appropriate.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to brief the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, on preliminary findings of the Comptroller General's evaluation, with the report to follow at a date to be determined at the time of the briefing.

READINESS ISSUES

Air Refueling Requirements

The committee notes that section 1054 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) required the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a business case analysis on converting the 168th Air Refueling Wing at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, to an Active Associate Wing. Congress has not received this report, which

was to be delivered 60 days after the date of the enactment of Public Law 113–291. The committee remains concerned that air refueling requirements may exceed capacity at Eielson Air Force Base. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than October 14, 2016, on the impact of air refueling operations at Eielson Air Force Base, an estimate of the ability to achieve air refueling requirements following the establishment of two F–35 squadrons in fiscal year 2020, and a business case analysis of the impact of these additional aircraft on refueling operations in the Alaska area-of-operations.

Armed Forces Sports Program and Service Academy Athletic Interns

The committee notes the significant end strength reductions the military services will continue to implement through fiscal year 2017. Although the committee provides the Department with a wide latitude of authority in order for the military services to execute their end strength reductions, the committee is concerned by the prioritization of some military sports programs. The committee believes these programs should be analyzed to determine the impact they may have on the readiness of units by allowing personnel to spend an extended period of time participating in sports programs instead of serving in their military occupational skill.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, on the impact that the Armed Forces Sports program has on the military services' readiness.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on the Armed Forces Sports program. At a minimum, the briefing shall include:

(1) The purpose of the program;

(2) Its measures of performance and effectiveness;

(3) The number of service members participating in the program;

(4) The cost of the program; and

(5) The number of days service members spend in the program.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on service academy athletic interns. At a minimum, the briefing shall include:

(1) The purpose of service academy graduate athletic interns;

(2) The number of service academy graduates who remain at the service academies for a full or partial year as an athletic intern;

(3) How the academies measure the performance and effectiveness of athletic interns;

(4) The cost to the academies to maintain graduate athletic interns; and

(5) The career impact to those who remain at the academies as athletic interns.

Army Aviation Multi-Component Pilot Program

The National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) recommended the Army develop "a substantial pilot program" to test multi-component approaches in the Army's aviation units. The committee believes that multi-component aviation units can improve readiness and enhance force integration by exploiting the differing strengths of the Regular Army and Reserve Components. The Army has begun limited use of multi-component approaches in aviation units with fixed-wing C–12 aircraft. Other co-located units, such as Black Hawk and Chinook helicopters in some States, allow units from different components to train together. The committee understands the Army is already pursuing implementation of the NCFA recommendation and is in the design phase of the pilot program. The committee applauds the Army's efforts to test the aviation multi-component approach and expects the Army to provide progress reports as requested by the committee on the initiative as it moves forward.

Assessment of Navy and Marine Corps Training Requirements

In the coming years, the Navy and Marine Corps will confront an increasingly complex security environment that will demand a wide range of missions, such as defeating terrorist organizations and responding to worldwide humanitarian crises. To meet these evolving challenges, the military services have developed plans to synchronize training and deployment schedules to improve readiness and are reemphasizing core training skills that degraded during a decade of counterinsurgency operations. However, factors such as equipment availability and access to training ranges can affect the services' ability to conduct training for their core capability areas. Moreover, the military services continue to face an environment of uncertain and constrained budgetary resources for the foreseeable future.

The committee is aware that some targeted investments have been made since fiscal year 2013 to improve training readiness but remains concerned about the ability of the Navy and the Marine Corps—to include Navy and Marine Corps Reserve—to balance training investments with available resources. As a result, the committee believes the services will need to re-examine the requirements for training their forces and explore whether they can achieve additional efficiencies or cost savings in their training approaches, such as by increasing reliance on virtual or simulator technologies to meet some training tasks.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate Navy and Marine Corps training requirements and provide a preliminary briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, with an assessment of the following:

(1) To what extent do the Navy and Marine Corps processes establish requirements and resource needs to train forces for core capability areas?

(2) To what extent have the Navy and Marine Corps conducted training for core capability areas and identified any factors that limit this training?

(3) To what extent have the Navy and Marine Corps taken steps to integrate the use of virtual or simulated training to prepare forces for the full range of military operations?

Any remaining work and a final report will be completed within a time as subsequently agreed upon with the committee.

C–130 Aircraft Maintenance and Modernization

Given current and future depot-level C–130 maintenance requirements, the likelihood of additional unscheduled requirements, depot capacity, the shortfall in depot maintainers, and broader responsibility for other military service C–130 maintenance requirements, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide an unclassified briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than September 30, 2016, on the service's approach to C–130 maintenance, service life extension, and modernization requirements over the next 5 years.

Condition-Based Maintenance on Navy Surface Ships

The committee notes that in 2013, the Department of the Navy established policy directing the integration of Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM) on ships, ship systems, and equipment. The committee understands that CBM has been successfully implemented on aircraft, helicopters, military and commercial vehicles, and trains and has demonstrated cost savings and increased operational readiness. However, the committee has learned that, with the exception of Littoral Combat Ships (LCS), the Navy has not implemented condition-based maintenance on its surface ships. The committee further notes that the CBM demonstration initiative for amphibious ships to address long-standing diesel readiness issues has been stalled for more than 3 years.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by June 30, 2016, on the status of implementing CBM on Navy surface ships. The committee expects this briefing, at a minimum, to address the implementation plan for amphibious ships.

Corrective Actions in Response to the Temporary Detention of United States Sailors by Iran

The committee remains concerned regarding the totality of circumstances that contributed to the temporary detention of ten United States Navy sailors by force of the Islamic Republic of Iran in January 2016. The committee directs the Chief of Naval Operations to notify the committee upon the conclusion of the ongoing investigation stemming from the events in question. The committee also directs the Chief of Naval Operations to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees no later than 90 days following the conclusion of the investigation to provide an update on corrective actions taken, including any administrative actions or judicial proceedings initiated against any service member as a result of that investigation.

Defense Language Institute Support to the Intelligence Community

The committee remains interested in ensuring that the Intelligence Community recruits, trains, and retains the most capable language experts. In light of ongoing global conflicts in the Middle East and North Africa, and the challenges posed by near-competitor states such as the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China, it is critical that the Department of Defense continue to adequately fund and support foreign language programs, especially the Defense Language Institute (DLI).

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the National Security Agency, to:

(1) Conduct an updated manpower study of the Defense Language Institute to determine the Institute's faculty and staff manning needs given increased requirements levied upon them by the Intelligence Community and the Department of Defense; and

(2) Develop a plan to modernize the 1996 Defense Language Institute pay structure, taking into account the significant variation between the DLI and other Department of Defense educational institutions and local colleges, including California community colleges. The new pay structure should appropriately reflect the capabilities of the DLI workforce and should seek to provide competitive salaries to Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center instructors.

The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the National Security Agency, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, by March 1, 2017, on the status of the manpower study and the new pay structure plan detailed above, as well as the status of efforts to meet the increased Intelligence Community and Department of Defense language expert requirements.

Defense Travel System

The committee is concerned that the Defense Travel System (DTS) is challenging for many service members to use, particularly among the Reserve Component. The committee has received information that the DTS process for booking travel, such as to-and-from drill locations, is often cumbersome and time consuming. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should explore ways to reform the DTS to make the system more user-friendly. The committee notes that the Defense Travel Management Office was established in 2006 as the single focal point for commercial travel within the Department. The committee directs the Director of DTS to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Service not later than September 1, 2016, on ways to improve DTS to ensure it better meets the needs of Department of Defense travelers.

Force of the Future

The committee is aware of the Department of Defense's personnel reforms collectively known as "Force of the Future." These reforms are "designed to provide the military services a balanced

set of force management tools that will allow them to improve their return on investment in human capital, improving military readiness in the long-run, while preserving military readiness and acknowledging operational demands in the near-term." The Department has to date issued two tranches of these reform proposals and plans to deliver more as they are ready for implementation. The committee supports the Department's efforts to address shortcomings in its military and civilian personnel systems and encourages its attempts to find innovative solutions to attract and maintain quality personnel. However, the committee is concerned that the readiness implications of many of these proposals have not been adequately addressed.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on the readiness impacts of each of the approved and pending Force of the Future proposals. At a minimum, the briefing shall include the estimated cost of each proposal across the Future Years Defense Program; the estimated loss of days, by service, of both military and civilian personnel; and details of how the Department plans to measure the performance and effectiveness of each proposal.

Global Response Force Readiness

In January 2012, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff published his Joint Operational Access Concept, which describes in broad terms his vision for how joint forces will operate in response to emerging anti-access and area-denial security challenges. Subsequently, in "Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense," the Secretary of Defense posits that the U.S. military will invest as required to ensure its ability to operate effectively in anti-access and area-denial environments, which would include implementing the Chairman's Joint Operational Access Concept. At the heart of that concept is the Global Response Force (GRF), an airborne brigade combat team prepared to deploy anywhere in the world within 96 hours of notification. Formed around an airborne infantry brigade, the Global Response Force also includes artillery, reconnaissance, Strykers, M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles, combat aviation, and other support, engineering, and logistical assets as needed.

According to the Army's fiscal year 2017 budget estimate justification documents, forces dedicated to Global Response Force requirements will remain ready. Recognizing that a critical aspect of maintaining a ready force is training, the committee is concerned that the Department's 2017 European Reassurance Initiative budget request allocates $25 million to exercising the Global Response Force, a figure that is less than half of what was enacted in fiscal year 2016. The committee believes a minimum of four joint, collective training opportunities during the fiscal year focusing on "no-notice" alert, marshal, and deploy operations is necessary to fully exercise installation nodal and outload capabilities, ensure joint interoperability between the Army and the Air Force, and validate the overall combat readiness of the GRF. Given the decrement in fiscal year 2017, the committee is also concerned that other aspects of GRF readiness, such as manning, equipping, local training, or logistical or other support may likewise be adversely affected by

present fiscal pressures, budgetary constraints, and competition for resources. In order to better understand the challenges that the Department may be facing with regard to the GRF and the impact they may have on the GRF's readiness, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2017, that assesses the following:

(1) The factors, if any, that may affect the ability of the GRF to carry out its intended missions;

(2) The extent to which the GRF's available support capabilities (including logistics, command and control, engineer, and intelligence) address operational requirements; and

(3) The impact, if any, that fiscal pressures or other challenges, such as the competition for resources, have had on GRF manning, equipping, and training.

Green Flag East

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's commitment to invest $1.00 billion over 5 years in Red Flag and Green Flag exercises, resulting in no fewer than 34 major exercises. The committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 required the Secretary of the Air Force to assess the adequacy of aviation resources provided during Green Flag East exercises at the Joint Readiness Training Center (JRTC). The committee remains concerned that Green Flag East continues to experience a lack of variety of air assets. The committee recommends the Secretary of the Air Force consider allocating a dedicated fixed-wing unit, manned or unmanned, to Green Flag East to support the anticipated increase in training days at the JRTC, including a potential doubling of Reserve Component rotations.

Impact of Mandatory Training Requirements on Achieving Increased Readiness

The committee understands that mandatory training requirements in the military services can range from training for nuclear, biological, and chemical defense to marksmanship qualification, suicide prevention, physical fitness, and sexual assault prevention, among others. A 2002 study at the Army company commander level found there were 297 days of annual mandatory training requirements for 256 available training days. Discussions across the force confirmed that commanders receive additional mandatory training requirements regardless of their units' ability to actually comply with the totality of the requirements. The Department of the Army Inspector General in 2012 reported that at none of the 16 locations inspected were companies in the Army Force Generation process able to complete all mandatory training.

The Army responded to a February 2015 study for the U.S. Army War College, which stated overwhelming training requirements may contribute to military personnel exaggerating or falsely reporting compliance in meeting statistical training requirements, by undertaking the "Objective T" initiative. "Objective T" seeks to reset mandatory training for appropriate individual-, leader-, and unit-level training; shift selected mandatory training tasks to "as-re-

quired" elements of command responsibility; establish a biennial cycle for select mandatory training tasks for the Reserve Components; and adopt new standards for mandatory training.

While the Army War College study focused on Army personnel, testimonies indicate this is a problem facing all branches of the U.S. military. The committee is concerned that the ever-increasing training demand forces military leaders at multiple levels in the chain of command to make ethical decisions between actually training to standard or falsifying reporting, as well as choosing between training for mission essential tasks and those perceived to be of lesser value.

In light of these concerns, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, addressing each of the following issues:

(1) What is the level and range of mandatory training required annually in each of the military services, and do the requirements derive from law, policy, or guidance;

(2) What processes do the military services use to establish and track mandatory training requirements for service members;

(3) To what extent do the military services review and validate existing mandatory training requirements and assess the effectiveness of training strategies in meeting intended training objectives;

(4) To what extent do the military services have processes in place to analyze the impact of mandatory training requirements and compliance checks on the training readiness and capabilities of their forces; and (5) To what extent do individual commanders have flexibility to prioritize mandatory training requirements in light of the amount of time available to complete individual and unit training.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 1, 2016, on preliminary findings of the Comptroller General's study.

Language Training

The committee believes that foreign language proficiency, including immersive regional and cultural training, is a major force multiplier and a key component of national defense. The committee therefore supports the fiscal year 2017 budget request for the Defense Language Institute (DLI) Foreign Language Center. The committee believes the fiscal year 2017 funding level will allow the DLI to address capability gaps in advanced foreign language training that otherwise would hamper the Department's ability to attain strategic national security objectives.

Further, due to recent Russian Federation activities in Eastern Europe, the committee believes the Department of Defense should examine whether training for U.S. service members in Russian language, regional expertise, and culture are sufficient to ensure service members deploying to Eastern Europe are prepared to effectively fulfill mission requirements. The committee urges the Director of the Defense Language and National Security Education Office (DLNSEO) to assess the need for additional courses in Russian language, regional expertise, and culture training.

As the Department continues to engage with allies across the combatant commands through security cooperation events, the committee encourages the Department to build awareness of foreign cultures and fluency in foreign languages and to provide opportunities for allies to experience American culture and improve their English-language proficiency. Among the opportunities the committee recommends exploring are expanding Army Cadet Command's Cultural Understanding and Language Proficiency program to the other military services, expanding the number of allied English-language instructors who receive instruction annually at the DLI, temporary overseas assignments for DLI instructors to teach English to allied students, and partnerships with U.S. colleges and universities who have degree programs for English-as-a-foreign-language studies. Accordingly, the committee directs the Director of the DLNSEO to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2016, on the feasibility and estimated costs of these opportunities and provide a suggested list of developing countries prioritized for engagement and instruction.

Management Software for Navy Training

The committee recognizes the importance of providing software applications designed to support visibility of readiness levels for individual service member training and qualifications. The committee notes that the Advanced Skills Management (ASM) system used by the Department of the Navy is a software application designed to identify job tasking requirements, assist in determining proficiencies, document qualifications and certifications, and track completed technical training. The committee notes that the Fleet Management and Planning System (FLTMPS) used by the Department of the Navy is a software application designed to assist in monitoring and managing training requirements, unit manning, and personnel and training status. The committee is aware of commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) software alternatives that may offer existing capabilities at a cost savings to the Navy. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than August 1, 2016, that includes:

(1) Market research conducted by the Navy to identify commercial software solutions for support training and manning requirements;

(2) A cost-benefit analysis of integration of ASM capabilities into FLTMPS;

(3) A cost-benefit analysis of available COTS and government-off-the-shelf software solutions for training and manning requirements;

(4) A review of the Department's acquisition strategy to enhance ASM and FLTMPS; and

(5) The long-term acquisition strategy for a software application designed to measure individual service member readiness as a critical gauge of readiness.

Military Bands

While the committee provides the Department of Defense with a wide latitude of authority for the military services to execute the end strength reductions that are continuing through fiscal year 2017, the committee is concerned by the prioritization of some military units. The committee believes that the services may be able to conserve end strength by reducing the number of military bands.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017, on the Department of Defense requirement for military bands.

The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on military bands. At a minimum, the briefing shall include:

(1) The number of military bands, by service, and their location;

(2) The cost of military bands (including recruitment, training, facilities, and transportation);

(3) The number of service members assigned to military bands;

(4) The history of reductions in military bands over the past 5 years; and (5) The feasibility of combining military bands at joint locations.

Mobility Support for Operations on the Korean Peninsula

U.S. and Republic of Korea forces train and plan together to deter and defeat aggression emanating from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. As a result of this longstanding alliance, operational and contingency plans have been codified, coordinated, and exercised. Over time those plans have evolved to meet changing conditions, enhance readiness, and strengthen the alliance's ability to defend the Republic of Korea and maintain stability on the Korean Peninsula. Plans for rapidly reinforcing U.S. forces already on the peninsula would require U.S. Transportation Command to undertake the rapid movement to the Korean Peninsula of forces and capabilities presently located in the continental United States and elsewhere. In light of new and increasingly threatening dynamics, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the following:

(1) The factors, if any, that may affect U.S. Transportation Command's ability to carry out its wartime mission with respect to operations on the Korean Peninsula;

(2) The extent to which U.S. Transportation Command's plans and capabilities are postured to support the outbreak of hostilities on the Korean Peninsula;

(3) The readiness of U.S. Transportation Command's assets (air, land, and sea) to carry out its wartime mission; and

(4) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to U.S. Transportation Command's support of operations on the Korean Peninsula.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, on the Comptroller General's prelimi-

nary findings and to submit a final report to the congressional defense committees on a date agreed to at the time of the briefing.

Output-Based Readiness Metrics

The committee notes that current readiness metrics largely focus on inputs rather than outputs, such as the amount of training completed, the number of personnel assigned to units, or the maintenance level of equipment. The committee is interested in how output-based readiness metrics, including objective measures of how well units and personnel perform during realistic training and exercises, could offer alternative measures of the ability of forces to perform the missions assigned to them and could help to improve the ways in which readiness is measured and resourced. The committee encourages the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to consider developing output-based readiness metrics that could be used to assess the ability of units to perform the tasks specified in their mission essential task lists and to consider how data related to these metrics could be appropriately collected and retained during relevant operations or training exercises.

Refinement of Joint Staff Input Into the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress

The committee is aware that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in complying with the Quarterly Readiness Report to Congress (QRRC) required by section 482 of title 10, United States Code, is seeking to refine the Joint Staff's input into the QRRC required through section 117 of title 10, United States Code, in order to improve relevance and timeliness in reporting while minimizing redundancy and overlapping processes. The committee itself, in previous authorization acts, has sought to increase the QRRC's value to the committee through the selective addition of information regarding preparation for, and support to, contingency operations and by eliminating portions of the QRRC which are available from other sources or no longer deemed important to congressional decision making. In light of current concerns about the readiness of U.S. military forces, the committee supports the Chairman's efforts to refine readiness information and reporting requirements and to streamline processes to meet the 45-day QRRC statutory deadlines, including consideration of separating and alternating semiannual assessments with semiannual reports.

Regional Air Ranges and Exercise

The committee notes that each military service relies on major national air ranges and military operating areas to provide realistic combined-arms pilot training against a variety of targets and simulated threats. The committee believes these ranges provide critical and efficient opportunities for small and large units to train together as a joint force on a variety of air-to-air and air-to-ground scenarios in increasing levels of complexity. The committee also believes that the integration of fourth- and fifth-generation combat capabilities on regional ranges during frequent local exercises is critical to maintain the readiness and proficiency of aircrews to

meet combatant commanders' requirements across the entire spectrum of potential operations.

The committee notes that diminished training resources require a prioritization of investments in training infrastructure. The committee believes that regional, jointly managed air ranges, and frequent, locally planned exercises would result in training opportunities for each service that are realistic, efficient, and effective. Looking ahead, the committee believes that the services must address common concerns about limited airspace to meet training requirements for fifth-generation aircraft and standoff precision-guided munitions by collaborating on the establishment and management of joint regional ranges consisting of connected, existing service-specific ranges. The committee also believes that regional ranges must be equipped with mobile joint threat emitters designed as a multi-threat, high-fidelity simulator with realistic, effective radiated power levels to help train aircrews to identify and counter enemy missile or artillery threats, as well as integrated air defense systems in a war-like training environment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish an investment strategy for the preservation and enhancement of regional ranges and exercises needed to provide adequate live training for aircrews across the full spectrum of operations. The committee notes that the Department's annual sustainable ranges report should inform this report and may facilitate development of an investment strategy. The strategy shall include:

(1) An assessment of the importance of regional ranges and exercises;

(2) A review of existing threats to continued operation or limits of regional ranges;

(3) A review of measures taken to date to preserve the capabilities of each regional range;

(4) A prioritized list of specific actions needed to promote compatible development in areas around each regional range;

(5) A prioritized list of proposed investments, including installation of joint threat emitter systems; and

(6) Specific actions proposed to enhance the training opportunities by combining existing regional ranges, enlarging operating areas, and establishing joint range management entities.

The committee further directs the Secretary to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than December 11, 2016, that includes the investment strategy and descriptions of other initiatives to improve regional opportunities for realistic, joint training of military aircrews.

Regional Biosecurity Plan Implementation

The committee notes that in March 2015, the Department of the Navy released the "Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii." This document provided recommendations that, if appropriately implemented, will minimize the harmful ecological, social, cultural, and economic impacts of invasive species through the prevention and management of such species' introduction, expansion, and dispersal within the region. With the influx of permanent and rotational U.S. military personnel and equipment in the region, the committee understands that the Department of the Navy agreed to fund the development of this plan in part to assist with minimizing

the risk of introduction and spread of invasive species to and within the region. The committee notes that the document contains numerous recommendations and action items at different priority levels for the Department of Defense.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with other Federal agencies as appropriate, to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee, not later than February 1, 2017, regarding the Department's implementation of the Regional Biosecurity Plan for Micronesia and Hawaii. In addition to the steps that are being taken to implement the recommendations and action items, the briefing may include an estimate of the additional costs associated with continued implementation, to include specifying in detail the cost for each component and program of the Department of Defense.

Report on Small Boat Maintenance

The committee is aware that some of the small boats and watercraft of the Navy Installation Command (CNIC) and United States Naval Academy do not utilize the Navy's Maintenance and Material Management (3M) program or are partially covered. The committee recognizes that over the life of these small watercraft, on-time performance maintenance inspection actions are necessary to optimize performance, reduce equipment failure and breakdowns, and ensure operational availability of these assets.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide an unclassified briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than August 31, 2016, on the service's approach to small boat and small watercraft maintenance. This briefing shall include, at a minimum:

(1) An inventory of Navy Installation Command and United States Naval Academy small boats and watercraft;

(2) The maintenance routine and inspections for these small watercraft and boats; and

(3) A review of existing Navy maintenance programs and commercially available maintenance products used with other small boats and watercraft.

Review of the Readiness of Military Sealift Command Ships and Employment Plans

The committee understands the Navy has called for a fleet with more distributed lethality to extend the global reach of its combatant ships. Concurrently, the Military Sealift Command (MSC) fleet will need to provide the logistics support required by globally distributed operations. These demands will be in addition to new tasking to the MSC fleet, given the declining numbers of combat ships in the fleet. In some mission areas, such as amphibious operations, MSC platforms are taking on new roles. For example, the Expeditionary Fast Transport (formerly designated the Joint High Speed Vessel) and the Afloat Forward Staging Base are providing some amphibious capabilities, including rapid transport of troops and equipment and forward logistics support and command and control to other Navy ships and helicopters in operational areas. The committee notes the Navy has introduced these ships into the fleet but has not yet provided a comprehensive account of the mis-

sions they are suitable to support. MSC's expanded roles also require a healthy supply of experienced mariners and a robust number of U.S. merchant ships to generate these qualified mariners. With declining ship numbers in the U.S. merchant fleet, the committee is concerned these new requirements may not be fully addressed.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees to address the following:

(1) What challenges does Military Sealift Command face with respect to material condition and service life of its fleet and what impact, if any, do these have on maintaining needed warfighting capabilities;

(2) What personnel and training challenges have impacted the Military Sealift Command, and what effects, if any, do these pose to maintaining warfighting readiness;

(3) How are Military Sealift Command's mission requirements evolving? What implications, if any, are there for the command's personnel and force structure; and

(4) Any other related matters as deemed appropriate in order to provide a comprehensive examination of Military Sealift Command readiness and employment plans.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a preliminary briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, with the report to be submitted at a date to be determined at the time of the briefing.

Rotary-Wing Aviation Readiness and Safety

The committee notes with concern the frequency of mishaps in rotary-wing aviation over the past 5 years. The committee further notes that the commander of the Army's Aviation Center of Excellence described home-station training as a significant concern due to the inability of the Army to provide sufficient flying hours for all pilots to meet established standards. Similarly, the committee notes that the Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Aviation has described the reduction of funding for aviation training and maintenance as a critical concern. Further, the committee believes that the proficiency of rotary-wing pilots and the readiness of rotary-wing platforms provide crucial capabilities to the joint force. Therefore, the committee urges the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to prioritize rotary-wing aviation funding in order to ensure that the United States maintains this crucial capability into the future.

The committee directs the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps each to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than January 2, 2017, on the impact of reduced funding on rotary-wing aviation readiness and safety from fiscal year 2012 to the present and an estimate of the impact to aviation readiness and safety if funding were maintained at levels consistent with the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112–25) through fiscal year 2023.

Soldiers Medically Unavailable for Training

The committee is concerned about the number of soldiers who, while assigned to deployable units, are medically unavailable for training or deployment. The committee shares the Army's desire to provide these soldiers the medical treatment they deserve, while at the same time moving them to Warrior Transition Units and/or discharging them as quickly as practicable. The committee recognizes the readiness strain that permanently non-deployable soldiers place on deployable units, and encourages the Army to make this process as streamlined as possible.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2016, regarding the effects on readiness of medically non-deployable soldiers. The briefing should include, at a minimum, the number of medically non-deployable soldiers currently in deployable units, the average time a medically non-deployable soldier waits to be reassigned out of a deployable unit, the process the Army uses to discharge medically non-deployable soldiers, what the Army is doing to speed up the discharge process, and any issues that slow down the discharge process.

Support Capabilities for Operations in Europe

Since the end of the Cold War, the size and footprint of U.S. forces in Europe have decreased. Recently, however, Russian activities in the region have provided cause for reassessment. The Secretary of Defense recommended in the budget request for fiscal year 2017 to quadruple the allocation for the European Reassurance Initiative to $3.40 billion, saying that this money will go to pay for increased rotations of U.S. forces to Europe, increased prepositioned stocks, and increased multinational training, among other things. Moreover, a significant part of the Department's future focus will be on Eastern Europe, where the United States has not previously had a significant military footprint. This increased U.S. effort in Europe raises concerns about the adequacy of the logistical and other support capabilities needed to sustain future operations.

In light of these concerns, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the following with regard to the Department's support capabilities for increased activities in Europe and provide a preliminary briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services on the following factors not later than February 1, 2017, with a report to follow at a date to be determined at the briefing:

(1) To what extent have the U.S. European Command and supporting commands identified gaps in logistical and other support capabilities relevant to an increased presence under the European Reassurance Initiative;

(2) How have the relevant Department of Defense organizations addressed any identified gaps in logistical and other support capabilities; and

(3) To what extent have the relevant Department of Defense organizations evaluated requirements for prepositioned stocks and other forward-positioned equipment to support future operations in

Europe and developed a joint strategy and plan to implement any needed changes to these items.

Synthetic Training System and Small Arms Qualification

The committee notes that in reviewing base security forces' response to the September 16, 2013, active-shooter attack at the Washington Navy Yard, Department of the Navy officials recognized the Navy's small-arms qualification programs are not aligned to post-9/11 force protection watch-standing requirements and that Navy programs and policies regarding hostile intent determination are unclear, under-resourced, and lack standardization among small-arms trainers. Also, the committee was concerned to learn that training prior to live-fire qualification lacks requisite frequency or sufficient standardization across all commands or weapons types to develop satisfactory proficiency; small arms marksmanship instructors lack the tools, procedures, and training to teach proper shooting techniques and to remediate shooter deficiencies; Navy Security Forces and force protection personnel lack adequate training to enhance proficiency after initial qualification; and the crew-served weapon course of fire does not objectively measure accuracy.

In support of the review's recommendation to address these training shortfalls through an improved small-arms training program, the committee encourages the Navy to proceed in a manner that will utilize synthetic marksmanship training systems that have a proven track record. For example, synthetic small arms training systems utilized by Navy Expeditionary Combat Command, Naval Special Warfare Command, and Naval Health Research Center, and the Joint Multi-National Training Center, are leveraging data collection and metric analysis to improve training efficiency and ensure that training effectiveness consistently transfers to live-fire qualifications and skills sustainment.

The committee notes, however, that the limited objective experiment conducted on behalf of U.S. Fleet Forces Command to determine the most advantageous capabilities of small-arms simulators reported on a single basic skills simulation training system in their inventory and did not evaluate advanced systems used by other commands. As the Navy implements small-arms simulator training systems to meet force protection requirements and hostile intent determination gaps, the committee encourages the Navy to evaluate a broader range of systems including those described above and not be limited to existing basic firearms training and engagement skills training systems and programs of record.

Toward that end, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than September 30, 2016, regarding the Navy's assessment of advanced, innovative non-program-of-record small-arms weapons and crew-served training systems, including those at the commands mentioned above, and outlining the planned program elements and parameters that will be used to contract for any small-arms simulation system in fiscal year 2017 and future fiscal years.

OTHER MATTERS

Acquisition of Highly Technical Contract Services

The committee notes that in June 2012, the Navy issued Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction 4200.7 addressing services contracting management that included "tripwires" triggering higher level review of specific contracting issues. Among the specific issues for which tripwires were established was the level of proposed contractor labor rates in competitive cost-type and time-and-materials service contracts and individual task orders.

According to the Navy instruction, tripwires were not intended to preclude execution, but instead to require higher level concurrence or notifications before continuing to execute. While the committee is generally supportive of efforts to oversee the cost and performance of contracts for services, the committee is concerned that the manner in which contracting organizations are interpreting this instruction may essentially be imposing a ceiling on labor rates in certain categories. The committee believes this may be occurring due to the unwillingness of lower level managers to seek higher level review and approval of proposed labor rates above those set by the tripwires, even in cases where such a request would be appropriate given the nature of the specific work to be performed. This approach may be affecting the service industry's ability to recruit and retain personnel in labor categories where there is significant competition among private-sector firms for limited numbers of highly qualified personnel, especially cybersecurity specialists.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to review the impact of the implementation and practice of the tripwire instruction with respect to labor rates on the ability to achieve contract objectives in areas where access to senior, highly skilled technical support is essential, and for which industry labor rates generally above the levels set by the tripwires are applicable and appropriate. The Secretary shall provide a briefing on his findings to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016.

Adoption of Tactical Explosive Detection Military Working Dogs

The committee notes the Tactical Explosive Detection Dog (TEDD) program was established in January 2011 as a temporary, Army-funded program supporting Army Brigade Combat Teams by providing maneuver units with canine assets to mitigate casualties associated with improvised explosive devices. In 2013, U.S. Central Command curtailed the requirement for TEDDs, and the TEDD program was terminated in February 2014. The Department of the Air Force, the executive agent for all military working dogs, delegated development of a disposition plan for the 229 TEDDs to the Department of the Army, through the Office of the Provost Marshall General (OPMG). The committee recognizes the challenge OPMG had in the disposition of TEDDs due to a limited transition window.

However, the committee is aware of persistent concerns raised by former TEDD handlers regarding their opportunity to adopt the TEDDs. The committee notes that the Department of the Army has, on multiple occasions, examined this issue in a singular fashion, examining a specific handler or TEDD. Despite these reviews,

the committee believes the Army has not been sufficiently responsive in addressing generally known challenges in the TEDD adoption process. The committee believes that the Army's reluctance to review the adoption application process holistically to ensure that military working dog handlers were provided the first opportunity to adopt TEDDs failed to meet the intent of military working dog adoption processes in law, instruction, and regulation.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by August 31, 2016, that should address the following issues:

(1) How TEDD handlers were identified and contacted to verify intent to adopt TEDD military working dogs, including a listing of all TEDD handlers, the method by which they were contacted, the handlers' stated intentions regarding TEDD adoption, and instances of handlers reporting errors in the adoption process;

(2) What steps the Secretary has taken to ensure that all military working dog handlers have visibility into the adoption process of all military working dogs, including TEDDs;

(3) The factors that led to instances in the adoption process of TEDDs where handlers did not have the first opportunity to adopt the TEDD, and how the Secretary intends to prevent future process errors in military working dog adoptions;

(4) Any resource, legislative, or departmental policy changes needed to correct deficiencies in the adoption process; and

(5) The process for selection of a handler for military working dog adoption when more than one handler requests to adopt the military working dog.

Army Explosive Ordnance Disposal

The committee has been closely monitoring proposed changes to the Army's Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) force structure, force modernization, and branch proponency for impacts upon capability and capacity to provide scalable and tailorable EOD mission command and EOD forces to conduct counter-improvised explosive devices operations, counter-unexploded ordnance operations, and combating weapons of mass destruction elimination operations in support of the Army and joint force commanders.

The Secretary of the Army has recently informed the committee that the Training and Doctrine Command has established a capability manager for explosive ordnance disposal to integrate EOD force modernization activities across all of the Army's Centers of Excellence. However, the committee remains concerned that the Army has not clearly identified its future branch proponency requirements for an EOD Corps consisting of a fully integrated explosives ordnance disposal, ammunition, and explosives safety basic branch.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on the Army's EOD branch. At a minimum, the report shall include:

(1) EOD officer development and career management program depicting key development assignments and key leadership positions from lieutenant to that of Logistics Corps general officer;

(2) EOD officer and EOD senior noncommissioned officer (NCO) standard of grade authorization requirements to fill the necessary positions throughout the institutional Army to ensure enduring health and viability of the EOD branch;

(3) Description of the Army EOD School licensing process of EOD soldiers;

(4) Identification of joint, interagency, intergovernmental and multinational EOD commissioned officer and NCO positions; and

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

Associated Unit Concept for Terminal High Altitude Area Defense Security Force Manning

The committee recognizes the important mission of the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) deployment in Guam and supports permanent basing as a means of establishing persistent deter-and-defeat capabilities in defense of the homeland and reassuring allies and partners. The committee appreciates the Army's commitment to total force integration and is encouraged by its support of opportunities to leverage cost savings and enable Active-Duty units to fill unique combatant command requirements by incorporating National Guard units into the THAAD security-force mission. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department of the Army and the National Guard Bureau to continue to work cooperatively to ensure there are adequate resources programmed in fiscal year 2018 to support an Active-Guard associated unit for THAAD security force manning on Guam.

Collaboration With U.S. Universities

The committee notes that in February 2015, the Secretary of Defense announced his goal to build the "Force of the Future" to enable the Department of Defense to maintain a competitive edge by, among other things, attracting the top talent from corporations and universities to serve the nation. One initiative from this effort is to improve and enhance Department of Defense internship programs in order to increase recruitment at colleges and universities.

The committee encourages the Department to pursue the opportunity to work with U.S. universities to shape certain curricula and programs with the goal of providing specific "whole-of-government" education for potential future Department leaders, emphasizing enterprise thinking, unity of effort, and creative, viable solutions to global issues that affect national security. The committee believes it is important for the Department to leverage this program to attract future talent to the civilian workforce. In return, the Department benefits from placing military and civilian personnel in the Secretary of Defense Corporate Fellows Program and selected academic programs provided by universities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than November 1, 2016, on efforts undertaken to encourage universities to offer master's and doctoral level programs in National Security and Strategic Studies, especially in regions where

universities could leverage the density of existing joint, inter-organizational, and multinational organizations.

Combat Footwear Survey

The committee recognizes the ongoing efforts of the military services to ensure that all new recruits are issued combat footwear of appropriate size and fit upon entering the military. Proper combat footwear fit not only maximizes comfort but prevents injury and can improve combat effectiveness. The committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 acknowledged the growing number of women in the military and directed the Office of the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to determine whether the military services were meeting the needs of female service members with regard to proper combat footwear. Upon review of the study report, the committee notes, with concern, that the Army, the largest service in terms of force structure, is the only service not to design combat footwear using lasts designed specifically for women. The study report also noted that the Army's most recent survey questioning whether service members were satisfied with the fit and sizing of combat boots was in 1992.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to conduct a survey of no fewer than 2,000 female Active Duty and Reserve Component soldiers from a variety of relevant military occupational specialties to determine whether or not they are satisfied with the fit, size, and performance of combat footwear issued to them. In order to establish appropriate comparisons, this study should also undertake, but not be limited to, a comparison of satisfaction rates among male soldiers and among both male and female service members from the other military services.

The committee further directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 1, 2016, on the results of the study.

Disabled Veterans Non-Profit Groups

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense is not maximizing the talents and efforts of non-profit groups who employ significant numbers of persons with disabilities, including veterans, who make products for the Department as participants in the AbilityOne Program. The committee encourages the Department to continue to explore additional opportunities to utilize the expertise, capability, and capacity of these non-profit groups and incentivize the Department's acquisition workforce to give them increased consideration as contracting solutions when doing so achieves the Department's acquisition objectives.

Disposal of Excess Agriculture-Related Equipment

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has a disposal process for its excess or unused equipment. Many individuals, including firefighters, state agencies, law enforcement, and private citizens, have access to equipment through this disposal process. The committee believes that some of this equipment might be appropriate for use in agricultural operations, and that veteran-owned farming operations could benefit from greater awareness of

what is available. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency to provide a briefing, not later than December 1, 2016, to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on all agriculture-related equipment disposals for the last five years. The briefing shall include an itemized list of each item disposed, a brief description of each item, the monetary value of each item, and whether the item was transferred to another government entity or a private company or citizen.

End-of-Service Veterinary Care for Military Working Dogs

The committee recognizes that military working dogs serve the nation as extensions of military law enforcement as well as through detection and tracking of drugs, explosives, and personnel threats. After numerous tours, military working dogs are retired from active service and made available for adoption. The committee recognizes that the physical environments in which these military working dogs operate may pose future health challenges for the adopting entity. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than November 18, 2016, on the following:

(1) An assessment of the number of living retired military working dogs and an estimate of their annual veterinary care expenses;

(2) The extent to which a military working dog's health is impacted by the environment in which the dog served and subsequent costs;

(3) Options for military working dog post-retirement care; and

(4) Any other issues the Comptroller General determines appropriate with respect to military working dog veterinary health following retirement.

Flame-Resistant Military Uniform Postures

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee directed the military services to provide a report on emerging flame-resistant (FR) technologies for military uniforms and evaluate where these technologies can provide cost-effective protection to a wider range of service members. The committee noted that distribution of flame-resistant uniforms is limited to military units that are preparing to deploy to contingency operations, are currently deployed in contingency operations, and to those serving in certain military occupational specialties. Since that time, the Army and the Marine Corps conducted an initial study and have begun to review additional commercial products for use in varying degrees of FR protection. In light of this, the committee encourages all military services to consider implementing FR uniform protective postures based on an assessment of the threat and the operating environment. The committee does not intend for the services to alter existing protection and reliability requirements for units deployed to contingency operations.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps to provide a joint briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by August 15, 2016, that outlines the plan and

process, including costs, for providing FR uniform protection postures for all military personnel.

Military Free Fall Course as a Requirement of the U.S. Army Special Forces Qualification Course

The committee is aware that in 2012 the U.S. Army Special Operations Command approved a concept and implementation plan for offering the Military Free Fall (MFF) course to all Special Forces upon completion of the Special Forces Qualification Course (SFQC), but prior to graduation. The committee would like to better understand the addition of the MFF course on Special Forces, including the impact on overall recruiting and retention if successful completion of MFF becomes a requirement for graduating SFQC.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2016, on the MFF course, including impacts on readiness if MFF becomes mandatory.

Military Glove System

The committee is aware that the military services currently lack a single glove system effective in a wide variety of climate environments. Modern organizational clothing and individual equipment (OCIE) provide service members with a distinct combat advantage. The committee encourages the services to pursue commercial-off-the-shelf solutions for military handwear and other personal protective equipment (PPE) and OCIE items to ensure that service members are provided with innovative, readily available solutions. Further, the committee supports efforts by the services to support a strong domestic industrial base to ensure that innovative and cost-effective commercial PPE/OCIE items are available in the future.

National Guard Cyber Protection Teams

The committee is aware that the Army National Guard has developed a plan to establish 10 cyber protection teams (CPT) to complement the Army's build for its contribution to the cyber mission force. The committee also understands that decisions relating to the establishment of those teams, and where they would be based, were made late in the budget cycle, and thus were not properly synchronized in the fiscal year 2017 budget request. The committee is aware that the Army National Guard has established three CPTs, but because of the lack of funding in fiscal year 2017, it will not be on track with its schedule for establishing teams this year.

Further, the committee recognizes that these Army National Guard CPTs are not integrated into the Army Cyber Command structure for cyber mission teams. This is unlike the approach the Air Force has taken, which integrates some Air National Guard units as part of its cyber mission force structure. The committee notes that the National Guard brings important capabilities to the Army, including experience and skills from industry experts, and the ability to bring greater outreach and support to States. The committee believes that the Army needs to work more expedi-

tiously to determine and codify the role National Guard forces should take in the cyber domain.

The committee supports the training of the National Guard CPTs planned for fiscal year 2017, and urges the Army, as well as the National Guard, to ensure that projected funding disconnects are resolved in the fiscal year 2018 budget request. The committee also urges Army Cyber Command to finalize and promulgate clear policy about the role of Reserve Component CPTs in the Army's cyber mission build.

National Guard Unit for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands

In response to section 515 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), the National Guard Bureau (NGB) in August 2015 reported that establishing National Guard units in both the Territory of American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) is feasible, but "major steps are necessary to reach that end state." Among the issues raised were the territories' limited ability to recruit, maintain, and sustain units, and that the costing framework to transfer force structure from one State or territory to American Samoa or the CNMI would have an impact on the donor State's or territory's ability to accommodate the NGB's "Essential Ten" homeland capabilities.

With these issues in mind, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than February 1, 2017, on how the Department of Defense would establish, maintain, and sustain a National Guard unit in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. At a minimum, the briefing shall include details regarding force structure allocation, recruiting, and funding requirements, including military construction, that would allow the committee to evaluate the cost and overall impact of locating a National Guard unit in CNMI.

Procurement and Inspection of Armored Commercial Passenger-Carrying Vehicles

In a report and briefing to Congress on procurement and inspection of armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles to transport civilian employees of the Department of Defense, dated August 2015, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics found that Department of Defense components procure and inspect armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and that Departmental policy provides components the necessary flexibility to procure armored vehicles to meet mission requirements.

However, the committee has learned that a "presumption of quality" on the part of the General Services Administration, and in the absence of known and clearly understood specifications, calls into question whether the Department's acquisition policies and procedures for the armoring of these vehicles provide appropriate physical protection for Department of Defense civilians. The committee is concerned that the rigor applied to the procurement of armored military vehicles is absent for the procurement of armored commer-

cial passenger-carrying vehicles. The committee questions whether appropriate standards are in place to ensure safety, quality, qualified vendor selection, contract compliance, sustainment, and reliability of armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the following and provide a preliminary briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than September 30, 2016, with a final report at a mutually agreed-upon date:

(1) The extent to which DOD components complied with Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) C–4500.51 in procuring armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles over the past 5 years, including the requirement or specifications for vetting of suppliers, ballistic and blast mitigation protection and inspection, automotive safety, and road performance;

(2) To what extent contracts for armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles have been awarded over the past 5 years to firms that do not have a valid U.S. security clearance and whether such contract awards are compliant with DODI C–4500.51, including procurements from third-party brokers, both domestic and international, and leased vehicles;

(3) To what extent the Department of Defense has purchased, quarantined, and refurbished armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles that do not meet contract specifications, and at what cost above the original purchase or lease price;

(4) To what extent the Department of Defense has guidance, policy, and procedures in place to track purchase, acceptance, deployment, and fleet management of armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles used to transport civilian employees; and

(5) How the protection and security requirements, specifications, processes, and policies for acquiring armored commercial passenger-carrying vehicles to transport civilian employees of the Department of Defense compare with the same for uniformed military personnel and compare with those for employees of the U.S. Department of State.

Public-Private Partnerships for Cyber Education and Training

The committee is aware of the efforts of the Reserve Components of the military services, including the National Guard, to develop cyber protection teams that can leverage the best attributes, authorities, and capabilities of both civilian and military cyber practitioners. The committee recognizes that Reserve Component cyber personnel often bring a wealth of experience from their civilian life, coupled with the additional training and discipline instilled by military service. The committee is concerned, though, that the current training pipeline is a major bottleneck to fully manning and training cyber mission teams. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that current active units are prioritized in the current schoolhouses, which already have limited available training billets.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense should look at additional ways to diversify the training pipeline available to all cyber personnel to help relieve that bottleneck. Elsewhere in this report, the committee encourages the Department to use Reserve Officer Training Corps programs, as well as senior military academies, to develop and implement common curricula that can

satisfy the joint training standard. Also elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Department of Defense to review its cyber training equivalency process to help improve the ability to give cyber personnel credit for other experience, certifications, or commercial training they may have received that meets the joint training standard. The committee also encourages the Department to look at additional ways to build public-private partnerships with academia, industry, and non-profit institutions as a way to develop additional training curricula equivalent to the joint standard to diversify that pipeline.

Retaining Critical Skills and STEM Capabilities During Headquarters Downsizing

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) directed the Secretary of Defense to achieve not less than a 25 percent reduction in headquarters, administrative, and support activities of the Department of Defense during the period beginning with fiscal year 2015 and ending with fiscal year 2019. The committee remains concerned that these cuts may result in the loss of critical capabilities across the Department of Defense and military services, particularly in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) competencies. As demonstrated by section 1105 of this Act, the committee has made clear its intention that the Department of Defense and the military services recruit, hire, and retain the Nation's top scientific and engineering talent. It would, therefore, be imprudent for the military services and the Department to achieve headquarters, administrative, and support activities reductions by reducing the number of STEM employees just because their workplace resides within a headquarters function.

Public Law 114–92 requires the Secretary, as part of the annual budget submission for the Department of Defense, to include a report describing and assessing the progress of the Department in implementing the headquarters reduction plan for fiscal years 2017, 2018, and 2019. As part of this reporting requirement, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to include a detailed assessment on the downsizing of employees, including through attrition, by component or military service that are considered STEM employees, and the operational impact on the Department of Defense or military service of that loss.

Further, as the committee has stated in past House reports, any reduction in personnel should not be implemented as an across-the-board cut, but rather should be strategically designed to retain critical functions, capabilities, and skillsets—including, but not limited to the depots, the arsenals, the ammunition plants and the acquisition workforce—and to eliminate unnecessary or redundant functions or skillsets that do not benefit or support mission requirements.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of each of the military services to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than February 15 of calendar years 2017, 2018, and 2019, on any depot, arsenal, or ammunition plant position that has been reduced as a result of headquarters downsizing. The report should include the position description, critical skills re-

quired for that position, and justification for the reduction. The report should also provide details on any gaps in compliance with section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, at the facility from which a position was cut or gaps in critical skill sets at an arsenal.

The Role of the National Security Contractor

The committee recognizes that government contractors provide critical subject-matter and engineering expertise, as well as help to ensure program continuity across the spectrum of national security and intelligence programs. The committee acknowledges that the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community will continue to work with these essential partners to ensure national security. At the same time, the committee reminds these agencies of their responsibility to remain vigilant with taxpayer funding by maintaining appropriate levels of contract oversight and regular review.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 301—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for operation and maintenance activities at the levels identified in section 4301 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Section 311—Rule of Construction Regarding Alternative Fuel Procurement Requirement

This section would amend section 526 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–140) to clarify that this section shall not be construed as a constraint on any conventional or unconventional fuel procurement necessary for military operations.

SUBTITLE C—LOGISTICS AND SUSTAINMENT

Section 321—Pilot Program for Inclusion of Certain Industrial Plants in the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support Initiative

This section would authorize a 5-year pilot program to allow for government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) industrial plants to participate in the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) Initiative (10 U.S.C. 4551–4555).

The committee notes the ARMS Initiative currently applies to GOCO ammunition manufacturing facilities and depots. The committee understands the ARMS Initiative was created to allow the Army to rent portions of its ammunition plants that are not being used in production to commercial companies. The committee notes the revenues from the property rental are used to help pay for the operation, maintenance, and environmental cleanup at the facilities; these savings in overhead cost lower the production cost of the

goods manufactured, as well as fund the environmental cleanup at no cost to the government.

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee required the Secretary of the Army to provide a report on manufacturing infrastructure investment for GOCO Joint Systems Manufacturing Center-Lima (JSMC–L), in an effort to obtain a comprehensive analysis of the operational costs associated with this facility, and to encourage the Army to explore more effective and efficient operating models at JSMC–L. The report recommended amending the ARMS Initiative to include GOCO industrial plants as a means to improve operating efficiency. The committee believes that this recommendation warrants further consideration, and believes the authorized pilot program should provide the opportunity to gain a better understanding of ways to improve operating efficiencies at JSMC–L. This provision does not authorize GOCO industrial plants' use of Army Working Capital Funds.

Section 322—Private Sector Port Loading Assessment

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to conduct a quarterly assessment of the private sector port loading for Norfolk, Virginia; Mayport, Florida; San Diego, California; Puget Sound, Washington; and Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. This section would also require the Secretary to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the assessments by October 1, 2016, and to provide quarterly updates through September 30, 2021.

Section 323—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defense Contract Management Agency

This section would limit funding for the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) until the DCMA Director provides a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the agency's plan to foster the adoption, implementation, and verification of the Department of Defense's revised Item Unique Identification policy across the Department and the defense industrial base.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS

Section 331—Modification of Annual Department of Defense Energy Management Reports

This section would modify subsection (a) and (b) of section 2925 of title 10, United States Code, to modify and extend, with a sunset date of January 31, 2021, the "Annual Report Related to Installations Energy Management" report and the "Annual Report Related to Operational Energy" report. This amendment would supersede section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

Section 332—Report on Equipment Purchased from Foreign Entities and Authority to Adjust Army Arsenal Labor Rates

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees 30 days after the submission of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2018 on weapons, weapons systems, components, subcomponents, and end-items purchased from foreign entities that could be manufactured domestically in depots or arsenals as well as a plan for moving that workload into such arsenals or depots. It also would authorize the establishment of a 2-year pilot program permitting Army arsenals to adjust their labor rates charged to customers based upon changes in workload and other factors. Finally, this section would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by May 1, 2019, that assesses certain information related to arsenal labor rates.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 341—Explosive Ordnance Disposal Corps

This section would amend section 3063 of title 10, United States Code, to add Explosive Ordnance Disposal Corps to the list of Army branches.

Section 342—Explosive Ordnance Disposal Program

This section would establish a joint Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) program, with the Navy as executive agent for the Department of Defense, to coordinate and integrate research, development, and procurement for EOD defense programs. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the management structure of the program and to brief the results of the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by May 1, 2018.

Section 343—Expansion of Definition of Structures Interfering With Air Commerce and National Defense

This section would amend section 44718 of title 49, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to include the interests of national security, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, in the Secretary's aeronautical studies and reports required under this this statute.

Section 344—Development of Personal Protective Equipment for Female Marines and Soldiers

This section would require the Army and Marine Corps to develop a joint acquisition strategy to provide more effective personal protective equipment and organizational clothing and equipment to meet the specific and unique requirements for female Marines and soldiers.

Section 345—Study on Space-Available Travel System of the Department of Defense

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study of the space-available travel system and to provide the results of such a study to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after entering into a contract with a federally funded research and development center for the purposes of conducting such a study.

Section 346—Supply of Specialty Motors from Certain Manufacturers

This section would exempt certain small business manufacturers of specialty motors from the requirements of section 431.25 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, regarding energy conservation standards.

Section 347—Limitation on Use of Certain Funds Until Establishment and Implementation of Required Process by Which Members of the Armed Forces May Carry Appropriate Firearms on Military Installations

This section would limit the obligation and expenditure of 15 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide, for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy for fiscal year 2017, until the Secretary of Defense establishes and implements a process by which members of the Armed Forces may carry an appropriate firearm on a military installation, as required by section 526 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ACTIVE FORCES

Section 401—End Strengths for Active Forces

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Active Duty personnel of the Armed Forces as of September 30, 2017:

Service	FY 2016 Authorized	FY 2017		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2017 Request	FY 2016 Authorized
Army	475,000	460,000	480,000	20,000	5,000
Navy	329,200	322,900	324,615	1,715	−4,585
USMC	184,000	182,000	185,000	3,000	1,000
Air Force	320,715	317,000	321,000	4,000	285
DOD Total	1,308,915	1,281,900	1,310,615	28,715	1,700

Section 402—Revisions in Permanent Active Duty End Strength Minimum Levels

This section would establish new minimum Active Duty end strengths for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force as of September 30, 2017. The committee recommends 480,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Army, 322,900 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Navy, 185,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Marine Corps, and 321,000 as the minimum Active Duty end strength for the Air Force.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE FORCES

Section 411—End Strengths for Selected Reserve

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Selected Reserve personnel, including the end strength for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves, as of September 30, 2017:

Service	FY 2016 Authorized	FY 2017		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2017 Request	FY 2016 Authorized
Army National Guard	342,000	335,000	350,000	15,000	8,000
Army Reserve	198,000	195,000	205,000	10,000	7,000
Navy Reserve	57,400	58,000	58,000	0	600
Marine Corps Reserve	38,900	38,500	38,500	0	−400
Air National Guard	105,500	105,700	105,700	0	200
Air Force Reserve	69,200	69,000	69,000	0	−200
DOD Total	811,000	801,200	826,200	25,000	15,200
Coast Guard Reserve	7,000	7,000	7,000	0	0

Section 412—End Strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in Support of the Reserves

This section would authorize the following end strengths for Reserves on Active Duty in support of the Reserves as of September 30, 2017:

Service	FY 2016 Authorized	FY 2017		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2017 Request	FY 2016 Authorized
Army National Guard	30,770	30,155	30,155	0	−615
Army Reserve	16,261	16,261	16,261	0	0
Navy Reserve	9,934	9,955	9,955	0	21
Marine Corps Reserve	2,260	2,261	2,261	0	1
Air National Guard	14,748	14,764	14,764	0	16
Air Force Reserve	3,032	2,955	2,955	0	−77

Service	FY 2016 Authorized	FY 2017		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2017 Request	FY 2016 Authorized
DOD Total	77,005	76,351	76,351	0	−654

Section 413—End Strengths for Military Technicians (Dual Status)

This section would authorize the following end strengths for military technicians (dual status) as of September 30, 2017:

Service	FY 2016 Authorized	FY 2017		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2017 Request	FY 2016 Authorized
Army National Guard	26,099	25,507	25,507	0	−592
Army Reserve	7,395	7,570	7,570	0	175
Air National Guard	22,104	22,103	22,103	0	−1
Air Force Reserve	9,814	10,061	10,061	0	247
DOD Total	65,412	65,241	65,241	0	−171

Section 414—Fiscal Year 2017 Limitation on Number of Non-Dual Status Technicians

This section would establish the maximum end strengths for the Reserve Components of the Army and Air Force for non-dual status technicians as of September 30, 2017:

Service	FY 2016 Authorized	FY 2017		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2017 Request	FY 2016 Authorized
Army National Guard	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0
Air National Guard	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve	595	420	420	0	−175
Air Force Reserve	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total	2,635	2,460	2,460	0	−175

Section 415—Maximum Number of Reserve Personnel Authorized To Be on Active Duty for Operational Support

This section would authorize, as required by section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, the maximum number of Reserve Component personnel who may be on Active Duty or full-time National Guard duty during fiscal year 2017 to provide operational support. The personnel authorized here do not count against the end strengths authorized by section 401 or section 412 of this Act unless the duration on Active Duty exceeds the limitations in section 115(b)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

Service	FY 2016 Authorized	FY 2017		Change from	
		Request	Committee Recommendation	FY 2017 Request	FY 2016 Authorized
Army National Guard	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Navy Reserve	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

Section 416—Sense of Congress on Full-Time Support for the Army National Guard

This section would express a sense of Congress that an adequately supported, full-time support force consisting of active and reserve personnel and military technicians for the Army National Guard is essential to maintaining the readiness of the Army National Guard.

SUBTITLE C—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 421—Military Personnel

This section would authorize appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in the funding table in section 4401 of division D of this Act.

TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Army National Guard Preventive Intervention for Suicide and Substance Abuse

The committee commends the Army National Guard for implementing a new, proactive approach to assessing the at-risk behaviors of members of the National Guard and for making suicide and substance abuse prevention a priority. The committee recognizes the Army National Guard's focused efforts to combat behaviors that may lead to substance abuse and suicide among service members, through the implementation of the Prevention, Response and Outreach program (PRO). PRO, which is an evidenced-based model that proactively identifies at-risk behaviors before soldiers are at a point of crisis, employs data-driven decisions to initiate commander interventions, monitor completion of support programs, and track follow-up to ensure ongoing support is available. The committee encourages the Army National Guard to continue its efforts by leveraging expertise to accelerate implementation of preventive measures such as those in the PRO program.

Briefing on Credentialing Programs for Service Members in Combat Arms Specialties

The committee is supportive of efforts made by the services to encourage service members to earn civilian credentials in comparable fields to their military occupations while on duty. These programs have the potential to remove an obstacle to employment faced by members of the military after they conclude their service. However, the committee is concerned that the opportunity to earn these credentials is limited for service members in combat arms fields. While this is largely due to the lack of an equivalent profession outside of uniform, the Department of Defense identified in a 2013 report to Congress that these service members possess soft skills such as "leadership, problem-solving, and team-building [which] can be related to the skills and credentials required for civilian careers." The committee agrees with this assessment that the skills, character, and training that our service members possess make them outstanding potential employees. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretaries of the military services to brief the House Committee on Armed Service no later than 120 days from the date of the enactment of this Act on the availability of credentials provided by accredited bodies which are aligned with the skills possessed by service members in combat arms specialties as well as how service members in these types of specialties are informed of those opportunities.

Briefing on Stars and Stripes Funding

Before the Secretary of Defense or the Defense Media Activity makes a determination or takes action to remove or reduce the appropriated funding for the Stars and Stripes, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense or his designee to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the justification or determination for the reduction or removal of Stars and Stripes from appropriated funding.

Community and Military Education Partnerships

The committee is aware that partnerships exist between the military and civilian communities to enhance education support of all children by understanding the needs and perspective of military children. Therefore, the committee directs Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2017, on the policies governing ongoing partnership efforts between the Department and communities with unusually high concentrations of military dependents enrolled in public schools. The briefing should address the following elements: an evaluation of partnership efforts in areas considered overseas assignments with unusually high concentrations of military dependents enrolled; organizations and resources currently dedicated to enhancement of these community partnerships; policies and guidelines governing the funding of community partnerships; and any other matters the Secretary deems relevant.

Comptroller General Review of the Military Entrance Processing Stations Medical Examinations

The committee understands that it is often difficult for the military services to have full visibility of the medical history of potential recruits. The committee is concerned that incomplete medical information and inadequate medical screening may result in attrition before the Active Duty enlistees' initial commitments are fulfilled. Further, the committee is concerned that the lack of availability of the Department of Defense electronic health record within the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) exacerbates the lack of visibility of pre-service medical conditions by the services throughout the individual's career. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the MEPS medical screening and submit a report on results of the review to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2017. The review shall address, at a minimum, the following:

(1) An evaluation of the extent to which attrition prior to completion of initial commitment is related to medical reasons;

(2) An assessment of the processes in place for recruiters and at MEPS for identifying, screening, and tracking medical qualifications of applicants; and

(3) An assessment of whether the current structure of the MEPS supports optimal medical screening and permanent documentation of medical conditions identified prior to initial entry.

Cyber Science Education at the Service Academies

The committee recognizes the growing threat to United States national, economic, and infrastructure security, among others, from destructive and disruptive cyberattacks by malicious government, criminal, and individual actors. The Department has formally recognized cyberspace as a domain of warfare that has become as critical to military operations as land, sea, air, and space, and as such, the military must be able to defend and operate within it. The committee believes that this practice should begin at the earliest levels of education within the U.S. military. The committee therefore encourages the Department to recognize the importance of cyber education within each of the U.S. military service academies and actively promote cyber sciences education and training within the service's respective curriculum.

Database Tracking System for Valor Awards

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its commitment to improving the awards and decoration process in order to recognize service members for their actions in a timely and efficient manner. The Department's recent Military Decorations and Awards Review, in conjunction with the Department's report on the Medal of Honor Process that was directed in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, highlighted numerous ways to improve the timeliness of processing Medal of Honor recommendations and mitigate the mishandling or loss of a nomination. The committee encourages the Department to develop and implement a Department-wide electronic awards sys-

tem, much like the Marine Corps Improved Awards Processing System, in order to streamline and facilitate online processing from initiation through approval, and provide better visibility of high-level valor awards, as well as to serve as the official system of record for preserving the award documents for later verification.

Dual Military Shared Parental Leave Feasibility Study

The committee notes that dual military couples are faced with unique challenges after the birth of a child. Women account for 15.6 % (201,318) of the active duty force and the number of annual births for active duty women is typically between 15,000 and 16,000 or about 7–8% of the women on active duty every year. Currently, a service member who gives birth is afforded 12 weeks leave and a service member whose spouse gives birth is eligible for 10 days of parental leave. There are approximately 84,000 dual military marriages that have to balance the challenges of two of the most solemn commitments they can make: a commitment to serve their country and a commitment to start and support a family.

The committee recognizes that paid maternity and parental leave can encourage recruitment and retention and help support the well-being of military families, especially those dual serving military families. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of allowing dual military couples to allocate shared parental leave based on the needs of their family. Specifically, the Secretary should address the impact on military recruitment, retention, and readiness, as well as the medical impact on the service members and the ability of both service members to bond with their child. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services on his findings by December 1, 2016.

Enhanced Access and Consideration before Discharge Review Boards and Correction of Military Records Boards

The committee recognizes the efforts made by the Department of Defense and the military departments to ensure applicants before Discharge Review Boards and Boards for the Correction of Military Records receive full and fair consideration of their applications for discharge upgrades. However, the committee encourages the Department to look for additional opportunities to enhance the review process, and allow applicants every opportunity to present the facts associated with their application. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department to extend the "liberal consideration" standard established for those applicants who allege a nexus between their misconduct and a diagnosis of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder or related conditions to all discharge upgrade cases considered by Discharge Review Boards, in addition to Boards for the Correction of Military Records.

In addition, the committee notes that advances in technology have made remote communication through video teleconferencing, telephone and similar technology more efficient and cost-effective than ever before. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to examine the feasibility of incorporating commercial, off-the-shelf video and video teleconferencing technologies to allow

applicants to the Discharge Review Board or, when appropriate, the Boards for the Correction of Military Records, to appear before the boards remotely. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than February 1, 2017, on the results of the examination.

Implementation by the Services of the Recommendations Listed in the "Program to Assist Veterans to Acquire Commercial Driver's Licenses Report to Congress"

The committee notes that the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112–141) mandated the creation of a report from the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, and in cooperation with the States, to study the regulatory, economic, and administrative challenges in obtaining Commercial Drivers Licenses by members and former members of the Armed Forces who received training and operated military Commercial Motor Vehicles safely during their service. The result was the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's (FMCSA) report "Program to Assist Veterans to Acquire Commercial Driver's Licenses Report to Congress". The committee is aware that while some of the recommendations have been partially implemented by particular Services, some of the Services have yet to take action on the proposed recommendations. Easing the transition to civilian employment for our service men and women should be a priority of the Department of Defense, especially when the skills and training gained while in the service are applicable to the civilian market. Accordingly, the committee directs the service secretaries to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees, no later than February 1, 2017, regarding where the services currently are in their efforts to implement these recommendations and what their plans are to implement those that have not been completed fully.

Improved Oversight of Hazing Prevention Programs and Reporting in the Military Services

The committee recognizes the efforts made by the Department of Defense and the military services to improve hazing prevention programs and increase oversight in an attempt to eliminate hazing in the military. Although the military services have created prevention training programs and have established reporting mechanisms, the committee remains concerned with the wide disparity in the programs across the services, to include the variation in reporting and tracking requirements of incidents of hazing. The committee notes the Department of Defense issued an updated policy, dated December 23, 2015, that defines hazing and bullying, directs requirements for training and education with respect to hazing and bullying, and standardizes reporting of hazing and bullying. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than December 1, 2016, on the implementation of the changes outlined in the December 23, 2015, policy memorandum. This briefing shall include an overview of the results of the 180-day report on allegations directed by the memorandum.

Information Regarding On-the-Job Training and Apprenticeship Programs

The committee is concerned about the lack of information provided on Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits for on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs during the Transition Assistance Program (TAP). In a November 2015 report, the Government Accountability Office found that the Transition Assistance Program did not adequately inform service members transitioning from Active Duty service of their options with respect to the availability of apprenticeship programs, in addition to Post-9/11 educational benefits. For example, 81 percent of surveyed TAP participants reported that they did not think TAP adequately informs veterans about on-the-job training and apprenticeship options. Nearly 50 percent of veterans who have used their Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits for a non-college degree, such as a trade school program, had the same response. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense in collaboration with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure on-the-job training and apprenticeship programs are adequately addressed in TAP.

Informing Service Members About the United Services Military Apprenticeship Program

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to ensure that all enlisted sailors and Marines receive a briefing during their military occupational specialty training that provides an overview of the United Services Military Apprenticeship Program (USMAP), including how to register and navigate USMAP and the value of USMAP in obtaining civilian employment following military service. The Secretary of the Navy is also encouraged to ensure that USMAP coordinators are assigned to appropriate commands. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by April 1, 2017, on the updated policy implementation plan for USMAP.

Integration of Women Into Previously Closed Military Occupations

The committee recognizes the extensive research and planning undertaken by the Department of Defense and the military services to fully integrate women into the Armed Forces. The committee understands that the services have begun to execute the implementation of their approved plans to open all previously closed military occupational specialties, career fields, and branches for accession by women. The service implementation plans address the Secretary of Defense's seven specified concerns: transparent standards, population size, physical demands and physiological differences, conduct and culture, talent management, operating abroad, and assessment and adjustment. The committee notes the services' commitment to maintaining gender neutral standards and the intent to assign women to previously closed occupational specialties based on merit rather than quotas. The committee believes assigning personnel, regardless of gender, should be based on established standards and merit and will monitor these critical factors to ensure the military services are complying with their plans.

Military Reemployment Initiatives

The committee applauds the efforts of the military services to partner with local communities to assist service members with post-military employment in the community. The committee is aware of an initiative between Tyndall Air Force Base, Eglin Air Force Base, Hurlbert Field, and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity to provide the skill sets of transitioning service members in the area to the local community to assist with providing jobs as well as expanding economic development for the community. The committee believes these efforts are beneficial to service members and veterans. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense and the military services, where appropriate, to continue to work with local communities to assist service members with post-service employment by expanding this program to other service branches and to ensure that the transfer of information is as efficient as possible.

National Guard Bureau Briefing Requirement

The committee notes a perceived imbalance regarding manning and resource allocation on a State by State and territory by territory basis, therefore the National Guard Bureau is directed to provide a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the distribution of full-time manning and controlled grade positions as they relate to all 54 states and territories no later than February 1, 2017, that includes the following elements:

(1) A description of the National Guard Bureau formula and allocation of full-time manning and how that number relates to resource end strength; why states are currently equally funded at the headquarters, staff and senior controlled grade level.

(2) Analysis and recommendations of a manning and end strength formula based upon an equitable formula as opposed to equally divided among states and territories, to include why states are not resourced at the paid end strength levels with full-time manning when requested to increase end strength by National Guard Bureau.

Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality Compliance With Department of Defense Policy

The committee is concerned about the protection of severely disabled employees of Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentality (NAFI) facilities from losing their jobs and directs the United States Air Force to adhere to Department of Defense Instruction 4105.67 and section 2492 of title 10, United States Code, which states that Non-Appropriated Fund Instrumentalities will not enter into contracts or agreements that will result in the loss of jobs pursuant to the Javits-Wagner-O'Day Act (AbilityOne Program). Currently, the Air Force Transformation Initiative (AFTI) is phasing out employees with severe disabilities who are employed through the AbilityOne program and replacing them with non-disabled individuals employed by the commercial prime-vendor for AFTI.

Therefore, the committee further directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2016, on the Air Force's compliance

with the Randolph-Sheppard Act, section 107 of title 20, United States Code.

Report on Department of Defense Efforts To Provide Timely Review of Separation Characterization of Former Members of the Armed Forces Who Were Separated by Reason of Sexual Orientation

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report on the efforts by the Department of Defense to ensure that former members of the Armed Forces whose separation was characterized, pursuant to section 654 of title 10, United States Code, as in effect before such section was repealed pursuant to the Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–321), as less than honorable by reason of their sexual orientation, are granted a timely process to correct the separation characterization to honorable. The report shall include the following:

(1) The number of such former members of the Armed Forces whose separation has been upgraded to honorable.

(2) The number of such former members whose request for an upgrade has been denied and, in the case of such members, the general trends for such a denial being overturned.

(3) The feasibility of providing automatic upgrades for such former members whose separation was less than honorable solely by reason of their sexual orientation and whose record does not disclose any type of misconduct.

Report on the Purpose and Utility of a Registration System for Military Selective Service

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by July 1, 2017, a report on the current and future need for a centralized registration system for military selective service. The report under subsection shall include the following:

(1) A detailed analysis of the current benefits derived, both directly and indirectly, from the Military Selective Service System, including:

(A) The extent to which mandatory registration benefits military recruiting;

(B) The extent to which a national registration capability serves as a deterrent to other nations.

(2) An analysis of the functions currently performed by the Selective Service System that would be assumed by the Department in the absence of a national registration capability;

(3) An analysis of the systems, manpower, and facilities that would be needed by the Department to physically mobilize inductees in the absence of the Selective Service System;

(4) A detailed analysis of the Department's manpower needs in the event of an emergency requiring mass mobilization, including:

(A) A detailed timeline, along with the factors considered in arriving at this timeline, of when the Department of Defense would require:

(i) The first inductees to report for service;

(ii) The first 100,000 inductees to report for service;

(iii) The first medical personnel to report for service.

(B) An analysis of any additional critical skills that would be needed in the event of a national emergency, and a timeline for when the Department would require the first inductees to report for service.

(5) A list of the assumptions used by the Department when conducting their analysis.

Review and Report on Port Chicago

The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to carry out a thorough review of the circumstances which may have influenced the mutiny charges against, and convictions of the individuals convicted in courts-martial arising from the explosion at the Port Chicago (California) Naval Magazine on July 17, 1944. The purpose of the review shall be to assess the extent to which racial prejudice or other factors may have impacted the African American sailors who were stationed at Port Chicago and Mare Island throughout the duration of their service. Specifically, the committee directs the Secretary to review findings of racial bias including those acknowledged in the Navy's 1994 report entitled "Port Chicago Courts-Martial Review." If the Secretary determines that the filing of a charge of mutiny against any of the African American sailors in any such case was connected to, or impacted by, racial prejudice, or if the Secretary determines that the presence of prejudicial practices created a pattern of discriminatory treatment affecting African American sailors at Port Chicago, then, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the committee directs the Secretary to submit to the President and Congress such recommendations as the Secretary considers appropriate regarding corrective actions that should be considered.

Review of Qualified Joint Tours

The committee commends the Department of Defense for its ongoing commitment to ensuring the interoperability of the joint force. The committee notes that operations conducted by the Department and the uniformed services at all levels of command are increasingly characterized by their joint nature. Accordingly, in light of the review of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–433), the committee urges the Department to continue these efforts and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than December 1, 2016, on the composition of the Joint Duty Assignment List (JDAL) and recommendations for congressional action required to bring the current JDAL in line with the joint nature of the current force.

Suicide Prevention

The committee notes that the Department of Defense Inspector General report entitled "Assessment of DOD Suicide Prevention Process," dated September 30, 2015, made a series of recommendations to improve the Department's efforts to reduce the incidence of suicide in the U.S. military. The committee applauds the efforts by the Department of Defense and the military services to reduce suicide and improve prevention programs, but the committee believes that the Department can and should improve its efforts, based on the Inspector General's recommendations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 1, 2016, on the implementation of the recommendations made in the Department of Defense Inspector General's report.

Troops to Teachers Partnership

The committee notes that veterans and their family members have proven to be exceptional teachers, as demonstrated through the national Troops to Teachers program where almost 20,000 veterans have distinguished themselves in America's classrooms. The committee believes that the Troops to Teachers program provides an organizational plan for a national effort to overcome two critical issues facing our nation: the continuous improvement of our schools and the transition of service members and their families into civilian roles after they have served our nation. Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to investigate the establishment of a public-private partnership with a 501c organization capable of leveraging private donations and relationships to improve and expand upon the current Troops to Teachers model.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—OFFICER PERSONNEL POLICY

Section 501—Number of Marine Corps General Officers

This section would amend sections 525, 526 and 5045 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an increase in the number of general officers in the grade above major general from 15 to 17, decrease the number of general officers in the grade of major general from 23 to 22 and increase the number of deputy commandants within the Marine Corps from 6 to 7.

Section 502—Equal Consideration of Officers for Early Retirement or Discharge

This section would amend section 638a of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretaries of the military departments authority to consider officers for involuntary separation below the grade of lieutenant colonel or commander as a single, consolidated year group without distinctions based on retirement eligibility. Such a change allows the military departments to conduct separation boards in a manner consistent with promotion selection board practices.

Section 503—Modification of Authority to Drop from Rolls a Commissioned Officer

This section would modify section 1161 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense (or in the case of a commissioned officer of the Coast Guard, the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating when it is not operating in the Navy), in addition to the President, to drop from the rolls certain commissioned officers.

SUBTITLE B—RESERVE COMPONENT MANAGEMENT

Section 511—Extension of Removal of Restrictions on the Transfer of Officers Between the Active and Inactive National Guard

This section would amend section 512 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) to extend the authorization to allow officers to participate in the Inactive National Guard for 3 years, from December 31, 2016 until December 31, 2019. The extension would give the National Guard more flexibility to access departing Active Component members during the drawdown and provide a 5-year period to evaluate the benefits of Inactive National Guard transferability.

Section 512—Extension of Temporary Authority to Use Air Force Reserve Component Personnel to Provide Training and Instruction Regarding Pilot Training

This section would amend section 514(a)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) to extend, for 1 year, the current temporary authority for the Air Force to allow no more than 50 Active Guard and Reserve personnel and dual status military technicians to instruct and train Active Duty and members of foreign military forces in the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or possessions of the United States as a primary duty.

Section 513—Limitations on Ordering Selected Reserve to Active Duty for Preplanned Missions in Support of the Combatant Commands

This section would amend section 12304(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to order forces to Active Duty during the year of execution if the Secretary identifies manpower and associated costs for the year of execution and provides a 30-day notice to the congressional defense committees.

Section 514—Exemption of Military Technicians (Dual Status) from Civilian Employee Furloughs

This section would amend section 10216(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to exempt military dual-status technicians from civilian employee furloughs.

SUBTITLE C—GENERAL SERVICE AUTHORITIES

Section 521—Technical Correction to Annual Authorization for Personnel Strengths

This section would amend section 115 of title 10, United States Code, to update the references to section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, as amended by the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). Section 502(f) provides for the conditions under which the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force may order a member of the National Guard to perform training or other duty in addition to required drills and field exercises.

Section 522—Entitlement to Leave for Adoption or Birth of Child by Dual Military Couples

This section would amend section 701(i) of title 10, United States Code, to provide one service member up to 21 days of leave under this subsection and the other service member up to 14 days of leave for the adoption of a child for dual-military couples of the Armed Forces.

Section 523—Revision of Deployability Rating System and Planning Reform

This section would amend chapter 1003 of title 10, United States Code, to revise the Department of the Army's deployability rating system and manner in which the Army is required to track prioritization of deployable units. To the extent it would apply across all Army components, this section would facilitate implementation of the Army "Total Force" Policy by requiring systems to identify the priority of deployment and track readiness for all Army units, not just for the Reserve Components. Currently, the Army is operating under the construct set forth in the Army National Guard Combat Readiness Reform Act of 1992 (title XI of Public Law 102–484; 10 U.S.C. 10105 note), which was enacted after the experience of Operation Desert Storm when several Army National Guard combat brigades were mobilized for, but not deployed to, combat.

Section 524—Expansion of Authority to Execute Certain Military Instruments

This section would amend section 1044d(c) of title 10, United States Code, to enable notaries to execute military testamentary instruments. This section would also modify section 1044a of title 10, United States Code, to extend Federal notary powers to those civilian paralegals working within military legal assistance offices.

Section 525—Technical Correction to Voluntary Separation Pay and Benefits

This section would amend section 1175a of title 10, United States Code, by updating the references to section 502(f) of title 32, United States Code, and the list of involuntary mobilization authorities.

Section 526—Annual Notice to Members of the Armed Forces Regarding Child Custody Protections Guaranteed by the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to notify service members with dependents annually, and prior to deployment, of the child custody protections guaranteed under the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act.

Section 527—Pilot Program on Consolidated Army Recruiting

This section would direct the Secretary of the Army to establish a 3-year pilot program in which recruiters from all three components (Regular, Reserve, and National Guard) are authorized to recruit individuals into any of the components, and receive credit toward periodic enlistment goals for each enlistment regardless of component. Not later than 1 year after implementation of the pilot program, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed report on the design of the program. The Secretary would also be required to submit a final report at the conclusion of the pilot period.

Section 528—Application of Military Selective Service Registration and Conscription Requirements to Female Citizens and Residents of the United States Between the Ages of 18 and 26

This section would amend section 3802(a) of title 50, United States Code, to require both male and female United States citizens, and every other male or female citizen residing in the United States, between the ages of 18 and 26, to register with the Selective Service.

Section 529—Parental Leave for Members of the Armed Forces

This section would amend chapter 40 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new section 701a which would authorize 14 days of leave to a member of the Armed Forces who becomes a parent when that member's spouse gives birth. This section would also amend section 701 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize 36 days of leave, to be shared between two members of the armed forces who are married to each other and adopt a child.

SUBTITLE D—MILITARY JUSTICE, INCLUDING SEXUAL ASSAULT AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND RESPONSE

Section 541—Expedited Reporting of Child Abuse and Neglect to State Child Protective Services

This section would amend section 1787 of title 10, United States Code, to require military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense working on military installations, who are otherwise required by law to report suspected instances of child abuse and neglect to their Department of Defense chain of command, to also promptly notify State Child Protective Services. This section would focus on reporting requirements between the Department of Defense and State Child Protective Services, but is in no way intended to require or encourage unnecessary duplicative efforts on

the part of federal and state agencies regarding investigations or other proceedings.

Section 542—Extension of the Requirement for Annual Report Regarding Sexual Assaults and Coordination with Release of Family Advocacy Report

This section would extend the requirement for the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO) report through January 31, 2021. In addition, it would require the release of the SAPRO report to be timed to coincide with the release of the Family Advocacy Program Report, as required elsewhere in this Act. This amendment would supersede section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

Section 543—Requirement for Annual Family Advocacy Program Report Regarding Child Abuse and Domestic Violence

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives an annual report, beginning not later than January 31, 2017, through January 31, 2021, on the child abuse and domestic abuse incident data contained in the Department of Defense Family Advocacy Program central registry for the previous year, and an analysis of the effectiveness of the Family Advocacy Program.

Section 544—Improved Department of Defense Prevention of and Response to Hazing in the Armed Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a comprehensive data-collection system for reports related to hazing in the Armed Forces, and require the Secretary of each military department to improve training to better recognize, prevent, and respond to hazing.

Section 545—Burdens of Proof Applicable to Investigations and Reviews Related to Protected Communications of Members of the Armed Forces and Prohibited Retaliatory Actions

This section would amend section 1034 of title 10, United States Code, to establish the burden of proof under this section for military retaliation investigations to be the same as the burden of proof applicable to retaliation investigation under section 1221(e) of title 5, United States Code.

Section 546—Improved Investigation of Allegations of Professional Retaliation

This section would amend section 1034(c)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary concerned to ensure that any individual investigating an allegation of retaliation be trained in the definition and characteristics of retaliation, and where applicable, trained in the characteristics of sex-related offenses.

SUBTITLE E—MEMBER EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND TRANSITION

Section 561—Revision to Quality Assurance of Certification Programs and Standards

This section would amend section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, relating to a program to enable members of the Armed Forces to obtain, while serving in the Armed Forces, professional credentials related to military training and skills that translate into civilian occupations. Specifically, this section would amend the requirements of any credentialing program used in connection with the skills program.

Section 562—Establishment of ROTC Cyber Institutes at Senior Military Colleges

This section would amend chapter 103 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a program to establish ROTC Cyber Institutes at the six Senior Military Colleges for purposes of accelerating the development of foundational expertise in critical cyber operational skills for future military and civilian leaders of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense, to include such leaders of the Reserve Components.

Section 563—Military-to-Mariner Transition

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to jointly report on the steps the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security have taken to maximize the extent to which Armed Forces service, training, and qualifications are creditable towards United States merchant mariner licenses and certifications and to promote awareness among Armed Forces personnel who serve in vessel operating positions of the requirements for post-service use of training, education, and practical experience from service in the Armed Forces in satisfying requirements for merchant mariner licenses and certifications.

Section 564—Employment Authority for Civilian Faculty at Certain Military Department Schools

This section would amend section 4021 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary concerned to hire staff for professional military education courses regardless of course length.

Section 565—Revision of Name on Military Service Record to Reflect Change in Name of a Member of the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, after Separation from the Armed Forces

This section would amend section 1551 of title 10, United States Code, to allow any person who legally changes their name to reflect their gender identity after separation from the Armed Forces to receive a new certificate of discharge or acceptance of resignation order under that new name.

Section 566—Direct Employment Pilot Program for Members of the National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to enhance efforts of the Department of Defense to provide job placement assistance and related employment services directly to members of the National Guard and Reserves. This section would also require the Secretary to submit a report on the program to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by January 31, 2021.

Section 567—Prohibition on Establishment, Maintenance, or Support of Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps Units at Educational Institutions That Display Confederate Battle Flag

This section would amend section 2102 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary concerned from establishing, maintaining, or supporting a Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit at an educational institution that displays the Confederate battle flag except where the board of visitors has voted to take down the flag described.

SUBTITLE F—DEFENSE DEPENDENTS' EDUCATION AND MILITARY FAMILY READINESS MATTERS

Section 571—Continuation of Authority to Assist Local Educational Agencies That Benefit Dependents of Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees

This section would authorize $30.0 million for the continuation of the Department of Defense assistance in fiscal year 2017 to local educational agencies that are impacted by the enrollment of dependent children of military members and Department of Defense civilian employees.

Section 572—Support for Programs Providing Camp Experience for Children of Military Families

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide support to nonprofit organizations that carry out camp or camp-like programs for children of military families who have experienced the death of a family member or a family member with substance abuse disorder or post-traumatic stress disorder.

SUBTITLE G—DECORATIONS AND AWARDS

Section 581—Review Regarding Award of Medal of Honor to Certain Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander War Veterans

This section would require the Secretaries of the military departments to review the service records of Asian American and Native American Pacific Islander veterans from the Korean war and Vietnam war to determine if the award of the Medal of Honor is appropriate. The Secretary concerned would be obligated to review the records of veterans who were previously awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, and the Air Force Cross, and veterans submitted to the Secretary concerned during the 1-year pe-

riod beginning with the date of the enactment of this Act. In those cases where the Secretary concerned determines that service records support the award of the Medal of Honor, this section would also waive the statutory time limitations for award.

Section 582—Authorization for Award of Medals for Acts of Valor

This section would waive the statutory time limitation specified in sections 3744, 6248, and 8744 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the President to award the Medal of Honor to those individuals identified by the "Current Conflict Service Cross and Silver Star Awards Review" directed by the Secretary of Defense on January 7, 2016.

Section 583—Authorization for Award of the Medal of Honor to Gary M. Rose for Acts of Valor During the Vietnam War

This section would waive the statutory time limitation under section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the President to award the Medal of Honor to Gary M. Rose, who served in the United States Army during the Vietnam War. The committee takes this action based on the written confirmation by the Secretary of Defense that the actions of Gary M. Rose merit the consideration of award of the Medal of Honor by the President.

Section 584—Authorization for Award of the Medal of Honor to Charles S. Kettles for Acts of Valor During the Vietnam War

This section would waive the statutory time limitation under section 3744 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the President to award the Medal of Honor to Charles S. Kettles, who served in the United States Army during the Vietnam War. The committee takes this action based on the written confirmation by the Secretary of Defense that the actions of Charles S. Kettles merit the consideration of award of the Medal of Honor by the President.

SUBTITLE H—MISCELLANEOUS REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 591—Burial of Cremated Remains in Arlington National Cemetery of Certain Persons Whose Service Is Deemed To Be Active Service

This section would amend section 2410 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of the Army to ensure that the cremated remains of an individual, whose service has been determined to be Active Duty service, are eligible for inurnment with military honors in Arlington National Cemetery. Further, this section would require the Secretary, not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the interment and inurnment capacity of Arlington National Cemetery.

Section 592—Representation from Members of the Armed Forces on Boards, Councils, and Committees Making Recommendations Relating to Military Personnel Issues

This section would require that enlisted or retired enlisted members of the Armed Forces be represented on all boards, panels, commissions, or task forces established under chapter 7 of title 10, United States Code, to render a recommendation on any aspect of personnel policy directly affecting enlisted personnel.

Section 593—Body Mass Index Test

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to review the current body mass index test procedure.

Section 594—Preseparation Counseling Regarding Options for Donating Brain Tissue at Time of Death for Research

This section would require that information be provided during transition separation counseling concerning options for donating brain tissue at the time of the member's death for chronic traumatic encephalopathy research.

Section 595—Recognition of the Expanded Service Opportunities Available to Female Members of the Armed Forces and the Long Service of Women in the Armed Forces

This section would express Congress' recognition of women who have served and are currently serving in the Armed Forces.

Section 596—Sense of Congress Regarding Plight of Male Victims of Military Sexual Trauma

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should enhance access to intensive medical and mental health treatment of male victims of sexual assault; look for opportunities to use them as presenters at prevention training; and ensure medical and mental health providers are trained to meet the needs of male victims.

Section 597—Sense of Congress Regarding Section 504 of Title 10, United States Code, on Existing Authority of the Department of Defense to Enlist Individuals, Not Otherwise Eligible for Enlistment, Whose Enlistment Is Vital to the National Interest

This section would restate the existing authority under section 504 of title 10, United States Code, regarding the enlistment of certain individuals.

Section 598—Protection of Second Amendment Rights of Military Families

This section would amend section 921(b) of title 18, United States Code, to state that, for the purposes of chapter 44 of title 18, a member of the Armed Forces on active duty and the spouse of such a member are residents of the State in which the permanent duty station of the member is located, and that the spouse may satisfy the identification document requirements of the chapter by presenting specified documents.

Section 599—Pilot Program on Advanced Technology for Alcohol Abuse Prevention

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program to demonstrate the feasibility of using breathalyzers to monitor the progress of alcohol abuse prevention programs.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Feasibility Study to Expanding Veterans Access to Commissary

The committee seeks to better serve disabled veterans that live near military installations and would like to increase their access to commissary and exchange facilities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the feasibility of allowing disabled veterans with a thirty percent disability rating or higher; or that have been awarded a Purple Heart the use of the commissary and exchange stores on the same basis as a member of the armed forces entitled to retired or retainer pay. The determination should include an evaluation of the potential costs to the Department and the impacts to the disabled veteran community. The committee further directs the Secretary to submit the results of the report to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017.

Inspector General Review of the Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Contract for the Pacific

The committee is concerned about the performance of the current Pacific Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (FFV) delivery contract, the past FFV contract and the FFV local purchase authority across the Defense Commissary Agency enterprise outside the continental United States. The committee therefore directs the Department of Defense Inspector General to evaluate and report to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on the effectiveness of the new FFV purchase process vice the previous second destination transportation funded process, and to do an assessment of the similar local purchase process currently ongoing in Europe.

The evaluation shall address the following issues so as to facilitate comparison between the establishment and progression of the local sourcing model in Europe and in the Pacific:

(1) A timeline showing the percentage of locally sourced produce made available to commissaries in Europe as compared to the Pacific, in 6 month increments, beginning from a point in time not less than 6 months prior to the expiration of precursor contracts in each theater. The review should include any information related to produce market maturity in both theaters and any documented issues related to the locally sourced produce in both.

(2) The amount of produce sold and appropriated funds paid by the Department of Defense for second destination transportation (surface, air and in-theater) in the last full year prior to award of the first contract for the locally sourced fresh fruits and vegetables for commissaries in Europe and the Pacific theater.

In addition, the Inspector General shall compare the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) contract for produce in effect through the end of October 2015, and the new contract's performance which began in November 2015, to include:

(1) Comparison of the amount of produce lost due to spoilage or importation delays/requirements between the previous Pacific contract to the current contracts.

(2) Comparison of the benefits/impacts of the current and previous DeCA models for the provision of fresh fruits and vegetables to Pacific commissaries relative to:

(a) Department of Defense;

(b) Commissary patrons; and

(c) The Cost of Living Allowance.

(3) Documentation of the percentage of increase or decrease in local market prices on produce as compared to Pacific commissary prices on produce.

The Inspector General may call upon the Defense Contract Audit Agency for assistance in performing an audit of the recently replaced fresh fruits and vegetable contract DeCA administered for its overseas commissaries in the Pacific theater between April 2008, and October 2015, to ensure that the produce prices offered to commissary patrons were reasonable.

Service Members Group Life Insurance Report

The committee notes that Active Duty service members are required to participate in pre-deployment readiness briefings, in which Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (SGLI) is a covered topic. The committee is concerned about the process by which service members subsequently select life insurance coverage during their pre-deployment readiness processing. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by December 1, 2016, evaluating the information provided to each service member on their SGLI benefits as he or she prepares for deployment. The evaluation shall include but is not limited to:

(1) The number of service members who have opted for less than $400,000 of SGLI coverage and died in combat during their deployment for the last 10 years;

(2) The current briefing materials provided to service members informing them of prerequisites necessary for deployment, the number of administrative decisions required for pre-deployment, the number of pre-deployment briefings given, and the amount of time period in which the pre-deployment briefings occur;

(3) The ratio of briefers-to-service members that communicate SGLI benefits in service members' preparation for deployment and the opportunity for service members to seek one-on-one counseling for guidance on pre-deployment paperwork;

(4) The financial and familial effects of an automatic increase to maximum SGLI benefit levels when a service member prepares to deploy, of which a service member must opt out in order to not receive the highest coverage, then an automatic resumption of the service members' previous SGLI levels upon their return from deployment.

(5) Any proposed changes to the pre-deployment process which lessens the administrative burden for a service member while

maximizing benefits for next of kin in the event of SGLI benefit use.

Student Loan Interest for Eligible Military Borrowers

The committee notes that service members are exempt from paying interest on their federal student loans for the length of time served in an area of hostilities. Unfortunately, since 2008, eligible service members have avoidably overpaid $100 million dollars in federal student loan interest payments due to a lack of communication between the Department of Education, Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, and student loan servicers.

The committee also notes that the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110–315) requires the Secretary of Education, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to create a publicly available, searchable website that discloses information concerning those who qualify as an eligible military borrower in order to receive loan interest accrual exemptions based on their service in an area of hostilities. Moreover, the Secretary of Education, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, is tasked with making such information widely known to members of the Armed Forces (including members of the National Guard and Reserves), veterans and eligible dependents of veterans, States, institutions of higher education and the general public.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to establish a plan of action to ensure the required information regarding eligible military borrowers is shared in a timely manner so service members can receive the benefits due under the law. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the plan of action by December 1, 2016.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PAY AND ALLOWANCES

Section 601—Annual Adjustment of Monthly Basic Pay

This section would direct that the rates of basic pay under section 203(a) of title 37, United States Code, be increased in accordance with section 1009 of title 37, United States Code, notwithstanding a determination made by the President under subsection (e) of such section 1009.

Section 602—Extension of Authority to Provide Temporary Increase in Rates of Basic Allowance for Housing Under Certain Circumstances

This section would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the rates of basic allowance for housing in areas impacted by natural disasters or experiencing a sudden influx of personnel.

Section 603—Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reductions Based on the Duration of Temporary Duty Assignment or Civilian Travel

This section would amend section 474(d)(3) of title 37, United States Code, and section 5702(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, to prohibit the Secretary concerned from altering the per diem allowance for the duration of a temporary duty assignment of a member of the Armed Forces or an employee of the Department of Defense.

SUBTITLE B—BONUSES AND SPECIAL AND INCENTIVE PAYS

Section 611—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Reserve Forces

This section would extend the authority, through December 31, 2017, for the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the authority to reimburse travel expenses for inactive duty training outside of normal commuting distance, and income replacement payments for Reserve Component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for Active Duty service.

Section 612—One-Year Extension of Certain Bonus and Special Pay Authorities for Health Care Professionals

This section would extend the authority for the nurse officer candidate accession program, repayment of educational loans for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, the accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, the incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, the special pay for Selected Reserve health care professionals in critically short wartime specialties, the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties, until December 31, 2017.

Section 613—One-Year Extension of Special Pay and Bonus Authorities for Nuclear Officers

This section would extend the authority for the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending a period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus until December 31, 2017.

Section 614—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Title 37 Consolidated Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would extend the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, the special bonus and incentive pay authority for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities, the special health profes-

sions incentive pay and bonus authorities, contracting bonus for Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps cadets and midshipmen, hazardous duty pay, assignment pay or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and the retention bonus for members with critical military skills or assigned to high-priority units, until December 31, 2017.

Section 615—One-Year Extension of Authorities Relating to Payment of Other Title 37 Bonuses and Special Pays

This section would extend the authority for the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus for active members, the incentive pay for members of precommissioning programs pursuing foreign language proficiency, the accession bonus for new officers in critical skills, the incentive bonus for conversion to military occupational specialty to ease personnel shortage, the incentive bonus for transfer between Armed Forces, and the accession bonus for officer candidates, until December 31, 2017.

Section 616—Increase in Maximum Amount of Aviation Special Pays for Flying Duty

This section would amend section 334(c)(1) of title 37, United States Code, to increase the statutory limits for the aviation incentive pay and retention bonus and allow the Secretary concerned the flexibility to increase the aviation incentive pay limit set forth in regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense under section 374 of title 37, United States Code.

Section 617—Conforming Amendment to Consolidation of Special Pay, Incentive Pay, and Bonus Authorities

This section would amend section 332(c) of title 37, United States Code, to conform the consolidated bonus amount to the current amount authorized under section 308j of title 37, United States Code. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) increased the bonus authority to $20,000 under section 308j, but will sunset on September 30, 2017, when the new consolidated bonus authorities take effect pursuant to the National Defense Authorization Act for 2008 (Public Law 110–181).

Section 618—Technical and Clerical Amendments Relating to 2008 Consolidation of Certain Special Pay Authorities

This section would make technical and clerical corrections to titles 10, 20, 24, 36, 37, and 42, United States Code, as well as section 586 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), section 362 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), and section 112(c)(5)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as part of the Department of Defense's transition to the consolidated authorities in section 661 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), which provided eight consolidated statutory special and incentive pay authorities for future use to replace those currently in use. This sec-

tion is consistent with technical corrections included each year in the annual National Defense Authorization Act.

Section 619—Combat-Related Special Compensation Coordinating Amendment

This section would amend section 1413a(b)(3) of title 10, United States Code, to correct the computation of Combat-Related Special Compensation (CRSC) to match the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 enacted military retirement system reduction in the retirement base pay multiplier from 2.5 percent to 2.0 percent for the years of service formula to calculate retired pay to be restored by CRSC.

SUBTITLE C—DISABILITY, RETIRED PAY, AND SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Section 621—Separation Determinations for Members Participating in Thrift Savings Plan

This section would repeal section 632(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) that added an additional definition of separation from government service which addresses cases of separation and/or resumption of service but applies only to military members. The Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, which oversees and administers the Thrift Savings Plan, has identified conflicts between section 632(c)(2) and section 211(c) of title 37, United States Code, which applies to the entire Federal Government workforce.

Section 622—Continuation Pay for Full Thrift Savings Plan Members Who Have Completed 8 to 12 Years of Service

This section would amend section 356 of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Department of Defense the flexibility to pay continuation pay at any point between the time the member completes 8 years of service and before the member reaches 12 years of service, in exchange for an agreement to continue serving for a period of not less than 3 additional years.

Section 623—Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance

This section would amend section 1450(m) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance at $310 per month through fiscal year 2018.

Section 624—Equal Benefits Under Survivor Benefit Plan for Survivors of Reserve Component Members who Die in the Line of Duty during Inactive-Duty Training

This section would amend section 1451(c)(1)(A) of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the different treatment under the Survivor Benefit Plan accorded members of the Reserve Component who die from an injury or illness incurred or aggravated in the line of duty during Inactive-Duty training, as compared to the treatment of members of the Armed Forces who die in the line of duty while on Active Duty.

Section 625—Use of Member's Current Pay Grade and Years of Service, Rather Than Final Retirement Pay Grade and Years of Service, in a Division of Property Involving Disposable Retired Pay

This section would amend section 1408(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code, to change the calculation concerning a service member's retired pay in a division of property.

SUBTITLE D—COMMISSARY AND NONAPPROPRIATED FUND INSTRUMENTALITY BENEFITS AND OPERATIONS

Section 631—Protection and Enhancement of Access to and Savings at Commissaries and Exchanges

This section would amend sections 2481(a) and (c), 2483(c), 2484, 2485, and 2487 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy to optimize practices across the defense commissary and exchange system that reduce the reliance of the system on appropriated funds without reducing the benefits to the patrons of the system or the revenue generated by non-appropriated fund entities or instrumentalities of the Department of Defense for the morale, welfare, and recreation of members of the Armed Forces.

SUBTITLE E—TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 641—Maximum Reimbursement Amount for Travel Expenses of Members of the Reserves Attending Inactive Duty Training Outside of Normal Commuting Distances

This section would amend section 478a(c) of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary concerned, on a case-by-case basis, to reimburse travel expenses at a higher amount for Reserve Component members traveling to training from rural areas.

Section 642—Statute of Limitations on Department of Defense Recovery of Amounts Owed to the United States by Members of the Uniformed Services, Including Retired and Former Members

This section would amend section 1007(c)(3) of title 37, United States Code, to establish a 10-year limitation on the collection of an overpayment of salaries and benefits or unpaid bills of service members. This section would establish a statute of limitations that goes into effect 10 years after it is signed into law and would direct the Defense Finance and Accounting Service to quantify the lost revenue for the Congressional Budget Office.

TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Briefing on TRICARE Coverage for Emerging Health Care Services

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, not later than June 30, 2017, on implementation of section 704 of the

Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The briefing shall include: the activities that have been undertaken to implement provisional TRICARE coverage for emerging health care services and supplies; any activities to implement such authority that are planned but have not yet occurred and the rationale for the delay; the services and supplies that have been granted such provisional TRICARE coverage; the rationale, if any, for implementation of demonstration projects for TRICARE coverage of such services and supplies in lieu of implementation of the provisional TRICARE coverage; and the impact that implementation of the provisional TRICARE coverage has had on access to and provider reimbursement for such services and supplies as compared to non-coverage.

Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Partnerships

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs have established partnerships to provide health care to beneficiaries of both departments. The committee understands that these partnerships expand access to care to veterans and Department of Defense beneficiaries, particularly in medically underserved areas. In addition, these partnerships provide Department of Defense providers additional patients with complex medical conditions that enhance medical provider readiness. However, the committee is aware that the Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs joint facility, the Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center at Naval Station Great Lakes, Illinois, established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), continues to suffer from management and leadership challenges, as reported by several Government Accountability Office evaluations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2016, on any plans for establishing new Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs partnerships to provide health care.

Designation of TRICARE Providers with Military Awareness and Cultural Training

The committee is aware that military beneficiaries prefer to seek assistance from mental health providers who have some knowledge and experience serving military populations. Section 717 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), directed the Secretary of Defense to develop a system by which non-Department of Defense mental health care providers receive a readiness designation if they meet certain criteria relating to knowledge with respect to the culture of members of the Armed Forces and family members. The committee believes this paradigm is similar for beneficiaries seeking health care from providers in the TRICARE network. The committee is aware that there are training programs available for businesses and organizations that employ or work with former military members. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to include TRICARE providers in the same system developed for mental health care pro-

viders and to look for opportunities to use existing training programs.

Diabetes Prevention Programs

The committee notes that the occurrence of diabetes within the currently serving military population and their families is relatively small compared to the incidence of diabetes in the general United States population. It is estimated that there are 30 million Americans with diabetes but only approximately 50,000 military members or their family members with the disease. The committee is aware that the number of military beneficiaries with diabetes increases to more than 200,000 for retirees and their family members who are under the age of 65 and doubles to over 400,000 for those beneficiaries in the TRICARE for Life, Medicare-eligible population. The committee is also aware that the Department of Health and Human Services recently expanded a pilot program for Medicare beneficiaries to prevent diabetes that showed estimated savings of $2,650 for each enrollee in the program. Therefore, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to examine the feasibility of using a similar program for TRICARE beneficiaries to prevent diabetes, improve health, and reduce health care costs.

Expedited Treatment for Fetal Repair

The committee is aware that advances in fetal medicine present military personnel and their dependents with opportunities to correct fetal anomalies in-utero, or before birth. The committee understands that complex birth defects have varying times for fetal intervention but in all instances of fetal anomalies, the earliest referral for in-utero procedures is best to ensure optimal outcomes for mother and fetus. The committee is concerned that in some cases, military beneficiary referrals have taken several weeks or longer. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than January 14, 2017, on the process for referring beneficiaries for fetal repair procedures. The Secretary shall include in the briefing information on referrals during calendar year 2016 that required an intervention, the amount of time between diagnosis, referral, treatment and the outcomes of such treatments.

Full Spectrum Ultraviolet Technologies for Routine Disinfection and Outbreak Mitigation

The committee is aware that both hospital-acquired infections and surgical site infections continue to be a major, yet preventable threat to patient and health care worker safety in both civilian and military treatment facilities, including the deployed environment. Full spectrum ultraviolet (UV) technologies have been shown to reduce infection rates in the health care environment in multiple published, peer-reviewed studies. In addition to routine disinfection in military treatment facilities, there are UV technologies that can be deployed as a biodefense mitigation strategy in the event of an outbreak including natural and man-made events. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to investigate full spectrum UV technologies to support patient and staff safety through routine

disinfection, and as a mitigation strategy in response to a biological outbreak.

Gluten-Free Meals Ready to Eat

The committee is aware of the impact that celiac disease and gluten sensitivity have on the health and medical readiness of members of the Armed Forces. The committee notes that the Army has expanded its field combat Meals Ready to Eat (MRE) by providing vegetarian meals and meals that accommodate religious requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, on the feasibility and any existing effort to provide a gluten-free MRE option.

Improving Beneficiary Experience and Outcomes

The committee notes the Department of Defense continues to seek ways to improve the health care service experience for military beneficiaries and personnel health and readiness, and lower the total cost of care. The committee is aware that certain large private sector employers are offering each covered family an on-demand health care navigator who is a trusted individual to assist families with understanding and utilizing their health benefits, support them in accessing and navigating the healthcare delivery system, and provide them with information so they can make informed decisions in collaboration with their care providers.

This approach has the potential to produce enhanced clinical outcomes, improved beneficiary experiences in navigating the health care system, and reduced utilization which may lower health care costs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to determine the feasibility of incorporating the use of healthcare navigators into the Military Health System to improve beneficiary experience and outcomes. The Secretary shall submit the results to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 1, 2017.

Improving Pediatric Health Care Under TRICARE

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has made strides to improve the delivery of health care services to pediatric patients, especially those patients with severe disabilities. However, the committee remains concerned that the Department has not completed addressing the deficiencies noted in the report required by section 735 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239). Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 1, 2016, on the actions taken and the plan to correct the remaining deficiencies identified in the pediatric health care report.

Infertility Treatment and Services for Wounded Ill or Injured Members of the Armed Forces

The committee notes the robust infertility services and supplies available to seriously wounded, ill or injured service members. Services include infertility testing and treatment, correction of the

physical or physiological cause of the infertility as well as assisted reproductive services that will now include a demonstration of cryopreservation for Active Duty prior to deployment. The committee is concerned that some seriously wounded, ill or injured service members may not be aware of the services available to them after they depart the military. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretaries of the military departments, to implement a plan by December 1, 2016, to actively reach out to former members of the military who were seriously wounded, ill or injured and inform them of the infertility services available to them.

Joint Medical Research Test Centers

The committee recognizes the need to develop joint capabilities for military health research projects to optimize opportunities to identify impactful research opportunities that support the Department of Defense's medical readiness. The Pacific Joint Information Technology Center (P–JITC) is the only joint research test center for the Military Health Service (MHS), and has produced successful research efforts, such as the Unified Theater Server Platform and Radio-Frequency Identification Bar Code Project. The committee also recognizes the need for joint requirements in four overarching focus areas: military health care services, theater/operational medicine, information technology infrastructure and data management, and medical resourcing. The committee encourages continued development of these capabilities at a joint research test center. The committee notes that the Defense Health Technology Review established a Review Panel to identify opportunities for efficiencies and savings through standardization and consolidation. As a result of the review, the P–JITC was recommended to be consolidated into existing MHS architecture. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Health Agency to brief the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on a comprehensive plan to conduct joint research across the MHS.

Military Medical Photonics

The committee is aware that military medical photonics research has been shown to improve battlefield patient care using photomedicine technologies. Recent breakthroughs in this research include major technology advances in burn and wound management, tissue imaging and bonding for vascular and reconstructive surgery, diagnosis and treatment of major eye diseases and trauma, critical care sensors and monitors, early assessment of inhalation airway injury, rapid imaging of coronary artery disease, and normalization of severe scarring from traumatic wounds. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue the work to develop important, innovative technologies for battlefield medicine.

Network of Support

The committee commends the Department of Defense's efforts to inform military families of the aspects and stressors of daily military life experienced by members of the armed forces, as well as the services available to assist service members with those

stressors. However, the committee believes that the military services can improve upon current efforts by providing information over the duration of the military service and during the transition to civilian life, when appropriate, coordinating across all branches the information that is provided, and how it is disseminated, and providing service members the opportunity to submit their "network of support" to receive this important information. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the options for new recruits of the armed forces to identify a small number of people that encompass their network of support and to identify the best ways to integrate these contacts into existing outreach efforts, including the estimated cost associated with this effort. In addition, the Secretary shall brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than February 1, 2017, on the results of the assessment.

Osteoarthritis

The committee is aware that the physical demands of military training and deployment may increase the risk of osteoarthritis in service members. The committee is concerned that post-traumatic osteoarthritis may affect the readiness of our military, yet there is limited information on the scope and impact of osteoarthritis on the military. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 2017, on the overall discharge rate of military service members as a result of osteoarthritis, the impact to the overall medical readiness from post-traumatic osteoarthritis, and recommendations on prevention and treatment to reduce the number of service members suffering from osteoarthritis.

Prescription Opioid Abuse and Effects on Readiness

The committee is aware of increased misuse of prescription opioid drugs on the national level. The committee understands that the Department of Defense employs several methods to prevent, educate and identify abuse of opioid drugs by military service members. However, the committee is concerned that new strategies may be necessary to combat opioid drug abuse to improve service member individual readiness, health and quality of life. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2017, on the Department's efforts to prevent, educate and treat prescription opioid drugs abuse by military service members. The report shall include: research on more comprehensive treatments for opioid addiction; integration of drug treatment into healthcare settings and addressing behavioral interventions; research on next generation analgesics in order to identify new pain relievers with reduced abuse, tolerance, and dependence risk; devising alternative delivery systems and formulations for existing drugs that minimize diversion; a focus on developing more effective means for preventing overdose deaths; and focused strategies on public communication and education.

Private-Public Partnership in Military Treatment Facilities

The committee is aware that there are significant challenges regarding access to health care on military bases particularly at smaller and mid-sized bases. The committee is committed to improving access to care at military treatment facilities (MTF) for military beneficiaries and to ensure the readiness of military medical providers. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the feasibility of including private-public partnerships using contracted services to provide health care within MTFs. In conducting the assessment, the Secretary shall consider the benefit of providing additional services, not previously available at clinics, through the partnerships, hybrid models of privately contracted care with direct military oversight providing services within the MTFs, potential costs savings by operating an MTF through the partnership, increased patient satisfaction, improved access to care measured by appointment availability and wait time, and overall improvement to service member medical readiness. Not later than December 1, 2016, the Secretary shall brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on the results of the assessment.

Storage of DNA Samples of Members of the Armed Forces

The committee notes that the Department of Defense uses the Armed Forces Repository of Specimens for the purpose of identifying human remains. The repository of DNA samples is critical to the identification of service members if they become casualties or Missing in Action and the remains are recovered. The committee is concerned that the storage of the original and duplicate DNA samples for members of the Armed Forces is in one location and could jeopardize future identification if the facility becomes inoperable. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the feasibility of storing duplicate DNA samples in an alternate facility and provide the results of the review to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by December 1, 2016.

TRICARE Coverage of Medically Necessary Foods

The committee is aware that medically necessary foods are prescribed for the safe and effective management of multiple disorders which affect digestion, absorption, and metabolism of nutrients. The committee is also aware of current TRICARE Program policy directing coverage of nutritional therapy when it is used as the primary source of calories or as the primary source of a required macronutrient. The committee is concerned that healthcare providers may have difficulty obtaining approval of medically necessary foods and formulas for the management of their patients' diseases and conditions, such as for the management of inflammatory bowel disease, eosinophilic esophagitis, and major milk sensitivity in pediatric populations. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to review the adequacy of current TRICARE coverage policy for nutritional therapy and provide a briefing of its findings to the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives by July 1, 2017. The briefing shall address the following elements; rates of appeal for denial of coverage,

average length of appeal, rates of denial of nutritional therapy coverage in pediatric and adult populations, and any other matters that the Secretary may deem appropriate.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—REFORM OF TRICARE AND MILITARY HEALTH SYSTEM

Section 701—TRICARE Preferred and Other TRICARE Reform

This section would establish TRICARE Preferred as the self-managed, preferred provider option that would replace TRICARE Standard and Extra. This section would also establish annual enrollment fees and fixed dollar copayments for Active Duty family members and retirees who join the armed services on or after January 1, 2018, and enroll in TRICARE Preferred or in TRICARE Prime, the managed care option. In addition, this section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish an annual enrollment fee for TRICARE Preferred for beneficiaries who were in the Active Duty or retired categories prior to January 1, 2018. However, the Secretary may not establish this annual enrollment fee until 90 days after the Comptroller General of the United States submits a report, not later than February 1, 2020, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on access to care, network adequacy, and beneficiary satisfaction under TRICARE Preferred compared to the baseline review. This section would require the Comptroller General, not later than September 1, 2017, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the baseline assessment of network adequacy and beneficiaries' access to care under the TRICARE health care provider network. Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit an implementation plan, not later than June 1, 2017, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives to improve access for TRICARE beneficiaries. The Comptroller General would be required to submit, not later than December 1, 2017, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a review of the implementation plan submitted by the Secretary.

Section 702—Reform of Administration of the Defense Health Agency and Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Defense Health Agency to become responsible for management of military treatment facilities throughout the Department of Defense, while preserving the responsibilities of the commanders of such facilities for ensuring the readiness of the members of the armed forces and civilian employees at such facilities and for furnishing the health care and medical treatment provided at such facilities. The Defense Health Agency would establish an executive-level management office consisting of professional health care administrators to manage health care operations, finance and budget, information technology, and medical affairs across all military treatment facilities. In addition, this section would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit an interim report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2017, on the preliminary plan to implement these changes, and

a final report not later than March 1, 2018. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to review each of the plans submitted by the Secretary and to submit the Comptroller's assessment to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2017, and September 1, 2018, respectively.

Section 703—Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would modify chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section 1073d which would establish the requirements for military medical treatment facilities in order to support medical readiness of the Armed Forces and the readiness of medical personnel. This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretaries of the military departments, to submit an updated Military Health System Modernization Study report to the congressional defense committees not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This section would also require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees, not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, an implementation plan to restructure or realign the military medical treatment facilities in accordance with section 1073d of title 10, United States Code.

Section 704—Access to Urgent Care Under TRICARE Program

This section would modify chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, by inserting a new section 1077a to require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 1 year after enactment of this Act, to ensure urgent care is available through 11:00 p.m. at military treatment facilities the Secretary determines to be appropriate. Further, this section would require that if urgent care is unavailable at the military treatment facilities, access to urgent care through the TRICARE network providers would be available through 11:00 p.m. This section would also eliminate the preauthorization requirement for urgent care.

Section 705—Access to Primary Care Clinics at Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would further modify section 1077a of title 10, United States Code, as added elsewhere in this Act, to require the Secretary of Defense to expand the primary care clinic hours at military treatment facilities during the week and on weekends beyond the standard business hours of the installation.

Section 706—Incentives for Value-Based Health Under TRICARE Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement value-based incentive programs as part of the TRICARE contracts to encourage health care providers under the TRICARE program to improve the quality of care and the experience of the covered beneficiaries. Not later than 1 year after implementation of a value-based incentive program and annually thereafter through 2022, the Secretary of Defense would be required to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and any other appropriate congressional

committee, on the quality performance metrics and expenditures related to the incentive program.

Section 707—Improvements to Military-Civilian Partnerships to Increase Access to Health Care and Readiness

This section would amend section 1096 of title 10, United States Code, to improve military-civilian partnerships to deliver health care to beneficiaries in a more effective, efficient, or economical manner and to provide members of the Armed Forces with additional training opportunities to maintain readiness requirements for military health care providers.

Section 708—Joint Trauma System

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate an implementation plan to establish a Joint Trauma System as an enduring organization within the Defense Health Agency. The Joint Trauma System would serve as a reference body for all trauma care provided within the military health system; establish standards of care for trauma services; coordinate the translation of research from the Defense Centers of Excellence into standards of care; and coordinate the lessons learned from joint trauma partnerships into clinical practice. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the implementation plan not later than 120 days after the Secretary submits the implementation plan.

Section 709—Joint Trauma Education and Training Directorate

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to assess the number of traumatologists needed to meet the requirements of the combatant commanders and to establish a Joint Trauma Education and Training Directorate to create enduring partnerships with civilian trauma centers. These military trauma surgeons and physicians, along with the clinical support teams, would be embedded within civilian trauma centers to maintain professional readiness to treat critically injured patients. This section would also require the Secretary to submit an implementation plan to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than July 1, 2017.

Section 710—Improvements to Access to Health Care in Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that military medical treatment facilities implement and consistently practice the following requirements: first call resolution, standardized appointment scheduling, increased provider productivity, and managed appointment utilization through maximizing use of telehealth and secure messaging. This section would require the Secretary to implement the requirements by February 1, 2017, and provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate on the implementation not later than March 1, 2017.

Section 711—Adoption of Core Quality Performance Metrics

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to adopt the core quality performance measures agreed upon by a collaborative group of Federal agencies, health plans, national physician organizations, employers, and consumers. The core quality measures would be used to evaluate performance of the Military Health System and the TRICARE network.

Section 712—Study on Improving Continuity of Health Care Coverage for Reserve Components

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to study the options for providing health care coverage to certain current and former members of the Selected Reserve. The section would require the Secretary to submit a report of the findings and recommendations to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER HEALTH CARE BENEFITS

Section 721—Provision of Hearing Aids to Dependents of Retired Members

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to sell hearing aids to dependents of retired members of the uniformed services.

Section 722—Extended TRICARE Program Coverage for Certain Members of the National Guard and Dependents During Certain Disaster Response Duty

This section would require that members of the National Guard be treated as if they were on Active Duty for purposes of coverage under TRICARE while performing disaster response duty, if the period immediately follows a period of full-time National Guard duty, unless a Governor determines that it is not in the best interest of the member or State.

SUBTITLE C—HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION

Section 731—Prospective Payment of Funds Necessary to Provide Medical Care for the Coast Guard

This section would amend chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to make a prospective payment to the Secretary of Defense of an amount that represents the actuarial valuation of treatment or care provided to members of the Coast Guard, former members of the Coast Guard, and their dependents at facilities under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense except for any period during which the Coast Guard operates as a service in the Navy.

SUBTITLE D—REPORTS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 741—Mental Health Resources for Members of the Military Services at High Risk of Suicide

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a methodology that identifies which members of the military services are at high risk of suicide based on association with units that have a high rate of suicide and provide additional mental health resources to members who have deployed with such units.

Section 742—Research of Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy

This section would authorize not more than $25.0 million to be used to award grants for research of Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy.

Section 743—Active Oscillating Negative Pressure Treatment

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to consider using active oscillating negative pressure treatment for members of the Armed Forces who incur blast-related injuries.

Section 744—Long-Term Study on Health of Helicopter and Tiltrotor Pilots

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to carry out a long-term study of helicopter and tiltrotor pilots to assess the acute and chronic medical conditions of such pilots. This section would also require the Secretary to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by June 6, 2017, on the results of such study.

Section 745—Pilot Program for Prescription Drug Acquisition Cost Parity in the TRICARE Pharmacy Benefits Program

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program to evaluate whether extending additional discounts for prescription drugs filled at retail pharmacies will maintain or reduce cost for the Department of Defense.

Section 746—Study on Display of Wait Times at Urgent Care Clinics, Pharmacies, and Emergency Rooms of Military Medical Treatment Facilities

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to study the feasibility of displaying average wait times at urgent care clinics, pharmacies, and emergency rooms of military medical treatment facilities. Not later than March 1, 2017, the Secretary would be required to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, which includes the estimated costs for displaying wait times.

Section 747—Report on Feasibility of Including Acupuncture and Chiropractic Services for Retirees Under TRICARE Program

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility of

furnishing acupuncture and chiropractic services to retirees under TRICARE.

Section 748—Clarification on Submission of Reports on Longitudinal Study on Traumatic Brain Injury

This section would, notwithstanding section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), require the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress the reports required by section 721 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Acquisition Auditing and Agility

The committee continues to believe that more could be done to improve the efficiency of defense contract audits. According to its annual report, the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) had an inventory of more than 18,000 incurred cost submissions at the end of fiscal year 2014, and the average time to complete these cost audits was about 1,000 days. Meanwhile, the Department of Defense recently withdrew a proposal that would have enabled additional external auditors to assist DCAA in conducting agency audits of contractor business systems. The inability of DCAA to carry out its audit responsibilities in a timely manner has cost and schedule consequences for both defense acquisition programs and the Department's industrial base.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive review of DCAA's current backlog of incurred cost submissions and contractor business system audits. The review shall assess issues such as:

(1) How DCAA defines and measures its backlog for audits;

(2) The nature, extent, and dollar value of the audits that comprise the backlog;

(3) The factors contributing to why audits have remained open;

(4) DCAA's criteria and approach for conducting audits and reducing the backlog;

(5) The time and resources used by DCAA to conduct backlog audits;

(6) The cost avoidance, cost savings, or other benefits realized from completing backlog audits;

(7) Whether any additional measures are needed to improve DCAA's ability to complete audits within a reasonable period of time; and

(8) Recommendations on ways to reduce DCAA's backlog and to prevent a backlog from reoccurring.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on the interim results of the review, and to provide a final report to the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2017.

Acquisition Manager Career Paths

For many years, acquisition experts have emphasized that military and civilian acquisition managers need more knowledge and experience to be able to effectively develop, manage, and oversee complex weapon system programs in the Department of Defense. The committee recognizes that the Department has recently made progress in improving the capacity of the acquisition workforce by providing acquisition managers with additional training, industry exchange opportunities, and leadership development. However, the committee continues to be concerned that these efforts focus on managing the "process" of the Department's acquisition system rather than on developing technical and business expertise, knowledge of industry operations, and the skills needed to achieve desired acquisition outcomes. The committee also is concerned that efforts to develop more skilled acquisition managers are hampered by the lack of clear and comprehensive acquisition manager career paths and incentives. Many acquisition studies have identified conflicts between what military officers need to do to be promoted and their tenure as program managers, as well as the limited incentives available to retain highly experienced managers.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive study of the career paths, development, and incentives for military and civilian acquisition managers in the Department of Defense. The review shall assess issues such as: (1) how acquisition career paths for civilian and military acquisition managers are structured and implemented in the military services; (2) the extent to which career development and training provide the requisite skills and experience needed to work effectively with industry; (3) the extent to which career path opportunities support program acquisition tenure requirements; (4) whether career path opportunities and other existing financial mechanisms are effective in retaining high performing managers; and (5) whether changes are needed in authorities, regulations, or procedures to provide for more effective career paths and development opportunities for acquisition managers. The committee further directs that the Comptroller General brief the House Committee on Armed Services on the interim results of the review by March 1, 2017, and provide a final report to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2017.

Advanced Small Business

Section 1613 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 by January 1, 2014, a report on an independent assessment of the procurement performance of the Department of Defense related to small business concerns. The committee is concerned that it has not yet received the results of the independent assessment. The committee understands that some of the required items have been completed and some continue to be assessed. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the results of the independent assessment as soon as possible. The committee further directs the Secretary to brief the House Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives not

later than February 1, 2017, on the elements of the assessment that have been completed. In particular, the committee seeks information on the transition challenges faced by businesses that graduate from small business programs or grow to exceed the size standards for participation in such programs, along with specific recommendations on steps that should be taken to help ensure the continued health and growth of such businesses (item 7 of the independent assessment).

Appropriate Use of Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable Source Selection Processes and Contracts

The committee notes that in a memorandum on "Appropriate Use of Lowest Priced, Technically Acceptable Source Selection Process and Associated Contract Type" dated March 4, 2015, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics stated that "Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable (LPTA) has a clear, but limited place in the source selection 'best value' continuum. Used in appropriate circumstances and combined with effective competition and proper contract type, LPTA can drive down costs and provide the best value solution. LPTA offers a streamlined and simplified source selection approach to rapidly procure commercial and non-complex services and supplies we need to support the warfighter. If not applied appropriately, however, the Department can miss an opportunity to secure an innovative, cost-effective solution to meet warfighter needs to help maintain our technological edge."

The committee agrees with this assessment of the limited and appropriate use of LPTA source selection processes and contracts, and the risks of their inappropriate use. However, the committee is concerned that LPTA processes and contracts are being used in many circumstances far beyond the depiction of appropriate in the Under Secretary's memorandum, resulting in the negative consequences described in the memorandum. For example, LPTA contracts have been inappropriately used to procure sensitive electronic test equipment that are very technical in nature and require calibration, repair, and software updates during their life cycle. Such long-term costs are not considered under LPTA processes, even though they may increase taxpayer costs by millions over the life of the equipment. Another example is procurement of personal protective equipment, which the committee strongly believes demands consideration of additional performance above a minimum threshold. The committee is also concerned that LPTA processes may prevent the Department of Defense from hiring auditing firms with the necessary experience to conduct audits for large, complex, multinational organizations.

The committee also is concerned that these anecdotal examples suggest a more widespread over-use of LPTA processes and contracts that may be having substantial unintended consequences. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to:

(1) Conduct a review of the Department's formal and informal policy guidance regarding the use of LPTA source selection processes and contracts;

(2) Conduct a survey of contracting officers regarding their understanding of such policy guidance; and

(3) Compile data on the frequency and type of goods or services for which LPTA source selection processes and contracts were used during fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

The committee further directs the Under Secretary to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2017, on the findings of the review, survey, and data compilation related to LPTA processes and contracts.

Contracting Delays for the Small Business Innovative Research Program

The committee is aware that in the past, continuing resolutions for the budget have caused delays in getting funds for Small Business Innovative Research (SBIR) program out to program offices. Additionally, these continuing resolutions also cause contracting backlogs with other contracts in the Department of Defense. The committee is concerned that SBIR contracting may become even further delayed by being put at the end of any contract officer's work queue. The committee applauds the Department for looking for innovative solutions to this problem, including the establishment of contracting centers of excellence to deal with the logjam. The committee encourages the Department to continue refining such ideas, and look at other ways to streamline and improve the SBIR contracting process.

Defense Acquisition University Course Curriculum

The committee is concerned that, following the issuance of Executive Order 13502, there have been very few project labor agreements (PLAs) used for Department of Defense construction. In 2010, the Annual Report of the White House Task Force on the Middle Class found that agency contracting offices had limited utilization of PLAs. The committee is concerned that such low utilization may result from limited curriculum on the use of PLAs at the Defense Acquisition University (DAU). For example, the committee notes that PLAs are not a main focus area of DAU's course on construction contracting (CON244). The committee directs the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than October 1, 2016, on the extent to which DAU instructs students on the use of PLAs. The briefing should include recommendations on how to elevate the importance of PLAs in DAU's curriculum.

Development Planning

Development planning has long been recognized as an effective tool for the Department of Defense, and the Air Force in particular, to understand future warfighting needs and reconcile those with available and potential capabilities, concepts, and emerging technologies, and to provide a technical foundation for acquisition programs. A 2014 study by the National Research Council of the National Academies called development planning "a key process to support the Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force in strategic decisions that guide the Air Force toward mission success today and in the future." The committee is encour-

aged by the commitment of the Department and the Air Force to development planning, including experimentation and prototyping, as a tool to support emerging capabilities that will lead to more effective and lower cost weapon systems.

Developmental and Operational Testing Agility

The committee recognizes that developmental and operational test and evaluation activities are an integral part of the acquisition of weapon systems, as they provide knowledge of a system's capabilities and limitations as it matures and is eventually deployed for use by the warfighter. However, the committee is concerned that test and evaluation processes in the Department of Defense may not be sufficiently aligned to support recent efforts to increase the rapid acquisition, prototyping, and fielding of advanced warfighter capabilities. In an environment where threats and technologies are changing at a rapid pace, it is critical that the Department have an agile acquisition system that provides the warfighter with the best capabilities possible.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, in coordination with the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Developmental Test and Evaluation, to conduct a review focused on ways to improve the agility and effectiveness of developmental and operational testing within the Department, especially for incremental upgrades to weapon systems and the rapid prototyping and fielding of advanced warfighter capabilities. The review should assess the Department's current use of modeling, simulation, automated testing, risk-based testing, and other testing approaches used in government or industry that could be used to support rapid prototyping and fielding activities. The review should also address whether operational and developmental test organizations are sufficiently positioned and resourced to effectively conduct their missions. The committee further directs the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than February 1, 2017, on the findings of the review, along with recommendations for any improvements in test and evaluation processes and procedures.

Discussions Between Government and Industry After Receipt of Proposals

The committee notes that the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) pertaining to exchanges with offerors after receipt of proposals is not consistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) on the same subject. Currently, FAR 15.306 makes clear that contracting officers must conduct discussions with each offeror within the competitive range, yet DFARS 215.306 states contracting officers should conduct such discussions above a certain monetary threshold, thereby introducing a possible discrepancy regarding if such discussions are mandatory or optional.

The committee is concerned that such inconsistency could have an adverse effect on exchanges between government and industry. Accordingly, the committee reminds the Department of Defense that the FAR makes discussions with offerors within the competitive range mandatory and expects Department contracting officers to follow the FAR. The committee has been supportive of improving

discussions overall between government and industry. For example, section 887 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) required the FAR Council to prescribe a regulation making clear that acquisition personnel are permitted and encouraged to engage in responsible and constructive exchanges with industry. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2016, on how the Department implements FAR 15.306 and DFARS 215.306, as well as any revisions or additions to the FAR based on the requirements of section 887 of Public Law 114–92.

Domestic Source of Traveling Wave Tubes

The committee is concerned with the use of foreign made components in the most sensitive national security programs. Specifically, the committee is aware that traveling wave tubes (TWTs) of non-U.S. manufacturers are being used in critical satellite and guided missile programs. Additionally, the committee notes the failure of a TWT constitutes a grave risk of single point failure in many of these national security programs. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on the risks of non-U.S. TWTs in national security programs. The briefing should include recommendations for ensuring all TWTs used as components in national security-related procurements are American in origin and manufacture.

Innovation Clusters

The committee recognizes the critical role that industry, nonprofit research institutes, and academia play in the innovation ecosystem that supports national security. In particular, the committee believes that small businesses and non-traditional contractors have an especially important role to play, though their size and lack of familiarity with Department of Defense processes can often be an impediment to effective cooperation. The increasing need for these entities to be involved in classified research poses additional problems, and makes it even more difficult for the Department to leverage these entities for the full range of national security work.

The committee believes the Department should find methods to bring together these disparate organizations in new and novel ways to help build communities that can work together on vital national security problems. The committee encourages the Department to support these sorts of regional innovation clusters or consortia, especially where they can help leverage limited or high-demand resources, like classified meeting or processing spaces, which would be difficult for individual small businesses to invest in by themselves.

Large Lot Procurement

The committee notes that the significant procurement reductions proposed in the fiscal year 2017 budget request make clear the imperative of changing acquisition policies to generate greater effi-

ciencies and to procure more weapon systems within constrained budgets. The committee is aware that Department of Defense acquisition officials have evaluated a concept known as Large Lot Procurement (LLP), which could generate substantial acquisition savings and more efficient utilization of the defense industrial base. The committee understands LLP to involve using a multiyear contract to purchase units from a portfolio of stable acquisition programs produced in common facilities. Purchases would be sequenced to realize economic order quantities, resulting in substantial savings across acquisition programs. Therefore, the committee encourages Department of Defense officials to continue to explore the LLP concept. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 1, 2016, on the potential utility of LLP, barriers to pursuing LLP, and potential policy and legislative changes necessary to enable LLP. The briefing should also include a list of current multiyear contracts that could be included in an LLP and a description of a notional LLP containing such multiyear contracts.

Operation and Support Cost Data

The committee notes that operation and support (O&S) costs comprise the majority of the life-cycle costs of a weapon system, yet O&S costs are difficult to accurately estimate during the acquisition process because historical data on actual O&S costs for weapon systems are limited. Section 832 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) directed the Secretary of Defense to establish standard requirements for the collection of O&S cost data, the military departments to revise their data systems to ensure complete and accurate collection of such data, and the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) to develop and maintain a database on O&S cost estimates, supporting documentation, and actual O&S costs. The committee is aware that some progress has been made in improving data collection and analysis; however, significant deficiencies still exist. For example, while existing systems collect data on the amount of funds executed for operation and maintenance of weapon systems, they fail to capture detailed information on how and for what purposes such funds are used, which are critical details for developing reliable O&S cost estimates for new acquisition programs. In addition, the committee is concerned that there is insufficient coordination across the military services regarding the collection of O&S cost data, making it difficult to integrate and use data across systems.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of CAPE, in coordination with the service secretaries and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to conduct a comprehensive review of the military services' O&S cost data collection efforts and systems and provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by February 1, 2017, on the results of the review. The review should include a case study of the O&S cost data available for at least one current major defense acquisition program from each of the military departments, based on data that is currently available to CAPE. It should identify any shortfalls in O&S cost data that reduce the accuracy of

O&S cost estimates and potential sources of additional data that could improve O&S cost modeling, such as information on how and for what purposes O&S funds are used and relevant information on operation and sustainment activities. The briefing should include recommendations for achieving an enterprise data repository that could retrieve and consolidate data from the military departments' various databases that contain information related to the operation and sustainment of weapon systems.

Public-Private Competitions Conducted Under Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76

The committee is aware that a moratorium on the conduct of public-private competitions governed by Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 has existed within the Department of Defense since fiscal year 2008. The committee is also aware that in the Department's report to the congressional defense committees on the Department's conduct of public-private competitions, required by section 325 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), the Department recommended Congress lift the suspension on A–76 competitions. The committee further notes that historically the Department has relied on conducting A–76 public-private competitions in an effort to achieve greater efficiency and productivity. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), to review the Department's report to congressional defense committees submitted pursuant to section 325 of Public Law 111–84 and brief the House Committee on Armed Services by March 31, 2017, on updated views and recommendations concerning the Department's ability to implement public-private competitions under Circular A–76. The briefing shall include what actions the Department has taken to correct the problems identified with Circular A–76 by the Department of Defense Inspector General in report D–2009–034 and by the Government Accountability Office in report GA0–11–923R.

Rare Earths

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee tasked the Director of the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) to conduct a supply chain review of rare earths in acquisition category (ACAT) I programs. DCMA concluded that virtually all ACAT I programs contain rare earths that are necessary for program functionality. DCMA also concluded that ACAT I programs containing rare earths are dependent on foreign sources at several points in the rare earth supply chain. However, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) reported in 2016 that the Department of Defense does not have a comprehensive approach to identifying rare earths that are critical to national defense. GAO further concluded that, without a comprehensive assessment, the ability of the Department to assess supply chain risks and mitigating actions is limited. The committee

notes that the Department concurred with GAO recommendations to improve management of rare earths. However, the committee remains concerned about rare earth supply chain risks. The committee looks forward to reviewing the results of the Department's efforts to improve management of rare earths and will continue to work with the Department to mitigate risks related to rare earths.

Requirement for Non-U.S. Contracts in Afghanistan

The committee understands that U.S. military personnel and civilians currently serving in Afghanistan receive contractor support, which allows them to focus on achieving mission objectives. This support is paid for with U.S. taxpayer funding and is executed in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR), subject to oversight of the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and allows for the appropriate congressional committees to fulfill their constitutional obligations to oversee funding for and performance of these contracts.

The committee is concerned that transferring control of these activities to a non-U.S. contracting authority could result in reduced quality of services and overall decline in contract performance, as well as diminishing Federal and congressional oversight to protect U.S. taxpayer funds against waste, fraud, and abuse.

Therefore, to maintain the quality of services being provided to U.S. personnel serving in Afghanistan, as well as safeguarding Congress' ability to conduct proper oversight, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on the plans and rationale for transferring any logistics or support contracts in Afghanistan currently awarded and administered by the U.S. Department of Defense, via the Army and the other services and defense agencies, to any other non-U.S. contracting authority. The briefing should include, at a minimum:

(1) How many U.S.-funded contracts have been transferred to a non-U.S. contracting authority;

(2) How many more transfers are planned; and

(3) How does DCMA monitor compliance with the FAR and ensure taxpayer funds are protected against fraud, waste, and abuse.

Service Contracts Inventory and Accountability

The committee remains concerned about the ability of the Department of Defense to properly account for its contracts for services. The committee encourages the Department's recent efforts to improve its services contracting inventory and accountability methods in order to inform sourcing decisions and workforce planning. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2016, regarding the steps the Department has taken to improve its services contracts inventory and accountability procedures. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would revise the current requirement related to the inventory of contracts for services found in section 2330a of title 10, United States Code.

Small Business Participation Across Industry Categories

The committee continues to support the appropriate use of small business set asides to strengthen the defense industrial base. Section 1631 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required the head of each agency to "develop a plan for achieving [the agency's small business goals] at both the prime contract and subcontract level" that addresses the participation of these small businesses by industry category. Section 868 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) required that when the Small Business Administration evaluates an agency's use of small businesses, it must assess the industrial distribution of those small business prime contracts and subcontracts. As neither of these requirements have been fully implemented, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 1, 2017, to outline Department of Defense efforts to ensure that awards to small businesses, including awards accomplished using set aside or sole source procedures, are appropriately distributed across industry categories.

Veterans in Piping Program

The committee is aware that the Veterans in Piping program offers high-quality skills training and jobs in the pipe trades to Active Duty military personnel preparing to leave service. The program is intended to address the growing shortage in the construction industry of skilled workers and the unemployment rate among veterans.

The committee supports this and similar transition programs, but notes that participating employers that provide training, certification, and guaranteed placement to Active Duty personnel often bear the full costs of such programs. The committee is concerned that, without more Department of Defense support, such transition assistance programs will not reach their full potential. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than February 1, 2017, on possible options within current law for supporting contractors working with service member transition organizations like the Veterans in Piping program. The briefing should also include potential legislative options on this issue for future consideration by the committee.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AMENDMENTS TO GENERAL CONTRACTING AUTHORITIES, PROCEDURES, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 801—Revision to Authorities Relating to Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center

This section would amend section 196 of title 10, United States Code, by limiting application of the existing law to the Major Range and Test Facility Base and those test and evaluation facilities that are used to support the acquisition programs of the Department of Defense. The amendment would align the statute to

the original enactment in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) and would prevent reporting requirements from being broadened to small laboratory and educational test and evaluation facilities. The section would also define the term "significant change" in test and evaluation facilities.

Section 802—Amendments to Restrictions on Undefinitized Contractual Actions

This section would amend section 2326 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Department of Defense to consider the cost risk to the contractor as of the date that a qualifying proposal to definitize a contract was submitted if the contract was not then definitized within the statutory 180-day period. The section would also apply the 180-day definitization period to foreign military sales contracts and would amend the definition of a qualifying proposal to a proposal that contains sufficient information to enable a meaningful audit of the definitization proposal.

Section 803—Revision to Requirements Relating to Inventory Method for Department of Defense Contracts for Services

This section would amend section 2330a of title 10, United States Code, to revise the current requirement related to how the Department of Defense accounts for and reports contracts for services.

Section 804—Procurement of Personal Protective Equipment

This section would amend section 884 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) to clarify source selection criteria to be used in the procurement of personal protective equipment or critical safety items. The criteria are that best value, rather than reverse auction or lowest price technically acceptable, contracting methods should be used in source selections to the maximum extent practicable.

Section 805—Revision to Effective Date of Senior Executive Benchmark Compensation for Allowable Cost Limitations

This section would remove the retroactive application requirement of section 803 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), which implemented a cap on the allowable compensation of contractor employees. As a result of this revision, section 803 would apply to compensation costs incurred after January 1, 2012, under contracts entered into on or after December 31, 2011.

Section 806—Amendments Related to Detection and Avoidance of Counterfeit Electronic Parts

This section would modify section 818 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) by replacing the term "trusted suppliers'" with the term "suppliers that meet anticounterfeiting requirements'", as well as related conforming amendments.

The committee is aware that the term "trusted" in this context has created some confusion, since "trusted suppliers'" refers to a

specific category of microelectronics suppliers that have been accredited by the Defense Microelectronics Activity. Counterfeit parts refer to a much broader set of circumstances and require a broader definition of the supplier base needed to address counterfeiting concerns.

Section 807—Amendments to Special Emergency Procurement Authority

This section would amend section 1903 of title 41, United States Code, to expand the permissible uses of special emergency procurement authorities to include support of international disaster assistance and support of a national emergency or natural disaster relief efforts in the United States as defined by the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

Section 808—Compliance with Domestic Source Requirements for Footwear Furnished to Enlisted Members of the Armed Forces Upon Their Entry into the Armed Forces

This section would amend section 418 of title 37, United States Code, to require the Department of Defense to adhere to the requirements of section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, and issue 100 percent American-made athletic shoes to new recruits upon entrance to basic training. This section would also allow waivers to be granted in cases of medical necessity.

Section 809—Requirement for Policies and Standard Checklist in Procurement of Services

This section would establish a procurement policy checklist to ensure accountability in the acquisition of services.

Section 810—Extension of Limitation on Aggregate Annual Amount Available for Contract Services

This section would extend the cap on the total spending for services contracts by 1 year.

SUBTITLE B—PROVISIONS RELATING TO MAJOR DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROGRAMS

Section 811—Change in Date of Submission to Congress of Selected Acquisition Reports

This section would amend section 2342(f) of title 10, United States Code, by changing, from 45 to 10, the number of days after the President's budget request transmittal that comprehensive annual Selected Acquisition Reports are due to Congress.

Section 812—Amendments Relating to Independent Cost Estimation and Cost Analysis

This section would amend sections 2334 and 2434 of title 10, United States Code, to make clear that the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) conducts or approves independent cost estimates (ICEs) for all major defense acquisition programs and major automated information systems. In recognition of improvements made by military department costing functions, the

section would authorize CAPE to approve ICEs conducted by the military departments rather than conducting all ICEs itself. The section would require assessments of risk and potential consequences in independent cost estimates, rather than the current reporting of confidence intervals. The section would also standardize and increase the scope of cost data collected by CAPE to create an enterprise cost data repository for use by all Department of Defense costing and acquisition functions. It is the committee's intent that the establishment of an enterprise data repository should not add additional layers of oversight to acquisition programs that are currently managed by the military departments.

Section 813—Revisions to Milestone B Determinations

This section would amend section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, to remove the requirement for the milestone decision authority, prior to milestone B approval, to determine affordability and funding levels for a major defense acquisition program relative to the Future Years Defense Program submitted during the year in which the determination is made. Since the Future Years Defense Program is not developed until the end of the year, the current requirement is typically waived. The section would maintain the requirement to determine affordability based on unit cost and total life-cycle cost, as well as determine the expected funding for product development and production.

Section 814—Review and Report on Sustainment Planning in the Acquisition Process

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with an independent entity with appropriate expertise to conduct an assessment of the extent to which sustainment matters are considered in decisions related to requirements, acquisition, cost estimating, and programming and budgeting for major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs). The study would include an evaluation of the availability and quality of information on sustainment of MDAPs and major weapon systems, including operation and support (O&S) cost data; an assessment of product support strategies for major weapon systems; an evaluation of how effectively the military departments consider sustainment matters at key decision points for acquisition and life-cycle management; and recommendations for improving access to information and the consideration of sustainment matters. This section would require the Secretary to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2017, on the preliminary findings of the independent entity. This section would also require the Secretary to submit to the congressional defense committees by August 1, 2017, the final report of the independent entity, his comments on the final report, and proposed revisions to laws or regulations.

The committee received testimony that the Department has limited ability to estimate the O&S costs of weapon systems, but such estimates are critical for accurately projecting complete life-cycle costs. Additionally, the committee continues to observe that operation and sustainment matters could receive more careful consideration early in the acquisition process during the planning and de-

sign of MDAPs. The committee expects the study to provide useful insights into the use of data in decision making, the effectiveness of sustainment planning in life-cycle management of major weapon systems, and how the decisions made early in the acquisition process affect the long-term operation and sustainment of major weapon systems.

Section 815—Revision to Distribution of Annual Report on Operational Test and Evaluation

This section would amend section 139 of title 10, United States Code, by including the Secretaries of the military departments in the list of people who receive and who may comment on the annual report of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. The section would also extend the annual report through January 31, 2021. This amendment would supersede section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

SUBTITLE C—PROVISIONS RELATING TO COMMERCIAL ITEMS

Section 821—Revision to Definition of Commercial Item

This section would amend section 103 of title 41, United States Code, to expand the types of nondevelopmental items that may be considered commercial items to include items that the procuring agency determines were developed at private expense and sold in substantial quantities on a competitive basis to foreign governments. Currently, nondevelopmental items are limited to items sold to multiple State and local governments. This section would eliminate the requirement that a nondevelopmental item be sold to multiple governments to be considered a commercial item. This section also would prescribe that nothing in this section shall affect the meaning of the term "commercial item" under section 2464 of title 10, United States Code, regarding core logistics capabilities.

Section 822—Market Research for Determination of Price Reasonableness in Acquisition of Commercial Items

This section would amend section 2377 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the preference for acquisition of commercial items by adding a new subsection that would require procurement officials of the Department of Defense to conduct or obtain market research when determining price reasonableness for commercial items.

Section 823—Value Analysis for the Determination of Price Reasonableness

This section would amend section 2379(d) of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new paragraph that would allow contractors to submit information or analysis pertaining to the value of a commercial item when responding to solicitations. This section would also allow contracting officers to consider value analysis, in addition to historic pricing data, when determining price reasonableness for commercial items.

Section 824—Clarification of Requirements Relating to Commercial Item Determinations

This section would amend section 2380 of title 10, United States Code, to expand Department of Defense centralized records relating to commercial item determinations to include market research and price reasonableness analysis. This section would also eliminate the requirement that such records be publicly accessible.

Section 825—Pilot Program for Authority to Acquire Innovative Commercial Items Using General Solicitation Competitive Procedures

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program under which innovative commercial items may be acquired through a competitive selection of proposals, resulting from a general solicitation and the peer review of such proposals.

SUBTITLE D—OTHER MATTERS

Section 831—Review and Report on the Bid Protest Process

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with an independent entity with appropriate expertise to conduct a review of the bid protest process related to major defense acquisition programs. The review would include an assessment of the incidence and duration of bid protests, whether bid protests have delayed procurement actions, and whether bid protests are frequent by, or provide financial benefits to, incumbent contractors. The section would require the Secretary to brief the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services on the interim findings of the independent entity by March 1, 2017, and submit the final report on the findings of the independent entity to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2017.

The committee recognizes that the bid protest process serves a valuable role in helping ensure the overall integrity of the Federal procurement system. In recent years, however, there have been conflicting reports about the role of bid protests in the Department of Defense and whether the number of protests has increased and contributed to avoidable cost and schedule effects on acquisition programs.

This review is likely to offer government-wide acquisition insights. Consequently, the committee intends to coordinate briefings and lessons learned with the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and House Oversight and Government Reform Committees.

Section 832—Review and Report on Indefinite Delivery Contracts

This section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the use of indefinite delivery type contracts by the Department of Defense during fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017. The Comptroller General would be required to report the findings of the review to Congress by March 31, 2018.

Section 833—Review and Report on Contractual Flow-Down Provisions

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract with an independent entity with appropriate expertise to conduct a review of contractual flow-down provisions related to major defense acquisition programs. The review would include an assessment of the number of contractual flow-down provisions; provisions that are critical for national security; the applicability of provisions for commodities acquired for multiple programs; and costs, burdens, and participation rate effects, if any, of contractual flow-down provisions on defense contractors. The section would require the Secretary to submit to the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services a briefing of interim findings of the independent entity by March 1, 2017, and a final report to the congressional defense committees on the findings of the independent entity by August 1, 2017.

The committee is concerned that prime contracts awarded by the Department of Defense can have adverse effects on subcontractors due to the myriad flow-down provisions established in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to the FAR. The committee is aware that the number of flow-down provisions has increased substantially and that some provisions may impose unnecessary burdens for the Department and its suppliers. The committee also is concerned that some provisions may be flowed down to subcontractors or suppliers to which they do not apply or without appropriate tailoring.

This review is likely to offer government-wide acquisition insights. Consequently, the committee intends to coordinate briefings and lessons learned with the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and House Oversight and Government Reform Committees.

Section 834—Review of Anti-Competitive Specifications in Information Technology Acquisitions

This section would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to review the policy, guidance, regulations, and training related to specifications included in information technology (IT) acquisitions within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The purpose of this review would be to ensure that current policies eliminate the use of potentially anti-competitive specifications, such as the use of brand name procurements, or references to proprietary specification or standards in IT acquisitions. This section would also require the Under Secretary to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services on the review. Lastly, this section would require the Under Secretary to revise current policies, guidance, and training to incorporate any recommended changes from this review, should changes be warranted.

Section 835—Coast Guard Major Acquisition Programs

This section would amend section 56(c) of title 14, United States Code, to direct the Chief Acquisitions Officer of the Coast Guard to inform the Commandant of developments in major acquisition programs that have new or revisited trade-offs between costs,

scheduling, feasibility, and performance. This section also would amend chapter 15 of title 14, United States Code, to clarify the role of the Acquisition Directorate in ensuring that the needs of customers in major acquisition programs are met in the most cost-effective manner practicable. The Vice Commandant of the Coast Guard would be responsible for representing the operating field units and would serve an advisory role to the Commandant for major acquisition programs. The customer of a major acquisition program would be specified as the operating field unit that would field the acquired system and "major acquisition program" would be defined as a program with a life-cycle cost estimate of $300.0 million or more.

This section also would prohibit the Commandant of the Coast Guard from awarding a contract for the design of an unmanned aerial system (UAS) for use by the Coast Guard, and would require the Commandant to use and operate only UASs that have already been acquired by either the Department of Defense or the Department of Homeland Security.

This section also would allow the Coast Guard to extend major acquisition program contracts if the Comptroller General of the United States finds that extending a current contract would be more cost effective than awarding a new contract. The Comptroller General would determine the costs for acquiring additional vessels under an existing contract, as well as the incurred costs due to schedule delays and asset design changes that would result from awarding a new contract.

This section also would require the Commandant to review all authorities provided under chapter 15 of title 14, United States Code, and other relevant statutes and deliver a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on how the Commandant can play a more appropriate role in the acquisitions process with regard to policies, requirements, and implementing a more customer-oriented acquisition system.

This section also would require the Secretary for the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to submit a report to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on an analysis of multiyear procurement authorities for the procurement of at least five Fast Response Cutters (beginning with hull 43) and Offshore Patrol Cutters (beginning with hull 5). The report would include an assessment of costs and benefits, impact on delivery times, and whether acquisitions would meet the four-part test under section 2306b of title 10, United States Code.

Section 836—Waiver of Congressional Notification for Acquisition of Tactical Missiles and Munitions Greater Than Quantity Specified in Law

This section would waive the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees of a decision, not later than 30 days after the date of the decision, to acquire a higher quantity of an end item (for tactical missiles and munitions annual procurements only) than is specified in law.

The committee believes this could be a considerable process improvement for the military service acquisition staffs by eliminating a significant staffing burden in working congressional notifications for nominal increases in missile and munition quantities over the budgeted levels that are based on unit cost savings.

Section 837—Closeout of Old Department of the Navy Contracts

This section would authorize the administrative closeout of a number of older Navy contracts and assist in obtaining a clean financial audit. The Department of Defense has estimated that this proposal would result in a one-time cost avoidance of at least $1.6 million and a one-time payment to the U.S. Treasury of approximately $0.58 million.

Section 838—Requirement That Certain Ship Components Be Manufactured in the National Technology and Industrial Base

This section would amend section 2534 of title 10, United States Code, and would require certain auxiliary ship components to be procured from a manufacturer in the national technology and industrial base.

Section 839—Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund Determination Adjustment

This section would amend section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Defense to reduce the threshold amount that must be credited to the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund during fiscal year 2017 from $400.0 million to $0. This section addresses an overfunding of the fund that has resulted from carryovers from prior years.

Section 840—Amendment To Prohibition on Performance of Non-Defense Audits by Defense Contract Audit Agency To Exempt Audits for National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would amend section 893 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) to exempt audits for the National Nuclear Security Administration from the prohibition on performance of non-defense audits by the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

Section 841—Selection of Service Providers for Auditing Services and Audit Readiness Services

This section would require the Department of Defense to select providers for audit and audit readiness services based on the best value to the Department, rather than based on the lowest price technically acceptable service provider.

Section 842—Modifications to the Justification and Approval Process for Certain Sole-Source Contracts for Small Business Concerns

This section would repeal section 811 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) and establish a standard justification and approval process for sole-source contracts valued at $20.0 million or greater.

TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

OVERVIEW

The Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–433) instituted a series of sweeping organizational reforms to the Department of Defense to include: (1) improving military advice to the President and the Secretary of Defense; (2) improving joint officer management; (3) placing clear responsibility on the commanders of the combatant commands; and (4) increasing attention to the formulation of strategy and to contingency planning.

These reforms were the result of 4 years of congressional oversight and deliberations. They led to a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities across the Department. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was designated as the principal military adviser to the President and the Secretary of Defense, and was to focus on planning and coordination across the joint force. The unified commands were assigned responsibility for conducting operations at the direction and control of the President through the Secretary of Defense, and all combat forces were to be assigned to the unified commanders. The role of the military departments was also clarified regarding organize, train, and equip functions. Lastly, to strengthen civilian authority, Public Law 99–433 codified the powers and duties of the Secretary of Defense. By all accounts, these reforms were a success and remain a model for bipartisan congressional oversight and reform of national security structures.

Three decades after Public Law 99–433 was enacted, the committee believes that the legislation should be reviewed and reevaluated. The committee recognizes that security challenges have become more transregional, multi-domain, and multi-functional; that U.S. superiority in key warfighting areas is at risk with other nations' technological advances; and that the Department of Defense lacks the agility and adaptability necessary to support timely decisionmaking and the rapid fielding of new capabilities.

This subtitle represents the committee's first step towards Goldwater-Nichols reform. The committee believes that reform efforts must start with a clear set of guiding principles and objectives, and it recognizes that further oversight hearings and deliberations are necessary to inform additional reforms. The proposals contained in this subtitle are focused on increasing accountability and oversight, enhancing global synchronization and joint operations, and strengthening strategic thinking and planning, while preserving civilian control of the military and the role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the principal, independent military advisor to the President and Secretary of Defense.

This subtitle contains a sense of Congress that outlines a set of guiding principles for reform. Regarding joint matters, it contains a provision that would reinforce the advisory role of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS) to provide independent advice on ongoing operations and on the allocation and transfer of forces across regions to bridge service and combatant command stovepipes. It contains a provision that would extend the CJCS term from 2 to 4 years in a manner that bridges administrations to in-

crease independence and to provide greater continuity of leadership, and it would require a revamped independent National Military Strategy to support U.S. national security objectives and to synchronize individual combatant command plans. It also includes a provision that would expand the definition of jobs that qualify for joint duty credit and decreases minimum joint tour lengths from 3 years to 2 years to enhance operational currency across joint operations and the joint staff.

Regarding unified commands, this subtitle includes a provision that elevates U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) to a unified command and directs the Comptroller General of the United States to study the dual-hat responsibility of the CYBERCOM Commander as the Director of the National Security Agency. Additionally, this subtitle contains a provision that would further de-layer and reduce top-heavy combatant command headquarters by reducing the rank of service and functional component commanders under a combatant command from four-star to three-star general and flag officers.

Regarding reform within the military departments, the committee has largely focused its efforts on acquisition reform and the role of the military services in acquisition through legislation contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and elsewhere in this Act.

Lastly, this subtitle contains provisions that would streamline strategic planning within the Department. The subtitle includes provisions that would eliminate the ineffective Quadrennial Defense Review and replace it with a new framework for Secretary-led strategic guidance. The Secretary would be required to issue top-down Defense Strategic Guidance every four years that sets force structure and resource priorities. This guidance would be implemented through classified annual program and budget guidance and biennial contingency planning guidance that Congress would receive to support its oversight. Finally, this subtitle contains a proposal that would establish an independent Defense Strategy Commission to make recommendations for the nation's defense strategy.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Conference Travel Policy

The committee has been concerned about the detrimental impact that restrictions on the ability of defense laboratory personnel to travel to technical conferences and symposia have had on recruitment and retention of personnel in the defense research enterprise. The committee notes that such conferences provide value by enabling Department of Defense engineers, scientists, and other technical personnel to share research, learn about cutting-edge innovations, and interact with their peers from across the country and the world. In some cases, participation in such conferences is a necessary step in attaining or maintaining technical professional society memberships or certifications. Participation in technical conferences is also a signal of technological leadership to the international community, and recent restrictions have created a vacuum in some cases that have led other nations' researchers and engineers to fill the void. The ability of the Department to maintain

technical leadership means U.S. scientists and engineers have to be present and active in this community.

The committee is aware that the Office of the Deputy Secretary of Defense updated the Department's Conference Policy guidance in September of 2015. These changes have allowed personnel within the military departments and several other Department of Defense agencies greater flexibility for participation in technical conferences and symposia. While some military departments and Department of Defense agencies have implemented this new guidance, the committee is concerned about the uneven implementation of this new, more decentralized decision making. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to ensure the new policy is broadly, and correctly, understood to ensure that it is fully implemented as soon as possible.

Defense Logistics Agency Overhead Costs

The Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) sources and provides nearly every consumable item used by U.S. military forces worldwide. The Department of Defense uses the Defense-Wide Working Capital Fund to cover the Department's costs for providing services and purchasing commodities under three DLA activity groups: Supply Chain Management, Energy Management, and Document Services. The Defense-Wide Working Capital Fund is reimbursed through DLA's sale of commodities and services to the military services and other customers, such as other Federal agencies and foreign military sales. DLA incorporates overhead costs into the reimbursement rates it charges its customers, which DLA uses to offset facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization; transportation; storage; and other costs.

The committee is interested in the potential for improving DLA's overhead cost estimates, which could, in turn, contribute to more accurate budget estimates and potential savings. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the following:

(1) The nature and size of DLA activities financed by overhead costs reimbursed through the Defense-Wide Working Capital Fund;

(2) How DLA calculates overhead costs for the commodities and services it manages through the Defense-Wide Working Capital Fund;

(3) How DLA's estimated overhead costs have compared to actual costs since fiscal year 2009, and factors that have contributed to any differences;

(4) The options, if any, DLA has considered in adjusting its approach to determining overhead costs in light of any differences between estimated and actual overhead costs; and

(5) Any best practices that DLA has previously used or is using to identify and manage overhead costs.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 30, 2017, on preliminary findings of the Comptroller General's evaluation and to submit a final report to the House Committee on Armed Services on a date agreed to at the time of the briefing.

Human Capital Plan for Business Transformation

The committee believes that business transformation will be increasingly important to the Department of Defense, especially as shrinking budgets and workforce reductions continue. Additional demands, like the growing implementation of enterprise resource planning systems for financial and personnel management, as well as the deadlines to reach full financial auditability, further highlight the need to focus on business transformation, and to have a workforce with the right skill sets and experience to ensure that business transformation is successful. As the lead within the Department of Defense for these activities, these workforce needs are especially acute for the Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO).

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has pointed out that the human capital needs for the Office of the DCMO are not completely defined, and that there appear to be gaps in the skill sets needed for that office to be effective. An earlier call to complete a gap analysis of the human capital needs to better understand what types of personnel are needed to manage and oversee business transformation efforts has not been completed. While there is expertise in business systems and process improvement, GAO found the Office of the DCMO lacking in people with strategic planning or performance management expertise. Continuing workforce reductions will not only impact the ability to conduct this sort of assessment, but also underline the needs to take a more focused look at the workforce in order to make strategic decisions about the limited number of people that office will be able to hire and retain.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Deputy Chief Management Officer to complete a gap analysis of the human capital needs of the Office of the DCMO, taking into account the merger of the positions of Chief Information Officer and DCMO as directed by section 901 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), and to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on the results of the analysis.

Oversight and Management of Defense-Wide Training

The committee notes that Department of Defense Directive 1322.18 pertaining to military training was last updated in January 2009. Since then, significant organizational changes within the Department have occurred, including the disestablishment of U.S. Joint Forces Command and the establishment of an Assistant Secretary of Defense for Readiness, directly affecting the oversight and management of defense-wide training policies, programs, and resources.

The committee notes that section 4(d) of the Directive states that "The Department of Defense shall maintain a comprehensive and effective Service, Defense Agency, and joint training management capability to develop, execute, and assess military training throughout the Department." The committee is aware, however, that, since the disestablishment of U.S. Joint Forces Command, defense-wide training and training-related activities and programs have been dispersed throughout the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the military services, the combatant com-

mands, and other defense organizations. The committee is concerned that such dispersal, combined with outdated policy guidance, has led to the ineffective oversight and management of defense-wide training and inefficient allocation of training-related resources. The committee believes that the Department should take a more holistic approach to managing the defense training enterprise to enhance the capability and readiness of the joint force, to include aligning the services' training investments to joint and common training needs, identifying opportunities for greater training integration and interoperability, and advancing innovative training methods and capabilities.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to update Department of Defense Directive 1322.18. The committee further directs the Secretary and the Chairman to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 1, 2016, on the status of the Department's efforts to update such Directive. The briefing should also address the following elements:

(1) The scope of training programs, facilities, activities, and resources covered by the updated Directive;

(2) The delineation of training roles and responsibilities among the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the military services, the combatant commands, and other relevant defense organizations;

(3) An assessment of joint and common training requirements and the adequacy of current, planned, and programmed training capabilities, resources, and personnel to meet those requirements;

(4) Any recommendations for improving the oversight and management of military training and related resources, including any recommendations for changes in authorities, budgeting structures, or organizational structures, including any recommendations for de-layering and consolidating defense-wide training organizations; and

(5) Any other matters the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—GOLDWATER-NICHOLS REFORM

Section 901—Sense of Congress on Goldwater-Nichols Reform

This section would express the sense of Congress that certain principles should be adhered to in any reform of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–433). These principles shape the legislative recommendations contained in this subtitle and will inform the committee's consideration of future reform proposals.

Section 902—Repeal of Defense Strategy Review

This section would repeal section 118 of title 10, United States Code, which requires the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive examination of the national defense strategy.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes provisions that would recommend comprehensive reform of the defense and military strategies of the Department of Defense.

Section 903—Commission on National Defense Strategy for the United States

This section would establish a commission to be known as the "Commission on National Defense Strategy for the United States" to examine and make recommendations with respect to national defense strategy for the United States. This section would further set the composition and duties of the commission, and require the commission to submit a final report to the President, Secretary of Defense, and the specified congressional committees on its findings, conclusions, and recommendations, and to provide an interim briefing to the specified congressional committees.

The committee notes that the strategic environment has evolved since the current defense strategy, as outlined in both the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance and 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review, was formulated. For example, the strategy does not reflect a resurgent Russian Federation, the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, or the fragile security environment in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee believes that the strategy and the assumptions underpinning it should be reviewed and revised, as appropriate.

The committee further notes that the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, in its 2009 final report, achieved a largely bipartisan consensus on its recommended strategic posture and nuclear weapons policy for the United States. The committee encourages the Commission on National Defense Strategy for the United States to strive for a similar bipartisan consensus. The committee believes that the Nation will benefit from such a bipartisan consensus on national security and that a new administration can leverage the work of the commission in its own defense strategy and posture development.

Section 904—Reform of Defense Strategic and Policy Guidance

This section would amend section 113(g) of title 10, United States Code, regarding Secretary of Defense policy guidance. Specifically, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide:

(1) Written strategic guidance every 4 years to components of the Department of Defense that expresses the national defense strategy of the United States;

(2) Written policy guidance annually to components of the Department that provides program and budget guidance for the development of the force;

(3) Written policy guidance every 2 years or more frequently, as needed, to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that provides contingency planning guidance; and

(4) A copy of all written guidance described above to the congressional defense committees not later than February 15th in any calendar year in which any of the guidance is required.

This section on reform of defense strategy and policy guidance from the Secretary of Defense is complemented elsewhere in this Act by reform of military strategy from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The committee aims to simplify the strategy and policy guidance required of the Secretary of Defense and to establish a hierarchy for Department of Defense strategy and policy

guidance documents. The committee encourages the Secretary to efficiently implement the requirements of this section and to avoid standing bureaucracies dedicated to the assembly of such documents.

The committee has previously expressed disappointment that the Department's seminal strategy document, the quadrennial defense review, was insufficient in providing a means to set Department priorities, shape the force, guide capabilities and resources, and to understand the relationships between missions, risks, and resources.

Further, the committee understands the importance of the Department publicly communicating its defense strategy to the American people, Congress, other U.S. Government agencies, and international partners and allies. However, the committee also recognizes that the classified assumptions and analysis underpinning the strategy, as well as the subsequent programming, budgeting, and contingency planning guidance that implement the strategy, are also important oversight tools for the committee and help to frame the annual budget request. Therefore, this section would require the congressional defense committees to receive such information and documents.

Section 905—Reform of the National Military Strategy

This section would strike section 153(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, on the National Military Strategy (NMS) and replace it with a requirement for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prepare a new National Military Strategy or to update a previous one in conjunction with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the commanders of the unified and specified combatant commands. The section would also require that the NMS support the objectives of national security and defense strategic guidance issued by the President and the Secretary of Defense, and focus the NMS on, at a minimum:

(1) Developing military ends, ways, and means to support national security objectives;

(2) Assessing strategic and military risks, and developing risk mitigation options;

(3) Establishing a strategic framework for the development of operational and contingency plans;

(4) Prioritizing joint force capabilities, capacities, and resources; and

(5) Establishing military guidance for the development of the joint force.

This section on reform of the military strategy from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is complemented elsewhere in this Act with reform of defense strategy and policy guidance from the Secretary of Defense. The committee aims to simplify the National Military Strategy and to link it to a hierarchy of Department of Defense strategy and policy guidance documents. The committee believes that the NMS should be re-focused to provide a strategic framework for the development of operational and contingency plans by the combatant commands, and to provide joint force and joint capability development guidance to guide resource investments by the military services. To provide such guidance, the committee also believes that the NMS should be a classified document.

Section 906—Modification to Independent Study of National Security Strategy Formulation Process

This section would amend section 1064 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), which requires an independent study of the national security strategy formulation process, by adding a requirement for the study to address the workforce responsible for conducting strategic planning and to examine how Congress fits into the strategy formulation process.

Section 907—Term of Office for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

This section would amend section 152(a) of title 10, United States Code, to extend the term of office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from 2 years to 4 years. This section would also limit the reappointment of the Chairman to additional terms only in a time of war, and limit the combined period of service of an officer serving as Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to 8 years.

The committee believes that a longer term of office for the Chairman provides greater stability and continuity of military leadership at the Department of Defense. Furthermore, by staggering the Chairman's term of office such that it is not aligned with the 4 year presidential election cycle, the committee believes that the Chairman's role in providing independent military advice to the President and Secretary of Defense is reinforced.

Section 908—Responsibilities of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relating to Operations

This section would amend section 153(a) of title 10, United States Code, which sets forth the functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by codifying the Chairman's responsibility to provide advice to the President and the Secretary of Defense on ongoing military operations and to provide advice to the Secretary on the allocation and transfer of forces among combatant commands.

While the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–433) established the combatant commands to conduct operations at the direction of the President, through the Secretary of Defense, the committee recognizes that these commands individually develop and execute operational plans for specific regions and functional areas. The committee also recognizes that security challenges will become increasingly transregional, multi-domain, and multi-functional, which will require an entity to transcend individual combatant commands and to support timely decision-making by the President and the Secretary. Therefore, the committee recommends vesting the Chairman with an advisory responsibility on operations and on the allocation and transfer of forces among combatant commands.

The committee also believes such a transcendent, global perspective should be brought to the Department's strategy development, contingency planning, requirements identification, resource allocation, and budgeting process. The committee understands that the Chairman, in an advisory capacity, has these authorities and encourages the Chairman to exercise them.

Lastly, the committee would note that the intent of Public Law 99–433 in revising the Chairman's functions was to focus the Chairman on strategy and planning. While the committee would grant the Chairman a greater role in advising on operations, it also believes that the Chairman should remain focused on strategic direction, strategic planning, and contingency planning, for the Chairman is the only senior military leader that, independently and holistically, looks across the military services and the combatant commands.

Section 909—Assigned Forces within the Continental United States

This section would amend section 162(a) of title 10, United States Code, to allow U.S. military forces within the continental United States to be assigned to a military department as directed by the Secretary of Defense.

Section 162(a) of title 10, United States Code, requires the Secretaries of the military departments to assign all forces under their jurisdiction to unified and specific commands, with certain exceptions. For example, military forces returning to the continental United States from deployments to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq, and who are conducting reset and reconstitution activities, are required to be assigned to a unified or specified command to support the missions of that command. This legislative recommendation would allow those forces, at the direction of the Secretary of Defense, to be assigned to a military department during such reset and reconstitution period rather than a unified or specified command.

Section 910—Reduction in General Officer and Flag Officer Grades and Positions

This section would amend section 164(e) of title 10, United States Code, on subordinate commanders of combatant commands to specify that the grade of an officer serving as the commander of a service or functional component command shall be no higher than lieutenant general or vice admiral. This section would further require that the total number of officers in the grade of general or admiral on active duty be reduced by five positions. Lastly, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees on the Department's plan for implementing such reductions.

The committee remains concerned that a top-heavy chain of command within the combatant commands adds unnecessary headquarters staff, adds distance and layers between commanders and warfighters, and slows decision-making and agility of command. The committee's focus on the number of senior military leaders within the combatant commands complements its previous efforts to streamline Department of Defense headquarters organizations, including reducing the size of staffs and eliminating tiers of management. The committee understands that the Secretary of Defense shares this concern and welcomes the Secretary's effort to review four-star general and admiral positions within the Department to simplify and improve command and control.

Section 911—Establishment of Unified Combatant Command for Cyber Operations

This section would establish a unified combatant command for cyber operations with the primary function to prepare cyber operations forces to carry out assigned missions.

Section 912—Revision of Requirements Relating to Length of Joint Duty Assignments

This section would amend section 664 of title 10, United States Code, to reduce the joint duty assignment tour length to a minimum of 2 years for officers of all ranks, and remove the statutory requirement for services to maintain a tour length average.

Section 913—Revision of Definitions Used for Joint Officer Management

This section would amend section 668 of title 10, United States Code, to revise the statutory definition of "joint matters" to more accurately reflect and properly clarify the types of joint duty positions for which an officer may receive joint duty credit to better capture the breadth of duties and positions that comprise joint matters experience.

Section 914—Independent Assessment of Combatant Command Structure

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to enter into a contract with an independent entity to conduct an assessment on combatant command structure, and to provide recommendations for improving the overall effectiveness of combatant command structures. Additionally, this section would require that, not later than March 1, 2017, the Secretary of Defense submit a report on the findings and recommendations of the independent entity to the congressional defense committees.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 921—Modifications to Corrosion Report

This section would amend section 2228(e) of title 10, United States Code, to make revisions to the annual report from the Office of Corrosion Policy and Oversight. This amendment would also supersede the effect of section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) on the report amended described in this section.

Section 922—Authority To Employ Civilian Faculty Members at Joint Special Operations University

This section would amend section 1595(c) of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Joint Special Operations University (JSOU) the flexibility to hire selected talent. The committee notes that hiring authority under title 10, versus the traditional title 5 authority, would ensure JSOU's faculty remain relevant in their area of expertise by enabling JSOU to hire faculty with relevant

expertise in an expeditious manner and, if necessary, replace faculty that do not maintain currency in their area of expertise.

Section 923—Guidelines for Conversion of Functions Performed by Civilian or Contractor Personnel to Performance by Military Personnel

This section would amend section 129a of title 10, United States Code, to clarify when military personnel could be used for functions currently being performed by civilian personnel or contractors.

Section 924—Public Release by Inspectors General of Reports of Misconduct

This section would require the Department of Defense Inspector General to publicly release reports of administrative investigations that confirm misconduct of members of the Senior Executive Service, schedule C employees, or commissioned officers in the Armed Forces in pay grades O–6 promotable and above. Information otherwise protected from release would not be disclosed.

Section 925—Modifications to Requirements for Accounting for Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense Civilian Employees Listed as Missing

This section would remove responsibility for recovering personnel who are missing during current operations or activities from the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency.

SUBTITLE C—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Section 931—Redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps

This section would redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps. It would also redesignate the Secretary of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps and redesignate other statutory offices.

Section 932—Conforming Amendments to Title 10, United States Code

This section would make several conforming amendments to title 10, United States Code, consistent with the redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps elsewhere in this Act.

Section 933—Other Provisions of Law and Other References

This section would amend other provisions of law and other references consistent with the redesignation of the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps and the redesignation of the Secretary of the Navy as the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps elsewhere in this Act.

Section 934—Effective Date

This section would state that this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle shall take effect on the first day of the first

month beginning more than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Colombia Peace Process

The committee commends the Republic of Colombia on its progress over the past 4 years to achieve a peace accord with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia. The committee notes that the United States has provided assistance over the past 15 years to help the Government of Colombia stabilize the nation. In those 15 years, Colombia has transformed from a near-failed state rife with violence, criminality, corruption, and paralyzing instability, to a state of economic prosperity, political stability, and security. The committee credits the people of Colombia and the leadership of the Colombian Government for this transformation.

The committee supports the peace process in Colombia and is hopeful that it concludes successfully. However, the committee also recognizes that challenges remain, including addressing potential renewed violence and illicit trafficking, an increase in coca production, charges of human rights violations, contamination by landmines and unexploded munitions, and a lack of state presence in many regions. To address these challenges, the committee believes that the assistance efforts of the Department of Defense and other U.S. Government organizations must be sustained.

United States Southern Command Operational Support

The committee commends the Department of Defense and the U.S. Southern Command for their continued efforts to address regional instability in Central and South America.

The committee notes several security challenges that persist in the area of responsibility of U.S. Southern Command. These challenges include continued violence and instability in Central America; pervasive drug cartels, corruption, and lack of economic opportunity; continued drug and illicit trafficking, particularly in the Caribbean where those nations serve as transit points; and continued smuggling of unaccompanied alien children into the United States from Central America. They also include rising coca production and increased violence in the Republic of Colombia, as the Government of Colombia continues its efforts to achieve a peace accord with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC).

The committee notes the important work of the U.S. Government in the Western Hemisphere, and particularly the Department of Defense, in providing valuable training, equipment, and assistance to U.S. regional neighbors and partners to address these challenges. Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends an increase of $30.0 million for Department of Defense United States Southern Command Operational Support within the Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities Appropriation.

OTHER MATTERS

Accessibility of Translated Foreign Military and Technical Writings

The committee notes that Department of Defense policy, strategy, and programmatic decision-making are informed by an understanding of foreign military and technical writings. The committee also notes that the Department and the U.S. Intelligence Community have organizations and resources dedicated to translating foreign military and technical writings. However, the committee is concerned that these translated writings are not widely disseminated or easily accessible within either the Department or the broader community of analysts supporting and informing U.S. defense strategy and policy.

The committee encourages the Department to make translated foreign military and technical writings more accessible within the Department and the Intelligence Community. The committee further believes that unclassified translated writings should be made publicly available so that civilian academics and researchers can leverage them to enhance their analytical work, including work conducted for the Department.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than July 15, 2016, on the policies governing the access and dissemination of translated foreign military and technical writings. The briefing should also address the following elements:

(1) Policies and guidelines governing the access and dissemination of translated writings;

(2) Policies and guidelines governing the releasability of translated writings, including release authorities;

(3) Organizations and resources currently dedicated to the translation and dissemination of such writings;

(4) Options to make translated writings more accessible within the Department and to the public, including identification of policy changes and resources required for each option; and

(5) Any other matters that the Secretary may deem relevant.

Air Force Combat Search and Rescue Associate Units

The committee supports the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force recommendation to expand the use of associate units, where appropriate. The committee notes, however, that none of the three Air National Guard combat search and rescue units in Alaska, California, and New York are associate units. Therefore, the committee encourages the Air Force to consider options for making these units active associate units under an appropriate organizational structure based on their local mission and operational demands. In addition, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 2017, on the potential options for transforming these units into associate units, including the potential cost, benefits, and challenges involved in each case.

Airlift Safety and Readiness for Certain Aircraft

As noted elsewhere in this report, the committee is concerned about the recent rise in Class A mishaps across the services. The committee has also observed the decrease in the readiness and availability of C–40, C–37, C–32, C–21, C–20, C–12, and C–9 aircraft, which has led to the cancellation or delay of a number of high-priority missions. These cancellations and delays, coupled with data on other recent mishaps, may suggest that the unique way the military services operate these aircraft may be leading to unforeseen maintenance issues, which could present a safety risk. The committee also continues to be concerned with the inconsistent way these aircraft are scheduled, tasked, operated, and managed among the military services.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the safety, readiness, and utilization of C–40, C–32, C–37, C–21, C–20, C–12, and C–9 aircraft across the military services and to provide a report on the findings of such assessment to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2017. The committee expects the Secretary of Defense to provide the Comptroller General any information and background materials necessary for completion of the assessment. At a minimum, the report should include:

(1) A summary of ground and flying safety mishap incidents by military service, aircraft type, model, and series over the past 10 years;

(2) A summary of both requested and actual funding for maintenance and spare parts by military service, aircraft type, model, and series over the past 10 years;

(3) Current policies and directives governing the operation and use of these aircraft;

(4) The overall requirement for C–40, C–37, C–32, C–21, C–20, C–12, and C–9 aircraft compared to the current inventory;

(5) A comprehensive review of scheduling, operational tasking, and operating procedures, including tactical control, across all of the military services, including integration and interoperability among the military services, and potential ways to standardize these practices;

(6) Utilization rates across all of the military services and a comparison with commercial practices and standards, including maintenance intervals;

(7) Maintenance plans, processes, and procedures for sustainment of the C–40, C–37, C–32, C–21, C–20, C–12, and C–9 aircraft and the impact of maintenance deferrals on operational availability; and

(8) Any other items the Comptroller General deems relevant to the assessment.

Army and Joint Force Integration of Former Unmanned Aircraft System Center of Excellence Responsibilities

The committee notes that under the former Joint Forces Combatant Command (JFCOM), a Joint Center of Excellence for Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) was established in 2005 by the Department of Defense at Creech Air Force Base, Nevada. A separate Unmanned Aircraft Systems Center of Excellence (COE) was estab-

lished in 2008 by the Army at Fort Rucker, Alabama. The purpose of the UAS COEs was to establish organizations that could collaborate and create an environment among the military services that would foster unity of effort focused on all aspects of UAS requirements, system development, acquisition, testing, fielding, training, airspace integration, employment concepts, sustainment, interoperability, data dissemination, capability gaps, and shortfalls. Consequently, in 2010 when JFCOM was disestablished by the Secretary of Defense, both the Joint COE and the Army COE were subsequently disestablished.

The committee understood at the time that all the responsibilities of the Joint COE would be divided between the Joint Staff J–8 Directorate for Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment, and the Department of Defense UAS Task Force. The committee further understood that all the responsibilities of the Army COE would be absorbed within the Capabilities Development and Integration Directorate of the Army's Aviation COE at the Army's Training and Doctrine Command.

Although the committee has been assured by the Department that all aspects of the UAS COEs that were disestablished were reabsorbed into the aforementioned organizations, the committee seeks to gain a further understanding regarding particular aspects of UAS issues.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than October 1, 2016, that explains:

(1) How the Army plans to grow resources and facilities to support the expansion of UAS orbits through 2030;

(2) How increased Army UAS operations will fit into joint and executive branch interagency operations; and,

(3) How the Army plans to mitigate frequency encroachment on test and training ranges.

The committee also directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than October 1, 2016, that explains how the role, mission, and responsibilities of the former Joint UAS COE were absorbed into the governance architecture of the J–8 Directorate of the Joint Staff, and provide an assessment to the committee regarding the benefits and challenges of those responsibilities being executed within the J–8 Directorate.

Carrier Air Wing Force Structure

The budget request would deactivate the Navy's 10th carrier air wing and its associated squadrons. The committee notes that the Navy wishes to pursue deactivating the 10th carrier air wing currently assigned to Naval Air Station Lemoore, which is in contravention to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) to maintain 10 carrier air wings and associated headquarters. The committee does not believe the Navy has sufficient analysis to support the risk associated with a reduction from ten to nine carrier air wings.

Therefore, the committee recommends $134.0 million, an increase of $2.3 million, in PE87732N, and an increase of $131.7 million in Operations and Maintenance, Military Personnel Navy, Reserve Personnel Navy, and Medicare Eligible Retiree Health Fund

Contribution Reserve Navy, in order to retain the 10th carrier air wing.

Comprehensive Detention Strategy

The committee believes that the Department of Defense's policy for the disposition of individuals captured on the battlefield is insufficient.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense intends to increase the pace of operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic that are either intended to capture individuals, or may result in the capture of individuals. In testimony before the committee on December 1, 2015, the Secretary of Defense described the creation of an "expeditionary targeting force" to assist Iraqi and Kurdish Peshmerga forces and to put pressure on the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). The Secretary stated that, "These special operators will, over time, be able to conduct raids, free hostages, gather intelligence and capture ISIL leaders. This force will also be in a position to conduct unilateral operations in Syria. That creates a . . . virtuous cycle of better intelligence, which generates more targets, more raids, more momentum." The Secretary went on to say, "One of the reasons for the expeditionary targeting for us is precisely to gain intelligence. And one of the ways you do that is by capturing people." According to the Secretary's public statements, as well as documents delivered to the committee, future captures would be considered on a "case-by-case basis."

The committee agrees that battlefield captures can yield significant intelligence. Given the anticipated increase in operational tempo, the committee believes that a more comprehensive detention strategy needs to be established to improve the intelligence gained from captured individuals and to ensure lawful dispositions of captured individuals.

Comptroller General Assessment of Deployable Identity Management Forensics Capability

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has used biometrics and forensics to successfully identify, target, and disrupt terrorists and enemy combatants in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Expeditionary forensic laboratories have deployed in theater to quickly exploit evidence collected from the battlefield, resulting in the capture and prosecution of enemy combatants. Many of the Department's expeditionary biometrics and forensics capabilities were resourced through the Department's Overseas Contingency Operations funding. The committee notes that the Department has taken steps to establish expeditionary biometrics and forensics as enduring capabilities in the base budget; however, these funding levels may not be adequate to sustain current and future validated mission requirements.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the Department's process for determining and validating its future expeditionary biometrics and forensics requirements, as well as actions the Department has taken to ensure that its expeditionary biometrics and forensics capabilities, including materiel solutions, trained personnel, and funding, are available to meet current and future requirements. The committee fur-

ther directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Armed Services Committee by March 1, 2017, on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings with a report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of the briefing.

Countering Violent Extremism

The committee remains concerned about the ongoing threat of violent extremism across the globe. The committee is aware of coordinated interagency efforts to address the threat of terrorism and to counter violent extremism. The committee encourages and supports continued efforts to ensure the urgent challenges of violent extremism, including root causes such as lack of effective governance, are addressed in a comprehensive, interagency approach.

Department of Defense Briefing on United States Ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

The committee has heard testimony from a multitude of U.S. military leaders who are supportive of the U.S. becoming a formal signatory of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). The committee is aware that these military leaders testified that ratifying UNCLOS is in our national interest, specifically regarding developing territorial challenges in the South China Sea and the Arctic.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2016, regarding United States ratification of UNCLOS. The briefing should contain, at a minimum, the strategic implications and surmised impacts—both benefits and disadvantages—to national security, current foreign military relations, and ongoing military operations should the United States ratify UNCLOS or maintain the status quo. The brief should also identify those areas in which the lack of ratification has impacted the interests of the United States and our allies.

Department of Defense Strategy for Countering Unconventional Warfare

Section 1097 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) directed the Department of Defense to develop a strategy to counter unconventional warfare threats posed by adversarial state and non-state actors. Section 1097 further directed the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to coordinate this strategy with the heads of other appropriate departments and agencies of the U.S. Government. The Secretary is required to submit this strategy to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of Public Law 114–92.

The committee remains concerned about the growing unconventional warfare capabilities and threats being posed most notably and recently by the Russian Federation and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee notes that unconventional warfare is defined most accurately as those activities conducted to enable a resistance movement or insurgency to coerce, disrupt, or overthrow a government or occupying power by operating through or with an underground, auxiliary, or guerrilla force in a denied area. The

committee also notes that most state-sponsors of unconventional warfare, such as Russia and Iran, have doctrinally linked conventional warfare, economic warfare, cyber warfare, information operations, intelligence operations, and other activities seamlessly in an effort to undermine U.S. national security objectives and the objectives of U.S. allies alike.

The committee also notes that the Department of Defense may require additional time to fully and properly coordinate the strategy, as directed by section 1097, with the heads of other appropriate departments and agencies of the U.S. Government. Given the importance of this coordination and the interagency aspects of an effective strategy for countering unconventional warfare threats, the committee expects frequent and periodic progress updates by the Department should an extension be required for interagency coordination and the development and delivery of this strategy. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide an update to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by May 23, 2016, on the completion of the strategy for countering unconventional warfare threats required by section 1097 of Public Law 114–92.

Enterprise Resource Planning Financial Management Implementation

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) mandated that the Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense develop and maintain a Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) Plan that describes the specific actions to be taken by the Department to be ready for audit by September 30, 2017. Implementation of Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) systems is a critical element in the military departments' audit readiness plans. The Army General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS) supports standardized financial management and accounting practices for the Army's general fund, the Navy Enterprise Resource Planning (Navy ERP) system standardizes Navy financial management, and the Air Force Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System (DEAMS) provides a range of financial management capabilities.

The committee notes that the successful implementation, operation, and full utilization of GFEBS, Navy ERP, and DEAMS are critical to the military departments' ability to produce auditable statements and pass financial audits. The committee therefore encourages the Army, Navy, and Air Force to ensure that full implementation, operation, and utilization of their respective ERP systems remain on schedule. The Department's Functional Management Office (FMO) is responsible for ensuring these ERP systems allow the end user to produce auditable, timely, and accurate reporting of all financial data. To fulfill the FMO's requirements and to ensure that GFEBS, Navy ERP, and DEAMS meet auditing standards, the committee believes that the Department should leverage greater certified public accountant expertise and Federal financial management experience. In that regard, the committee believes that this expertise and experience should be included in any follow-on award of a contract for implementation of, or enhancement to, GFEBS, Navy ERP, and DEAMS, to better ensure ERP

system success, compliance with all laws and regulations, and to meet the functional needs of the financial user community.

Financial Management Systems for Army Non-Appropriated Fund Activities

The committee is aware of the priority placed on financial management and auditability for the Department of Defense and the various military services. The committee continues to emphasize the need to ensure greater visibility and control over financial resources, in both appropriated and non-appropriated funds. For the Army, the committee recognizes that the General Fund Enterprise Business System (GFEBS) is the principal enterprise resource planning system for appropriated funds. While non-appropriated funds are not processed by that system, the committee is aware that the non-appropriated fund community is looking at financial management tools to support their mission. Because of the similarity in requirements, as well as the efficiencies that could be gained in common training and enterprise license purchases, the committee encourages the Army to look at GFEBS as a possible solution to financial management for non-appropriated fund activities.

Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account

In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee recommended that the Department of Defense take into consideration the current balance within the Foreign Currency Fluctuation, Defense (FCF,D) account when determining foreign currency levels in future budget submissions. The committee observes that there has been no such change to how foreign currency rates are calculated since it identified the issue 2 years ago.

The General Accounting Office (now the Government Accountability Office, or GAO) noted in a 1986 report (NSIAD–86–173) that the purpose of the FCF,D account is to provide a mechanism for stabilizing the portion of Operation and Maintenance (O&M) and Military Personnel funding used for purchasing foreign goods and services. The FCF,D provides funds to O&M when foreign exchange rates are unfavorable (when losses occur) and receives funds from O&M when the rates are favorable (when gains occur). This ensures, as GAO stated, that "any given O&M appropriation for the purchase of foreign goods and services will purchase the budgeted amount of goods and services, regardless of the gains and losses of the dollar caused by currency fluctuations." Based on the rationale for the genesis of the FCF,D account, the committee believes that when the Department determines foreign currency rates for budget programming, the current balance of funds in the FCF,D account should be considered.

When the FCF,D account has a balance close to or at the cap of $970.0 million, the committee believes the budgeted rates should be adjusted to generate losses within the account, thereby drawing down the FCF,D account balance. This would reduce the O&M budget requirement for foreign goods and services, allowing excess funds to be allocated to other readiness programs without changing

the budget topline. However, as the FCF,D account realizes a net gain, these gains remain in O&M and are used for purposes not originally requested in the annual budget submission to Congress. Without visibility of these transactions through a reprogramming request, the committee cannot determine whether funds remaining in the FCF,D account are being used to reduce current readiness shortfalls.

The committee notes that GAO estimates the Department will again realize a net gain in fiscal year 2017 when comparing the rates used to develop fiscal year 2017 budgetary needs to cover foreign currency fluctuations with the projected needs based on current exchange rates. Due to the projected net gain and the lack of the use of current balances to structure foreign currency rates, the committee recommends both a reduction in the O&M budget for fiscal year 2017 as shown in section 4301 of this Act and a reduction in the Military Personnel budget for fiscal year 2017 as shown in section 4401 of this Act, and realigns those funds to support higher priority defense requirements throughout the Department.

Maintaining Compliance with the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness Plan

The committee continues to monitor progress on the Department of Defense's Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan, and expects the Department to continue to work towards achieving the goal of validating financial statements as ready for audit by September 30, 2017, as required by section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). Full audit readiness will provide the Department and Congress with auditable information that can be used to verify Department balance sheets and track Department spending, which will aid in the appropriate oversight of the Department's various budgetary activities and appropriations accounts, as well as assist in the identification of waste, fraud, and abuse. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to address the findings and recommendations identified in the Department's latest FIAR Plan Status Report, dated November 2015, and to continue improving the Department's audit infrastructure and annual audit regimen.

Minerva Research Initiative

The committee is aware of the ongoing efforts of the Department of Defense to increase sociocultural understanding at tactical, operational, and strategic levels through programs like the Minerva Initiative. The Minerva Initiative is a university-based, social science research initiative focusing on areas of strategic importance to U.S. national security policy. The committee continues to support the Minerva Initiative's efforts to utilize the capabilities within universities, research institutions, and of individual scholars to execute interdisciplinary and cross-institutional projects addressing specific topic areas determined by the Secretary of Defense. The committee believes that strategic research efforts, such as those that are part of the Minerva Initiative's research program, are critical to better understand and manage the social, cultural, and political forces that allow threats, such as the emergence of radical Islamic groups, to emerge. The committee encourages the Department of Defense

to continue to improve their social science research, foreign area, and interdisciplinary studies to improve the Department's capacity to understand and predict these emerging threats.

Preventing Unfair Trade Practices in Military Equipment Sales

The committee notes that offsets are generally prohibited under most U.S. trade agreements and generally considered a violation of the principles of the European Union treaty, with the exception of certain specific, limited, and agreed-upon defense procurements. The committee believes that any free trade agreement negotiations between the United States and the European Union should include a prohibition on offset agreements with respect to the sale of defense equipment by U.S. companies to European Union member states that would, for example, require U.S. companies to reinvest a percentage of the value of any resulting contract in the importing country.

Recommendations of the National Commission on the Future of the Army

The committee notes that Congress established the National Commission of the Future of the Army (NCFA) in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The primary purpose of the NCFA was to address two major concerns:

(1) How the Army should best organize and employ the Total Force in time of declining resources; and

(2) Whether the Army should proceed with the transfer of AH–64 Apache aircraft from the Reserve Components to the Regular Army as directed by the Army's aviation restructure initiative.

In its final report, the NCFA made 63 recommendations that were directed to the President, Congress, Department of Defense, Joint Staff, combatant commands, and the Army. In considering these recommendations, based on the underlying law that established the NCFA, the commission was instructed to take into account "anticipated mission requirements for the Army at acceptable levels of national risk and in a manner consistent with available resources and anticipated future resources." Consequently, the commission presumed a budget request level for fiscal year 2016, and its recommendations assumed that a total Army force of 450,000 in the Regular Army, 335,000 in the Army National Guard, and 195,000 in the Army Reserve could not be increased. Furthermore, all recommendations with funding implications assumed that the Army would have to take risk and make internal trades to resource the recommendations, as well as assumed that Congress would not provide additional resources across the Future Years Defense Program.

The committee commends the efforts of the commissioners and their staff for the on-time completion of the NCFA report and associated recommendations. In general, the committee is supportive of many of the commission's recommendations; however, the committee requires additional information from the Department of Defense and the Army, as well as more time for sufficient review in order to make informed decisions regarding most of the recommendations made by the NCFA. Of these recommendations, the

committee supports the recommendation to retain 4 Apache attack helicopter battalions in the National Guard and an 11th combat aviation brigade in the Regular Army. The committee expects the Army to plan and program accordingly based on available resources across the Future Years Defense Program. The committee is also supportive of a permanent combat aviation brigade in the Republic of Korea, a permanent armored brigade combat team presence in Europe, and increasing armored brigade combat team capacity in the Army. The committee is also supportive of the recommendations for developing one Army under the total force policy. The committee is also supportive of the recommendation to consolidate Army marketing functions under the authority of the Army Marketing Research Group to eliminate redundancy and gain unity of effort. The committee is not supportive, however, of any recommendation that would reduce the Army's current force structure or use reductions in combat force structure as offsets to resource any recommendation. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would address the commission's recommendations focusing on Army modernization capability and capacity shortfalls, as well as alternative Army force designs and modeling.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Chief of Staff of the Army, to provide a written assessment of all of the NCFA recommendations that are within such official's respective jurisdiction to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2016. The committee expects the Army's written assessment to be separate, and include comments from the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. The respective assessments should include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) Whether the recommendation is agreeable;

(2) Potential implementation plans for those recommendations, to include resource options and timelines;

(3) Costs anticipated in execution of those implementation plans; and

(4) Any legislative assistance required.

Repeal of Report on Unmanned Aircraft Systems

In the committee report (H. Rept. 106–652) accompanying the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to submit an annual report on the Department's progress in addressing the challenges facing unmanned aircraft systems. The Department has provided the requested report for 7 years, including the most recent report on March 23, 2016. Based on the committee's ability to obtain the information in these reports through other means, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to no longer provide this report to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Special Operations Forces Education Briefing

The committee remains concerned that high operational tempo and dwell times may not afford U.S. Special Operations Forces

(SOF) appropriate time for enrollment in Department of Defense education programs such as the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) and the Post 9–11 GI Bill. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command, to brief the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives not later than September 16, 2016, on the following:

(1) The number of U.S. Special Operations Forces active and reserve personnel currently enrolled in TAP and the Post 9–11 GI Bill;

(2) The number of SOF active and reserve enrolled in these programs over the past five years;

(3) Percentage of SOF personnel active and reserve enrolled in these programs as compared to general purpose forces; and

(4) Any additional elements the Commander deems relevant.

Wassenaar Arrangement Impacts to the Department of Defense

The committee understands the Wassernaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies prevents destabilizing accumulations of covered goods and technologies, and seeks to prevent acquisition of such items by terrorists. Covered technologies and goods subject to the Wassernaar Arrangement impact items which have both military and civilian applications. For example, controls for software, hardware, and technology that operate, deliver, or communicate with intrusion software added to the list of dual-use technologies in 2013 include a number of products regularly used for cyber security research and defense. The committee believes restricting export of these technologies may negatively impact use of such products for national security purposes. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on the impact of the Wassernaar Agreement to Department of Defense applications, including efforts to support alliance partners or otherwise build partner capacity with friendly nations.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1001—General Transfer Authority

This section would allow the Secretary of Defense, with certain limitations, to make transfers between amounts authorized for fiscal year 2017 in division A of this Act. This section would limit the total amount transferred under this authority to $5.00 billion. This section would also require prompt notification to Congress of each transfer made.

Section 1002—Requirement To Transfer Funds From Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund to the Treasury

This section would reduce the unobligated balance of the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund by $475.0 million due to excess funds.

SUBTITLE B—COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES

Section 1011—Extension of Authority To Provide Additional Support for Counter-Drug Activities of Foreign Governments

This section would amend section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 1012 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), by extending the authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of foreign governments to September 30, 2019.

Section 1012—Secretary of Defense Review of Curricula and Program Structures of National Guard Counterdrug Schools

This section would amend section 901 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (Public Law 109–469) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to review and approve the curriculum and program structure of each of the National Guard counterdrug schools.

The committee notes the importance of the National Guard counterdrug schools in the development, training, and maintenance of skills for Federal, State, local, and foreign government officials to combat illicit trafficking. The committee supports increased oversight by the Secretary of these schools to improve the alignment of curriculum to defense priorities and the allocation of limited resources.

Section 1013—Extension of Authority To Support Unified Counterdrug and Counterterrorism Campaign in Colombia

This section would extend, by 1 year, the authority to support the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism campaign in the Republic of Colombia originally authorized by section 1021 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), and most recently amended by section 1011 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

SUBTITLE C—NAVAL VESSELS AND SHIPYARDS

Section 1021—Definition of Short-Term Work With Respect to Overhaul, Repair, or Maintenance of Naval Vessels

This section would amend section 7299a of title 10, United States Code, and expand the homeport limitation of an overhaul, repair, or maintenance ship availability from 6 months to 10 months.

Section 1022—Warranty Requirements for Shipbuilding Contracts

This section would require shipbuilding contracts to include warranty of work for a period of at least 1 year. A contracting officer may waive this requirement if a limited liability of warranted work is in the best interest of the government.

The committee is concerned about incentives that reward shipbuilders for delivering a ship that needs additional work. The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office completed an assessment entitled “Navy Should Reconsider Approach to War-

ranties for Correcting Construction Defects" dated March 6, 2016. The report indicated that in most instances, the Navy paid the shipbuilder to build the ship as part of the construction contract, and then paid the same shipbuilder again, including profit, to repair the ship when defects were discovered after delivery.

Section 1023—National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund

This section would expand the transfer authority provided by section 1022(b)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to include fiscal year 2018. Also, this section would amend section 2218a of title 10, United States Code, relating to the national sea-based deterrence fund to include authority for multi-year procurement of critical components to support continuous production. Finally, this section would clarify the definition of a national sea-based deterrence vessel.

Section 1024—Availability of Funds for Retirement or Inactivation of Ticonderoga-Class Cruisers or Dock Landing Ships

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from using funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act to retire a cruiser or dock landing ship or to place in a modernization status more than six cruisers and one dock landing ship. Furthermore, the Secretary of Defense would be prohibited from obligating more than 75 percent of the funds made available for the Office of the Secretary of Defense until the Secretary of the Navy enters into a contract for the modernization of four cruisers and one dock landing ship and enters into a contract for the procurement of combat systems upgrades associated with six such cruisers.

Section 1025—Restrictions on the Overhaul and Repair of Vessels in Foreign Shipyards

This section amends section 7310(b)(1) of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit the Department of the Navy from performing any overhaul, repair, or maintenance work that takes longer than 6 months in foreign shipyards.

SUBTITLE D—COUNTERTERRORISM

Section 1031—Frequency of Counterterrorism Operations Briefings

This section would amend section 485 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to provide monthly counterterrorism operations briefings to the congressional defense committees.

Section 1032—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Transfer or Release of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba to the United States

This section would prohibit the use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2017, to transfer or release detainees at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo

Bay, Cuba, to or within the United States, its territories, or possessions.

Section 1033—Prohibition on Use of Funds to Construct or Modify Facilities in the United States To House Detainees Transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2017, to construct or modify any facility in the United States, its territories, or possessions to house any detainee transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, for the purposes of detention or imprisonment in the custody or under the effective control of the Department of Defense.

Section 1034—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Transfer or Release to Certain Countries of Individuals Detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense to be used during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on December 31, 2017, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to Libya, the Federal Republic of Somalia, the Syrian Arab Republic, or the Republic of Yemen.

Section 1035—Prohibition on Use of Funds for Realignment of Forces at or Closure of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba

This section would prohibit the use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2017 for the closure or abandonment of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, the relinquishment of control of Guantanamo Bay to the Republic of Cuba, or the implementation of a material modification to the Treaty Between the United States of America and Cuba signed in the District of Columbia on May 29, 1934, that constructively closes United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay.

Section 1036—Modification of Congressional Notification of Sensitive Military Operations

This section would modify section 130f of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional oversight of sensitive military operations.

Section 1037—Comprehensive Strategy for Detention of Certain Individuals

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Attorney General and the Director of National Intelligence, to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees by July 19, 2017, setting forth the details of a comprehen-

sive strategy for the detention of individuals captured and held pursuant to the Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law 107–40) pending the end of hostilities. Additionally, this section would require that the strategy contain certain specific elements. This section would also define "appropriate congressional committees'" as the congressional defense committees, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SUBTITLE E—MISCELLANEOUS AUTHORITIES AND LIMITATIONS

Section 1041—Expanded Authority for Transportation by the Department of Defense of Non-Department of Defense Personnel and Cargo

This section would amend section 2649 of title 10, United States Code, to reinstate the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide transportation to allied military personnel and civilians in contingencies or disaster responses on a non-interference basis, without charge, and expand such authority to include allied and civilian cargo, as well as passengers. In addition, a new subsection would authorize the Secretary of Defense to enter into a contract or other arrangement with one or more commercial providers to provide commercial insurance products to non-Department of Defense shippers using the Defense Transportation System.

Section 1042—Limitation on Retirement, Deactivation, or Decommissioning of Mine Countermeasures Ships

This section would modify section 1090 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 111–92) to prohibit funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2017 to be used to deactivate, decommission, or place in reduced operating status any mine countermeasures ships. The limitation in this section may be waived if the Secretary of the Navy certifies that the operational test and evaluation for replacement mine countermeasures capabilities are available in sufficient quantity and capacity to meet combatant commander requirements. This section would also modify the reporting requirement of such section 1090 of Public Law 111–92.

Section 1043—Extension of Authority of Secretary of Transportation To Issue Non-Premium Aviation Insurance

This section would amend Section 44310(b) of title 49, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to provide aviation insurance and reinsurance upon the request of another U.S. Government agency.

Section 1044—Evaluation of Navy Alternate Combination Cover and Unisex Combination Cover

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to change the mandatory possession or wear date of the alternate combination cover or the unisex combination cover from October 31, 2016, to October 31, 2020. This change would provide female service

members a 5-year transition window consistent with standard uniform policy transition windows for non-operational and non-tactical uniforms.

Additionally, this section would prohibit the Secretary of the Navy from implementing or enforcing any change to Navy female service dress uniforms until the Secretary submits to Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the evaluation of Navy female service dress uniforms. The committee is concerned that recent changes to Navy female service dress uniforms, uniform covers, and other non-operational uniform components were not consistent with the Navy's standard processes for evaluating uniform items, including user test groups that represented a broad spectrum of service-member locales and operational specialties, out-of-pocket expenses to service members, including members of both the Active Forces and Reserves, and the inability for the Navy to identify an operational necessity driving this uniform change during a time of fiscal constraint.

Section 1045—Department of Defense Protection of National Security Spectrum

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to jointly evaluate and to provide to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act their views on the following:

(1) The statutory and regulatory options available to them to protect critical test and training capability in the event of a spectrum auction that affects frequency used by the Department of Defense; and

(2) The utility, effect, and limitation, if any, of section 1062 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Section 1046—Transportation on Military Aircraft on a Space-Available Basis for Members and Former Members of the Armed Forces with Disabilities Rated as Total

This section would amend section 2641b of title 10, United States Code, to authorize space-available travel for disabled veterans with a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total by the Department of Defense. The committee notes that this section would clarify eligibility within an existing category of space-available travel already afforded to disabled veterans.

Section 1047—National Guard Flyovers of Public Events

This section would provide a statement of policy for National Guard flyovers of public events.

SUBTITLE F—STUDIES AND REPORTS

Section 1061—Temporary Continuation of Certain Department of Defense Reporting Requirements

This section would exclude certain reports from the effect of section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). The committee notes that section 1080

of Public Law 114–92 would repeal 254 standing requirements for reports to Congress. The committee believes that some of these reports should be retained as they provide valuable oversight information and therefore the committee recommends retaining 84 reporting requirements, only four of which would not sunset on January 31, 2021.

Over the past 2 years, the committee has significantly reduced the number of reporting requirements it levies upon the Department of Defense. The committee expects the Department to deliver the remaining reports on time.

Section 1062—Matters for Inclusion in Report on Designation of Countries for which Rewards May Be Paid under Department of Defense Rewards Program

This section would modify the reporting requirements in section 127b(h) of title 10, United States Code, for the Department of Defense Rewards Program to clarify the requirement to report on the designation of countries for which rewards or payment-in-kind may be paid.

Section 1063—Congressional Notification of Biological Select Agent and Toxin Theft, Loss, or Release Involving the Department of Defense

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide notification to the congressional defense committees within 15 days of notifying the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and/or the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of any theft, loss, or release of biological select agents or toxins.

Section 1064—Report on Service-Provided Support to United States Special Operations Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on support contributed from each of the military services towards special operations forces for each of the fiscal years 2018–20.

Section 1065—Report on Citizen Security Responsibilities in the Northern Triangle of Central America

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to jointly submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, on the military units that have been assigned to policing or citizen security responsibilities in the Republic of Guatemala, the Republic of Honduras, and the Republic of El Salvador.

Section 1066—Report on Counterproliferation Activities and Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a biennial report, with

a sunset date of January 31, 2021, on the Department of Defense's counterproliferation activities and programs. This report would be a simplified replacement for the Counterproliferation Program Review Committee report from section 1603 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160) that has recently expired. The content of this report is aimed to reduce the reporting burden on the Department, while still providing the congressional defense committees with program analysis critical for robust program oversight.

Section 1067—Inclusion of Ballistic Missile Defense Information in Annual Report on Requirements of Combatant Commands

This section would amend the statutory requirement of section 153c of title 10, United States Code, that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff submits to the congressional defense committees the annual Integrated Priorities List of the combatant commands to add a requirement that he also submit the Integrated Priorities List submitted to the Missile Defense Agency and U.S. Strategic Command and the Prioritized Capabilities List produced by them. This section would also sunset the reporting requirement on January 31, 2021.

Section 1068—Reviews by Department of Defense Concerning National Security Use of Spectrum

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a comprehensive review of all uses by the Department of Defense of spectrum. Such review would include the use of spectrum in military plans, training, test, and in military capabilities that are in development or have been fielded for any known or potential impacts of sharing or repurposing of spectrum used or allocated to be used by the Department of Defense that may be reallocated or shared pursuant to a spectrum auction, sharing arrangement, or other arrangement, or that is otherwise identified as part of the 10-year plan developed by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). The review would further include whether there are known or possible mitigations in the event of reallocation or sharing that the Secretary and Chairman recommend would protect Department of Defense use of spectrum, including the costs to do so and whether such costs would be borne out of the Department's total obligation authority.

This section would also require the Secretary and Chairman to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every two years thereafter until January 21, 2021, on the results of such review.

This section would further require the Secretary and Chairman to certify at the time of submission of such report and provide such certification to the congressional defense committees that they understand any potential impacts to Department of Defense use of spectrum that could result from a spectrum auction, reallocation, or sharing arrangement as of that date.

Furthermore, this section would require the Secretary to notify the congressional defense committees as to whether the Secretary

has not concurred with or otherwise objected to the most recent version of the 10-year plan developed by the NTIA not later than 30 days after the date of such non-concurrence or objection.

Lastly, this section would prevent the Secretary and Chairman from obligating more than 95 percent of the funding authorized to be appropriated to the Department for fiscal year 2017 for operation and maintenance for headquarters operations until 30 days after the date on which the report and certification are submitted to the congressional defense committees.

Section 1069—Annual Report on Personnel, Training, and Equipment Requirements for the Non-Federalized National Guard To Support Civilian Authorities in Prevention and Response to Domestic Disasters

This section would modify the reporting requirement of section 10504 of title 10, United States Code, to include a report on non-federalized National Guard personnel, training, and equipment requirements.

SUBTITLE G—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1081—Technical and Clerical Amendments

This section would make a number of technical and clerical amendments of a non-substantive nature to existing law.

Section 1082—Modification to Support for Non-Federal Development and Testing of Material for Chemical Agent Defense

This section would modify subsection (d) and subsection (e) of section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), to modify and extend, with a sunset date of January 31, 2021, the "Support for Non-Federal Development and Testing of Material for Chemical Agent Defense" report to include reporting on any instance where the Department provides biological select agents or toxins to a non-Federal entity for development of biological defenses. This amendment would supersede section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

The committee notes the importance of developing and procuring effective biological countermeasures. However, the committee is concerned by the inadvertent shipments of live Bacillus Anthracis from Dugway Proving Ground. The committee encourages the Department to minimize the instances where it provides biological select agents and toxins to a non-Federal entity for development of biological defenses as much as possible.

Section 1083—Increase in Maximum Amount Available for Equipment, Services, and Supplies Provided for Humanitarian Demining Assistance

This section would raise the monetary cap in section 407 of title 10, United States Code, for the cost of equipment, services, and supplies for humanitarian demining assistance and stockpiled conventional munitions assistance provided by the Department of Defense, from $10.0 million to $15.0 million in any fiscal year.

The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to provide training, assistance, and equipping of global partners to support demining efforts. The goal of the Department's Humanitarian Mine Action (HMA) program is to reduce the adverse effects of land mines and other explosive remnants of war on noncombatants while supporting U.S. geographic combatant commander theater campaign plans and national security objectives. The committee notes the increased efforts of the Republic of Colombia, the United States, and the newly commissioned Global Demining Initiative, which consists of approximately 20 international partners, to address the demining assistance that Colombia is expected to need following the anticipated achievement of a peace accord between Colombia and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia.

Section 1084—Liquidation of Unpaid Credits Accrued as a Result of Transactions Under a Cross-Servicing Agreement

This section would amend section 2345 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense with the discretionary authority to liquidate unpaid debts owed to the United States by a foreign government or international organization as a result of the Department of Defense providing logistic support, supplies, or services to that foreign government or international organization. Liquidation would occur by offsetting the debt against any amounts owed by the Department to that foreign government or international organization for logistic support, supplies, or services obtained by the Department pursuant to a transaction or transactions concluded under the authority of subchapter I of chapter 138, title 10, United States Code.

Section 1085—Clarification of Contracts Covered by Airlift Service Provision

This section would amend section 9516 of title 10, United States Code, to ensure both contracts and subcontracts for airlift service are covered by this section. The committee is concerned that significant volumes of cargo for the Department of Defense are moved outside "contracts for airlift services," and this amendment would ensure any cargo movements paid for by the Department of Defense, even those in service contracts such as Logistics Civil Augmentation Program or Defense Logistics Agency Prime Vendor, will be compliant with section 9516 and the intent of the National Airlift Policy of 1987. The committee notes that the maintenance of a viable Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) is a national security priority and encourages the Department to update its regulations quickly to ensure that contractors are including a CRAF requirement in all of their subcontracts. The proposed amendment is not to be construed as limiting the operational flexibility of Air Mobility Command or U.S. Transportation Command.

Section 1086—National Biodefense Strategy

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly develop and submit to the appropriate congressional committees, within 275 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a national bio-

defense strategy and implementation plan. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a joint briefing to the appropriate congressional committees annually, starting March 1, 2017, and ending March 1, 2019, on the strategy and status of its implementation. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, within 180 days of submission of the national biodefense strategy, on a gap analysis of the national biodefense strategy and its implementation plan.

Section 1087—Global Cultural Knowledge Network

This section would require the Secretary of the Army to carry out a program to support the socio-cultural understanding needs of the Department of the Army, to be known as the Global Cultural Knowledge Network. The program would increase the organic socio-cultural expertise of the Army, and support future Army missions and regionally aligned forces that would need access to such expertise. Further, this section would require the Secretary of the Army to issue a directive related to the employment of such activities, including oversight mechanisms and procedures for requesting support. This section would also prohibit any social scientists from being deployed outside of the United States unless the Secretary of the Army provides a waiver.

The committee is aware of past efforts with the Human Terrain System (HTS) to bring socio-cultural understanding to units deployed in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee believes that many valuable lessons have been learned from HTS, including the need to institutionalize such organizations so they can retain the level of oversight and auditability needed to prevent abuse or misuse of valuable military resources. The committee believes that specifically authorizing such activities is an important step in ensuring the Army maintains some level of organic socio-cultural expertise that can adapt to the future security environment, while also maintaining robust oversight and notification safeguards to ensure allegations that affected HTS in the past are not further perpetuated.

Section 1088—Modification of Requirements Relating to Management of Military Technicians

This section would delay the implementation date of section 1053 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) from January 1, 2017, to October 1, 2017, and align the date of conversion for military technicians (non-dual status) with military technicians (dual status). This section would also clarify that the positions to be converted will be reviewed and determined by leadership from the Army Reserve, the Air Force Reserve, the National Guard Bureau, and the State Adjutants General for purposes of implementation.

This section would also require the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by March 1, 2017, on the feasibility

and advisability of converting any remaining military technicians (dual status) to personnel performing Active Guard and Reserve Duty under section 328 of title 32, United States Code, or other applicable provisions of law.

Section 1089—Sense of Congress Regarding Connecticut's Submarine Century

This provision would express the sense of Congress commending the dedication and contribution of the people of Connecticut to the Navy and the submarine force.

Section 1090—LNG Permitting Certainty and Transparency

This section would require the Department of Energy to issue a final decision on any application for the authorization to export natural gas not later than 30 days after completing an environmental review or the date of enactment of this Act. Such a decision applies only to proposals that must also obtain authorization from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or the United States Maritime Administration.

Section 1091—Sense of Congress Regarding the Reporting of the MV–22 Mishap in Marana, Arizona, on April 8, 2000

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the reporting of the MV–22 mishap in Marana, Arizona, on April 8, 2000.

Section 1092—Transfer of Surplus Firearms to Corporation for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and Firearms Safety

This section would require the Army to transfer excess .45 caliber M1911A1 pistols to the Civilian Marksmanship Program.

Section 1093—Sense of Congress Regarding the Importance of Panama City, Florida, to the History and Future of the Armed Forces

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the importance of Panama City, Florida, to the history and future of the Armed Forces.

Section 1094—Protections Relating to Civil Rights and Disabilities

This section would require that religious organizations that are recipients of or offerors for a Federal Government contract be provided the protections and exemptions for religious organizations under the Civil Rights Act.

Section 1095—Nonapplicability of Certain Executive Order to Department of Defense and National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would exempt the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration from implementation of Executive Order 13673.

Section 1096—Determination and Disclosure of Transportation Costs Incurred by Secretary of Defense for Congressional Trips Outside the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to determine and disclose the transportation costs incurred by the Department of Defense for certain congressional trips outside the United States.

Section 1097—Waiver of Certain Polygraph Examination Requirements

This section would allow the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to waive certain polygraph examination requirements for qualifying veterans.

TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Defense Intelligence Agency Housing Allowances

The committee is concerned about the cost of housing allowances, including the Living Quarters Allowance (LQA) incentive program for Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) civilian employees serving overseas. The committee is also concerned about potential disparity between DIA civilian and military personnel housing allowances and overseas incentives. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to provide a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives by December 1, 2016, on DIA civilian personnel housing allowances, the relocation incentive program, and the potential disparity between military and civilian allowances. The report will include, at a minimum:

(1) How the Department of Defense determines cost of living allowance for DIA civilian employees;

(2) How the amount of LQA is determined and the Department's policy and guidance to military services and defense agencies for authorizing the payment;

(3) The total cost of DIA cost of living allowances and LQA paid at overseas locations, by locations; and

(4) The differences between housing allowances for DIA civilians and their military counterparts, including enlisted personnel.

Five-Year Limitation on Civilian Personnel Working Overseas

The committee recognizes the challenges that the Department of the Navy faces in hiring and maintaining a professional civilian workforce for overseas assignments, particularly ship repair specialists. The current "5-year rule" limiting civilian personnel to a maximum of 5 consecutive years serving overseas in the same location may have the unintended consequence of forcing the departure of highly qualified and difficult-to-replace ship maintenance professionals. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 1, 2016, on the impact on ship maintenance due to the 5-year rule. At a minimum, the briefing shall include the annual rate of civilian attrition because of the rule,

what skills or functions are affected most, how frequently waivers are requested and granted, what steps the Navy is taking to address the issue, and the timeline for implementation.

Joint Base Wage Grade Parity

The committee is concerned about the ongoing wage grade pay-parity issue at Joint Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst (JB MDL). The 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission brought together three bases with two different wage grade locality pay rates. In 2009, all salaried employees at JB MDL were placed on the New York City locality pay area. However, Federal wage grade system workers were never brought onto the same wage scale, with 82 percent being paid at the Philadelphia rate and 18 percent at the New York City rate. The committee understands the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) has had the authority to fix this discrepancy since 2009 but has yet to act.

The committee notes this pay disparity has created management challenges for leaders at JB MDL. In some cases, two sets of employees are performing the same function on the same base for the same boss yet are paid at different rates. This disparity has affected the base's mission by limiting management's flexibility to move employees from one side of the base to the other as needed to meet mission requirements and has negated efficiencies that otherwise would have been realized under the joint basing model.

On October 15, 2015, the Federal Prevailing Rate Advisory Committee (FPRAC) approved "Proposal to Move a Portion of Joint-Base McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst from the Philadelphia Wage Area to the New York, NY, Wage Area, 599–ACT1." The proposal recommended that OPM correct the wage grade pay-parity issue at JB–MDL, bringing wage grade employees onto a single locality pay. The committee urges OPM to address FPRAC's recommendation and develop a plan to resolve the pay disparity in a timely manner.

Security Clearances

The committee has received information from multiple Department of Defense sources about the length of time it takes to grant prospective civilian employees security clearances. The committee is concerned that the process is so lengthy that many highly qualified civilians find other work rather than wait for the process to end.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on the Department's efforts to reduce the length of time it takes to grant security clearances for civilians. At a minimum, the briefing should include:

(1) The average length of time it takes to grant a civilian employee or prospective employee a security clearance;

(2) The factors that exist that prevent the Department from reducing the amount of time it takes to grant security clearances; and

(3) The steps the Department is taking to reduce the amount of time it takes to grant a security clearance.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1101—Temporary Direct Hire Authority for Domestic Defense Industrial Base Facilities and the Major Range and Test Facilities Base

This section would provide direct-hire authority for Department of Defense industrial base facilities located in the United States, as well as the Major Range and Test Facilities Base, for 2 years.

Section 1102—Temporary Personnel Flexibilities for Domestic Defense Industrial Base Facilities and Major Range and Test Facilities Base Civilian Personnel

This section would allow Department of Defense industrial base facilities located in the United States and Major Range and Test Facilities Base centers to hire temporary employees into permanent positions outside of the requirements of the competitive service.

Section 1103—One-Year Extension of Temporary Authority to Grant Allowances, Benefits, and Gratuities to Civilian Personnel on Official Duty in a Combat Zone

This section would grant a 1-year extension of temporary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to civilian personnel on official duty in a combat zone.

Section 1104—Advance Payments for Employees Relocating within the United States and Its Territories

This section would modify section 5524a of title 5, United States Code, to authorize advance payment of basic pay for current civilian employees who relocate within the United States and its territories to a location outside the employee's current commuting area.

Section 1105—Permanent Authority for Alternative Personnel Program for Scientific and Technical Personnel

This section would remove the sunset date and annual reporting requirement for section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105—261), and codify the authority in chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code.

The committee notes that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency has used this alternative personnel hiring authority to great effect since its inception. Furthermore, the committee believes that given the limited scope of this authority, the fact that there have been no reports of misuse or abuse in 15 years, and the fact that it does not authorize any new civilian billets for the Department of Defense, the authority should be made permanent. The committee believes that such unique hiring authorities will be important tools for the technical community in the Department to recruit, hire, and retain the Nation's top scientific and engineering talent.

Section 1106—Modification to Information Technology Personnel Exchange Program

This section would modify the Information Technology Exchange Program established by section 1110 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as amended by section 1106 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014. Among the changes, this section would rename the program the "Cyber and Information Technology Exchange Program," and would increase the number of personnel that could be exchanged from 10 to 50.

Section 1107—Treatment of Certain Localities for Calculation of Per Diem Allowances

This section would consolidate per diem localities in the Dayton, Ohio, area.

Section 1108—Eligibility of Employees in a Time-Limited Appointment to Compete for a Permanent Appointment at Any Federal Agency

This section would modify section 9602 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of employees of a land management agency in a time-limited appointment to compete for a permanent appointment at any Federal agency.

Section 1109—Limitation on Administrative Leave

This section would provide that a Federal employee may not be placed on administrative leave, or other paid non-duty status without charging leave, for more than 14 total days for reasons relating to misconduct or performance.

Section 1110—Record of Investigation of Personnel Action in Separated Employee's Official Personnel File

This section would require the head of an agency to make a permanent notation in an individual's personnel file if the individual resigns from government employment while the subject of a personnel investigation and an adverse finding against the individual is made as a result of the investigation.

Section 1111—Review of Official Personnel File of Former Federal Employees before Rehiring

This section would require an appointing authority to review and consider the information relating to a prospective employee's former government service in the candidate's official personnel record file prior to making any determination with respect to the appointment or reinstatement of the employee to such position.

TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS

OVERVIEW

Framing the committee's oversight of national security matters relating to foreign nations is the observation that the United States faces a wider range of serious threats than at any time in recent history. As the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency testified to the committee in March 2016, "The world is far more complicated; it is far more destabilized; it is far more complex than at any time I have seen it."

The committee believes that America's global military capabilities and commitments have undergirded peace, security, and economic prosperity, and underwritten an international world order aligned with American interests. However, the committee also recognizes that others seek to threaten such security and prosperity. The provisions contained in this title reinforce the committee's belief that America's military strength and its global posture and presence, will continue to be necessary to deter aggression, to reassure U.S. allies and partners, and to exercise global influence.

The committee continues to focus on U.S. military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. It recognizes the fragile security situation in Afghanistan and the risks associated with reducing U.S. forces to 5,500 by January 1, 2017. Therefore, this Act includes the resources to sustain at least 9,800 U.S. troops in Afghanistan through April 2017, to preserve options and provide time for a new President to assess the security environment and U.S. military missions in Afghanistan. The Act would also extend key authorities and express the committee's view that the President should provide additional resources to strike the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in Afghanistan; authorize unilateral strikes against the Taliban and the Haqqani Network, the most lethal group on the battlefield; and provide support for 352,000 Afghan National Defense and Security Forces.

The committee has also focused oversight on the efforts of the Department of Defense to counter ISIL in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic, as part of Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR), and to address the growing instability and terrorism threats across the Middle East and Africa. The Act would extend the Syria train and equip authority, and maintain strong congressional oversight of the program through a continued reprogramming requirement. It would also extend the Iraq train and equip authority, but fence 25 percent of the funds until a comprehensive plan is submitted to Congress. Lastly, it would provide an additional $50.0 million in stipends and sustainment, exempt from the above fence, for Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga and Sunni tribal security forces that are directly engaged in the campaign for Mosul.

The committee remains concerned about the Islamic Republic of Iran's malign military activities, and H.R. 4909 would express the committee's view that the United States should counter Iran's malign activities and ensure that the U.S. military maintains a robust, enduring posture in the Arabian Gulf to deter and respond to Iranian aggression.

The committee has also focused on the Department's efforts to deter aggression by the Russian Federation against Ukraine and other allies and partners in Europe. The committee supports a significant increase in European Reassurance Initiative funding above the fiscal year 2016 request, including funding for heel-to-toe rotations of U.S. forces and the pre-positioning of an Armored Brigade Combat Team's equipment in Europe. The bill would also provide $150.0 million for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative to enhance the defense of Ukraine and to deter further Russian aggression.

In the Asia-Pacific region, H.R. 4909 would express a sense of Congress on trilateral security cooperation between Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the United States, and on security cooperation between the Republic of Singapore and the United States.

Lastly, the committee notes that the Department has placed greater emphasis on security cooperation. To aid in its oversight, the committee would require an independent assessment of Department of Defense security cooperation programs; consolidate existing security cooperation authorities into a new chapter in title 10, United States Code; and consolidate multiple reporting requirements into a single document. Additionally, to address concerns that the foreign military sales (FMS) process is slow, cumbersome, and complicated, the committee would require the Comptroller General the United States to undertake a review of the Department of Defense's performance in the FMS process.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Assistance to Iraqi Forces for Mosul Operations

The committee believes that the operation to retake the city of Mosul, in the Republic of Iraq, from the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) is an important step to achieving the military objectives of Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR) and to supporting the United States vital national security interests.

The committee notes that the operation to retake Mosul will be complex and will require sustained operations by security forces in Iraq, including the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga, Sunni tribal security forces, and local security forces with a national security mission. The committee believes that an operation to retake Mosul should include sufficient U.S. military and logistical assistance and support.

To that end, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would extend the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to the military and other security forces of, or associated with, the Government of Iraq, including the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga, Sunni tribal security forces, and local security forces with a national security mission, to counter ISIL. This authority, specifically as it pertains to sustainment activities for forces that have direct involvement in combat operations to retake Mosul, includes payment of salaries and provision of life support, including sustenance.

The committee is also concerned that the U.S. military support for an operation to retake Mosul would be challenged by current force management levels; restrictions on U.S. Armed Forces ground combat activities with the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF), the Iraqi

Kurdish Peshmerga, and the Sunni tribal security forces; and constraints on U.S. airstrikes. Therefore, the committee believes that such U.S. policy limitations should be revisited in the lead-up to an operation to retake Mosul. Further, the committee believes that U.S. assistance and support should be sustained for all phases of any such operation.

Assistance to the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces

The stability and security of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan remains a vital national security interest of the United States. The Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) are a critical component to the immediate and long-term security of Afghanistan, which also reinforces stability in the region.

The committee notes the deteriorating security situation in Afghanistan due to a resurgence of the Afghan Taliban, as well as the growth of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in Afghanistan. As such, the committee remains focused on the sufficiency of United States assistance to the ANDSF, including weapons and equipment.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than February 15, 2017, that includes a review of the major weapon systems and equipment provided to the ANDSF. The briefing should include, but is not limited to, the following:

(1) Outline all major weapon systems and equipment procured for the ANDSF, consistent with the program of record;

(2) Summarize how such weapon systems and equipment support the overall strategy for the ANSDF;

(3) Describe the current capability and capacity of the ANSDF to operate and sustain such weapon systems and equipment;

(4) Identify any gaps in ANDSF capability given the evolving security situation and overall strategy; and

(5) Address any other matters that the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

Chinese Participation in Rim of the Pacific Exercise

The committee is concerned by certain unilateral actions taken by the People's Republic of China in the South China Sea and by the implications that those actions may have on regional stability. Rather than abiding by internationally accepted norms and contributing to a peaceful and equitable resolution to the many disputed claims in the South China Sea, China has engaged in controversial land reclamation projects and resorted to aggressive tactics, short of open conflict, to further its foreign policy goals.

The committee notes that the United States has maintained its invitation to China to participate, to a limited extent, in the Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC) exercise for 2016, despite China's concerning actions in the South China Sea. The committee acknowledges the benefits of inviting China to participate in international exercises, which aim to reinforce the merits of cooperative security. However, the committee believes that these invitations should be continuously evaluated in light of China's conduct. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to

the House Committee on Armed Services, which may include a classified portion, not later than July 1, 2016, on the merits of continued Chinese participation in forthcoming RIMPAC exercises.

Comptroller General of the United States Assessment of Foreign Military Sales

The committee believes that an efficient, thorough, and effective Foreign Military Sales (FMS) process is vital to U.S. foreign policy and national security, and contributes to the health of the U.S. defense industrial base. The committee is aware of concerns raised by U.S. military leaders, the defense industry, and foreign partners that the FMS process is slow, cumbersome, and complicated. The committee is also aware of provisions in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–154) accompanying the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2016, and in the Explanatory Statement accompanying H.R. 2029, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114–113), directing the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to submit a report to Congress on the interagency processes for implementing the Foreign Military Financing (FMF) and FMS programs. The committee supports the GAO review of the FMF and FMS processes, and contends that continued study of the performance of the Department of Defense in the FMS process is warranted to determine if additional efficiencies can be found to improve the process.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, by June 30, 2017, that further evaluates the performance of the Department of Defense in the FMS process. Such a report should include the following:

(1) Roles, responsibilities, and lines of authority for implementing Department of Defense processes in FMS;

(2) An assessment of performance measures established by the Department of Defense in the FMS process;

(3) An assessment of the extent to which the Department of Defense meets established performance measures;

(4) Where performance measures are not met, an assessment of the causes;

(5) An assessment of the extent to which previous reforms have improved the efficiency of the FMS process, including but not limited to training and workforce challenges, challenges defining partner country requirements, and obtaining acquisition and delivery status information;

(6) An assessment of FMS compared to practices followed in other procurement processes such as the procurement of similar items and services for the U.S. military, excess defense articles sales to foreign nations, direct commercial sales to foreign nations, or procurement of items and services under Department of Defense authorities for building partner capacity;

(7) An assessment of the impacts of Firm Fixed Price and Fixed Price Incentive Fee contracting types on the defense industrial base and the FMS process;

(8) Further examination of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency and the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acqui-

sition, Technology and Logistics to ensure the Department of Defense acquisition work force is properly sized and aligned to meet the performance measures in (2);

(9) An evaluation of the size and use of the Foreign Military Sales Trust Fund; and

(10) Any other matters the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

Additionally, the committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not later than October 31, 2016, on any preliminary findings and recommendations from its evaluation.

Countering Adversarial Messaging

The committee remains concerned about the success of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) messaging and propaganda, and their ability to persuade, inspire, and recruit from across the globe. ISIL's continued success on the battlefield depends on this messaging, and the group's propaganda attracts recruits and other support that enables it to persist. Consequently, the committee believes that the campaign to degrade and defeat ISIL on the battlefield must be linked with a comparable effort to degrade and defeat ISIL's message in the minds of potential supporters. The committee recognizes that other extremist groups have taken note of ISIL's success and are expanding their messaging operations, particularly in social media.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 17, 2017, on the Department of Defense's long-term strategy to counter adversarial messaging and recruiting utilizing digital technologies, including social media. The briefing should address the following questions:

(1) What are the Department's roles, responsibilities, and rules of engagement when it comes to countering adversarial messaging?

(2) What is the Department's integrated strategy to counter online radicalization and recruitment?

(3) What measures of effectiveness exist to inform outcomes?

(4) What analytical data points have already been collected to compare our capabilities to those of our adversaries?

(5) What policies, regulations, or other guidance need to be updated or modified to improve the Department's ability to execute an integrated strategy?

Counterterrorism and Security Cooperation Efforts in Somalia and the Horn of Africa

The committee recognizes the contributions made by the Department of Defense through bilateral security cooperation and counterterrorism efforts to improve the security situation in the Federal Republic of Somalia and the Horn of Africa. These efforts are important to address terrorist threats to the United States emanating from Al Shabaab. The committee acknowledges that security and stability improvements in Somalia require a whole-of-government approach and cooperation with the international community, including the African Union. The committee also acknowledges the

importance of collaboration with the Department of State to work with the international community to prevent Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant recruitment within the region. The committee urges the Department of Defense to continue coordination of efforts with the Department of State and international community, recognizing the important role Somalia plays in the Horn of Africa.

Department of Defense Briefing on Foreign Military Sales

The committee is aware of concerns raised by U.S. military leaders, the defense industry, and foreign partners that the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) process is slow, cumbersome, and complicated. Although FMS is an interagency process, the Department of Defense plays a key role in implementation. The committee is aware that the Department has taken certain steps to improve the FMS process, such as the establishment by the Deputy Secretary of Defense of the Defense Senior Steering Group on Arms Transfers and Technology Review, to improve the Department's decision making on arms transfers and release of sensitive technology. The committee remains concerned, however, that inefficiencies may exist in internal Department of Defense processes that cause suboptimal outcomes such as delays. The committee therefore directs the Deputy Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2016, on the results of the Department's initiatives to streamline procedures and on other Department efforts to improve the FMS process.

Enduring Basing Requirements in the U.S. Central Command Area of Responsibility

The committee notes the criticality of U.S. strategic basing in the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) area of responsibility (AOR). Such basing supports myriad operations conducted by the Department of Defense, including Operation Inherent Resolve to counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in the Syrian Arab Republic and the Republic of Iraq, the Resolute Support Mission in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and the defense of the Arabian Gulf. Further, such basing reassures U.S. allies and partners in the region, supports their military efforts in the region, and enables a forward-based U.S. posture to deter the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The committee believes that some of these bases within the CENTCOM AOR are enduring in nature. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 15, 2016, on regional basing in the CENTCOM AOR, including:

(1) The bases that are determined to be enduring within the AOR;

(2) The enduring missions that such bases will support;

(3) The current funding for such bases;

(4) The plan for sustaining funding for such bases;

(5) The impact to U.S. interests and regional objectives if such bases are not sustained; and

(6) Any other matters that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

Enduring High-Resolution Geospatial Data

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has been utilizing sophisticated three-dimensional high-resolution light detection and ranging systems to provide geospatial data for tactical users in theaters of hostilities. Such data has proven to be useful for these tactical users in providing capabilities for accurate foundation mapping that supports special operations and other forces with situational awareness, mission planning, targeting, as well as the ability to share with coalition partners and aid in the development of partner capacity. While national capabilities are useful in a strategic context, the committee believes that these tactical systems are vital to supporting urgent, in-theater operational forces in the successful execution of their missions. However, the committee is concerned that the reliance on overseas contingency operations (OCO) funds have prevented Special Operations Command and the Army from properly ensuring that such capabilities are included in the base budget request. Funding these capabilities in the base budget ensures these capabilities are available to support existing and emerging requirements, while enabling broader application of the capability in regions outside of traditional OCO-funded geographies. Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of Special Operations Command, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to conduct a review of these activities and the capabilities supporting them and provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2016. This review should examine the current requirements, especially those outside of areas of active hostilities, and how those requirements will be satisfied across the future years' defense program.

Instability in Libya

The committee notes with concern the continued deterioration of the security situation in Libya as the Libyans work to establish a unity government. Instability continues to grow in the country, providing sanctuary for terrorist groups to organize, train, and potentially to launch attacks against U.S. citizens, interests, and allies and partners around the world.

The committee remains concerned about the expansion of terrorist elements in Libya, especially, although not exclusively, the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). According to Department of Defense officials, there are over 5,000 ISIL fighters in Libya. In public remarks on February 4, 2016, the Secretary of Defense stated, "[T]he concern there is that Libya not get on a glide slope to the kind of situation that we find elsewhere, where ISIL in a politically disturbed environment seizes a foothold, gathers a piece of territory from which it's able to tyrannize people and plot operations elsewhere." ISIL has taken credit for attacks in North Africa, and there is increasing concern that ISIL fighters from Libya will conduct attacks in Europe or the United States.

In addition, the lack of security and governance throughout southern Libya allows terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb to operate freely and threaten instability across the entire region.

The committee recognizes that instability in Libya affects the entire region. Countries bordering Libya, such as the Tunisian Republic, have been especially impacted. The committee therefore will continue to consider ways in which the Department of Defense can support Tunisia's ability to maintain border security and stability.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to conduct prudent planning necessary to advance regional stability. The committee also urges the administration to work with U.S. allies and partners in Europe and North Africa to address the foreign fighter threat in a cooperative and coordinated manner.

Interpretation of Gross Violation of Human Rights

The committee is aware of the ongoing assessment by the Department of Defense Inspector General to address allegations of sexual abuse of children by members of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces. The committee remains concerned about allegations of abuses perpetrated against children, and therefore encourages the Secretary of State to interpret "a gross violation of human rights," as referred to in section 620M of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2378d), to include the sexual abuse of a child.

Military Assistance to the Government of Ukraine

The committee continues to urge the Department of Defense to provide timely support to the Government of Ukraine to enable it to defend itself against aggressive actions by the Russian Federation and Russian-backed separatists that threaten its sovereignty and territorial integrity. The committee acknowledges the progress achieved to date by U.S. efforts to train and equip Ukrainian security forces, but notes that such efforts may need to be expanded or expedited in the event that Ukraine's security situation further deteriorates. In such a scenario, timely access to a sufficient inventory of military equipment could become critical.

The committee, therefore, directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than October 1, 2016, on how efforts, inherent to the Department of Defense's European Reassurance Initiative and the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, including any plans to preposition military weapons, munitions, and equipment in Europe, may facilitate the Department of Defense's capacity to respond to the potential need for additional military assistance to the Government of Ukraine.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Defense Spending Commitments

The committee acknowledges the importance of allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) meeting the defense expenditure commitments listed in Declaration 14 of the Wales Summit Declaration, dated September 5, 2014. The declaration states that allies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2 percent of their gross domestic product (GDP) on defense will aim to continue to do so, and that allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defense is below this level will aim to move towards the 2 percent guideline.

The committee believes that meeting these commitments is essential to the security and fiscal interests of the United States and fellow allied states. Allies that fail to meet this commitment render NATO less capable of addressing the threats posed by adversaries. The committee commends the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Republic of Poland, the Hellenic Republic, and the Republic of Estonia for annual defense expenditures at 2 percent or more of their GDPs since the Wales Summit Declaration, and it urges other allied states to make similar efforts. The committee also urges NATO to prioritize discussions on allied resourcing and equipping methodologies at the NATO Warsaw Summit in July 2016.

Report on U.S. Military Enabler Support Within Operation Inherent Resolve

The committee remains concerned about the overall effectiveness of indigenous forces on the battlefield in the Syrian Arab Republic and the Republic of Iraq, including the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) and the appropriately vetted elements of the Syrian opposition. This effectiveness is hindered by the lack of U.S. military enabler support, such as attack aviation and counter-improvised explosive device capabilities for the ISF. Additionally, the committee is concerned that other actors on the battlefield, such as Shia militias backed by the Islamic Republic of Iran or Iranian military forces, may benefit from U.S. military enabler support.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2017, that evaluates U.S. military enabler support to the ISF and such elements of the Syrian opposition, including:

(1) How U.S. military enablers support coalition airstrikes;

(2) How enabler resource allocation decisions are made within Operation Inherent Resolve;

(3) How the United States determines the types of enabler support to provide;

(4) How the United States ensures that groups, such as Iranian-back Shia militias or Iranian military forces, do not benefit from U.S. military enabler support; and

(5) Any other matters that the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

Additionally, the committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than January 16, 2017, on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings.

Reporting Requirements of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

The committee notes the importance of the Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism, as provided in section 1208 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as most recently amended by section 1274 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense com-

mittees of funding changes to programs executed under this authority when such a proposed increase exceeds 20 percent of the currently approved total for that particular program, or $1.0 million; whichever amount is less.

Review of Taiwan Midshipman Cruise Training Port Call

The Midshipman Cruising and Training Squadron is the only annual, long-distance, high-sea training for Taiwanese officers, sailors, and first-class midshipmen. The committee is aware that prior to 1979 the Squadron, which made resupplying port calls at foreign ports and harbors throughout the Pacific during the training exercise, would routinely stop at U.S. ports, including those on Guam and Hawaii. The committee notes that the United States and Taiwan routinely conduct bi-lateral and multi-lateral training exercises and recognizes the potential theater security cooperation benefits associated with increased engagement through Taiwanese port visits.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in consultation with appropriate Department of State authorities, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 1, 2017 on the feasibility of permitting U.S. port calls in the Pacific for Taiwanese sailors during the annual training exercise.

Social Media Analytics and Publically Available Information Supporting Battlespace Awareness

The committee remains concerned with the Department of Defense's ability to effectively monitor and utilize social media analytic tools to support awareness of the operating environment for force protection, operational security, and other missions. The committee believes that the lack of clearly defined policies is hampering the ability to use such Publicly Available Information (PAI) to understand adversarial sentiment and narrative messaging in theaters of active hostilities, as well as monitoring for non- and semi-permissive environments, and areas of potential future activity. While there are some technology capabilities that currently exist that could support these activities, including many that can be leveraged from the commercial sector, the committee believes that the Department of Defense is not effectively leveraging these tools because of a fundamental lack of policy, doctrine, and procedures that delineate how such tools might be used. In the lack of such guidance, the committee believes that the Department is abdicating this space to adversaries that have no compunction to limit their actions, and in fact actively exploit it to achieve their strategic goals of recruitment, fundraising, and strategic messaging.

The committee notes that PAI use and exploitation is having a revolutionary impact on both operations and intelligence within the Department. Further, the committee recognizes that while intelligence activities have important uses for PAI, the Department also has unique operational uses and requirements for PAI that support force protection, targeting, battlespace awareness, and other traditional military activities. As a result, the demand signal for the operational use of PAI has increased across the force.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the current policy directives on how defense entities use such social media tools, and to provide a briefing on this assessment to the House Committee on Armed Services by February 15, 2017. This assessment should examine the demand for such capabilities from the combatant commanders to identify any gaps or areas needing clarification in policy, doctrine, training, and technology capabilities. In conducting this assessment, the Secretary should consider operational missions for social media analytics, such as battlespace awareness, operational security, and sentiment analysis for counter-messaging adversarial narratives and the operational use of PAI. The assessment should also include a discussion of legal and policy issues associated with the use of PAI, as well as resource limitations, approval processes, training requirements, and steps being taken to improve coordination of effort and leverage best practices and capabilities across the Department. Finally, the Secretary should report on how to continue and enhance capabilities to ensure U.S. persons' PAI is not inadvertently viewed, as well as methods for addressing inadvertent viewing while in enemy battlespace.

State Partnership Program Activities in Ukraine

The committee supports the role of the State Partnership Program (SPP) in Department of Defense security cooperation efforts, including in activities to assist Ukraine. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) authorized the National Guard to conduct SPP activities with security forces and governmental organizations of a foreign country whose primary functions include disaster response or emergency response, if the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, determines and notifies Congress that the activity is in the national security interest of the United States. The committee is aware of delays in making determinations that would permit the National Guard to carry out SPP activities with Ukrainian security forces or with governmental organizations whose primary functions include disaster response or emergency response. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State to facilitate timely execution of such determinations, as appropriate.

Strategy for Regional Counter-Narrative Capabilities

The committee remains concerned with the success of Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant's (ISIL) messaging and propaganda, and ISIL's ability to persuade, inspire, and recruit from across the globe. ISIL's continued success on the battlefield depends on this messaging, and the group's propaganda attracts recruits and other support that enables the organization to persist. Consequently, the committee believes that the campaign to degrade and defeat ISIL on the battlefield must be mated with a comparable effort to degrade and defeat ISIL's message in the minds of potential supporters.

The committee is also aware that Russian actors have been highly effective in shaping the information environment against Ukrainian forces, as well as against other actors in the region seeking to counter Russian influence. The ambiguity that these infor-

mation operations create has been critical in the hybrid and unconventional warfare strategy of Russian forces, and have effectively masked, created confusion, or otherwise undermined timely reactions from Western and allied forces.

Not only does the Department need to consider how adversaries use such information strategies to support their operations and undermine our own, but the committee believes that the Department should be developing an integrated strategy that can leverage, and when necessary combine with, allied and partner capabilities to maximize our messaging and its broader effects. The committee also believes that there are useful technologies, training, and strategies that U.S. forces could use to support allied, and international, partner information operations capabilities to mitigate and marginalize adversaries' ability to influence and inspire.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop and submit a strategy for regionally building partnership capacity to the House Committee on Armed Services by June 1, 2017. This strategy should look at means for monitoring, data collection of narratives, and development of networks for countering narratives to support the missions of the combatant commands. Additionally, this strategy should outline how to leverage existing partnership funds to support regional cooperation, as well as prioritize the types of capacity building that could take place, and the regional partners that are most mature to conduct this kind of capacity building.

Syria No Fly Zone

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, no later than October 31, 2016, that gives a detailed description of the financial costs of establishing and maintaining a no fly zone over a significant portion or all of Syria, as well as the tactical, operational and strategic impacts it would have on the fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, Al Qaeda, and other affiliated groups.

The Military Campaign To Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant

The committee is concerned that the end-state objectives for the military campaign against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as part of Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR), are unclear and that the resourcing of that campaign may prove insufficient. While the committee is mindful that a balance must be struck to minimize the risk of collateral damage, the committee also remains concerned that limitations on force management levels, restrictions on the authority for U.S. military commanders to conduct airstrikes, and the lack of clarity in overall U.S. policy for the Syrian Arab Republic and the Republic of Iraq, may hinder the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces' to plan, execute, and achieve the objectives of the military campaign against ISIL.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would authorize the Secretary of Defense to train and equip the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF), including the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga and Sunni tribal forces, and the vetted elements of the Syrian moderate opposition. The committee believes that these efforts are necessary to counter

ISIL; however, these efforts will not achieve their intended effect without a coherent, comprehensive plan and a detailed analysis of the full scope of resources required.

The committee believes that the United States should support appropriately vetted, effective indigenous groups in Syria and Iraq, including vulnerable ethnic and minority groups such as Iraqi Christian militias, with a national security mission. The committee further believes that, in preparation for the operation to retake Mosul, Iraq, the United States should take steps to assist the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga, including medical evacuations, force protection, logistics, and radio communications.

The committee believes that the U.S. commander of OIR should have all authorities necessary to counter ISIL. The committee also believes that the United States must support its friends and allies in the region who are participating in the counter ISIL military campaign, including the Gulf Cooperation Council countries.

Transparency in Security Cooperation Activities

The committee notes that section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) required the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to develop and issue a strategic framework for the Department of Defense to guide prioritization of security cooperation resources and activities. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center, or another appropriate independent entity, with expertise in security cooperation to conduct an assessment of the Strategic Framework for Department of Defense Security Cooperation. Further, in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee directed the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report on an inventory of Department of Defense security cooperation programs intended to build partner security capabilities. The committee also notes the continued development of the Global Theater Security Cooperation Management Information System (G–TSCMIS), which is intended to provide a comprehensive picture of whole-of-government security cooperation activities and contribute to planning more effective cooperative security activities to align or meet desired outcomes in support of security cooperation end states.

The committee supports such efforts that contribute to improved security cooperation planning and intends to continue to review additional measures that may be taken to improve the transparency of the Department of Defense's security cooperation program budgeting, planning, implementation, and outcomes. The committee also intends to continue to review the Department's development and implementation of effective assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of security cooperation programs.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Section 1201—One-Year Extension of Logistical Support for Coalition Forces Supporting Certain United States Military Operations

This section would amend section 1234 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), by authorizing the Secretary of Defense to provide supplies, services, transportation, and other logistical support to coalition forces supporting U.S. operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan during fiscal year 2017.

Section 1202—Extension of Authority for Training of General Purpose Forces of the United States Armed Forces with Military and Other Security Forces of Friendly Foreign Countries

This section would extend the authority in section 1203 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) for training of general purpose forces of the United States Armed Forces with military and other security forces of friendly foreign countries to December 31, 2019.

Section 1203—Modification and Extension of Authority to Conduct Activities to Enhance the Capability of Foreign Countries to Respond to Incidents Involving Weapons of Mass Destruction

This section would modify section 1204 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) to include a 48-hour congressional notification when assistance expected to exceed $4.0 million is provided to certain foreign countries, to cap the funds available at $20.0 million, and extend the authority 1 year, through September 30, 2020.

Section 1204—Extension of Authority for Support of Special Operations to Combat Terrorism

This section would modify and extend section 1208(h) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as most recently amended by section 1208(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), for 3 years, through fiscal year 2020.

Section 1205—Modification and Codification of Reporting Requirements Relating to Security Cooperation Authorities

This section would modify and codify certain reports to Congress for programs carried out by the Department of Defense to provide training, equipment, or other assistance or reimbursement relating to security cooperation authorities. This section would modify the Biennial Report on Programs Carried Out by the Department of Defense to Provide Training, Equipment, or Other Assistance or Reimbursement to Foreign Security Forces, as required by section

1211 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), as follows:

(1) Revise it from a biennial to an annual report;

(2) Extend the expiration date to January 31, 2021;

(3) Include the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to receive the report;

(4) Strike section 2011 of title 10, United States Code, relating to authority to reimburse foreign troops for participation in Joint Combined Exercise Training, from the specified authorities covered by the report; and

(5) Include additional elements required in the report.

In addition, this section would add the following provisions to the specified authorities covered by the report:

(1) Section 401 of title 10, United States Code, relating to authority to provide humanitarian assistance;

(2) Section 1206 of Public Law 113–291, relating to authority to conduct human rights training of security forces and associated security ministries of foreign countries;

(3) Section 1534 of Public Law 113–291, relating to the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund; and

(4) Section 1203 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), relating to training of general purpose forces of the United States Armed Forces with military and other security forces of friendly foreign countries.

The amendments of this section would supersede section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

Modifying, consolidating, and standardizing reports to Congress on certain programs to train, equip, assist, or reimburse foreign security forces is intended to create a single product that will aid transparency, congressional oversight, and assist the Department of Defense in the development of effective assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of security cooperation programs.

Section 1206—Independent Assessment of Department of Defense Security Cooperation Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into an agreement with a federally funded research and development center, or another appropriate independent entity, with expertise in security cooperation to conduct an assessment of the Strategic Framework for Department of Defense Security Cooperation. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives not later than November 1, 2017, containing the assessment.

Additionally, the committee expects the Secretary of Defense, acting through the federally funded research and development center, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2017, on the initial findings of the assessment required by this section.

SUBTITLE B—MATTERS RELATING TO AFGHANISTAN AND PAKISTAN

Section 1211—Extension and Modification of Commanders' Emergency Response Program

This section would amend section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as most recently amended by section 1211 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), by authorizing the Commanders' Emergency Response Program in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan during the period beginning on October 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2017. This section would also authorize ex gratia payments for damage, personal injury, or death that is incident to combat operations of the U.S. Armed Forces in the Republic of Iraq.

Section 1212—Extension and Modification of Authority for Reimbursement of Certain Coalition Nations for Support Provided to United States Military Operations

This section would amend section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as most recently amended by section 1212 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), by extending the authority for reimbursement of coalition nations for support provided to the United States for military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan through December 31, 2017.

Additionally, this section would limit the overall amount available for reimbursement to $1.10 billion, of which $900.0 million would be available for reimbursement to the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The committee will continue to review the reimbursements made to Pakistan and how it comports with the future of U.S. policy, including key counterterrorism and security objectives, in the region.

This section would also extend, through December 31, 2017, the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to notify the congressional defense committees prior to making any reimbursement to the Government of Pakistan for any logistical, military, or other support that Pakistan provides to the United States.

Further, this section would extend the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to certify, prior to making any reimbursement to Pakistan, that Pakistan is maintaining security along the Ground Lines of Communications through Pakistan, taking demonstrable steps to support counterterrorism operations, disrupting cross-border attacks, and countering the threat of improvised explosive devices.

Finally, this section would specify that, of the total amount of reimbursement and support authorized for Pakistan during the period beginning on October 1, 2016, and ending on December 31, 2017, $450.0 million would not be eligible for a national security waiver unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that Pakistan continues to conduct military operations against the Haqqani Network in North Waziristan, is demonstrating commitment to preventing the Haqqani Network from using North Waziristan as a safe haven, and is actively coordinating with the Government of Af-

ghanistan to restrict the movement of militants, including the Haqqani Network, along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border.

Section 1213—Extension of Authority To Acquire Products and Services Produced in Countries Along a Major Route of Supply to Afghanistan

This section would extend section 801(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), as most recently amended by section 1214 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), through December 31, 2017.

Section 1214—Extension of Authority To Transfer Defense Articles and Provide Defense Services to the Military and Security Forces of Afghanistan

This section would extend section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), as most recently amended by section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), through December 31, 2017.

Section 1215—Sense of Congress on United States Policy and Strategy in Afghanistan

This section would express certain findings and the sense of Congress on U.S. policy and strategy in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, including that the President should authorize at least 9,800 U.S. troops to continue to conduct the train, advise, and assist (TAA) and counterterrorism missions in Afghanistan after 2016; the President should provide the U.S. commander in Afghanistan with the authority to unilaterally strike the Taliban and the Haqqani Network and to conduct TAA below the corps-level of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces; the President should provide additional resources to strike the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in Afghanistan; and U.S. military personnel who are tasked with the mission of providing combat search and rescue, casualty evacuation, and medical support should not be counted as part of any force management level limitation in Afghanistan.

Section 1216—Special Immigrant Status for Certain Afghans

This section would modify section 602 of the Afghan Allies Protection Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–8) by extending the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program through December 31, 2017.

Further, this section would modify the eligibility requirements for applicants to such program by requiring that any alien, that is submitting an application for Chief of Mission approval after May 31, 2016, and has been employed by, or on behalf of, the United States Government, must have served as an interpreter or translator for United States military personnel in Islamic Republic of Afghanistan while traveling off-base with such personnel or performing sensitive and trusted activities for United States military personnel stationed in Afghanistan.

Finally, this section would amend the report in section 602(b)(14) of Public Law 111–8 by requiring that the Secretary of State and

the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, provide such report to the Committees on Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 31, 2016, and annually thereafter through January 31, 2021.

SUBTITLE C—MATTERS RELATING TO SYRIA AND IRAQ

This section would amend section 1209 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), as amended by section 1225 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), by extending the "Syria train and equip" program through December 31, 2017. This section would also extend the reprogramming requirement through December 31, 2017.

Further, this section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a certification, with each reprogramming request, that the required number and type of U.S. Armed Forces have been deployed to support:

(1) The strategy for the Syrian Arab Republic required by section 1225(b) of Public Law 114–92;

(2) A plan to re-take and hold Raqqa, Syria; and

(3) The elements of the Syrian opposition and other Syrian groups and individuals trained and equipped so that such elements are able to defend themselves from attacks by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and the Government of Syria forces.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would authorize $250.0 million to be appropriated in title XV for fiscal year 2017 in the Syria Train and Equip Fund for assistance to the vetted Syrian opposition.

The committee notes that recipients of U.S. assistance under this section should reflect the ethnic make-up of Syria, including the vetted Sunni elements of the opposition, as appropriate.

Section 1222—Modification and Extension of Authority To Provide Assistance To Counter the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant

This section would express the sense of Congress that U.S. policy should support the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga, the Iraqi Security Forces, and Sunni tribal forces in the fight against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) and that there should be efforts to ensure transparency and oversight mechanisms for U.S. assistance. Additionally, the sense of Congress would recognize the important role of the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga and express that the United States should provide arms, training, and appropriate equipment directly to the Kurdish Regional Government.

This section would also authorize the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide $680.0 million in assistance in fiscal year 2017 to the military and other security forces of, or associated with, the Government of the Republic of Iraq, including Kurdish and Sunni tribal security forces or other local security forces with a national security mission, through December 31, 2017.

This section would restrict the obligation or expenditure of 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for the "Iraqi Train and Equip Fund" (ITEF) until 15 days after the Secretary of

Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, submits to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a plan to retake and hold Mosul, Iraq. However, of the funds authorized to be appropriated for ITEF, $50.0 million is not subject to such restriction and is available for stipends and sustainment to the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga, the Sunni tribal security forces, or other local security forces with a national security mission. Further, of the $50.0 million for stipends and sustainment, not less than 33 percent of such funds must be available for the Iraqi Kurdish Peshmerga.

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to provide the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, a briefing not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that includes an assessment on the extent to which the Government of Iraq is meeting certain conditions relating to political inclusion of ethnic and sectarian minorities within the security forces of Iraq. This section also would require a briefing that contains an update of the assessment not later than 180 days after the first such assessment.

Finally, this section would prohibit U.S. assistance authorized under this section from being provided to the Government of Iraq 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the Government of Iraq has taken actions to safeguard against U.S. assistance being transferred or acquired by violent extremist organizations, as designated by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189) or that are known to be under the command and control, or associated with, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Section 1223—Extension and Modification of Authority To Support Operations and Activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq

This section would amend section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as most recently amended by section 1221 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), by extending the authority for the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC–I) for 1 year through fiscal year 2017. This section would also allow the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to authorize OSC–I to conduct training activities in support of the Iraqi Border Police.

Section 1224—Report on Prevention of Future Terrorist Organizations in Iraq and Syria

The section would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, that describes the political, economic, and security conditions in the Republic of Iraq and the Syrian Arab Republic that would be necessary to prevent the formation of future terrorist organizations therein.

Section 1225—Semiannual Report on Integration of Political and Military Strategies Against ISIL

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to jointly submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a semiannual report on the political and military strategies to defeat the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

Additionally, this section would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report that: (1) reviews the accountability measures taken by the Government of Iraq for assistance provided under the Iraq Train and Equip Fund, and (2) the financial management capacity and accountability of U.S. assistance with respect to recipients under such fund.

The two reports required under this section would expire 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBTITLE D—MATTERS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Section 1231—Limitation on Use of Funds To Approve or Otherwise Permit Approval of Certain Requests by Russian Federation Under Open Skies Treaty

This section would limit the use of funds authorized by this Act, or any other Act, for fiscal year 2017 or any subsequent fiscal year for the approval of an initial or exhibition overflight, or a certification event, by the United States for the Russian Federation until a certification and report are provided to the specified congressional committees.

The certification that would be required by this section would be a joint certification by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Energy, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of National Intelligence (DNI), the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, and, in the case of an overflight of the United States, the Commander of U.S. Northern Command, and, in the case of an overflight of another state party to the treaty, the Commander of U.S. European Command. The certification that would be required would be that the Russian Federation is taking no action inconsistent with the terms of the Open Skies Treaty (OST); is not exceeding the imagery limits set forth by that treaty; is allowing overflights of certain territories, including Kaliningrad; and that covered states party to the treaty have been notified and briefed on concerns of the Intelligence Community regarding upgraded sensors used under the Open Skies Treaty.

The report that would be required by this section would include the mitigation costs of complying with the treaty; a plan to replace the Open Skies Treaty with a more robust sharing of commercial imagery; and an evaluation by the DNI on how the Russian Federation uses Open Skies flights in its intelligence collection posture.

This section would require that, not later than 14 days after the completion of an observation flight over the United States, the Secretary of Defense, jointly with the Secretary of Energy, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of the Federal Bureau of

Investigation, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall notify the specified congressional committees, of the flight path of such Open Skies flight; an analysis of any U.S. critical infrastructure imaged during the flight; mitigation costs of the Department of Defense as a result of the flight; and an assessment of how the information collected during the flight fits into Russia's collection against the United States.

This section would further limit funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act for fiscal year 2017 to carry out any activities to implement the Open Skies Treaty until a joint report is submitted to the specified congressional committees by the DNI and the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) on providing enhanced access to U.S. commercial imagery and other information, and a report by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Director of NGA and the Secretary of Defense on the costs of the Open Skies Treaty.

Section 1232—Military Response Options to Russian Federation Violation of INF Treaty

This section would withhold $10.0 million from Department of Defense support functions to the Executive Office of the President until the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate congressional committees the plan required by section 1243(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) for the development of military capabilities to respond to the violation of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces by the Russian Federation and until the Secretary carries out the development of capabilities pursuant to such plan and requirement of the same section of Public Law 114–92.

Section 1233—Limitation on Military Cooperation Between the United States and the Russian Federation

This section would limit the use of fiscal year 2017 funds for bilateral military-to-military cooperation between the Governments of the United States and the Russian Federation until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, provides a certification relating to certain actions by Russia to the appropriate congressional committees. This section would also allow the Secretary of Defense to waive the limitation under certain conditions.

In effect, this section would extend, by 1 year, section 1246 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). The committee notes that Russia continues to illegally occupy Crimea, to foster instability in Ukraine, and to maintain an aggressive posture towards its regional neighbors. Bilateral military-to-military cooperation is unwarranted so long as Russia continues its aggressive and intimidating behavior towards U.S. partners and allies in Europe.

Section 1234—Statement of Policy on United States Efforts in Europe To Reassure United States Partners and Allies and Deter Aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation

This section would express a series of findings, including a citation that the Russian Federation presents the greatest threat to U.S. national security; recommendations from recent studies calling for increasing U.S. defense presence in Europe; and a summary of the funding for fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017, for the European Reassurance Initiative. This section would also express a statement that it is the policy of the United States to reassure U.S. partners and allies in Europe and to deter aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation in order to enhance regional and global security and stability.

Section 1235—Modification of Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative

This section would amend section 1250 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) to make conforming changes of a non-substantive nature.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would authorize $150.0 million to carry out this authority in fiscal year 2017. The committee continues to be concerned that certain types of assistance are not being provided to the Ukrainian military and national security forces because they are considered dual-use in nature. For example, the committee is aware that the Government of Ukraine's request for sniper training was denied by the United States because it is considered offensive training. The committee believes that such a distinction is irrelevant for training focused on building basic soldier skills, and urges the U.S. Government to revisit this issue.

The committee commends the men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces who have assisted in the training and equipping of the Ukrainian military and national security forces. The committee notes the persistent aggression of the Russian Federation in Ukraine to gain political influence and stature while attempting to weaken governmental institutions and leadership. The committee commends the citizens of Ukraine who continue to face threats from Russian-backed separatists in the Donbass region. The committee notes the continued need of the Ukrainian military and national security forces for training, equipment, and assistance to counter Russian-backed separatists.

Section 1236—Prohibition on Availability of Funds Relating to Sovereignty of the Russian Federation Over Crimea

This section would prohibit the use of fiscal year 2017 funds to implement any activity that recognizes the sovereignty of the Russian Federation over Crimea. The section would also allow the Secretary of Defense, in concurrence with the Secretary of State, to waive the prohibition if the Secretary certifies that doing so would be in the national security interest of the United States and submits a notification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

In effect, this section would extend, by 1 year, section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

Section 1237—Modification and Extension of Report on Military Assistance to Ukraine

This section would express a series of findings and the sense of Congress on Ukraine. This section would also modify section 1275 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to add a reporting element on a description of the Department of Defense assistance provided to Ukraine for the protection and monitoring of Ukraine's borders, to add the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives as report recipients, and to extend the report to December 31, 2019.

Section 1238—Additional Matters in Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the Russian Federation

This section would amend section 1245 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), as most recently amended by section 1248(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), to require additional reporting elements examining the Russian Federation's foreign military deployments.

SUBTITLE E—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1241—Sense of Congress on Malign Activities of the Government of Iran

This section would express certain findings and the sense of Congress on the malign activities of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The sense of Congress would include that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) does not address the totality of the malign activities of the Government of Iran. Additionally, the section would state that the United States should increase its efforts to counter the continued expansion of Iran's malign activities in the Middle East; should ensure that it has robust, enduring military posture and capabilities forward deployed to deter Iranian aggression; and should strengthen ballistic missile defense capabilities and increase security assistance to partners and allies in the region.

Section 1242—Modification of Annual Report on Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China

This section would amend section 1202 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), which requires the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives an annual report on the military and security developments involving the People's Republic of China. The Secretary of Defense would be

required to provide such report by January 31 of each year through January 31, 2021. Additionally, this section would require a summary of the order of battle of the People's Liberation Army as part of such report. This amendment would supersede section 1080 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

Section 1243—Sense of Congress on Trilateral Cooperation Between Japan, South Korea, and the United States

This section would set forth certain findings and express the sense of Congress on trilateral defense cooperation between Japan, the Republic of Korea, and the United States. The sense of Congress would express that the United States should continue to support trilateral cooperation with Japan and South Korea. Additionally, the sense of Congress expresses support for defense cooperation between Japan and South Korea on the full range of issues related to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as well as nonproliferation, cyber security, maritime security, security technology and capability development, and other areas of security mutual benefit.

Section 1244—Sense of Congress on Cooperation Between Singapore and the United States

This section would express certain findings and the sense of Congress regarding cooperation between the United States and the Republic of Singapore, including the United States welcomes the enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement with Singapore and should expand bilateral defense cooperation and support; the United States should continue efforts with Singapore to address transnational issues and strengthen regional and multilateral institutions; and the United States should improve joint interoperability and security collaboration with Singapore.

Section 1245—Monitoring and Evaluation of Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid Programs of the Department of Defense

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to 5 percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act for Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (OHDACA) for fiscal year 2017, to conduct monitoring and evaluation of the OHDACA programs of the Department of Defense. This section would also require the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the specified committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on mechanisms to evaluate OHDACA programs. This section is consistent with section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

Section 1246—Enhancement of Interagency Support During Contingency Operations and Transition Periods

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to enter into an agreement under which each Secretary may provide support, supplies, and services on a reim-

bursement basis, or by exchange of support, supplies, and services, to the other Secretary during a contingency operation and related transition period.

The committee asserts that such an authority could decrease the current bureaucratic delays and inefficiencies associated with negotiating dozens of individual agreements to acquire or transfer such items as fuel, communications, biometrics data, blood supplies, and mortuary services, which has affected the timeliness of providing support to U.S. service members and diplomats serving in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq. The committee also notes that the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Secretary of State, is authorized to enter into an agreement with certain foreign countries and international organizations for the reciprocal exchange of support, supplies, and services, yet is limited in such reciprocal exchanges with the Secretary of State in contingency operations.

This section would set a sunset date of December 31, 2018, to allow the committee to revisit the use and benefits of the authority. This section would also require a notification to specified committees, upon use of the authority, containing a copy of any written agreements entered into under this section and a description of the acquisitions and transfers of support, supplies, and services to enable congressional oversight.

Section 1247—Two-Year Extension and Modification of Authorization of Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery Capabilities

This section would modify section 943 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as most recently amended by section 1271 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), to permit the recovery of individuals identified by the Secretary of Defense when a non-conventional assisted recovery capability is already in place. This section would also extend the authority through 2020.

The committee reminds the Department that this authority constitutes a traditional military activity for personnel recovery and should not be interpreted as an intelligence activity. The committee notes that failure to use and report this authority accordingly will jeopardize future re-authorizations.

Section 1248—Authority To Destroy Certain Specified World War II-Era United States-Origin Chemical Munitions Located on San Jose Island, Republic of Panama

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to destroy the eight U.S.-origin chemical munitions on San Jose Island, Republic of Panama. These munitions are remnants from research, development, and testing conducted jointly by an American, British, and Canadian effort during, and shortly after, World War II. By a letter dated May 8, 2013, the Republic of Panama formally requested U.S. assistance and limited its request to disposing of only these eight U.S.-origin chemical munitions. This section also includes certain related conditions and a sunset date for the authorization.

Section 1249—Strategy for United States Defense Interests in Africa

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act to the congressional defense committees that contains a strategy for United States defense interests in Africa.

The committee is concerned about the broad range of current and potential security challenges across the continent, including the deteriorating security situation in Libya and violence from terrorist organizations and their affiliates such as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in North Africa, Boko Haram in the Lake Chad region, Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb in the western Sahel, and Al Shabaab in the Horn of Africa. Additionally, the committee is concerned that insufficient coordination between geographic combatant commands may hinder the unity of effort necessary to counter threats that cross combatant command boundaries. The committee believes that a comprehensive strategy for achieving the Department of Defense's objectives on the continent will better enable the Department to address and plan for these challenges.

Section 1250—United States-Israel Directed Energy Cooperation

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation activities, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish directed energy capabilities to detect and defeat ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and other threats to the United States, deployed U.S. forces, or Israel.

The section would require a memorandum of agreement (MOA) between the U.S. and Israel regarding the sharing of research and development costs for directed energy capability to counter the aforementioned threats and that such MOA be provided to the specified congressional committees.

This section would limit the authorization for such activities to not more than $25.0 million.

The authority to carry out this section would expire on December 31, 2018.

Section 1251—Sense of Congress on Support for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania

This section would express the sense of Congress on U.S. support for the Republic of Estonia, the Republic of Latvia, and the Republic of Lithuania, including support for their sovereignty, concern over aggressive military actions of the Russian Federation against these nations, and encouragement for further defense cooperation between the United States and these nations.

Section 1252—Sense of Congress on Support for Georgia

This section would express the sense of Congress on U.S. support for Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as support for continued cooperation between the United States and Georgia.

Section 1253—Modification of Annual Report on Military Power of Iran

This section would amend section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84), by adding two reporting requirements to the Annual Report on the Military Power of Iran on: (1) Iran's cyber capabilities, and (2) Iranian military and security organizations responsible for detaining U.S. Armed Forces or interfering in U.S. military operations.

Section 1254—Sense of Congress on Senior Military Exchanges Between the United States and Taiwan

This section would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should conduct a program of senior military exchanges between the United States and Taiwan.

Section 1255—Quarterly Report on Freedom of Navigation Operations

This section would amend chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, by adding the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to provide a report on U.S. freedom of navigation operations to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after the end of each fiscal quarter. This reporting requirement would terminate on September 30, 2018.

SUBTITLE F—CODIFICATION AND CONSOLIDATION OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AUTHORITIES

Section 1261—Enactment of New Chapter for Department of Defense Security Cooperation Authorities and Transfer of Certain Authorities to New Chapter

This section would create a new chapter in title 10, United States Code, entitled "Security Cooperation," and would transfer and codify, as appropriate, the following existing security cooperation-related provisions to this new chapter:

(1) Section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84);

(2) Section 1051b of title 10, United States Code;

(3) Section 2010 of title 10, United States Code;

(4) Section 127d of title 10, United States Code;

(5) Section 2282 of title 10, United States Code;

(6) Subsections (a) through (d) of section 1081 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81);

(7) Section 184 of title 10, United States Code;

(8) Section 941(b) of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417);

(9) Section 1065 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (Public Law 104–201);

(10) Section 1306 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1995 (Public Law 103–337);

(11) Section 8073 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2003 (Public Law 107–248; 10 U.S.C. prec. 2161 note);

(12) Section 2166 of title 10, United States Code;

(13) Section 2350m of title 10, United States Code;

(14) Section 2249d of title 10, United States Code;
(15) Chapter 905 of title 10, United States Code;
(16) Section 9415 of title 10, United States Code;
(17) Section 1268 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291);
(18) Section 2249a of title 10, United States Code; and
(19) Section 2249e of title 10, United States Code.

Additionally, this section would extend the authority in section 273 of chapter 11, title 10, United States Code, as added by this section, to December 31, 2019.

This section would also make conforming stylistic amendments, cross-reference amendments, and conforming repeals, as appropriate.

TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION

OVERVIEW

The budget request for the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program contained $325.6 million for fiscal year 2017.

The committee continues to support the goals of the CTR program, which are important for national security. The committee notes that the CTR Cooperative Biological Engagement Program now encompasses the majority of the CTR budget request, and is concerned that CTR is no longer focused on reducing nuclear threats.

For this reason, the committee recommends certain reallocations of the budget request for CTR to emerging proliferation threats, such as Additive Manufacture ("3–D Printing"), elsewhere in this Act. The committee reaffirms its view that the CTR program as a whole should "maintain a strong focus'" on the full range of threat reduction challenges.

Lastly, the committee welcomes efforts by the Department of Defense to actively consult with the committee and to keep it fully informed of efforts and developments in these areas, though it notes there is room for improvement and recommends certain measures elsewhere in this Act to provide the committee with additional opportunity for oversight.

The committee recommends $325.6 million, the amount of the budget request, for the CTR program.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1301—Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction Funds

This section would define Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs and funds as those authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this Act and made available by section 4301 of this Act, and would specify that CTR funds shall remain available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

Section 1302—Funding Allocations

This section would allocate specific amounts for each program under the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction

(CTR) Program from within the overall $325.6 million that the committee would authorize for the CTR Program. The allocation under this section reflects the amount of the budget request for fiscal year 2017.

This section would also extend certain notification requirements, which would allow the committee to enhance its oversight of proposed CTR projects. Further, it would require a new determination as to whether other authorities are also available to the Secretary of Defense, and other Secretaries as applicable, and if they exist, an explanation for why the Secretaries were not able to use them for a specific proposed project.

Section 1303—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cooperative Threat Reduction in People's Republic of China

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense obligate and expend funds on Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) activities in the People's Republic of China on a quarterly basis.

This section would further require that the Secretary of Defense not obligate or expend funds for CTR activities in China unless he has submitted to the specific congressional committees a certification regarding certain nonproliferation benchmarks (including the arrest of Li Fangwei, also known as "Karl Lee") with respect to China.

TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Beryllium Metal Supply

The committee notes the continuing importance of the strategic and critical material, beryllium, to national security. The committee understands that, starting in 2004, the Department of Defense took affirmative steps to invest in a domestic beryllium manufacturing facility in order to maintain security of supply, as well as the affordability of beryllium for defense systems. The committee encourages the Department to continue to take affirmative steps to maintain a secure domestic source of beryllium. The committee notes that several improvements currently available make the production of domestic beryllium more efficient and affordable, through the Defense Production Act and other means, which the Department should consider as part of this ongoing strategy.

Clarification of Product Improvement Pilot Program Authority

The committee notes that section 330 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) provided the Department of the Army, and subsequently section 323 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) provided the Department of the Air Force and the Department of the Navy the authority to use working capital funds for procuring and installing components or subsystems that would improve the reliability and maintainability, extend the useful life, enhance safety, lower maintenance costs, or provide performance enhancement of weapon system platforms or major end items. The committee has learned, however, that some military de-

partments are interpreting the language in paragraph (a) of section 330 of Public Law 110–181 to mean "except as stated in section 2208 of title 10, United States Code." The committee notes that the intent of the statute, as clearly indicated in the phrase "Notwithstanding section 2208 of title 10, United States Code. . .", is to waive the requirements of section 2208 to enable the execution of the pilot program established for certain product improvements. In light of this clarification, the committee directs the Secretary of each military department to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than December 1, 2016, on which weapon system components or subsystems could be considered as candidates for the product improvement pilot programs authorized in section 330 of Public Law 110–181 and section 323 of Public Law 114–92.

Defense Production Act Implications for Propeller Shafts

The committee recognizes that of the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III program provides the Department of Defense with a powerful tool to ensure the timely creation and availability of domestic production capabilities for technologies that have the potential for wide-ranging impact on the operational capabilities and technological superiority of U.S. defense systems. DPA Title III is unique in that it is the sole Department of Defense program focused on creating, maintaining, protecting, expanding, or restoring domestic production capacity to strengthen domestic industry and to establish the industrial base capacity for essential national defense capabilities. The committee supports the DPA Title III program and recognizes its importance to preserving key capabilities throughout the defense industrial base.

The committee notes the importance of the segments of the defense industrial base where limited numbers of suppliers provide materiel that is critical to readiness of the force. The committee has been made aware that the industrial segment responsible for the manufacture and refurbishment of propeller shafts for the Navy's surface and submarine fleet faces considerable strain from high demand from Naval Supply Systems Command and Naval Sea Systems Command. The committee encourages the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, as manager for the DPA Title III program, to ensure that this and other areas of the defense industrial base are maintained and enhanced.

Destruction of Chemical Weapons Stockpile

The committee is aware that recently the Program Executive Office (PEO) for Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives (ACWA) at the Pueblo Chemical Agent Destruction Pilot Plant (PCAPP) successfully completed elimination of problematic chemical munitions deemed unsuitable for processing in the main plant. The committee is also aware that the PCAPP main plant operations are scheduled to begin this fiscal year at the U.S. Army Pueblo Chemical Depot, and systemization is underway at the Blue Grass Army Depot. The committee believes it is important to ensure that all chemical weapons stockpile destruction is completed by December 31, 2023, which is the congressionally mandated deadline. The committee en-

courages the PEO–ACWA to continue to evaluate options to accelerate the destruction schedules without sacrificing worker and public safety and security.

Locality Pay at Department of Defense Working Capital Fund Facilities

The committee is concerned that the implementation of the Department of Defense's policy on locality pay at Defense working capital fund facilities is having a negative impact on the rates charged at these facilities. The committee believes that by allowing working capital fund enterprises to spread the costs of locality pay increases over a number of years, a sufficient working capital fund accumulated operating result would be sustained, and thereby allow these institutions to provide valuable services at competitive rates. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of departmental policy and to provide a briefing on the findings of the review to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 31, 2016.

Rare Earth Stockpile Acquisitions by the Defense Logistics Agency

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) granted authority to the National Defense Stockpile Manager to acquire six materials for the National Defense Stockpile: ferroniobium, dysprosium metal, yttrium oxide, cadmium zinc tellurium substrate materials, lithium ion precursors, and triamino-trinitrobenzene, and insensitive high explosive molding powders. The committee is concerned about the manner in which this acquisition authority has been used for the procurement of yttrium oxide and dysprosium metal. Specifically, the awardee of the yttrium oxide acquisition has closed its mine in the United States. For dysprosium metal, no solicitation has been issued, even though the Administrator of Defense Logistics Agency—Strategic Materials (DLASM) issued requests for information for dysprosium metal and yttrium oxide less than a month apart.

To better understand how DLASM intends to use this acquisition authority, the committee directs the Administrator of Defense Logistics Agency—Strategic Materials to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than September 30, 2016, that addresses the following questions with respect to the yttrium oxide acquisition:

(1) Where will this material be physically mined and refined?

(2) If either of these process steps will occur outside of the United States or other allied nations, what is the DLASM's assessment of the risk associated with that acquisition?

The briefing should also address the following questions with respect to the dysprosium metal acquisition:

(1) Why has the dysprosium metal acquisition been delayed?

(2) What additional information does DLASM require to issue a solicitation prior to the expiration of the acquisition authority for dysprosium in fiscal year 2019, to include the ability to store or rotate dysprosium metal stocks?

(3) Has DLASM investigated storage mitigation options, such as a vendor-managed inventory or buffer stock?

Successful Changes to Working Capital Fund Cash Management Policy

The committee is encouraged by the work performed by the Department of Defense to develop a well-defined metric to identify lower and upper operational requirements for working capital fund cash balances rather than resorting to the arbitrary, outdated goal of maintaining 7 to 10 days of cash to sustain business operations. The previous metric could not respond to changes related to external pressures, such as fluctuations in commodity markets that are outside of the Department's control.

The committee has directed the Department for several years to develop a metric that was not arbitrary, but more in line with true operational requirements. In the committee report (H. Rept. 111–166) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to provide a report examining a range of alternative cash-balance parameters by which the revolving funds could be managed to sustain a single rate or price to the customer throughout the fiscal year. Having found this report to be insufficient, the committee mandated a study in section 1402 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) requiring an independent review of each working capital fund within the Department to ascertain the appropriate cash corpus required to maintain good financial management of each fund. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112–479) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, the committee responded by recommending that the Department modify its Financial Management Regulations to adjust the range of the cash corpus required for fuel-related working capital funds to mitigate the continued fluctuation of rates charged to the customer during the fiscal year.

The committee commended the Department in the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 for initiating processes to determine the correct cash corpus thresholds for each working capital fund, looking forward to future budget submissions with prices and rates set to maintain an adequate cash balance to absorb external pressures, thereby maintaining a steady, dependable rate for the customer throughout the fiscal year.

In the fiscal year 2017 budget request, the new methodology developed by the Department consists of four elemental components: rate of disbursement, range of operation, risk mitigation, and reserves for future requirements. Through these four components, the committee believes the Department has developed a metric that can adjust to accommodate seasonality, known changes in the business environment, and unplanned events within the activities. Absorbing these fluctuations in market forces stabilizes prices for customers, most notably those funded through constrained operation and maintenance funds. Therefore, the committee commends the development of this new cash-management policy.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY PROGRAMS

Section 1401—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1402—National Defense Sealift Fund

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at the levels identified in section 4501 of this Act.

Section 1403—Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense

This section would authorize appropriations for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1404—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1405—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1406—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

Section 1407—National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund at the levels identified in section 4501 of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—NATIONAL DEFENSE STOCKPILE

Section 1411—Authority to Dispose of Certain Materials from and to Acquire Additional Materials for the National Defense Stockpile

This section would authorize certain disposals of materials from, and acquisition of materials for, the National Defense Stockpile under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98d(b)).

Section 1412—Revisions to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act

This section would amend sections 4 and 15 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98c and 15 U.S.C. 98h–6, respectively) to make certain clarifying amendments and to allow the Department of Defense to contract with facilities to recycle strategic and critical materials.

SUBTITLE C—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1421—Authority for Transfer of Funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer funds from the Defense Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund created by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

Section 1422—Authorization of Appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home

This section would authorize $64.3 million to be appropriated for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home during fiscal year 2017.

TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Execution of Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund

The Department of Defense provided a briefing to the committee that the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF) strategy contemplates extensive, long-term future efforts to build the capacity of partner nations in certain regions. The committee supports such efforts, but expects the Department to address the specific concerns outlined below in future CTPF reprogramming requests and other Building Partnership Capacity (BPC) authority notifications, as appropriate. Further, as part of future BPC proposals or briefings, the committee expects the Department to differentiate those projects intended solely to address short-term tactical needs (for example, training a unit to deploy on a peacekeeping operation) from those that are long-term (for example, assisting the Federal Republic of Somalia with the development of a national army).

The committee is concerned that some of the nations described in past CTPF reprogramming requests lack the capacity to absorb and sustain some of the assistance contemplated. The Department should be prepared to provide assessments of the capacity of nations to absorb and sustain assistance as part of future CTPF reprogramming requests or BPC authority notifications. The committee is concerned about the ability of Somalia to absorb and em-

ploy the assistance provided by the United States effectively, as well as the ability of the Department, given the security environment in that region, to oversee how such assistance is maintained and used in the future. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than June 30, 2016, to update the committee on efforts to address these concerns. The committee further directs the Secretary to provide a second briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than December 31, 2016, on the same subject.

Further, the committee expects that future CTPF reprogramming requests will include specific programs for defense institution building for nations that the United States intends to be part of any long-term effort. The committee also expects the Department to include as part of any such requests the specific activities being undertaken by other U.S. Government agencies, allied countries, and international organizations that are contributing to the capacity-building efforts of partner nations, especially in areas that relate to civilian control of security forces and the rule of law.

The committee continues to expect that the Department will evaluate carefully the commitments of partner countries that receive assistance to principles of rule of law and human rights, especially as part of any long-term effort, and will be prepared to discuss these commitments as part of any future reprogramming request or notification of assistance.

Finally, the committee notes that there are efforts within the Department to evaluate the estimated sustainment costs for proposed BPC assistance, as well as the sustainment costs for assistance already provided. The committee expects that such estimated costs will be provided as they are identified. This information is vital to evaluating any future changes to policy or authorities.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee would decrease funding for the CTPF.

National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Account

The budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations contained no funding for a National Guard and Reserve Component equipment account. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee notes that the base budget request contained $3.0 billion for procurement of National Guard and Reserve Component equipment.

Given the uncertainty of the current and projected fiscal environment, the availability of equipment needed to sustain and modernize the National Guard and Reserve Components as an operational reserve and for their domestic support missions remains a concern. The committee recognizes the National Guard and Reserve Components continue to report significant equipment shortages in modernized equipment and challenges associated with efficiently fulfilling combat readiness training requirements. For example, the committee notes there are significant modernization, capability, and training challenges associated with the current Air National Guard aircraft assigned to the Aerospace Control Alert mission, and those aircraft crews maintaining proficiency and readiness in other mission areas critical to full-spectrum combat readiness. The committee also notes the Army National Guard continues to experi-

ence modernization shortfalls in utility rotorcraft and heavy lift rotorcraft.

The committee believes additional funds would help eliminate identified shortfalls in the areas of critical dual-use equipment. The committee expects these funds to be used for the purposes of, but not limited to, the procurement of rotorcraft, avionic and radar upgrades for legacy strike fighter aircraft, wheeled and tracked combat vehicles, tactical wheeled vehicles, ammunition, small arms, tactical radios to include single channel ground and airborne radio systems, non-system training devices, logistics automation systems, sense and avoid system upgrades for unmanned aerial systems, civil support communication systems, hail and warning escalation of force systems, out of band infrared pointer and illumination systems, near infrared aiming and illumination systems, crashworthy, ballistically tolerant auxiliary fuel systems, Engagement Skills Trainer II systems, F–16 distributed-operations mission training centers, mobile ad hoc network emergency communications equipment, and other critical dual-use, unfunded procurement items for the National Guard and Reserve Components.

The committee recommends additional funding for a National Guard and Reserve Component equipment account within the Overseas Contingency Operations budget request. The committee also recommends $3.0 billion, the full amount of the base budget request, for National Guard and Reserve equipment.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 1501—Purpose and Treatment of Certain Authorizations of Appropriations

This section would establish the purpose of this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act, to provide for additional costs due to Overseas Contingency Operations and other additional funding requirements.

Section 1502—Procurement

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Procurement at the levels identified in section 4102 and section 4103 of division D of this Act.

Section 1503—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation at the levels identified in section 4202 and section 4203 of division D of this Act.

Section 1504—Operation and Maintenance

This section would authorize additional appropriations for operation and maintenance programs at the levels identified in section 4302 and section 4303 of division D of this Act. Appropriations for operation and maintenance identified in section 4302 would be available for obligation until April 30, 2017.

Section 1505—Military Personnel

This section would authorize additional appropriations for military personnel at the levels identified in section 4402 and section 4403 of division D of this Act. Appropriations for military personnel identified in section 4402 would be available for obligation until April 30, 2017.

Section 1506—Working Capital Funds

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act. These appropriations for the Defense Working Capital Funds would be available for obligation until April 30, 2017.

Section 1507—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense-Wide

This section would authorize additional appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities, Defense-Wide at the levels identified in section 4502 and section 4503 of division D of this Act.

Section 1508—Defense Inspector General

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

Section 1509—Defense Health Program

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act. These appropriations for the Defense Health Program would be available for obligation until April 30, 2017.

Section 1510—Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund

This section would authorize additional appropriations for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF) at the level identified in division D of this Act.

The budget request contained $1.00 billion in Overseas Contingency Operations for CTPF. The committee notes that the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) authorized $1.30 billion for CTPF, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) authorized an additional $750.0 million for this fund. The committee is encouraged by improvements in the Department of Defense's execution of CTPF, but remains concerned about the capacity of some partner nations to absorb the resources provided through the fund in a short period of time. Therefore, the committee recommends $750.0 million, a decrease of $250.0 million, for CTPF.

The committee is also concerned that the Department is developing, but does not yet have in place, an effective process to assess, monitor, and evaluate the outcomes of security cooperation activities, including assistance to partner countries. The committee intends to conduct close and thorough oversight of CTPF authoriza-

tions to ensure that the Department executes the funding effectively. Thus, elsewhere in this Act, the committee provides additional direction to the Department for the execution of CTPF.

SUBTITLE B—FINANCIAL MATTERS

Section 1521—Treatment as Additional Authorizations

This section would state that amounts authorized to be appropriated by this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

Section 1522—Special Transfer Authority

This section would authorize the transfer of up to $4.50 billion of additional war-related funding authorizations in this title among the accounts in this title.

SUBTITLE C—LIMITATIONS, REPORTS, AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 1531—Afghanistan Security Forces Fund

This section would continue the existing limitation on the use of funds in the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF), subject to certain conditions of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended by section 1531(b) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), through December 31, 2017.

Additionally, this section would require that, of the funds available in ASFF for fiscal year 2017, a $25.0 million goal would be set to support the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women serving in the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces, as well as the recruitment, training, and contracting of female security personnel for future elections in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The Department's efforts to meet this goal should emphasize programs and activities that promote the integration of Afghan women into the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces' (ANDSF) organizational culture, professional development, and opportunities for advancement. The committee notes that in recent years there has significant investment into infrastructure for Afghan women serving in the ANDSF.

Finally, this section would modify the requirement for the Secretary of Defense to provide a quarterly report to the congressional defense committees that summarizes the details of any obligation or transfer of ASFF funds, changes the frequency of such reporting requirement to a semi-annual basis, extends such report through January 31, 2021, and makes other conforming changes. Such report should also address the steps taken to increase fraud prevention, transparency, and accountability.

Section 1532—Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund

This section would modify subsection 1532(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) by extending the use and transfer authority for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund to fiscal year 2017. This section would also modify section 1532(c) of the National Defense Au-

thorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) by expanding the foreign governments to whom assistance may be provided in order to counter the flow of improvised explosive device precursor chemicals. Finally, this section would extend the authority for interdiction of improvised explosive device precursor chemicals to December 31, 2017.

Section 1533—Extension of Authority to Use Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund for Training of Foreign Security Forces to Defeat Improvised Explosive Devices

This section would modify section 1533(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) by extending the Authority to Use the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund for Training of Foreign Security Forces to Defeat Improvised Explosive Devices and precursor chemicals from September 30, 2018, to September 30, 2020.

TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Accrediting Models for Missile Defense Testing

The committee notes that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) sometimes uses element models, developed both by MDA and the military services, during ground tests that have not been fully accredited; full accreditation could improve the reliability of test results.

The committee notes that the majority of element models used during ground tests to support delivery of phase 2 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach were not accredited, and the models for Aegis Ashore and the ship-based Aegis ballistic missile defense weapon systems were not accredited, but have proven to be successful missile defense capabilities.

The committee is aware that MDA, the services, and the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation have been working together to accredit the models used in ground tests to support operational testing. The committee supports these efforts, and directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in coordination with the military services and the Director of the Office of Operational Test and Evaluation, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 1, 2016, on the status of these efforts and the expected timeline for accrediting these models to enhance missile defense operational testing and reliability, the cost, and any technical limitations or operational considerations that may be encountered.

Air Force Global Strike Command

Following the establishment of Air Force Global Strike Command (AFGSC) in 2009, the Air Force has taken limited steps to consolidate and focus attention on the Air Force's nuclear mission through this major command. Last year's installation of a four-star general officer as commander has undoubtedly led to increased stature

within the organizational structure of the Air Force, but the committee believes further consolidation of functions is required. Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would consolidate certain nuclear command and control and missile warning capabilities within AFGSC.

As part of this consolidation and focus, the committee also believes AFGSC must be provided the appropriate resources and manpower required to effectively plan and execute its mission. Balancing priorities across the service, the committee expects the Air Force to program funding and personnel commensurate with the command's mission and needs.

Analytic Line Review of U.S. Central Command Intelligence Assessments

The committee notes that on October 21, 2015, the House Committee on Armed Services, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense requested that the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, and the Commander of U.S. Central Command conduct an analytic line review of U.S. Central Command intelligence assessments. The Department has not yet undertaken that request. In response, the aforementioned committees subsequently requested again on January 7, 2016, and April 11, 2016, that an analytic line review be undertaken.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, in coordination with the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency and the Commander of U.S. Central Command, to conduct the analytic line review as described in the classified annex to this report, and to provide a written report on the review to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees not later than July 1, 2016.

Army Small Satellite Technology Development

The committee supports the activities of the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command/Army Forces Strategic Command (USASMDC/ARSTRAT) to develop experimental capabilities which would assist the ground warfighter's exploitation of space capabilities. USASMDC/ARSTRAT is working to demonstrate capabilities and identify key technology maturation requirements to meet the Army's demands for enhanced intelligence, reconnaissance, surveillance, communications, target acquisition, position/navigation, missile warning, ground-to-space surveillance, and command and control capabilities. The committee recognizes the innovation and progress regarding small satellite technologies and capabilities. Therefore, in order to leverage this advancing technology and address the rapidly emerging threat, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to prioritize and accelerate the technology development and on-orbit testing of militarily relevant small tactical satellites in support of warfighter requirements.

Assessment of Department of Defense Efforts To Secure Internet of Things

The proliferation of embedded computing systems within the Department of Defense has provided significant capabilities that have enabled battlefield superiority, created realistic training environments, facilitated the tracking of supplies and equipment, improved health care provided to wounded soldiers, and provided common operating pictures to support command and control decisions. However, as these and future capabilities become more connected to the Internet, the success, security, and resilience of the Department's missions, personnel, and capabilities could become jeopardized. For example, the same systems that allow commanders to provide command and control or have situational awareness of troop movement from remote locations could be used by enemies or other bad actors to identify, track, and even misdirect U.S. and allied forces. Further, while the Department tries to mitigate Internet-based threats that could emanate from or use Department of Defense networks, the Department may remain vulnerable based on the reliance on non-defense networks, such as those from defense industrial base partners or allies. Those systems may collect and store critical information the Department is reliant on, and thus weaknesses in the security of those systems may have inadvertent impacts on Department of Defense data and networks.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the Department of Defense's planning and management for the security impact and challenges that the Internet of Things will present to the Department. The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a report on the findings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Comptroller General should provide a briefing on preliminary results to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, with the report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of the briefing. The assessment should address the following:

(1) To what extent does the Department have situational awareness of the extent to which its current capabilities are exposed to Internet-based threats and the vulnerabilities that could result; and what actions, if any, is the Department taking to mitigate these threats?

(2) To what extent does the Department have policies and plans in place to monitor, track, report, and manage incidents where the Department's Internet-based capabilities are accessed or manipulated?

(3) To what extent has the Department taken action to manage the security of Internet-based capabilities being procured by Department of Defense components?

(4) Any other matters the Comptroller General determines are relevant.

Assessment of Hardening Technologies for Microgrids

The committee is aware of the increasing development and use of microgrids on Department of Defense installations in an effort to provide better isolation capabilities from failures to the public electrical grid, but also to integrate other sources of energy to make

bases more secure in the event of long-term power outages. The committee is also aware that the Department recently completed a Joint Concept Technology Demonstration (JCTD), called "Smart Power Infrastructure Demonstration for Energy Reliability and Security (SPIDERS), to demonstrate how to integrate cybersecurity, energy efficiency, and energy storage technologies into a common architecture for military installations. However, the committee does not believe that this demonstration looked at how to integrate technologies to harden against electromagnetic pulse (EMP) from high-altitude nuclear burst or space weather. The committee remains concerned that EMP effects could have potentially catastrophic effects against an electrical grid, and the effects against such new technology as microgrids is not currently quantified.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 20, 2017, assessing the capabilities and needs for EMP hardening Department of Defense microgrids. This briefing should include an overview of the results of the SPIDERS JCTD, including any technologies that that demonstration considered that would improve EMP hardening. The briefing should also assess the three locations used in the demonstration to identify what kinds of hardening technologies might be incorporated into their architectures, as well as an estimate of the projected costs in hardening those sites.

Asset Tracking for Information Technology Security

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense needs a comprehensive asset management system with continuous remediation across all layers of the open systems interconnection model in order to achieve and maintain security over the Department's information technology systems. Section 935 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) directed the Department to provide a plan for a software inventory process for the products for which any military department spends more than $5.0 million annually. According to the response from the Chief Information Officer received January 14, 2016, the Department intends to use the ongoing Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) efforts to enable reporting for software licenses owned, and the information security continuous monitoring (ISCM) to report software in use and license compliance.

The committee is supportive of utilization of these processes but believes the Department is capable of achieving asset management and continuous monitoring prior to the scheduled FIAR and ISCM schedules of 2018 and 2020 by using existing capabilities and partnering with industry. Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Chief of Information Officer to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by October 1, 2016, on the utilization of FIAR and ISCM to do information technology asset tracking, including management processes, resources required, timelines for execution, and the capture and collection of data.

Biennial Cyber Exercises

The committee notes that section 1648 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) requires the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the heads of the critical infrastructure sector-specific agencies designated under Presidential Policy Directive-21 and in consultation with Governors of the States and the owners and operators of critical infrastructure, to conduct biennial exercises. These exercises are based on scenarios in which critical infrastructure of the United States is attacked in cyberspace and the President directs the Secretary of Defense to defend the United States and provide support in responding to and recovering from cyberattacks. The committee believes that these exercises are critical for developing and sustaining necessary skills, and to identify potential issues that could compromise the nation's ability to respond to and recover from such an attack.

The committee urges the Department of Defense to utilize these exercises to identify gaps and problems that require new or modified training, capabilities, procedures, or authorities; document key observations and lessons learned; understand local, State, and national strengths that should be leveraged; identify weaknesses that need to be mitigated; and use initial exercises to make recommendations for future exercises, to include scenarios and participants. The committee expects to be kept informed of such exercises and results of those exercises.

Briefing on B61–12 Deployment Plans and Costs for Modifying Dual-Capable Aircraft

The committee supports the joint efforts of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to develop and deploy the B61–12 nuclear gravity bomb. The committee believes this modernized B61 weapon is a central component of both our own strategic deterrent as well as the extended deterrent provided to allies, and the committee believes that sustaining the ability to forward deploy B61 bombs on U.S. and allied aircraft provides important deterrence and assurance value.

To better understand the Department of Defense's plans for deployment of B61–12 bombs, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by November 1, 2016, on the Secretary's intended plans for deploying B61–12 bombs. Such briefing should include the planned deployment locations or areas, the schedule and cost for swapping out currently deployed B61 bombs, the U.S. and foreign dual-capable aircraft that the B61–12 will be deployed on, and the estimated cost of modifying existing dual-capable aircraft to carry the bombs.

Briefing on Security Standards Related to Forward-Deployed U.S. Nuclear Weapons

The committee notes the importance of security at bases with forward-deployed U.S. nuclear weapons.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Air Force and the relevant combatant

commanders, to provide a classified briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, no later than November 30, 2016, on the following:

(1) An evaluation of the security at host bases, including how these standards compare from base to base;

(2) An evaluation of the security for active nuclear weapons storage areas;

(3) A description of security improvements and funding improvements planned at active nuclear weapons storage areas;

(4) A description of programs to address any known modernization and obsolescence of security equipment at active nuclear weapons storage areas;

(5) The implications, if any, of the current regional security threat level and any additional security requirements; and

(6) The division of costs related to security and security improvements between the U.S., host nations, and any other entities, and options to enhance burden-sharing.

Cloud Access Points

The committee remains supportive of enabling the adoption of cloud computing throughout the Department of Defense in order to realize cost savings and efficiency, as well as increased agility and security. The committee recognizes that the Department must develop the necessary security requirements to ensure that sensitive missions and data are protected from evolving cyber threats. However, the committee is concerned that the current Department approach to protecting the Department of Defense Information Network from outside intrusions through the Cloud Access Point (CAP), for data classified as Information Impact Level 4 and above, may impede the adoption of cloud-based commercial solutions due to inadequate implementation of the CAP to date. This approach may also impede the limitations the current CAP model places on the Department's ability to scale with commercial cloud service providers.

In order to move forward with the adoption of cloud computing, the committee believes the Department should implement the current CAP iteration to allow the movement of eligible data to the Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program accredited commercial cloud providers in the short term. The Department should also consider developing a strategy for the development and implementation of a more capable CAP program that enables greater adoption of commercial cloud, while also evolving with cybersecurity threats.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than December 1, 2016, with an update on the status of the implementation of the current CAP program. The briefing should include the identification of near-term steps necessary to implement the current CAP program goals and objectives, in addition to long-term goals and requirements to evolve and improve the CAP program. Finally, the briefing should also include emerging standards and practices to address intrusion detection and institute appropriate firewalls on any defense network utilizing the CAP program.

Command and Control of National Security Space Assets

The committee is concerned with the growing and serious threats to U.S. national security space systems. As noted in a House Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on the fiscal year 2017 budget request for national security space, a senior military commander offered in the statement for the record that, "simply stated, there isn't a single aspect of our space architecture, to include the ground architecture, that isn't at risk." The committee believes it is important to understand the operational implications of this risk and the challenges to command and control of national security space assets in potential situations in which conflict extends to space.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, in coordination with each of the combatant commanders, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by November 1, 2016, on the importance of and reliance on military and national reconnaissance space systems in operational military campaigns; the military operational challenges regarding the defense and protection of these systems in a potential conflict with the current and projected future foreign threats; and complications or problems observed in war games, exercises, and experiments regarding chain of command or other aspects of operational authority.

The committee also directs the Director of the National Reconnaissance Office to separately provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by November 1, 2016, on the Director's views as they relate to complications or problems observed in war games, exercises, and experiments, if any, regarding chain of command or other aspects of operational authority.

Commercial Geospatial Intelligence

The committee supports the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency's (NGA) leadership to foster a diverse, resilient, agile, and responsive geospatial intelligence (GEOINT) program that provides seamless user access to the best mix of capabilities to meet warfighter requirements. The committee is aware of the release of the commercial GEOINT strategy in October 2015. The committee commends the Director of NGA for both continuing the effective current commercial partnerships and pursuing new methods of intelligence collection and analysis by looking to further leverage current and emerging commercial technology providers' capabilities, in order to increase capacity, persistence, resilience, and cost effectiveness. The committee supports NGA's course of action in partnering with the commercial GEOINT industry to meet the relevant future warfighter intelligence requirements, while ensuring that the appropriate steps are taken to protect national security. The committee encourages the Director of NGA and the Secretary of Defense to keep the committee informed of NGA's progress in implementing the commercial GEOINT strategy.

Commercial Satellite Communications

The budget request contained $86.3 million in PE 303600F for wideband global satellite communications. Of this amount, $30.0

million was requested for the commercial satellite communications (SATCOM) pathfinder program. The committee supports the Department of Defense's efforts to reform commercial satellite communications acquisition through implementing more efficient business practices and innovative acquisition methods.

However, the committee believes that the Department should be more rapidly exploring additional opportunities, to include order-of-magnitude improvements, to increase efficiency of the acquisition of commercial SATCOM, as required by the congressionally mandated pilot program defined in section 1612 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). The committee believes it is important to evaluate these capabilities in the near term, in order to inform the path forward on SATCOM acquisition.

Therefore, the committee recommends $116.3 million in PE 303600F, an increase of $30.0 million, for the commercial SATCOM pilot program as defined in Public Law 114–92.

Additionally, as the Department pursues the various innovative solutions, the committee recommends it consider capacity, affordability, mission flexibility, communications security, and other aspects as appropriate to rapidly address the warfighter's requirements in the most cost effective manner for the taxpayers. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2016, on the implementation plan to execute the commercial SATCOM pilot program as required in Public Law 114–92 and an update on the Department's ongoing, planned, and potential future options for pathfinder programs.

Commercial Space-Based Capabilities

The committee supports the emerging commercial space market and the leadership of U.S. space industry. The committee recognizes that these emerging space-based technologies could enable the government to leverage additional services not previously available from private entities. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and other relevant Federal agencies as appropriate, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by November 1, 2016, on national security-related commercial space-based capabilities. The briefing shall include:

(1) An evaluation of how emerging commercial space-based capabilities can meet mission requirements and augment government systems for the Department of Defense and Intelligence Community;

(2) Identification of existing regulations, and suggested modifications needed to leverage commercial space-based capabilities and protect national security;

(3) A strategy for leveraging, as appropriate, commercial space-based capabilities, products, and services in a timely manner.

(4) Any other considerations regarding the use of commercial systems for national security missions.

Comptroller General Assessment of the Management and Measurement of Cyber Activities

The committee notes that the Department of Defense's primary cybersecurity mission is to defend its own networks, systems, and information, and if the Department's systems are not dependable in the face of cyber warfare, all other missions are at risk. The committee is aware that a cyber incident could have significant impact on the Department, including loss of confidence in national security, loss of national security or personal identifiable information, and the inability to conduct military operations.

The committee recognizes that it is imperative that Department leaders, commanders, and supervisors at all levels implement cybersecurity discipline, enforce accountability, manage the shared risk to all Department missions, and take action as soon as possible, because a weakness in one part of the Department's network is a vulnerability and potential back door to other parts of the network. Recently, senior Department leaders have issued important cybersecurity guidance to help manage and focus cybersecurity efforts. Among these are a revised Department Cyber Strategy, a Cybersecurity Campaign memo, cybersecurity execute orders, a Department Cybersecurity Scorecard, and Cybersecurity Discipline Implementation Plan.

The committee also recognizes that it has been 6 years since U.S. Cyber Command became fully operational, and that the effectiveness of the dual-hat relationship between the director of the National Security Agency and the commander of United States Cyber Command has been a matter of concern. The committee believes that the right balance of effective management, tone established at the top, and Department-wide commitment to defense cybersecurity matters is vital to ensuring success in the Department's cyber efforts. Prior assessments by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) have highlighted management weaknesses across the Department, and made recommendations that could improve the Department's cybersecurity posture.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess the Department of Defense's management and measurement of progress in protecting its own networks, systems, and information, and to provide a report on the findings to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by April 15, 2017. The assessment should address the following:

(1) What are the benefits and drawbacks of maintaining a dual-hat relationship between the director of the National Security Agency and the commander of U.S. Cyber Command, and how is the Defense Department measuring the performance of this relationship?

(2) To what extent has the Department made progress in implementing key cybersecurity guidance, such as the Defense Cyber Strategy, the Cybersecurity Campaign, and the Cybersecurity Scorecard?

(3) A review of the extent to which the Department has implemented Government Accountability Office recommendations from the reports titled "Management Improvements Needed to Enhance Programs Protecting the Defense Industrial Base from Cyber

Threats" (GAO–12–762SU), and "Defense Cyber Security: Opportunities Exist for DOD to Share Cybersecurity Resources with Small Business" (GAO–15–777).

(4) To what extent has the Department implemented recommendations from GAO assessments of the Department's management of cybersecurity issues?

(5) Any other matters the Comptroller General determines are relevant.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by March 1, 2017, on the Comptroller General's preliminary findings.

Comptroller General Review of Software-Intensive Space Acquisition Programs

Given the importance of space acquisition programs to national security, as well as the technical complexity, large investments, and increasing cyber threats, it is imperative that Department of Defense's space acquisitions incorporate leading government and industry practices in order to develop robust systems that meet warfighter needs on a timely basis. The delays, including urgently needed capabilities being years behind schedule, and cost growth in acquiring software-intensive, cyber-hardened, military space systems, such as the Global Positioning System Next Generation Operational Control System (OCX) and the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System (JMS), may indicate that the Department's acquisition policies, processes, and oversight are not adequately structured to deliver critical capabilities in a timely and cost effective manner.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the Department's software-intensive military space system acquisitions. The committee further directs the Comptroller General to deliver a report of the review to the congressional defense committees by July 1, 2017. The review should address the extent to which the Department:

(1) Aligns software development efforts for space systems with systems engineering and acquisition decision-making processes;

(2) Understands, establishes, implements, and properly manages changes in a consistent manner for cybersecurity requirements for space systems;

(3) Applies applicable industry best practices;

(4) Has appropriately trained technical personnel managing and supporting these software-intensive activities;

(5) Appropriately leverages independent review teams.

The Comptroller General may include any other applicable items and shall offer recommendations as appropriate.

Comptroller General Review of the Space Acquisition Workforce

The committee is aware that many Department of Defense military space system acquisition efforts continue to experience significant cost, schedule, and performance challenges. Given the technical complexity and billions of dollars of investment these efforts involve, it is imperative that acquisition program offices have adequate numbers of personnel, from program managers and systems

engineers to contracting officers and cost estimators, with the right mix of skills and abilities to effectively manage these efforts.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the state of the Department's military space system acquisition workforce. This review is not intended to include the space acquisition workforce of the National Reconnaissance Office. The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a report to the congressional defense committees by February 1, 2017, on the review, including any recommendations as appropriate that would help ensure the Department is well-positioned to manage its space acquisitions with better results. The review should include consideration for the numbers and types of personnel positions authorized; the extent to which the positions have been filled; the expertise level of the military and civilian personnel such as seniority, experience, training, technical knowledge, and length of tenure; opportunities for personal training and development; and the extent to which federally funded research and development centers and support contractors are relied upon to provide program office expertise and continuity of knowledge.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive study on acquisition manager career paths. The committee expects the Comptroller General to ensure the studies are conducted in complementary manner.

Confidence-Building Measures Related to Conventional Prompt Global Strike Capabilities

The former commander of U.S. Strategic Command stated during a December 8, 2015, House Armed Services Committee Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing that "I believe any steps (diplomatic or military-to-military) we can take with adversaries or potential adversaries that allow us to better understand intentions, motivations, capabilities and decision-making processes will help build confidence" and "regarding CPGS (conventional prompt global strike) specifically, I believe it is important to build confidence around capabilities, numbers, and the attributes that would clearly separate these weapons from nuclear weapons."

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by December 15, 2016, describing any reciprocal confidence-building measures (CBM) that are appropriate should the United States deploy a conventional prompt global strike capability (CPGS) including:

(1) How they would address potential risks such as warhead ambiguity, destination ambiguity, or survivability of strategic nuclear forces, and an assessment of whether the Department of Defense is concerned about these issues;

(2) Whether measures such as reciprocal notifications of a launch of a CPGS weapon, reciprocal inspections, joint studies on the implications of CPGS capabilities for warhead ambiguity, destination ambiguity, or survivability of strategic nuclear forces, and information exchanges on types of CPGS capabilities would be considered, and an explanation as to why or why not;

(3) How and if any potential CBMs would vary depending on the delivery vehicles (land- or sea-based), and flight path (i.e., boost-glide, ballistic, or other);

(4) His assessment of whether any state that is developing similar capability is considering such CBMs; and

(5) Whether such state is developing conventional or nuclear CPGS, and any specific issues that raises for U.S. detection and defense against such systems.

Contribution of AN/TPY–2 Radars

The committee notes the increased level of ballistic missile activity by countries like the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Islamic Republic of Iran. The committee also notes the important contribution of the Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance (AN/TPY–2), including those deployed in forward-based mode (FBM), to improve early detection and cuing capabilities to defend against these evolving threats and to contribute to the protection of U.S. personnel, allies, and partners.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by February 15, 2017, on requirements of the combatant commands for additional AN/TPY–2 radars in FBM, if any; combatant command requirements for additional Terminal High Altitude Area Defense batteries, and such radars, beyond those in the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) budget plans.

The committee also directs the Director of the MDA to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by February 15, 2017, on any known obsolescence issues, modernization opportunities, requirements to ensure the capability of the radar industrial base, options to leverage Foreign Military Sales for the same, and any plans to provide additional forward-deployed TPY–2 radars to meet increased combatant commander requirements, if any, along with projected costs of such additional radar procurements.

The briefing by the Director should also include his evaluation of the feasibility and operational utility of operationalizing the AN/TPY–2 radar already stationed at the Pacific Missile Range Facility to add ballistic missile sensor capability for the defense of Hawaii until the MDA deploys a permanent sensor with increased capability to address increasing threats. The briefing should include any costs and enhancements to counter electronic attack and advanced jamming he believes are necessary.

Cyber Hardening Through Program Sustainment

The committee is aware of the ongoing efforts to harden our major weapon systems against cybersecurity threats. The committee understands that for many systems, it will be necessary to address those threats after the system has been deployed and in sustainment. The committee is concerned that the current funding and execution processes for modernization and sustainment are not well synchronized, leading to gaps in our ability to address some of these problems. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should examine using existing cycles for software block up-

grades or replacement of obsolete electronic systems as a way to cost effectively harden our more vulnerable platforms, such as aircraft, ships, submarines and other vehicles. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 16, 2017, on how to implement a pilot to cyber harden existing programs through sustainment activities in fiscal year 2018. This briefing should identify a subset of programs to examine, as well as an estimate of both resources and time needed to carry out such efforts.

Cyber Training Equivalency

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is in the process of rapidly expanding the cyber workforce in order to man the 133 teams of the cyber mission force. As articulated by the Commander of U.S. Cyber Command, the committee recognizes that a significant bottleneck in that process is the training pipeline. The committee believes that the Department should be looking for opportunities to help diversify the training pathways available to all members of the cyber mission team workforce, in order to more quickly and efficiently bring team members up to operational capacity. The committee believes that diversification can take many forms, such as utilization of Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) courses, military academies, public-private partnerships with universities and other training providers, and senior leader military academies. The committee also recognizes that the National Security Agency and the Department of Homeland Security National Centers of Academic Excellence (CAE) for cyber defense and cyber operations could also be leveraged to promote higher education and research in cyber and the production of more cyber professionals. The committee also believes that to make those other training pathways effective, the Department needs to have a robust process for determining equivalency, so that it is clear when those other avenues can be used to meet the currently defined joint training standard, such as CAEs, ROTC program or other certification programs. The committee is concerned that the immaturity of that equivalency process may be further slowing up the training pipeline.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 30, 2017, on the training equivalency process for the Department. This briefing should address how the Department makes recommendations on equivalency for members of the active and reserve components, as well as for civilian team members. Specifically, this briefing should include:

(1) What is the decision making chain for making equivalency decisions?

(2) How does the Department communicate standardized courses that are eligible for equivalency?

(3) When equivalency is denied, what is the feedback loop to communicate those decisions back to affected personnel?

(4) What is the process for remediation for service members to determine what actions might be taken to gain equivalency certification?

Department of Defense Equities on Approval of the Galileo Positioning, Navigation, and Timing System

The committee is aware that the National Space Policy of the United States of America directed the United States to "engage with foreign GNSS [global navigation satellite system] providers to encourage compatibility and interoperability, promote transparency in civil service provision, and enable market access for U.S. industry."

The committee is also aware that the European Commission has requested the approval of its Galileo GNSS system by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in October of 2013. The committee believes approval of such an allied positioning, navigation, and timing system could meet important national security goals, including the goals outlined in the National Space Policy. The committee is also aware that the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) has concluded that the Galileo system and the European Commission request "meets the criteria NTIA previously established to grant the waiver."

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than July 1, 2016, outlining the national security benefits that the Department of Defense would expect to derive from a decision by the FCC to approve the European Commission request for the Galileo GNSS system and any other matters they deem relevant.

Department of Defense Requirements for National Reconnaissance Office Programs

The committee is aware that the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) provides critical support to both the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community. As the NRO develops acquisition programs, it works to meet the necessary national security requirements while appropriately balancing cost and schedule constraints. The committee believes that when NRO programs are being established or modified, the Department of Defense, along with other national security customers, should clearly articulate their requirements. The committee is concerned that the Department's process for identifying and articulating its priority intelligence requirements to the NRO, and the Intelligence Community functional managers, is not well defined or done in a timely manner.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, jointly with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence by December 1, 2016, on the process to assess, identify, and prioritize in a timely manner Department of Defense requirements to inform NRO programs, as well as identification of specific upcoming programs and milestones that will go through such process.

Ensuring Robust Missile Defense for Hawaii

The committee notes with concern the rapid expansion of missile development and testing by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK). The committee notes the DPRK's multiple tests in the past six months of long-range missiles and engines, all of which

violate international sanctions and continue to threaten the United States. The committee recognizes the Missile Defense Agency's focus on ensuring the state of Hawaii is fully protected from missile threats in the Asia Pacific. The committee notes the plan the Agency submitted to this committee on fielding a medium-range discrimination radar to enhance discrimination capability in Hawaii. The committee continues to remain concerned, however, about the pace of deploying those systems, in light of the increasing threat.

Therefore, the committee directs the Missile Defense Agency to brief the House Committee on Armed Services no later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the Agency's plan to enhance missile defense in Hawaii, such that the defense continues to keep pace with the threat.

Ensuring Technical Expertise for Sustainment of the Nuclear Command and Control System

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense's recent attention on modernization of the nation's nuclear command and control (NC2) system. The committee supports this modernization effort and believes the credibility of the nation's nuclear deterrent is only as robust as the NC2 system upon which it relies.

During its oversight, it has come to the committee's attention that many of the agencies responsible for parts of the disparate NC2 system are encountering similar difficulties in attracting, hiring, and retaining highly skilled technical personnel to steward the NC2 system into the future. The ability of these organizations to quickly hire and appropriately compensate civilian employees to carry out the systems engineering and other complex tasks required within the NC2 system is exacerbated by the highly classified and highly technical nature of the work, as well as Federal employment structures. The committee believes the Department must coordinate across organizational stovepipes and seek creative solutions to this problem.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System established by section 171a of title 10, United States Code, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by December 1, 2016, regarding a pilot program for improving the ability of all organizations with NC2 responsibilities within the Department to attract, hire, retain, and compensate highly skilled technical personnel to support NC2 modernization efforts. Such briefing should include efforts by the Department to work with or support university programs that could develop necessary skills and provide a student pipeline in critical areas.

Evaluation of Department of Defense Use of Non-Allied Global Navigation Satellite Systems

The committee is concerned about the potential reliance of the Department of Defense on non-allied positioning, navigation, and timing systems, and systems that use such systems. Therefore, elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would prohibit the use of such systems starting in fiscal year 2017 and would require the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint

Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of National Intelligence to submit an assessment of the risks of using such systems to certain congressional committees. In order to further inform the committee's position on this matter, the committee directs the Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than July 1, 2016, on the extent to which the Department uses either the Russian Federation's Glonass or the People's Republic of China's Beidou Global Navigation Satellite System or telecommunications systems that rely on them, and potential impacts of prohibiting use of such systems.

Excess Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Motor Certification

The committee notes that the Air Force Rocket System Launch Program currently certifies excess intercontinental ballistic missile motors for 12 months for use by the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies for launch activities. The committee is aware that this length of time may not be enough, especially when launches are delayed. Therefore, the committee encourages the Air Force to examine other possibilities for certification that would increase the length of time to at least 24 months.

Expeditionary Large Data Object Repository for Analytics in Deployed Operations

The committee supports the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency program called Expeditionary Large Data Object Repository for Analytics in Deployed Operations (ELDORADO). The committee is aware that this is a capability designed to gather, analyze, manage, and store large amounts of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) data from remote sources in order to, among other objectives, facilitate rapid access to theater and continental United States analysts, while at the same time reducing storage and analytical access costs. The committee is aware that there may be opportunities to establish additional nodes in the continental United States to ensure that large data objects are readily available to analysts to improve the intelligence analysis and exploitation for the warfighter.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by December 1, 2016, on the costs, value, and impacts to the Department of Defense and Intelligence Community of establishing home nodes for ELDORADO at existing facilities in the continental United States that are co-located with complementary ISR exploitation and analysis missions, such as the services' intelligence centers.

Ground Based Strategic Deterrent

As the Air Force moves into the technology maturation and risk reduction (TMRR) phase of the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) program in fiscal year 2017, the committee continues its oversight of this important program to recapitalize a leg of the nation's nuclear triad. The committee believes the decision by the Air

Force and the Department of Defense to consolidate the missile flight system and related ground-based infrastructure and equipment into a single integrated "weapon system" is the correct decision and will facilitate both acquisition and long-term sustainment of the components that comprise and enable the intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) capability. However, the committee cautions that the complexity, challenge, importance, cost, and visibility of the combined GBSD program is significant and expects the Air Force to provide it the leadership attention and general officer-level program management it therefore requires.

The committee understands and appreciates the Air Force's decision to award two TMRR contracts to develop preliminary designs, mature technologies, and reduce risk for the GBSD program. As it has expressed in the past, the committee expects the Air Force to carefully consider the impacts of the GBSD program and its acquisition strategy on the industrial base for subsystems and components through the TMRR phase and beyond. In particular, due to the volume of rocket motors likely to be procured, the Air Force's acquisition strategy for GBSD will have lasting impacts on the health and vitality of this key element of the U.S. industrial base. Full and open competition will help ensure innovation, cost efficiency, and contractor performance.

Finally, while the committee supports the GBSD program and efforts to recapitalize the full triad, the committee believes the Air Force, U.S. Strategic Command, and the Department of Defense in general must provide Congress and the public improved information and transparency regarding why it is pursuing GBSD. To ensure sustained congressional and public support for this important program, the Department must, to the extent possible without compromising national security, be transparent in the requirements for GBSD, what factors are driving those requirements, and why it has decided development and acquisition of a new ICBM system is required.

To enable its continued oversight, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2016, on the GBSD program. Such report should include the following:

(1) The results of the analysis of alternatives (AOA) on GBSD, in particular cost and effectiveness comparisons of various options including life extension or upgrading of the Minuteman III system until 2045 and the implications for test assets;

(2) The costs associated with sustaining Minuteman III until the GBSD system is deployed;

(3) The military requirements for GBSD and the rationale and drivers for those requirements, including how those requirements have changed from those of Minuteman III and the ability of various options considered within the AOA to meet those requirements;

(4) The Air Force's acquisition strategy and contract structure for GBSD, including how it expects to manage industrial base risks throughout the program; and

(5) The incremental cost associated with missile designs which include the flexibility to develop mobile variants, as well as the

strategic doctrine which will inform an eventual decision on whether to include mobility requirements in a future procurement.

Host Based Security System Best Practices

The committee is aware that the Host Based Security System (HBSS) has become an increasingly effective tool to manage the cyber defense of the Department of Defense. HBSS is a capability that monitors, detects, and counters known cyber threats to the Department, and includes commercially available intrusion detection and firewall capabilities.

The committee notes that in recent cyber exercises conducted by United States Cyber Command, HBSS has been the primary warfighting system for cyber defenders. However, the committee is also aware from after action reviews and discussions with senior leaders from the military departments and Cyber Command, that the results from the various teams are uneven, in terms of how well they employ HBSS in these exercises. While some variation in learning and execution can be useful, the committee believes that the military services should be learning and implementing best practices to improve how HBSS is used.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer, in coordination the military departments and the Defense Information Systems Agency, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by August 1, 2017, on the best practices and lessons learned for use and configuration for the Host Based Security System. This briefing should include:

(1) Recommendations for configurations or implementations that have proven successful in recent training exercises where HBSS is used, as well as from real-world operational experiences with HBSS;

(2) Identification of opportunities to better leverage capabilities inherent in the current technology solution, such as digital rights management, including scenario development for how such tools might be used in future exercises; and

(3) Identification of gaps from the operational community that might be found in other commercially available tools that could potentially be integrated into future generations of HBSS or follow-on programs.

Hosted Payloads

The committee believes that the Department of Defense may not be fully taking advantage of opportunities to reduce the government's cost to launch and operate satellites for defense purposes. Hosted payloads and ride sharing are two options which can reduce government launch costs while providing the Department with the ability to more rapidly procure additional capacity. The committee supports the Air Force efforts in establishing the Hosted Payloads Solutions (HoPS) standardized and streamlined contract vehicle for qualified commercial space companies to provide hosting services.

The committee believes that a more deliberate consideration for the use of hosted payloads could better leverage available commercial capabilities, particularly through the HoPS program. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Air Force to ensure that any future analysis of alternatives for space capabilities includes hosted

payloads and commercial services as options to satisfy mission requirements. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, on the plan to include hosted payloads as an option to consider in future analyses of alternatives, and the standards and any other requirements necessary for new entrants to qualify for HoPS program certification.

Improving Intelligence Support to Acquisition

The committee is aware that the Department has begun to implement a new integrated defense intelligence priorities (IDIP) process, as directed by section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). The committee is encouraged by the level of effort invested in ensuring this process is in concert with the National Intelligence Priorities Framework, while also highlighting areas of specific interest to defense intelligence consumers.

The committee believes the new IDIP emphasis is a good step, especially in identifying areas needing renewed emphasis. One area that this process has identified that has atrophied recently is intelligence support to acquisition. The committee supports the Department's renewed focus, but believes more work needs to be done to take into consideration emerging areas of emphasis. For example, IDIP needs to be more responsive to addressing intelligence questions surrounding the third offset strategy. IDIP could also be helpful in better characterizing areas of concern, such as how well the Department is doing in protecting unclassified controlled technical information.

The committee is also aware that the Department has provided substantial new resources to increase intelligence support to acquisition programs. The committee supports the Department's decision, but cautions against growing management or support personnel in the process. The committee believes the focus should be on providing dedicated analytical personnel, and when possible, embedding such personnel within acquisition programs to provide the widest benefit to the affected community, in addition to educating program management personnel on the importance of intelligence to acquisition strategy and programs.

Improving Sea-Based X Band Radar

The committee recognizes the importance of the tracking and discrimination capabilities that the Sea-Based X–Band (SBX) radar contributes to the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS), particularly for the protection of the U.S. homeland.

The committee is aware that the platform has been under-utilized and encourages the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to more fully employ the SBX to address increasing threats and provide support to a greater number ongoing operations and testing events, if required and cost-effective. Further the committee understands that for what could be a small investment in software updates and technology refresh, the SBX could provide a more robust sensor capability for homeland defense.

Therefore the committee directs the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than January 15, 2017, on MDA's historical utilization rates for SBX; the requirements, if any, for increased operational availability, and resultant costs of such increase; and hardware and or software improvements MDA may pursue to address obsolescence and modernization needs of the SBX, and to obtain enhanced sensor capability (and costs and schedule for such improvements) to address warfighter requirements, if any.

Information Assurance of Joint Test and Evaluation Activities

The committee recognizes that information assurance policies continue to be disjointed, often redundant, and overly complex and cumbersome. That problem is highlighted by how those challenges manifest in the joint test and evaluation (T&E) community. As noted elsewhere in this report, joint programs can be especially complex, and thus substantially more difficult to manage. When network information assurance policies from the various military departments are included in that mix, it often results in unnecessary program delays and bureaucratic red tape. The lack of clear guidance or reciprocity for information assurance policies is a significant factor in this problem.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Department of Defense Chief Management Officer, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by January 13, 2017, assessing the policies and processes for coordinating information assurance policies on test and evaluation facilities when conducting joint or multiservice T&E activities. The briefing should also make recommendations for improving reciprocity or prioritization of interagency policies related to T&E facilities when conducting joint or multiservice activities.

Insider Threat Capabilities for the Joint Information Environment

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is continuing to implement an initiative known as the Joint Information Environment (JIE) that is intended to streamline, standardize, and modernize the information network of the Department and the military services. A key part of the strategy to implement JIE is development of a single security architecture that will improve network monitoring and defense of the JIE.

The committee notes that the primary focus of network monitoring and defense has been on external threats to the network. However, the committee is concerned about the threat from insiders, as well as the ability for adversaries to move laterally within a network once they have penetrated barrier defenses. Historically, the tools used to monitor those exterior threats do not provide good defenses against insiders or lateral movements within a network. Where the Department has been focused on insider threats, the committee is concerned that those recommendations have been focused on procedural changes that are not connected to the capabilities, or the capability needs, for network tools and digital rights management.

Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense Chief Information Officer, in coordination with the Director of the Defense Information Systems Agency, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on how insider threat capabilities are planned to be integrated into the JIE. This briefing should address those tools currently planned for incorporation, like digital rights management, as well as identification of any gaps in the architecture where commercial tools for insider threat monitoring might be included into JIE, or into upgrades to key enabling capabilities like the Joint Regional Security Stacks or the Host Based Security System.

Integrated Department of Defense Intelligence Priorities

The committee is aware that the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence has published official guidance on the Integrated Department of Defense Intelligence Priorities (IDIP) in accordance with section 922 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). The committee supports these efforts to establish policy which assigns roles and responsibilities, and provides procedures for internal coordination of intelligence priorities of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the combatant commands, and the military departments to improve the identification of the intelligence needs of the Department. Further, the committee is aware that the IDIP is in its initial stages of execution and the Under Secretary has yet to publish the first official priorities document.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense by November 1, 2016, on the status of the implementation of the IDIP guidance, to include identification of any consolidated defense intelligence priorities and the utility of such coordinated activities.

Intelligence Analysis Processes of the Combatant Commands

The House Committee on Armed Services, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense established a Joint Task Force to investigate allegations that senior intelligence leaders at U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) improperly influenced intelligence analysis. The Task Force has found that CENTCOM personnel have stated that they follow Intelligence Community Directives (ICD) and Defense Intelligence Agency tradecraft notes; however, there are no additional instructions, directives, policies, or other forms of documentation to apply those policies to internal CENTCOM practices. The Task Force has also found indications that, since early 2015, senior leadership within the CENTCOM intelligence directorate have implemented various process and organizational changes without formal documentation, leading to confusion and uncertainty within the intelligence workforce regarding roles and responsibilities for analytic review of intelligence products.

The committee directs the Commander of U.S. Central Command to formally review and document all necessary processes, policies, instructions, and procedures to ensure effective implementation

and governance within CENTCOM of ICD 203, Analytic Standards; ICD 206, Sourcing Requirements for Disseminated Analytic Products; ICD 208, Write for Maximum Utility; and other Intelligence Community tradecraft requirements and best practices. The committee also directs the Inspector General of the Defense Intelligence Agency to provide in writing by October 1, 2016, a report to the congressional defense committees and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence showing the extent to which policies have been established within the CENTCOM intelligence directorate to ensure compliance with analytic integrity requirements and best practices.

The committee is also concerned that other U.S. combatant commands may lack similar intelligence documentation processes. Therefore, the committee also directs the Inspector General of the Defense Intelligence Agency to provide a report to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by October 1, 2016, on the extent to which each U.S. combatant command has established the necessary processes, policies, instructions, and procedures to ensure compliance with intelligence analytic integrity requirements and best practices.

Interagency Collaboration on Physical Security for Nuclear Weapons

The committee continues to believe that the Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration can better leverage expertise, resources, and lessons learned between themselves to more effectively and efficiently safeguard the nation's nuclear weapons. The successful development and use of the Joint Integrated Lifecycle Surety (JILS) analysis and decision-support tool is one recent example of successful interagency efforts to understand and improve nuclear weapons security. The committee believes much more can and should be done to enhance collaboration on security across the two agencies to drive down costs and improve effectiveness.

Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security, in coordination with the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by November 30, 2016, on specific collaborative opportunities and joint actions they will carry out to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of providing security for nuclear weapons and defense nuclear facilities. The opportunities and actions should include:

(1) Comprehensive examination and cross-walking of security policies, processes, and procedures to seek harmonization and share lessons learned where appropriate, including with regard to insider threat mitigation and security infrastructure sustainment and recapitalization planning;

(2) Joint development or adoption of analysis, training, or testing tools and methods;

(3) Implementation of common standards and processes for each organization to utilize physical security technology tested and approved for general use in nuclear weapon security environments;

(4) Joint development, testing, and procurement of security technologies and equipment;

(5) Implementation of a shared interagency program for conducting force-on-force exercises; and

(6) Such other opportunities or actions that the Administrator or the Chairman determine appropriate.

Intermediate-Range Ground-Launched Missiles

The committee is concerned that strategic competitors have fielded large numbers of theater ballistic missiles and ground-launched land-attack cruise missiles. The People's Liberation Army (PLA) of the People's Republic of China (PRC), in particular, possesses a large and growing inventory of these long-range ground-launched weapons that enables the PRC to hold targets at risk throughout a broad expanse of the Western Pacific. The PRC's possession of these missiles compels the United States and its allies and partners to confront the prospect that the PLA could strike a large set of targets with high value, including critical bases and infrastructure, with very little warning. The committee notes that the PRC's possession of these missile capabilities has resulted in the United States and its partners devoting a great deal of energy and resources to ballistic and cruise missile defense.

The committee notes that the United States, by contrast, is prohibited from fielding such systems by the 1987 Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty with the Russian Federation and several other former Soviet Republics, which prohibits the parties from fielding surface-to-surface ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers (330–3,400 miles). The committee also notes that prior to the ratification of this treaty, the U.S. military possessed two medium-range surface-to-surface missile systems: the Army's MGM–31 Pershing II medium range ballistic missile (MRBM), and the Air Force's BGM–109G Gryphon ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM), a variant of the Navy's ship-launched Tomahawk.

The committee is interested in ascertaining whether conventional land-based surface-to-surface missiles would have military value to the United States, or to its allies, as a means of promptly striking time-sensitive and other high-value targets, as well as denying enemy use of adjacent waters. The committee believes that the possession of such capabilities by the United States could impose upon potential aggressors defensive costs, including those associated with developing and deploying ballistic and cruise missile defenses and suppressing and deterring missile launch, thereby helping the United States to improve its position in potential long-term military competitions. In addition, while the committee is mindful of the potential implications of these systems for regional stability, the committee also believes that Russian violations of the INF Treaty cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely without implications for the long-term viability of the treaty if only the United States abides by it. Lastly, the committee notes that research and development of such systems is not prohibited by the INF treaty.

The committee therefore directs the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command to conduct a study on the potential military benefits of conventional ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers and to provide the results to the congressional defense com-

mittees by not later than April 1, 2017. Such study shall address the following:

(1) Whether such systems could contribute to more effective offense and defense, assurance and deterrence, against major powers in Europe, the Middle East and in the Western Pacific, including by evaluating the roles that medium- and intermediate-range ground-launched fires played prior to U.S. ratification of the INF treaty;

(2) The role of such systems in land-attack (including left-of-launch ballistic and cruise missile defense) and anti-ship capability;

(3) How such systems could contribute to "cross-domain operations'" as described in the U.S. Army Operating Concept (TRADOC Pam 525–3–1): "Future Army forces will support Joint Force freedom of movement and action through the projection of power from land across the maritime, air, space, and cyberspace domains."

(4) The estimated cost of developing and procuring such systems.

(5) The potential force structure that would be required to deploy such systems, with and without long-range fires being strictly associated with ground maneuver units; and

(6) The relative costs and benefits of potential INF-compliant long-range strike systems, such as boost-glide weapons, in comparison to systems prohibited by the INF Treaty.

The committee further directs that this study shall be resource-unconstrained and should not assume that resources would be provided at the expense of current or projected total obligation authority for the U.S. Army. The Commander shall submit this report in unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary.

The committee notes that elsewhere in this Act, it recommends an increase in resources for the conventional prompt global strike development program, and it recommends a legislative provision regarding potential near-term limited operational capability for a conventional prompt strike system.

The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to submit any views he may have on the report submitted by the Commander of TRADOC, separately, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 30 days after the Commander has submitted his views to such committees. The Secretary should include such matters relating to the Commander's report that he deems appropriate. Such views should be submitted in unclassified form, with a classified annex if necessary.

JLENS Redeployment

The committee is aware that on March 19, 2015, the Commander of U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) testified at the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces that, "Russia is progressing toward its goal of deploying long-range, conventionally-armed cruise missiles with ever increasing stand-off launch distances on its heavy bombers, submarines, and surface combatants, augmenting the Kremlin's toolkit of flexible deterrent options short of the nuclear threshold" and that "[s]hould these trends continue, over time NORAD will face increased risk in our ability to defend North America against Russian cruise missile threats."

The committee is also aware that the Commander testified on April 14, 2016 that, "[w]e are in the first segment of our three-phase Homeland Defense Design (HDD) effort, which will improve our capability to find, fix, track, target, and engage growing air threats, such as those posed by cruise missiles, low-slow aircraft, and long-range aviation. In this first phase, we are testing and evaluating advanced sensors as well as integrated command and control capabilities. In addition to the new Stateside Affordable Radar System (STARS), we had begun a three-year operational exercise of the Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor System (JLENS)."

The committee notes the U.S. Army terminated procurement of JLENS in 2011. The committee does not support restarting this program of record. However, the committee notes that the research, development, testing, and evaluation of JLENs resulted in the acquisition of two JLENs systems consisting of two aerostats per system. The exercise supported by the Commander of NORTHCOM is therefore only using equipment that the United States already owns.

The committee believes the defense of the national capital region and the mid-Atlantic region, as part of the broader defense of the homeland, is critical to national security in view of the emerging threats posed by Russia and other states.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Northern Command, and any appropriate Department of Defense officials, to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on his recommendations for the optimal manner to complete the first phase of Homeland Defense Design effort. Such report should include the following elements:

(1) The ideal location to which existing JLENS systems could be deployed for the defense of the National Capitol and mid-Atlantic region, and a schedule and detailed estimate of the costs to relocate the system to that location;

(2) Any issues, including airspace closures, that would have to be coordinated with other U.S. government agencies, and a plan to do so, as part of the relocation of JLENS (noting its direction in House Committee Report 113–446, which accompanied H.R. 4435, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015);

(3) An assessment of the impact to the Homeland Defense Design of a failure to complete the first phase, including the operational exercise involving JLENs.

The committee notes that, elsewhere in this Act, it has recommended continuing funding for JLENS operations to support the relocation of JLENS to another site.

Joint Interagency Combined Space Operations Center

The Joint Interagency Combined Space Operations Center (JICSpOC) is a joint Department of Defense and Intelligence Community activity to facilitate information sharing and data fusion to develop, test, validate, and integrate new space system tactics, techniques, and procedures for national security space systems. The committee supports the integrated interagency efforts to protect and defend critical national space capabilities in response to increasing counterspace threats from potential foreign adversaries.

The committee is also aware that the completion of the initial series of experiments is expected by the end of 2016 and there is no defined strategy for the future the JICSpOC or its capabilities. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by January 15, 2017, on the future objectives, strategy, and resources planned for the JICSpOC and how these activities will be complementary or appropriately integrated with U.S. Strategic Command's Joint Space Operations Center and the National Reconnaissance Operations Center. The Secretary shall also review the costs and benefits of maintaining a separate JSpOC and JICSpOC as well as the optimal location to perform the related activities.

Lastly, the committee is aware of the Department of Defense and Intelligence Community's review of the data protection and security classification standards and guidance for commercial space situational awareness and battle management command and control capabilities. The committee further directs the Secretary to address in the aforementioned briefing how this review ensures national security information is protected and how the warfighter will benefit from this commercial capability. The briefing should also include the decision timeline related to the review of the data protection and security classification standards.

Military Space Acquisition Improvements

The committee is aware and concerned with the challenges regarding military space acquisition programs. The committee recognizes the complexity of the space systems being developed and the associated processes in place in order to ensure the warfighter requirements are met and the taxpayers are protected. However, as noted in a statement for the record by a senior official of the U.S. Government Accountability Office to the Senate Committee on Armed Services on March 9, 2016, "Over more than the last 15 years, we have noted—along with congressional committees, and various commissions and reviews—concern about the fragmented nature of DOD's space system acquisition processes and acquisition oversight," and further that, "it is clear that more needs to be done to improve the management of space acquisitions."

The committee believes there are multiple aspects of military space acquisition reform that need further review and improvement, to include: oversight and decision making authority; requirements development; funding and independent cost estimates; leadership, staffing, and culture; and acquisition strategy development to include analysis of alternatives and technology insertion planning.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of the Space and Missiles Systems Center to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2016, on the challenges of the military space acquisition process and opportunities for improvement. As part of the briefing, the Commander shall also address the feasibility, and, if applicable, the necessary elements of establishing a pilot program to improve the agility and effectiveness of the military space acquisition process.

The committee notes that the Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, in coordination with the Assistant Director of National Intelligence for Systems and Resource Analyses, is reviewing the acquisition practices for national security space programs of the Department of Defense consistent with the direction in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. The committee is aware that the review is ongoing, and expects the Commander of the Space and Missile Systems Center will take into account the findings and recommendations of such review.

Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network

The Air Force's Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN) program is developing and procuring new equipment to improve the nuclear command and control system within the United States. Within the umbrella of MEECN, efforts include upgrades to Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) capability for intercontinental ballistic missile launch control centers and command posts as well as improved very low frequency or low frequency capability for airborne and ground nodes of the nuclear command and control system.

While MEECN is appropriately focused on systems within the United States, the committee is aware of the need to recapitalize portions of the nuclear command and control system that are located outside the United States within geographic combatant commands. The committee believes an opportunity may exist to leverage MEECN technologies and programs to accelerate this recapitalization. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command and the commanders of appropriate geographic combatant commands, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by September 1, 2016, on potential application of MEECN technologies and programs to nuclear command and control nodes outside the United States.

Modernizing the Ballistic Missile Defense System

The committee is concerned that the budget request for fiscal year 2017 represents a 10 percent decrease in funding for the Missile Defense Agency as compared to the final appropriation for missile defense in fiscal year 2016. The committee understands that this decrease in funding was the result of how the Department of Defense decided to allocate budget reductions to meet the defense budget caps enacted by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–72). The committee also notes that the budget request for fiscal year 2017 is $300.0 million less than was projected in the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) that was submitted along with the budget request for fiscal year 2016.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends a series of budget increases for the Missile Defense Agency budget for fiscal year 2017, to a level in excess of what was projected for fiscal year 2017 in the FYDP submitted with the fiscal year 2016 budget request. The committee intends these recommended budget increases

to help to restore the focus of the agency on research and development of ballistic missile defense capability.

Accelerating development of missile defense radars for homeland defense

The budget request included $230.1 million in PE 63884C for Ballistic Missile Defense System Sensors, but contained no funding to support acquisition of a medium-range defense radar and to support implementation of the requirement in section 1684 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

The committee believes an increase in funding for enhancing missile defense of Hawaii is justified in order to ensure that missile defense keeps pace with increasing threats. The committee believes that additional funding can initiate preparations to issue a request for proposal for a medium-range defense radar in Hawaii, and additional radar coverage to defend against threats originating from Southwest Asia, that will improve homeland missile defense.

Therefore, the committee recommends $240.1 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63884C to support acquisition of a medium-range defense radar and to support implementation of the requirement in section 1684 of Public Law 114–92.

Booster upgrades for improved homeland defense interceptor

The budget request for fiscal year 2017 contained $274.2 million in PE 64874C for Improved Homeland Defense Interceptors. Of this amount, $20.8 million was requested for the C3 Booster Development program.

The committee is concerned that the Future Years Defense Program for fiscal year 2017 shifts the development schedule for the C3 booster out in time; the committee understands this was a result of budget reductions at the Missile Defense Agency and a shift in priorities to more quickly fielding the Redesigned Kill Vehicle, consistent with the requirement in section 1682 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

The committee believes that additional funding could accelerate the development and initial fielding of an upgraded Ground-based Interceptor. This acceleration could allow for earlier flight testing and accelerate the initial fielding and replacement of the older Capability Enhancement 1 boosters in fiscal year 2021.

The committee recommends $70.8 million, an increase of $50.0 million, in PE 64874C for the C3 Booster Development program.

Cyber protection improvements to the Ballistic Missile Defense System

The budget request contained $31.2 million in PE 91598C for management headquarters, Missile Defense Agency (MDA), but contained no funding for cyber protection improvements to the Ballistic Missile Defense Program.

The committee believes additional funding could be used to accelerate compliance with the Department of Defense Cybersecurity Campaign and mitigate cybersecurity risks as directed by global, regional, and Department of Defense component authorities. The committee further believes that additional funding could accelerate implementation of additional security controls and provide an inte-

grated active monitoring and reporting capability necessary to protect MDA's mission and test data and assets from both inside and external threats.

The committee recommends $56.2 million, an increase of $25.0 million, in PE 91598C for cyber protection improvements to the Ballistic Missile Defense Program.

Ground system communications and fire control software upgrades to enable full Redesigned Kill Vehicle capabilities

The budget request contained $862.1 million in PE 63882C for Ballistic Missile Defense Midcourse Defense, but contained no funding for ground system communications modernization and fire control software upgrades to enable full Redesigned Kill Vehicle (RKV) capabilities.

The committee understands that the current interceptor in-flight communications system hardware and software cannot support the on-demand communications capabilities currently being designed into the RKV. The committee believes that not only is the development, testing, and deployment of the RKV a critical priority for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), it is further critical that the RKV's full functionality be available when it is deployed.

The committee is also mindful that the Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD) system continues to age and require increased funding for sustainment, and in many cases consists of components that have reached obsolescence, as they can no longer be supported by industry or there are no longer spare components available.

The committee believes MDA needs to be taking steps now to address these modernization, sustainment, and obsolescence issues.

The committee recommends $927.1 million, an increase of $65.0 million, in PE 63882C for ground system communications modernization and fire control software upgrades to enable full Redesigned Kill Vehicle (RKV) capabilities.

Missile defense test ranges

The budget request contained $293.4 million in PE 63914C for ballistic missile defense test activities, but contained no funding to consider the utility of additional test range locations.

The committee is aware that an additional test range could be a benefit to the Missile Defense Agency, including potential sites that have federally licensed national security operational launch capabilities. The committee is aware of potential sites that possess extensive infrastructure and support or have supported U.S. government activities.

The committee recommends $303.4 million, an increase of $10 million, in PE 63914C for test infrastructure to support potential additional Missile Defense Agency test range locations.

Multi-Object Kill Vehicle technology maturation

The budget request contained $71.5 million in PE 64894C for development of the Multi-Object Kill Vehicle (MOKV).

The committee believes an increase in funding is justified in order to ensure that the development of this program is kept on track and meets the requirements set in section 1681 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). The committee believes additional funding can assure

technology maturation and risk reduction for key technologies, including advanced sensors and new propulsion systems critical to enabling a MOKV.

Therefore, the committee recommends $126.5 million, an increase of $55.0 million, in PE 64894C for the Multi-Object Kill Vehicle.

Post-Intercept Assessment acceleration

The budget request contained $439.6 million in PE 63896C for the Ballistic Missile Defense Command and Control, Battle Management and Communication (C2BMC) system, but contained no funding for Post-Intercept Assessment acceleration.

The committee is concerned that the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) will be deploying 22 Space-based Kill Assessment (SKA) sensors in space as hosted payloads, but has not determined how it will integrate these sensors into the Ballistic Missile Defense System. The committee believes that by recommending a funding increase, it can provide MDA with resources to integrate SKA into the C2BMC in its fiscal year 2020 Spiral 8.2–5 deployment.

The committee recommends $449.6 million, an increase of $10.0 million, in PE 63896C for Post-Intercept Assessment acceleration.

Redesigned Kill Vehicle risk reduction

The budget request contained $274.2 million in PE 64874C for improved homeland defense interceptors. Of this amount, $247.1 million was for the Redesigned Kill Vehicle program.

The committee believes a funding increase would allow for the acceleration of system engineering and risk reduction testing to reduce schedule risk for a Redesigned Kill Vehicle (RKV) critical design review in late fiscal year 2017 and the first flight test in fiscal year 2018. As referenced elsewhere in this report, the committee believes the fielding of the RKV, consistent with the requirement in section 1682 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), is a high priority for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system.

The committee recommends $272.1 million, an increase of $25 million, in PE 64874C for the Redesigned Kill Vehicle program.

Next Generation Operational Control Segment

The committee supports the Global Positioning System Next Generation Operational Control Segment (GPS/OCX) program, however, is concerned with the significant technical challenges, cost increases, and schedule delays that the program is experiencing. The committee recognizes the key capabilities that the program is designed to address, including rigorous information assurance requirements to ensure the ground system is secure from adversary threats; ground control for the GPS block III satellites; and ground control of the enhanced anti-jam military code signal. The committee supports the Department of Defense's close oversight to minimize further cost growth and schedule delays. The committee believes that the Secretary of the Air Force should have the appropriate contingency plans and back-up capabilities for the GPS/OCX program in place in the event of further challenges with the GPS/OCX program.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2016, on the contingency plans and capabilities for the GPS/OCX program to ensure that warfighter requirements will be met and the program risk will be appropriately managed.

Nuclear Weapons Security Forces Standards

The committee is aware that, following the Department of Defense's Nuclear Enterprise Review, the Air Force has begun shifting away from the Personnel Reliability Program (PRP) and toward an Arming and Use of Force (AUF) standard for qualifying security personnel responsible for protecting nuclear weapons. The committee is also aware that the Navy has opted to continue utilizing the PRP for its nuclear weapon security personnel. The Air Force has described to the committee why it chose to move to AUF and why it believes the newly enhanced AUF standards and process provide equivalent screening and personnel reliability. The committee notes that the Air Force's transition to AUF has greatly increased the pool of available security personnel qualified to guard nuclear weapons and therefore is concerned that the new AUF standard may not be as rigorous as the former PRP standard. The committee believes that custody and security of nuclear weapons is a special responsibility and requires the highest level of attention and performance. The committee also notes serious lapses in performance in Air Force personnel involved in the nuclear deterrence mission over the past several years.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by February 1, 2017, containing an assessment and comparison of the Air Force's new AUF standard and the PRP. Such assessment should evaluate the similarities and differences between AUF and PRP, the amount of information available under both standards to determine whether security personnel are able to perform their job effectively and reliably, the administrative and other burden on personnel and commanders involved with AUF and PRP, how many additional Air Force personnel became available to guard nuclear weapons under the new standard and why, and the reasons why the Navy continues using PRP and why the Air Force chose to shift to the AUF standard.

Operationally Responsive Space

The budget request contained $7.9 million in PE 64857F for the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program. The committee is pleased to see that funds were requested for the ORS program through the Future Years Defense Program in the fiscal year 2017 budget request; however, the committee believes the level of funding requested is not sufficient to achieve the ORS mission. The committee recognizes that a portion of the ORS activities may be funded through other related program elements, depending on the specific activity.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the

charter of the ORS program. The committee believes that a renewed analysis of the ORS program, in the context of the broader space security and defense activities of the Department of Defense, may offer an opportunity to reinvigorate and refine the activities of the office. The committee believes that a revamped approach to reconstitution could greatly support space architecture resiliency. This would include, as appropriate, small satellites through low-cost responsive launch capabilities and program of record satellite systems through existing launch infrastructure.

Therefore, the committee recommends $27.9 million, an increase of $20.0 million, in PE 64857F for reconstitution and responsive launch activities of the Operationally Responsive Space program.

Plan for Strengthening Outer Space Cooperation With Japan

The committee is aware that the Guidelines for Defense Cooperation between the United States and the Government of Japan issued in April 2015 included important openness to cooperation in several areas, including those utilizing outer space.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, jointly with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees, the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, not later than April 1, 2017, outlining the opportunities to improve U.S.-Japan cooperation in outer space including in maritime domain awareness; counterproliferation; missile warning and missile defense; positioning, navigation, and timing; command, control, and communication; meteorological observation; space situational awareness; and such other matters they deem appropriate.

Propulsion Test Facilities

The committee is aware of the importance of small liquid rocket propulsion for national security applications, including satellites, rockets, and missile defense systems. The committee recognizes that propulsion test facilities are a key industrial base capability that the Department of Defense should closely monitor and provide the appropriate resources to maintain. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Secretary of Defense consider the use of Defense Production Act of 1950 (Public Law 81–774) funding to provide the necessary resources to maintain the key industrial base capabilities related to small liquid rocket propulsion for national security applications.

Quarterly Briefings on Strategic Forces

The committee desires to continue to improve the timing and content of notifications it receives.

Consistent with the direction in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide quarterly briefings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services, starting June 1, 2016, and continuing through September 30, 2017, detailing the following:

(1) Readiness and disposition of ballistic missile defense assets, including interceptors (including Patriot, Terminal High Altitude Area Defense, Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense ships and ashore sites, Army/Navy Transportable Radar Surveillance radars), as well as any matters related to the cybersecurity of the ballistic missile defense system, including data held by contractors who support the same;

(2) Readiness and disposition of assets and personnel in the nuclear triad (including ballistic missile submarines, intercontinental ballistic missiles, nuclear certified heavy bombers, and systems and components of the nuclear command and control system), as well as any matters related to the cybersecurity of these systems, including data held by contractors who support the same, and the results of readiness, security, and surety investigations; and

(3) Readiness of national security space systems of the Department of Defense, as well as any matters related to the cybersecurity of these systems, including data held by contractors who support the same.

Report on Long-Range Standoff Weapon

The committee notes that section 1657 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by March 24, 2016, on the justification for the number of planned nuclear-armed cruise missiles, known as the long-range standoff (LRSO) weapon, that will be acquired. The committee further notes that section 1663 of Public Law 114–92 requires the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by May 31, 2016, on the outcome of the Milestone A decision for the long-range standoff weapon. The committee notes that it has received the report required by section 1657 of Public Law 114–92 and still awaits submission of the report required by section 1663. The committee believes the capability provided by LRSO is important to the long-term credibility of the nation's nuclear deterrent and seeks to ensure the development and acquisition program stays on cost and schedule.

In continuance of its ongoing and robust oversight of this program, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2016, containing additional information with respect to the LRSO program. Such report should include details on the analysis of alternatives that was carried out with respect to LRSO; an assessment of any comparative ability of conventionally armed, long-range cruise missiles to meet deterrence requirements; the military requirements for LRSO and ability for LRSO to hold targets at risk as compared to nuclear gravity bombs and other aspects of the nuclear triad; the capabilities and reliability of LRSO as compared to the current AGM–86 cruise missile; and a description of the number of LRSOs to be procured for operational needs, spares, and test assets and how this compares to the number of AGM–86s originally procured.

Report on Strategic Missile Commonality

The committee continues to support the nuclear triad and the need for modernization of all three legs of the triad, and recognizes and appreciates that the Department of Defense has made clear that nuclear deterrence is the highest priority defense mission for the nation. The committee also recognizes the substantial cumulative cost to accomplish this modernization and continues to seek opportunities to find efficiencies and cost savings when possible, without reducing capability or delaying modernization plans. Therefore, the committee continues to support efforts to pursue appropriate commonality between components and subsystems for the Air Force's and the Navy's strategic missile systems. At the same time, the committee remains mindful of the risks that commonality could introduce if a technical failure in a common component or subsystem led to widespread impacts to two legs of the triad.

Based on the "Report to Congress on Strategic Missile Commonality" submitted in December 2015 as required in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee believes the Air Force and the Navy have identified promising areas for pursuing commonality in their respective programs, but is concerned that the report lacked detail about the systems, subsystems, and components that are being considered. The report also did not include any decisions on the specific common systems, subsystems, or components that would be pursued or timelines for making decisions on commonality. The committee is concerned that decisions on commonality may not be completed in time to inform acquisition cycles, and that without sufficient oversight and encouragement from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and Congress, the services will revert to historical stovepipes and miss the opportunity to inform acquisition strategies.

The committee therefore directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2016, detailing the date by which a decision on incorporating common components and technologies must be made; the Department's plan for incorporating common components and technologies for both strategic systems, including listing which technologies, components, and subsystems are being pursued for commonality and the rationale for each; the potential for near-term and long-term cost savings; how such efforts are being incorporated into program plans, acquisition strategies, and contracts for the Air Force's Ground-based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) program and the Navy's D5 Life Extension Program; if and how the Air Force plans to consider and incorporate potential long-term cost-savings to the Navy in the GBSD contract award criteria; and, how the Air Force and the Navy are measuring and assessing risks of commonality.

Report on Theater Missile Defense Training and Deployment Requirements

The committee understands the continuing strategic importance of Patriot and Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) missile defense systems for U.S. and allied missile defense. As threats

continue to adapt and increase, the committee notes the importance of maintaining these systems and providing adequate training and deployment schedule for the crews. The committee also notes the requirement in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, in which the committee directed the Comptroller General of the United States to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees on:

(1) The current status of the Army's Patriot system performance;

(2) The Army's strategy to upgrade and modernize its Patriot system, as well as other coordinating systems in the Army's Air and Missile Defense, in order to meet combatant commander requirements and address the growing threat;

(3) The effect that Patriot modernization requirements will have on integration and interoperability; and

(4) How well the Army has and is currently providing the training, size, capability, and availability of Patriot operators necessary to meet combatant commander needs and to remain current with the latest modernizations being added to the Patriot system.

The committee notes the on-going work by the Comptroller General on this issue, and recently received the interim briefing on this report and expects to receive the final report in June. The committee continues to be concerned that the deployment schedule for Patriot and THAAD may become unsustainable due to expanding requirements on these units, which are already highly utilized. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department's plans for training and deployment cycles for Patriot and THAAD units and provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than January 15, 2017, on the ability to meet current mission and deployment requirements, as well as the capability and plan to meet potential expanding deployment requirements.

Review of Dual-Hatting Relationship

The committee is aware that U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) was established with an intertwined relationship with the National Security Agency (NSA) to help improve resourcing and decision making in this domain by unifying those organizations. The committee believes that making the Commander of U.S. Cyber Command and the Director of the National Security Agency a single individual made sense in 2010 in order to mature CYBERCOM quickly and prevent duplication of resources or lack of coordination.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee includes a provision that would establish CYBERCOM as a combatant command under the Unified Command Plan. Therefore, the committee believes it is timely to reassess the dual-hat relationship. For example, the committee is concerned that with a dominant focus on cyber activities, other responsibilities of the NSA, such as signals intelligence and communications security, may not be gain adequate focus and attention. The committee is also aware that during the civilian workforce furloughs that took place in 2013 there were impacts on NSA employees supporting CYBERCOM that were not felt by NSA as a whole. The committee is also concerned that proper internal and

external oversight of the two organizations' roles and responsibilities will become increasingly difficult to distinguish and manage the more cyber is operationalized, especially as it pertains to NSA's collection and other activities in support of national and Departmental priorities for foreign intelligence and counterintelligence, and CYBERCOM's intelligence activities to support cyber operations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by November 1, 2016, on a review and assessment of the dual-hat relationship for CYBERCOM. This review should include the following:

(1) Roles and responsibilities, including intelligence authorities, of each organization;

(2) Assessment of the current impact of the dual-hat relationship, including both advantages and disadvantages;

(3) Recommendations on courses of action for separating the dual-hat command relationship between the Commander of CYBERCOM and the Director of the NSA, if appropriate;

(4) Suggested timelines for carrying out such courses of action; and

(5) Recommendations for legislative actions as necessary.

Satellite Ground Control Systems

The committee is aware of the critical role that the Air Force Satellite Control Network (AFSCN) has regarding the command and control of national security space satellites. The Air Force is currently fielding modifications to increase reliability and decrease sustainment costs of the current system. Additionally, the Air Force engaged in a study of the viability of using commercial facilities and operations for the tracking, telemetry and command (TT&C) of government satellites.

Section 822 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) contained a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to develop a long-term plan for satellite ground control systems, including the Air Force Satellite Control Network, and to brief the plan to the congressional defense committees. The committee is aware that due to the breadth of the plan it took additional time to complete; however, the committee has yet to receive the required briefing. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the required briefing no later than July 1, 2016, and also address the viability, costs, benefits, and security considerations of leveraging commercial facilities and operations for the TT&C of government satellites.

Space Defense and Protection

In accordance with section 912 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), the National Research Council (NRC) completed a study in December 2015 and provided findings and recommendations regarding the national security space defense and protection options and strategies to address the near-term and long-term counterspace threats to U.S. space systems.

The committee remains concerned about the growing and serious risk that foreign counterspace threats pose to our national security

posture, and the committee believes the NRC offered useful guidance in addressing this challenge. The committee is also aware of the coordination and interagency work that is progressing to address this new threat, and recognizes the value of ongoing dialogue and updates as policy and acquisition strategies are developed. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees by December 1, 2016, on the perspectives and actions, as applicable, being taken in response to the NRC findings and recommendations.

Space Situational Awareness

The committee believes that improvements to the space surveillance network of the United States are critical. The committee is also aware that the Department of Defense may have the opportunity to increase operational capabilities and cost effectiveness by employing emerging technologies. For instance, the committee understands that ground-based optical systems, currently limited to night-only operations, may be able to be upgraded for daytime operations to provide greater custody of critical space assets. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Secretary of the Air Force review opportunities to incorporate emerging technologies in order to augment, improve, or replace the legacy space surveillance network systems in support of U.S. Strategic Command.

Spaceports

The committee is aware that state-owned spaceports have supported certain national security launch and missile defense activities. The committee believes that these facilities may be able to provide additional flexibility and resilience to the Department of Defense launch infrastructure, particularly as the Department evaluates concepts such as reconstitution of small satellites to address the growing foreign counterspace threat. However, the committee is also aware of the significant cost to maintain and modernize the East and West coast ranges and the priority for the Air Force to maintain those capabilities. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016, on the opportunities to enhance the capability of these state-owned spaceports to support national security.

Strategic Plan for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense established the Defense Insider Threat Management Analysis Center (DITMAC) in order to consolidate and analyze specified defense reporting of potentially adverse information, to include potential insider threat information. Specifically, the DITMAC has the following missions:

(1) Oversee the mitigation of insider threats to defense personnel, infrastructure, and essential national security information resident on defense facilities or networks;

(2) Develop risk thresholds and standards for actions, and compile results to evaluate those actions on threats that insiders may pose to their colleagues, defense missions, and resources;

(3) Establish standards to ensure the Department's Insider Threat Program is compliant with applicable executive orders and regulations;

(4) Fulfill certain requirements of national insider threat policy and minimum standards; and

(5) Promote collaboration and information sharing on insider threats to defense personnel and facilities.

While the DITMAC is a relatively new capability that is still scaling up to conduct its defined missions, the need for a robust insider threat capability is important and will continue to grow in the future. Additionally, with the Department's new responsibilities for developing and sustaining the information technology resources related to personnel security clearances, the DITMAC has the potential to support that mission area as well.

Therefore, the committee directs the Director of the Defense Security Services to develop and submit a strategic plan for the DITMAC to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees, not later than June 1, 2017. This strategic plan should address the needed technical capabilities, such as digital rights management, as well as updated policies, and workforce considerations to adequately execute its missions, and a concept of operations for how the DITMAC might scale if needed to support the personnel security clearance analysis needs of the Department.

Streamlining Missile Defense Oversight

The committee is aware of significant streamlining and staffing reductions underway in the Department of Defense as a result of legislative direction and internal efficiency improvement efforts.

The committee is also aware of the significant staffing and resources oversight in the ballistic missile defense enterprise across the Department, including by U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM), U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM), the Joint Staff, Joint Functional Component Command-Integrated Missile Defense (JFCC–IMD), and the Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Organization (JIAMDO). The committee is also aware that while STRATCOM is the combatant command "owner" of ballistic missile defense under the Unified Command Plan (UCP), it assigns missile defense to other combatant commands for operational purposes. In the case of homeland ballistic missile defense, the committee is not aware of these forces being assigned to an operator other than the commander of NORTHCOM. The committee understands that the assignment of other military forces to combatant commands is ordinarily performed by the Joint Staff as opposed to a specific combatant command. The committee believes this oversight structure and UCP assignment could benefit from a reassessment to ensure the best possible allocation of staffing resources, especially as significant streamlining and staffing reduction efforts are underway.

Therefore, the committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later

than April 1, 2017, on any changes to the UCP regarding ballistic missile defense he deems efficient and expedient, and his assessment of the benefits and costs of the current division of responsibility between the multiplicity of organizations including the combatant commands, the Joint Staff, JFCC–IMD, and JIAMDO. As part of this assessment, the commander of STRATCOM should recommend to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff whether the Joint Forces Component Command (JFCC) structure at his command is the optimal and most efficient structure for division of his varied military responsibilities under the UCP or if there is an alternate structure with as good or greater benefits at reduced cost.

Supply Chain Security of Strategic Capabilities

The committee is aware of the report submitted by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), "DOD Needs to Improve Reporting and Oversight to Reduce Supply Chain Risk," (GAO–16–236) in February 2016. The committee noted the finding that, "DOD contractors rely on thousands of subcontractors and suppliers, including the original component manufacturers that assemble microcircuits and the mid-level manufacturers subcontracted to develop the individual subsystems that make up a complete system or supply."

The committee is concerned that, as a practical matter, it appears that the Department possesses very little real data about the supply chain associated with certain critical systems. It also appears that the Department largely relies on assurances it receives from prime contractors, but oftentimes those prime contractors rely on subcontractors and others for information regarding supply chains and there may be little or no actual data on which to base their assurances to the Department.

Furthermore, the committee is aware that the Department recently promulgated DFARS Subpart 239.73 ("Requirements For Information Relating To Supply Chain Risk"), but the committee is concerned that there has been little practical progress in implementing these regulations. Moreover, even when implemented, an approach that relies primarily (or exclusively) on simply analyzing threat intelligence in Government databases will almost certainly not generate sufficient data about actual hardware and software components and subcomponents necessary to understand critical supply chains.

Therefore, the committee directs the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct an audit to evaluate the supply chain security and assurance of one network or system deemed critical in each of the Missile Defense Agency, Air Force Space Command, the nuclear command and control system, and a delivery system or platform for U.S. nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the committee directs the Inspector General to submit a final report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than May 1, 2017, on the supply chain security and assurance evaluation of such networks or systems. The committee further directs the Inspector General to provide an interim briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than July 1, 2016, on the manner in which it intends to conduct this evaluation. As part of the Inspector General's assessment, the following matters should be addressed:

(1) Does the defense agency or military service responsible for the particular system or network conduct actual forensic evaluations of the supply chain associated with the system or network? Does the agency or service rely on the representations of U.S. suppliers or does it perform independent verification and validation of the source of supply for each critical component and subcomponent of U.S.-branded products or systems?

(2) For software, firmware, and chip design that is deemed by the command or agency to be critical to the reliability and performance of the designated network or system, can the service or agency (or its suppliers) identify by name and nationality the developers involved?

(3) How much diligence has been performed by the service or agency on second- and third-tier suppliers?

Sustainment and Modernization of the Cobra Dane Radar

The committee continues to be concerned about the lack of a plan for the long-term sustainment and modernization of the Cobra Dane radar at Shemya, Alaska, despite its critical role in exclusively meeting certain warfighter requirements.

The Joint Explanatory Statement to Accompany S. 1356, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Committee Print No. 2) directed the Commander of U.S. Northern Command, jointly with the Commander of U.S. Air Force Space Command, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, and the Director of National Intelligence, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees not later than April 1, 2016, on the plan for the Cobra Dane radar and the military requirements it serves and whether those requirements continue to justify a material capability solution. The committee has since received that briefing, and appreciates U.S. Northern Command's timely response.

The committee notes the finding that, "programmed architecture enhancements through 2022 in both SSA [Space Situational Awareness] and BMD [Ballistic Missile Defense] have capability gaps, currently covered by Cobra Dane. Cobra Dane is crucial until all requirements can be fulfilled with system level improvements." However, the committee is also aware that although there is no dispute that increased funding is required to sustain Cobra Dane beyond 2022, the budget request contained no modernization funding for fiscal year 2017, nor was there any in the fiscal year 2016 request.

Therefore, the committee directs the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, jointly with the Commander of U.S. Air Force Space Command, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, and the Commander of U.S. Northern Command, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 1, 2016, on the cost, schedule, and program plans to provide the system-level upgrades for the BMD and SSA architectures to render Cobra Dane no longer needed to meet requirements for BMD and SSA. This briefing should also address the costs (broken out by service or defense agency), schedules, and system and parts obsolescence concerns required to maintain Cobra Dane until the aforementioned system-level upgrades are complete.

Further, the committee expects that the Secretary of Defense will not take irreversible action concerning the Cobra Dane radar without first notifying the congressional defense committees.

Trusted Foundries for Strategic-Hardened Microelectronics

The committee understands that one of the trusted foundries capable of producing strategic-hardened microelectronics for the Department of Defense was sold to a foreign-owned company in 2015. In testimony before the committee on October, 28, 2015, the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manufacturing and Industrial Base Policy expressed concern about the dwindling number of domestic microelectronic manufacturers. In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee noted that the acquisition of the microelectronics fabrication and related intellectual property by a foreign-owned entity creates uncertainty about the Department's future access to strategic-hardened trusted microelectronics and presents risk for the national security programs that rely on these products.

The committee recognizes that the Defense Production Act (DPA) Title III program provides the Department the ability to ensure the availability of domestic production capabilities for certain critical technologies, and that the National Security Space Industrial and Supply Base (NSS ISB) Risk Mitigation Program was developed to formulate a systematic process to fund mitigation efforts and rectify shortcomings in the space and industrial supply base. The committee believes the Department must ensure a continued domestic supply for strategic-hardened and trusted microelectronics and should consider utilizing DPA Title III authorities and the NSS ISB. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by September 1, 2016, containing information on the Secretary's plans to ensure a continued domestic source of strategic-hardened trusted microelectronics and the Secretary's views on using DPA Title III and the NSS ISB for such purposes.

Unified Platform

The committee is aware that U.S. Cyber Command has articulated a priority for a common set of tools and infrastructure needed to support the development of the Cyber Mission Force, to be known as the Unified Platform. The committee recognizes that the manning of 133 cyber mission teams will be the critical underlying capability needed to monitor and defend Department of Defense networks; however, without capable and sufficient equipment for those teams, that investment will reap little reward. The committee is aware that the Air Force has been designated as the executive agent for performing the analysis of alternatives to support a capability trade study for Unified Platform. The committee encourages the Department, in conducting this analysis of alternatives, to look thoroughly at the full range of government developed capabilities to ensure that Unified Platform encapsulates a best of breed of existing systems from the military services and agencies. The committee further encourages the Department to

take a broad look at existing commercial capabilities in the marketplace to integrate and leverage those systems as well in a best-of-breed solution.

Use of Surplus ICBM Motors for Commercial Space Launches

The committee is aware that the Air Force stores and maintains excess intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) assets for limited reuse to support certain Department of Defense and other government agency space launch activities. Section 50134 of title 51, United States Code, provides the guidelines for use of these excess ballistic missile assets.

The committee is aware that Russia has used Russian made excess ICBM motors to support commercial launch missions, including the launching of payloads manufactured in the United States.

The committee believes that modification to the law to allow for increased commercial use of decommissioned U.S. ICBM motors could yield benefits for the U.S. domestic launch industry and payload launching capacity while also saving the U.S. Air Force excess motor storage costs. However, the committee also recognizes concerns regarding unintended negative consequences for the U.S. commercial space industrial base resulting from such a change in policy.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2016, on the range of options and recommendations, if applicable, for modification of the existing policy that would support the national industrial base upon which the Department of Defense relies. In addition, the briefing should include any other implications, savings, and costs of such options. The briefing should also address any requirements for technical data that the Department may require with regard to usage of such excess ballistic missiles.

Additionally, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment, and provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by 90 days after the receipt of the briefing from the Secretary of Defense, on the study conducted by the Department of the Defense, and the extent that it appropriately considered the costs and benefits on the industrial base and the United States Government, and various options to address this issue.

Weather Forecasting Model

The committee is aware that the Air Force Weather Agency provides critical weather forecasts for military operations around the world. The committee is also aware that the Air Force plans to change its numerical weather modeling approach from the current weather research and forecasting model to a United Kingdom-based system. The committee is concerned that the Air Force may not have conducted a complete analysis of alternatives, including the appropriate coordination with other military stakeholders.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy, to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by December 1, 2016, on the strategic approach and plan

to provide weather forecasting in a manner that meets the military requirements, the options that were considered to include market research of commercial capabilities, and the costs and considerations of each option that was evaluated.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—SPACE ACTIVITIES

Section 1601—Rocket Propulsion System To Replace RD–180

This section would modify section 1604 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), as amended by section 1606 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92).

This section would require that the use of funds for the development of the rocket propulsion system only be obligated or expended for the development of the rocket propulsion system to replace non-allied space launch engines and for the necessary interfaces to, or integration of, the rocket propulsion system with an existing or new launch vehicle. The funds would not be authorized to be obligated or expended to develop or procure a launch vehicle, an upper stage, a strap-on motor, or related infrastructure. This section would refer to funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 or any fiscal year thereafter for the Department of Defense for the development of the rocket propulsion system, and funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 or otherwise made available for fiscal years 2015–16 for the Department of Defense for the development of the rocket propulsion system that are unobligated as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

This section would also allow the Secretary to obligate or expend a portion of the funds described in the prior section, in any fiscal year for activities not authorized by the prior section, to include developing a launch vehicle, an upper stage, a strap-on motor, or related infrastructure. The Secretary may exceed the limit if a certification with certain specified elements are provided to the appropriate congressional committees and the reprogramming or transfer is carried out in accordance with established procedures for reprogramming or transfers, including with respect to presenting a request for a reprogramming of funds.

This section would also define the term 'rocket propulsion system', with respect to the development authorized in this provision, as a main booster, first-stage rocket engine or motor. The term does not include a launch vehicle, an upper stage, a strap-on motor, or related infrastructure.

This section would require that the Secretary of Defense acquire government purpose rights (or greater rights) in technical data, patents, and copyrights pertaining to the rocket propulsion system. Such rights may be for the purpose of developing alternative sources of supply and manufacture in the event such alternative sources are necessary and in the best interest of the United States.

This section would also limit the obligation or expenditure of not more than 90 percent of funds authorized to be appropriated by

this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force until the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Secretary has carried out the rocket propulsion system program under section 1604 of Public Law 113–291 during fiscal years 2015 and 2016 as described in paragraph (d)(1) of this section of this Act.

Section 1602—Exception to the Prohibition on Contracting with Russian Suppliers of Rocket Engines for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program

This section would modify section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), as amended by section 1607 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) by striking subsection (c) and inserting a new subsection.

The new subsection would state that the prohibition would not apply to either the placement of orders or exercise of options under the contract numbered FA8811–13–C-0003 and awarded on December 18, 2013, or contracts that are awarded for the procurement of property or services for space launch activities that include the use of a total of 18 rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation in addition to the Russian-designed or manufactured engines to which paragraph (1) applies.

Section 1603—Analysis of Alternatives for Wide-Band Communications

This section would amend section 1611 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) by striking subsection (b) and would insert a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to develop study guidance for the analysis of alternatives for wide-band communications to consider the full range of military and commercial satellite communications capabilities, acquisition processes, and service delivery models. This section would also require the Secretary to ensure that any cost assessments of military or commercial satellite communications systems include detailed full life cycle costs, as applicable, including but not limited to military personnel, military construction, military infrastructure operation, maintenance costs, and ground and user terminal impacts; and to also identify any considerations relating to the use of military versus commercial systems for wide-band satellite communications.

This section would also direct the Comptroller General of the United States to review the study guidance for the analysis of alternatives, as well as the completed analysis of alternatives, as to whether, and to what extent, the Secretary conducted such analysis using best practices; fully addressed the concerns of the acquisition, operational, and user communities; and complied with the guidance in this section. The Comptroller General would also be required to provide a description of how the Secretary identified the requirements and assessed and addressed the cost, schedule, and risks posed for each alternative included in such analysis. This section would require the Comptroller General to submit the review to the

congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after the Comptroller General receives the completed analysis of alternatives.

The Secretary would also be required to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and semiannually thereafter until the date on which the analysis of alternatives is completed. The committee expects the study guidance to be provided to the committee as part of the briefings.

The committee notes that the removal of the fiscal year 2017 date for completing the analysis of alternatives does not reflect decreased interest or oversight of this program, but rather that this date was not realistic given the Department's progress on this analysis and the opportunities for a more complete analysis. The committee believes that allowing more time will enable the Department to consider the full range of options, to include the results of the commercial satellite communications pathfinders and pilot program.

Section 1604—Modification to Pilot Program for Acquisition of Commercial Satellite Communications Services

This section would amend section 1605 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), as amended by section 1612 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), by adding a requirement that in developing and carrying out the pilot program, the Secretary shall take actions to begin the implementation of each specified goal by not later than September 30, 2017.

Section 1605—Space-Based Environmental Monitoring

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to establish mechanisms to collaborate and coordinate in defining the roles and responsibilities of the Department of Defense and NOAA with regards to carrying out space-based environmental monitoring and planning for future non-governmental space-based environmental monitoring capabilities. Furthermore, this section would direct the Secretary of Defense and the Director of NOAA to jointly submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the mechanisms established.

This section is not an authorization for a joint satellite program of the Department of Defense and NOAA.

Section 1606—Prohibition on Use of Certain Non-Allied Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Systems

This section would require that, not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the Armed Forces and each element of the Department of Defense do not use a non-allied positioning, navigation, and timing system or a service provided by such a system. This requirement would sunset on September 30, 2018.

This section would also provide that the Secretary of Defense may waive the prohibition if the Secretary determines it is in the national security interest of the United States and is necessary to mitigate exigent operational concerns, and notifies the appropriate congressional committees in writing and a period of 30 days has elapsed from the date of such notification.

This section would further require the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Director of National Intelligence to submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act an assessment of the risks to national security and to the operations and plans of the Department of Defense from using a non-allied positioning, navigation, and timing system or service provided by such a system.

Section 1607—Limitation of Availability of Funds for the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System

This section would limit 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for increment 3 of the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System program, until the Secretary of the Air Force, in coordination with the Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, submits to the congressional defense committees a report on such increment. The report would include the acquisition strategy; requirements; funding and schedule; the strategy for use of commercially available capabilities, as appropriate, relating to such increment to rapidly address warfighter requirements, including the market research and evaluation of such commercial capabilities; and how it relates to other applicable activities and investments of the Department of Defense.

The committee understands that these are critical capabilities and encourages the Secretary to rapidly conduct the requirements in this section as necessary to begin increment 3. Additionally, the committee recommends that the Secretary leverage commercially available capabilities, as appropriate and in accordance with the necessary security requirements, to support the warfighter requirements for the Joint Space Operations Center Mission System program.

Section 1608—Space-Based Infrared System and Advanced Extremely High Frequency Program

This section would state that Congress finds the recently completed analysis of alternatives (AOA) for the space-based infrared system did not define the criteria and assessment for resilience and mission assurance. In addition, Congress finds the AOA for the advanced extremely high frequency program is ongoing.

Therefore, this section would restrict the Secretary of Defense from developing or acquiring an alternative to the space-based infrared system program of record, as well as developing or acquiring an alternative to the advanced extremely high frequency program of record, until the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command and the Director of the Space Security and Defense Program, in coordination with the Defense Intelligence Officer for Science and Technology of the Defense Intelligence Agency, jointly submit an assess-

ment to the appropriate congressional committees of the resilience and mission assurance of each alternative considered for the respective programs. Specifically such review would include the requirements for resilience and mission assurance; the criteria to measure such resilience and mission assurance; and how the alternatives affect deterrence, full spectrum warfighting, warfighting requirements and relative costs to include ground stations and user terminals, the potential order of battle of adversaries, and the capabilities of the broader space security and defense enterprise.

The restriction would not apply to efforts to examine and develop technology insertion opportunities for the space-based infrared system program of record or the satellite communications programs of record.

Section 1609—Plans on Transfer of Acquisition and Funding Authority of Certain Weather Missions to National Reconnaissance Office

This section would limit 50 percent of the funding for the weather satellite follow-on program until the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the appropriate committees a plan for the Air Force to transfer, beginning with fiscal year 2018, the acquisition authority and the funding authority for certain space-based environmental monitoring missions from the Air Force to the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), including a description of the amount of funds that would be necessary to be transferred from the Air Force to the NRO during fiscal years 2018 through 2022 to carry out such plan.

This section would also direct the Director of the NRO to develop a plan to carry out certain space-based environmental monitoring missions. The plan would include a description of the related national security requirements, a description of the appropriate manner to meet such requirements, and the amount of funding that would be necessary to be transferred from the Air Force to the NRO during fiscal years 2018 through 2022. The plan would be due to the appropriate committees not later than the date of the submission of the budget request for fiscal year 2018. The Director would be authorized to conduct pre-acquisition activities in fiscal year 2017, to include requests for information, analyses of alternatives, study contracts, modeling and simulation, and other activities the Director determines necessary to develop such plan.

Finally, this section would require the Director of the Cost Assessment Improvement Group of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Director of the Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, to certify the funding identified by the Secretary of the Air Force and the Director of the NRO is sufficient.

As reflected in the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), the committee has been concerned with the Air Force's lack of planning, coordination, and execution of activities to meet the top two Joint Requirements Oversight Council certified requirements for space-based environmental monitoring. The committee notes that the current Defense Meteorological Satellite Program began with the NRO in the 1960s before the program and budget were transferred to the Air Force. The

committee recommends the Director of the NRO and the Secretary of the Air Force arrange a similar agreement, in which the NRO develops the program and then transfers it back to the Air Force after it is in operation.

This section does not and is not intended to affect the jurisdiction of the congressional defense committees over the weather-related missions of the Department of Defense. The committee expects the funds at the NRO for this activity will be classified within the Military Intelligence Program.

Section 1610—Pilot Program on Commercial Weather Data

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to establish a pilot program to assess the viability of commercial satellite weather data to support requirements of the Department of Defense. The Secretary would have 1 year and up to $3.0 million to carry out the pilot program by purchasing and evaluating commercial weather data that meets the standards and specifications set by the Department of Defense. The Secretary would be required to provide interim and final briefings on the utility, cost, and other considerations regarding the purchase of commercial satellite weather data to support the requirements of the Department of Defense.

Section 1611—Organization and Management of National Security Space Activities of the Department of Defense

This section would state findings and the sense of Congress on the organization and management of the national security space activities of the Department of Defense. This section would also direct the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to each separately submit a report to the appropriate committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on the recommendations to strengthen the leadership, management, and organization of the Department of Defense with respect to the national security space activities of the Department.

Section 1612—Review of Charter of Operationally Responsive Space Program Office

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the Operationally Responsive Space Program Office and submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This report would include a review of the key operationally responsive space needs with respect to the warfighter and with respect to national security; how the Office could fit into the broader resilience and space security strategy of the Department of Defense; an assessment of the potential of the Office to focus on the reconstitution capabilities with small satellites using low-cost launch vehicles and existing infrastructure; an assessment of the potential of the Office to leverage existing or planned commercial capabilities; a review of the necessary workforce specialties and acquisition authorities; a review of the funding profile; and a review of the organizational placement and reporting structure of the Office.

Section 1613—Backup and Complementary Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Capabilities of Global Positioning System

This section would direct the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Transportation, and Secretary of Homeland Security to jointly conduct a study to assess and identify the technology-neutral requirements to backup and complement the positioning, navigation, and timing (PNT) capabilities of the Global Positioning System for national security and critical infrastructure.

This section would also direct the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Transportation, and Secretary of Homeland Security to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act on the study.

The report would include the identification of the respective requirements to backup and complement the positioning, navigation, and timing capabilities of the Global Positioning System for national security and critical infrastructure; an analysis of alternatives to meet such requirements including at a minimum an analysis of the viability of a public-private partnership to establish a complementary PNT system and an analysis of the viability of service level agreements to operate a complementary PNT system; and a plan and estimated costs, schedule, and system level technical considerations, including end user equipment and integration considerations, to meet such requirements.

This section would also require that each Secretary designate a single senior official to act as the primary representative of such Department for purposes of conducting the study.

The committee is aware that while a continental United States "enhanced" Long-Range Navigation (eLoran) system would not meet the Department's requirements for worldwide operations, it could contribute to increasing resilience of PNT in the United States. The committee is also aware that a complementary PNT tiger team recommended eLoran as the leading candidate for fulfilling the maximum number of PNT user needs within the next 5 years for certain sectors, but that there is currently no planned funding for this capability. The committee expects that a joint study will help inform a coordinated, effective and efficient way ahead for a backup and complementary system to GPS.

SUBTITLE B—DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AND INTELLIGENCE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Section 1621—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Intelligence Management

This section would limit the amount of authorized funds available to be obligated or expended for intelligence management until the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence provides a report to the appropriate congressional committees on counterintelligence activities described in the classified annex accompanying this Act.

Section 1622—Limitations on Availability of Funds for United States Central Command Intelligence Fusion Center

This section would establish a limitation on the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2017 for the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) Intelligence Fusion Center.

Twenty-five percent of such funds may not be obligated or expended until 15 days after the Commander of CENTCOM submits to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on the steps taken by CENTCOM to formalize and disseminate procedures for establishing, staffing, and operating the CENTCOM Intelligence Fusion Center.

Additionally, 25 percent of such funds may not be obligated or expended until 15 days after the Commander of CENTCOM submits to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on the steps taken by CENTCOM to address the findings of the final report of the Department of Defense Inspector General regarding the processing of intelligence information by the Intelligence Directorate of CENTCOM.

Section 1623—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex

This section would limit 15 percent of the increase in spending for manpower for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex until the Secretary of Defense provides a revised analysis of alternatives to the congressional defense committees and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives for the basing of a new complex. The new analysis should be based on operational requirements and costs and informed by the findings of the report of the Comptroller General of the United States on the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex cost estimating and basing decision process.

SUBTITLE C—CYBERSPACE-RELATED MATTERS

Section 1631—Special Emergency Procurement Authority To Facilitate the Defense Against or Recovery From a Cyber Attack

This section would modify the current special procurement authority in section 1903(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code, to include use of such authority for recovery from or defense against cyber attacks.

Section 1632—Change in Name of National Defense University's Information Resources Management College to College of Information and Cyberspace

This section would modify section 2165 of title 10, United States Code, to change the name of the Information Resources Management College to the College of Information and Cyberspace.

Section 1633—Requirement To Enter Into Agreements Relating to Use of Cyber Opposition Forces

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with each combatant command relating to the use of cyber opposition forces by September 30, 2017. This section would also require the development of a joint certification and training standard for cyber opposition forces by March 31, 2017.

The committee recognizes that the Department is making strides in establishing, manning, and training an adequate cyber mission

force to help defend Department of Defense networks and information systems. An important aspect of that training, as well as the maintenance of long-term proficiency, will be through the use of cyber opposition forces that can realistically emulate the types of threat actors these teams will likely face. Just as conventional forces often face opposition forces in training exercises to improve their combat capability, the committee recognizes that such practices will have great utility in the cyber domain.

The committee also believes that the Department's move to a persistent training environment should be matched with the ability to continuously integrate such cyber opposition force training into these ongoing training evolutions. As the Department tries to marry the persistent training environment with continuous opposition force training, the committee believes that there will be a number of issues that should be addressed. In addition to the need to provide a joint training standard for those teams that mirrors the joint training standard for the cyber mission teams, the committee recognizes that special arrangements will be needed to deconflict training from real world activities that may happen on mission networks. The committee urges the Department to address these kinds of issues in developing agreements with the combatant commands to integrate cyber opposition force training into continuous and ongoing training activities.

Section 1634—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Cryptographic Systems and Key Management Infrastructure

This section would limit the amount of authorized funds available to be obligated or expended in fiscal year 2017 for cryptographic systems and key management infrastructure until the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Director of the National Security Agency, provides a report on the integration of the cryptographic modernization and key management infrastructure programs of the military departments, including a description of how the military departments have implemented stronger leadership, increased integration, and reduced redundancy with respect to such modernization and programs.

SUBTITLE D—NUCLEAR FORCES

Section 1641—Improvements to Council on Oversight of National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System

This section would amend the statutory charter of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System Council ("The Council"), to add to its responsibilities the oversight of the Integrated Tactical Warning and Attack Assessment (ITW/AA) system, as well as the Continuity of Government functions of the Department of Defense. This section would also require The Council, acting through the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees reviewing potential changes to the architectures of certain Air Force space systems prior to milestone A and milestone B approval.

This section would also require that prior to any changes to the systems under The Council's oversight that would reduce the stra-

tegic missile attack warning time provided to the national leadership of the United States, it must provide a notification to the congressional defense committees and wait a period of 1 year. Additionally, this section would require The Council to determine each year that the ITW/AA systems have met all warfighter requirements for operational availability, survivability, and endurability. In the event The Council cannot make such a determination, this section would require the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to jointly submit certain information to the congressional defense committees.

Lastly, this section would extend the requirement that The Council provide its annual report to the appropriate congressional committees until January 31, 2021.

Section 1642—Treatment of Certain Sensitive Information by State and Local Governments

This section would amend section 128 of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that information that the Secretary of Defense prohibits to be disseminated pursuant to such section 128 that is provided to a State or local government shall remain under the control of the Department of Defense and that a State or local law authorizing or requiring a State or local government to disclose such information shall not apply to such information.

In addition, this section would amend section 130e of title 10, United States Code, to clarify that the Secretary may designate information as being Department of Defense critical infrastructure security information, including during the course of creating such information, to ensure that such information is not disseminated without authorization. This section would provide that information so designated is subject to a determination process to determine whether to exempt such information from disclosure. This section would also clarify that Department of Defense critical infrastructure security information covered by such section 130e, either by a written determination or a designation, that is provided to a State or local government shall remain under the control of the Department of Defense. Finally, this section would further provide that a State or local law authorizing or requiring a State or local government to disclose such information shall not apply to information that is covered by a written determination, and that if a person requests, pursuant to a State or local law, that a State or local government disclose information that is designated as Department of Defense critical infrastructure security information, the State or local government shall provide the Secretary an opportunity to carry out a determination process to determine whether to exempt such information from disclosure.

Section 1643—Procurement Authority for Certain Parts of Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Fuzes

This section would authorize $17.1 million of the funds made available by this Act for Missile Procurement, Air Force, for the procurement of certain commercially available parts of intercontinental ballistic missile fuzes, notwithstanding section 1502(a) of title 31, United States Code, under contracts entered into under section 1645(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

Section 1644—Prohibition on the Availability of Funds for Mobile Variant of Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent Missile

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal years 2017 or 2018 may be obligated or expended to retain the option for, or develop, a mobile variant of the ground-based strategic deterrent missile.

Section 1645—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Extension of New START Treaty

This section would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or any other Act for fiscal year 2017 or any other fiscal year for the Department of Defense unless the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff submits a report to the congressional defense committees and the Director of National Intelligence submits a National Intelligence Estimate and a period of 180 days has elapsed.

Section 1646—Consolidation of Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications Functions of the Air Force

This section would require the Secretary of the Air Force to consolidate under a major command, commanded by a single general officer, the responsibility, authority, accountability, and resources for carrying out the nuclear command, control, and communications functions of the Air Force by March 31, 2017. This consolidation would be required to include, at a minimum, all terrestrial and aerial components of the nuclear command and control system that are survivable and endurable, as well as all terrestrial and aerial components of the integrated tactical warning and attack assessment (ITW/AA) system that are survivable and endurable.

This section would also require the Secretary to provide this same commander the responsibility, authority, accountability, and resources to:

(1) Conduct oversight over all components of the NC2 and ITW/AA systems, regardless of the location or the endurability of such components; and

(2) Approve or disapprove of any budgetary actions related to all components of the NC2 and ITW/AA systems, regardless of the location or the endurability of such components.

Finally, this section would require the Secretary to submit a report to the congressional defense committees by January 15, 2017, on the plans and actions taken by the Secretary to carry out this section, including any guidance, directives, and orders that have been or will be issued by the Secretary, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, or other elements of the Air Force.

Section 1647—Report on Russian and Chinese Political and Military Leadership Survivability, Command and Control, and Continuity of Government Programs and Activities

This section would require the Director of National Intelligence to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, consistent with the protection of sources and methods, by January 15, 2017, on the leadership survivability, command and control, and continuity of government programs and activities of the People's Republic of China and the Russian Federation. The report would be required to include various matters with respect to these programs and activities.

This section would also require, not later than 90 days after the Director submits the report described above, the Council on Oversight of the National Leadership Command, Control, and Communications System, established by section 171a of title 10, United States Code, to submit an assessment of how the command, control, and communications systems of the national leadership of China and Russia compare to such systems of the United States.

Finally, this section would require the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command to submit, together with the assessment submitted by the Council described above, the views of the Commander on the report of the Director, including a detailed description of how the leadership survivability, command and control, and continuity of government programs and activities of China and Russia are considered in plans and options for which the Commander is responsible.

Section 1648—Sense of Congress on Importance of Independent Nuclear Deterrent of United Kingdom

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the importance of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland's independent nuclear deterrent.

SUBTITLE E—MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Section 1651—Extensions of Prohibitions Relating to Missile Defense Information and Systems

This section would extend the prohibitions currently in law regarding sharing of certain missile defense information with the Russian Federation and integrating U.S. missile defenses with Russian or Chinese systems until January 1, 2027.

Section 1652—Review of the Missile Defeat Policy and Strategy of the United States

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to jointly conduct a new review by January 31, 2018, of the missile defeat capability, policy, and strategy of the United States with respect to left- and right-of-launch ballistic missile defense, the integration of offensive and defensive forces for the defeat of ballistic missiles, and the cruise missile defense of the homeland.

The committee recommends this provision in order to require a new strategy for the more comprehensive set of capabilities and

goals for ballistic and cruise missile defense the United States now faces. This new strategy would include the full range of missile defeat capabilities and requirements, including the integration of left- and right-of-launch ballistic missile defense, the integration of offensive and defensive capabilities in ballistic missile defense in both the defense of the homeland and in regional defense settings, and the development of homeland cruise missile defense.

This section would also require the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to submit to the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the congressional defense committees an annual update on the implementation of the missile defeat strategy for the 5-year period beginning on the date of the submission of the report on the missile defeat policy and strategy review.

The section would further require the Director of National Intelligence to submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees a report, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, containing an unclassified summary of the existing ballistic and cruise missile threats to the United States, the deployed forces of the United States, and the friends and allies of the United States, and an assessment of such threat in 2026. The section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from changing the non-standard acquisition authorities of the Missile Defense Agency until the Secretary notifies the congressional defense committees and a period of 180 days has elapsed. Lastly, the section would require the Secretary of Defense to designate, not later than March 31, 2018, a military department or defense agency with the acquisition authority for the capability to defend the United States from cruise missiles and the authority for left-of-launch ballistic missile defeat capability.

Section 1653—Iron Dome Short-Range Rocket Defense System and Israeli Cooperative Missile Defense Program Codevelopment and Coproduction

This section would make available $62 million of the funds authorized to be appropriated by section 101 of this Act, and as specified in the funding table in section 4101, for the Government of the State of Israel for Tamir interceptors for the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system.

This section would condition those funds subject to the terms, conditions, and coproduction targets specified for fiscal year 2017 in a bilateral international agreement amending the "Agreement Between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement."

This section would also require that not less than 30 days prior to the initial obligation of these funds, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a certification that such Agreement is being implemented as provided in the Agreement and an assessment detailing any risks relating to the implementation of such Agreement.

This section would authorize $150 million and $120 million out of such funds as are authorized to be appropriated in section 101

of this Act, and as specified in the funding table in section 4101, for procurement and coproduction of the David's Sling Weapon System and the Arrow 3 Upper Tier missile defense system, respectively.

This section would further specify the terms and conditions that shall be achieved by the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics prior to the disbursement of the authorized funds for David's Sling and Arrow 3. These terms and conditions would include achievement of the knowledge points and production readiness agreements within the current bilateral research, development, test, and evaluation agreements; matched funding by the Government of the State of Israel; the successful negotiation of a bilateral international agreement between the United States and the Government of Israel; agreed coproduction targets based on the teaming agreements for the codevelopment programs; and certain other matters, including apportionment of the costs of any delays for coproduction.

The committee recommends the authorization of these funds for procurement of missile defense system batteries and interceptors for the Government of Israel, however, it is not establishing specific production goals or commitments.

Section 1654—Maximizing Aegis Ashore Capability

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an evaluation of the optimal anti-air warfare capability for each current Aegis Ashore Site by not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. This section would also require that such evaluation is a part of the future deployment of an Aegis Ashore site. The assessment of Aegis Ashore anti-air warfare capability would include use of enhanced sea-sparrow missiles, standard missile block 2 missiles, standard missile block 6 missiles, or the SeaRAM missile system. The Secretary of Defense would be required to carry out this subsection consistent with the classified annex accompanying this Act.

The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would also be required to submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act an evaluation to include:

(1) The ballistic missile and air threat against the continental United States and the efficacy of deploying one or more Aegis Ashore sites and Aegis Ashore components for the ballistic and cruise missile defense of the continental United States; and

(2) The ballistic missile and air threat against Guam, and the cost and efficacy of deploying Aegis Ashore there.

Regarding the Aegis Ashore site on the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF) in Hawaii, this section would restrict the Secretary from reducing the manning levels or test capability of that site as they were on January 1, 2015, or to put the site into a "cold" or "stand by" status. This section would also require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to notify the congressional defense committees if the preferred alternative for fielding a medium-range ballistic missile defense sensor for the defense of Hawaii, identified through the study conducted by the Director pursuant to section 1689(b)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal

Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), would require any study or assessment pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91–190). The Director would be required to initiate that study or analysis not later than 60 days after his notification.

Lastly, this section would also require the Secretary and the Chairman to jointly submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act an evaluation of the ballistic and air threat to Hawaii; the efficacy (including with respect to cost and potential alternatives) of making the Aegis Ashore site at PMRF operational; deploying the preferred alternative for fielding a medium-range ballistic missile defense sensor for the defense of Hawaii; and any other alternative the Secretary and Chairman determine appropriate.

Section 1655—Technical Authority for Integrated Air and Missile Defense Activities and Programs

This section would reaffirm the authority delegated to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) as the Department of Defense technical authority for integrated air and missile defense activities and programs. The committee notes the May 8, 2013 Acquisition Decision Memorandum approved by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics designating MDA as the technical authority for the Department of Defense on these programs, and believes this statutory step would improve the Department's efforts on integration and interoperability.

This section would further provide that the Director may obtain, as detailees from the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense and the Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Organization, such manpower as they deem necessary solely for technical authority responsibilities, but no more than double the manning assigned for that purpose as of January 1, 2016. This authority would be to obtain as detailees the Federal workforce of these two entities.

This section would further require the Director of MDA to provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees not later than January 31, 2017, and biennially thereafter until January 31, 2021, of the state of integration and interoperability of the integrated air and missile defense capabilities of the Department of Defense. This assessment would include an identification of any gaps in the integration and interoperability of the air and missile defense capabilities of the Department; a description of the options to improve such capabilities and remediate such gaps; and a plan to carry out such improvements and remediations, including milestones and costs for such plan.

Section 1656—Development and Research of Non-Terrestrial Missile Defense Layer

The section would require that, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, with the support of federally funded research and development centers with subject matter expertise, shall commence the planning for the concept definition, design, research, development, engineering evaluation, and test of a space-based ballistic missile intercept and defeat layer.

This section would also include a requirement to commence the planning for the research, development, test, and evaluation activities with respect to a space test bed for a missile interceptor capability.

This section would further require the Director to submit with the budget request of the President for fiscal year 2018, a detailed budget and development plan, irrespective of planned budgetary total obligation authority, assuming an initial on-orbit demonstration by 2025.

Section 1657—Hypersonic Boost Glide Vehicle Defense

This section would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to establish a program of record to develop and field a defensive system to defeat hypersonic boost-glide and maneuvering ballistic missiles not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. It would also require the Director to consider opportunities for co-development of the defensive system, including through financial support, with allies and partners of the United States.

This section would also limit the headquarters expenditures of both the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics by withholding $25.0 million from each until the Director of the MDA certifies the establishment of the program of record and certain other matters.

This section would additionally require the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide a report to specific congressional committees not later than 120 days after the enactment of this Act on the implications of the Missile Technology Control Regime of such defensive system.

This section would require that a plan be submitted along with the fiscal year 2018 budget request on the cost and schedule to develop such a defensive capability.

Section 1658—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Patriot Lower Tier Air and Missile Defense Capability of the Army

This section would limit the obligation or expenditure of fifty percent of the amounts authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2017 for the Patriot lower tier air and missile defense capability of the Army until:

(1) The Director of the Missile Defense Agency certifies to the congressional defense committees that such capability, upon completion of the modernization process for the Patriot radar, will be interoperable with the ballistic missile defense system and other air and missile defense capabilities;

(2) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff certifies to the congressional defense committees that such capability, upon the completion of the modernization process for the Patriot radar, will meet the modularity sought by the geographic combatant commands and the validated and objective warfighter requirements for air and missile defense capability; and

(3) The Chief of Staff of the Army, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, submits a determination as to whether the requirements of the radar modernization program are suitable for ac-

quisition through an Army Rapid Capabilities office, the terms of the competition planned for the radar modernization program ensure fair competition for all competitors, and either a certification that the radar modernization acquisition program is the most modern rapid deployment acquisition program possible at low risk, or a revised acquisition program has been submitted to the congressional defense committees and a period of 30 days has lapsed.

Section 1659—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Conventional Prompt Global Strike Weapons System

This section would require that not more than 75 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for conventional prompt global strike capability may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Commander of U.S. European Command, the Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, and the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, submit to the congressional defense committees a report on whether there are warfighter requirements or integrated priorities lists-submitted needs for a limited operational conventional prompt strike capability and whether the program plan and schedule proposed by the program office supports such requirements and integrated priorities lists submissions.

Section 1660—Pilot Program on Loss of Unclassified, Controlled Technical Information

This section would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to establish a pilot program for the protection of unclassified, controlled technical information and controlled unclassified information not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. In implementing the required pilot program, the Director would be required to give priority to data protection options that are used by the private sector and have already proven successful. The pilot program would be set for a 5-year duration. The Director would be required to notify the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate not later than 30 days prior to the commencement of the pilot program of the following:

(1) The data protection options that the Director is considering, and their potential cost; and

(2) Such option that is the preferred option of the Director.

Section 1661—Review of Missile Defense Agency Budget Submissions for Ground-based Midcourse Defense and Evaluation of Alternative Ground-based Interceptor Deployments

This section would require the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to provide a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act concerning the sufficiency of the budget request to meet modernization, obsolescence, and to ensure industrial base capability. Such report would also be required not later than 30 days after the President's budget request is submitted in subsequent years through January 31, 2021.

This section would also require that the Commander of U.S. Northern Command submit to the congressional defense committees not later than 60 days after each budget request is submitted, through January 31, 2021, his certification that the budget request includes a sufficient level of funding for the ground-based midcourse defense system to modernize the system to remain paced ahead of the developing limited ballistic missile threat to the homeland.

This section would further require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) to submit to the congressional defense committees a report on transportable ground-based interceptors.

Section 1662—Declaratory Policy, Concept of Operations, and Employment Guidelines for Left-of-Launch Capability

This section would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to develop and provide to the congressional defense committees, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the following: (1) both the classified and unclassified declaratory policy of the United States regarding the use of left-of-launch capability of the United States against potential targets and how the Secretary and Chairman intend to ensure that such capability is a deterrent to attacks by adversaries; (2) both the classified and unclassified concept of operations for the use of such capability across and between the combatant commands; and (3) both the classified and unclassified employment strategy, plans, and options for such capability.

The committee notes that in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee directed the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to submit a report on left-of-launch no later than December 1, 2015. The committee directed that this report detail, among other matters, how the concepts outlined in the Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense: Vision 2020 strategy and in the memo from the Chief of Staff of the Army and Chief of Naval Operations were being implemented, including an assessment of left-of-launch and non-kinetic means of defense. While the Department provided a briefing in October 2015 and a more recent briefing on the fiscal year 2017 budget request for left-of-launch activities, the Department has not submitted the required report. The committee notes that while the briefings answered several of the committee's questions and provided constructive engagements on this issue, they did not provide a comprehensive answer to the committee's request. The committee notes that the report is nearly 5 months late, and expects that this report will be submitted as soon as possible to help inform the committee's oversight on this important issue.

Section 1663—Procurement of Medium-Range Discrimination Radar To Improve Homeland Missile Defense

This section would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to issue a request for proposals for a medium-range discrimination radar by not later than October 1, 2017. This section would also require the Director to plan to procure a medium-range

discrimination radar or equivalent sensor to improve the ballistic missile defense of Hawaii.

Section 1664—Semiannual Notifications on Missile Defense Tests and Costs

This section would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to notify the congressional defense committees semi-annually starting 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act on certain matters related to flight and intercept tests. The requirement under this section would terminate on January 31, 2021.

Section 1665—National Missile Defense Policy

This section would repeal section 2 of the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–38) and replace it with a modified statement on the missile defense policy of the United States.

Section 1666—Sense of the Congress on Initial Operating Capability of Phase 2 of European Phased Adaptive Approach to Missile Defense

This section would state the sense of the Congress regarding the declaration at the upcoming North Atlantic Treaty Organization Summit in Warsaw, Republic of Poland, of the initial operating capability of the second phase of the European Phased Adaptive Approach.

SUBTITLE F—OTHER MATTERS

Section 1671—Protection of Certain Facilities and Assets From Unmanned Aircraft

This section would amend chapter 3 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to take, and authorize the Armed Forces to take, certain actions necessary to mitigate the threat of an unmanned aircraft or unmanned aircraft system that poses an imminent threat (as defined by the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Transportation) to the safety or security of certain assets or facilities relating to the nuclear deterrence mission, the missile defense mission, or the national security space mission of the Department of Defense.

Section 1672—Improvement of Coordination by Department of Defense of Electromagnetic Spectrum Usage

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than December 31, 2016, on the value of an intra-departmental council in the Department of Defense to improve its coordination on the use of the electromagnetic spectrum.

TITLE XVII—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ACQUISITION AGILITY

OVERVIEW

In the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, the committee expressed concern that the conventional acquisition system of the Department of Defense is not sufficiently agile to support warfighter demands. On average, major defense acquisition programs operate for 9 years before yielding new capabilities. Requirements determination, budgeting, and contracting can each take another 2 years or more before programs begin. Meanwhile, technological change has been rapidly generating new, and often unforeseeable, innovations. Global threats are evolving even more quickly, with adversaries leveraging new technologies to exploit gaps in our military capabilities. The conventional acquisition system simply does not enable capabilities to be delivered to warfighters fast enough.

The committee notes that this persistent lack of agility derives in part from the basic incentives embedded in the requirements, acquisition, budget, and oversight processes. Weapon system requirements must be set anticipating technology that will be available after years of development, so requirements are naturally optimistic. Optimism carries with it substantial technical risk, which has often led to costly overruns and schedule delays. To avoid such outcomes, the acquisition system makes short-term, cost-savings decisions that reduce flexibility and increase long-term costs. Budget timelines and oversight committees require the military services to provide detailed budget justifications, even though such details then limit the military services' ability to pursue new technological innovations after funds are appropriated. Then in response to acquisition shortcomings, both Congress and the Department have imposed new layers of bureaucratic management and special authorities to circumvent the conventional acquisition process.

This title is intended to begin to address these challenges and change the way capabilities are acquired. Rather than setting requirements in anticipation of future technologies, weapon system platforms should be designed to provide the needed warfighter capabilities in the short-term and flexible, open-system architectures that allow components to evolve with technologies and threats. The military services should experiment with and incrementally deploy new components, and this "component acquisition" should be unshackled from the traditional and time-consuming requirements, acquisition, and budget processes. The committee recognizes that some experiments will not succeed, which is an important part of the learning process. But because developing and fielding new technologies are central to retaining our military advantage, component experimentation should be integral to the standard acquisition system. Components and their underlying technologies should have a separate, dedicated path for development, including a funding source that is not constrained by large acquisition programs of record.

For "platform acquisition," the deliberative requirements, acquisition, and budget processes remain critical. Major platforms rep-

resent substantial investments that often remain in the arsenal for decades, so early concept development should be strengthened to ensure programs are started well. The Secretary of Defense should be responsible for establishing early cost and fielding targets for platforms. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be responsible for establishing requirements for joint warfare. The military services should then be responsible for managing acquisition programs in a transparent manner that enables adequate oversight by the Secretary, the Chairman, and Congress. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), Congress delegated additional acquisition decision authority to the military services; the committee envisions further delegation to the services once transparency has improved. Towards that end, the committee is clarifying the need for independent technical risk assessments and enhancing acquisition transparency.

The committee also seeks to improve accountability for acquisition outcomes. The committee intends that the military services use component acquisition authorities to more rapidly pace technological change and threats and to mature component technologies outside of acquisition programs of record. Acquisition programs for major platforms should only include technology development that is not expected to delay deployment of the platform. If technology is not sufficiently mature, then the program should not be initiated and the technology should be matured with separate research and development funds. The military services should manage programs to comply with program cost and schedule targets, as well as joint warfare requirements. In turn, the Secretary should, in the event that a program deviates from such targets and standards, use his existing, substantial authorities to make changes within the program and hold the service leadership accountable, rather than rebuilding a redundant bureaucracy to manage the program.

The committee once again commends the Department of Defense for recent efforts to improve the acquisition process, but notes that reforming acquisition will be iterative and that there is more work to be done. Agility can be further enhanced by improving supporting processes, including contracting and auditing processes, speeding testing, and further supporting the acquisition workforce. The committee looks forward to continuing to work with the Department on these and other important matters.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Implementation of the Acquisition Agility Authorities

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes provisions that are intended to improve the agility, effectiveness, and accountability of the Department of Defense's acquisition system. Key legislative provisions include expanding the use of modular open system approaches in the design and development of major defense acquisition programs, providing the Department with more flexibility to prototype and rapidly deploy weapon system components and other technologies, expanding delegation of program management to the military services, and promoting greater transparency throughout the acquisition process. The committee recognizes that the Department will need to assess and develop policies and procedures for how best to implement several elements of this proposed

legislation. Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the service secretaries, the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives, not later than March 31, 2017, on how the proposed legislation in this title will be implemented. The briefing should address issues such as:

(1) How key terms that pertain to modular open system approaches, such as a major system platform, major system component, and major system interface, should be defined and operationalized;

(2) How major system interfaces and standards will be identified, developed, and sustained;

(3) How technical expertise and resources will be provided to support a modular open systems approach in requirements development and acquisition program planning;

(4) How prototyping and experimentation of major system components and other technologies will be overseen by the military services, including the identification and composition of the prototype oversight boards, as well as the services' procedures for selecting prototype projects; and

(5) How officials in the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, the Joint Staff, and other offices will maintain visibility, and have access to relevant data, into the performance of major defense acquisition programs when an official of a military service is the milestone decision authority.

As part of the review, the committee directs the Under Secretary to assess whether additional authorities are needed, beyond those provided in this title and other existing authorities, to facilitate development, prototyping, and experimentation of technologies outside of acquisition programs of record. The committee is concerned that too often the Department starts major defense acquisition programs with immature technologies that result in undesirable outcomes such as cost growth and schedule delays. The committee wants to ensure that there are appropriate opportunities and funding mechanisms in the Department to fully mature and rapidly demonstrate promising technologies that can enhance warfighting capabilities without the need to commit prematurely to an acquisition program.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 1701—Modular Open System Approach in Development of Major Weapon Systems

This section would require all major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs) initiated after January 1, 2019, to be designed and developed with a modular open system approach (MOSA), to the maximum extent practicable. MOSA would be defined, with respect to MDAPs, as an integrated business and technical strategy that employs a modular design with major system interfaces between a major system platform (such as a ground vehicle, ship, or aircraft) and its major system components (such as sensors or communication equipment) or between major system components. Well-defined

interfaces at the shared boundaries between a platform and its components, or between components, would allow components to be added, removed, or replaced throughout the life cycle of a platform system without having to redesign the entire weapon system. Interfaces would be consistent with widely-supported and consensus-based standards, unless such standards are unavailable or unsuitable.

This section also would require MOSA to be addressed throughout the requirements development and acquisition processes for MDAPs. Performance requirements for weapon systems would identify capabilities that would be expected to evolve during the life cycle of the weapon system due to evolving technology, threat, or interoperability needs. For capabilities expected to evolve, the requirements process would also identify the minimum acceptable capability needed for initial fielding of the system. The acquisition process would then ensure that MOSA is considered in analyses of alternative weapon system solutions, the program acquisition strategy, and solicitations to industry for the development or production of the weapon system. Before approving system development, the milestone decision authority would determine that MOSA with clearly defined interfaces has been used in the acquisition program or, if MOSA is not practicable, the basis for not employing MOSA. Information on the use of MOSA would be included with the first Selected Acquisition Report submitted to the congressional defense committees, required under section 2432 of title 10, United States Code. The military services would be responsible for coordinating the development and maintenance of interfaces and standards, providing technical expertise and support to program offices, and ensuring adequate related training for requirements and acquisition personnel.

Section 1702—Development, Prototyping, and Deployment of Weapon System Components or Technology

This section would require a major defense acquisition program (MDAP) initiated after January 1, 2019, to include only technical development that the milestone decision authority determines, with a high degree of confidence, would not delay fielding target for the program. Concurrent technology maturation and systems development would remain authorized, but only for technologies for which there is high confidence that concurrency would not postpone fielding. For higher risk technologies, the milestone decision authority would use the new authorities provided in this section, or other available authorities, to mature and demonstrate technologies prior to initiating or separate from a program of record.

This section also would provide the military services with new funding and acquisition flexibility to experiment with, prototype, and rapidly deploy weapon system components and other technologies. The committee has received testimony that the current requirements development, budgeting, and contracting processes in the Department of Defense preclude new capabilities from being developed at a pace commensurate with rapidly changing technologies and threats. To address this issue, the services would allocate some advanced component development and prototyping funds within the research, development, test, and evaluation budget into capability, weapon system component, or technology portfolios,

rather than specifying all funding for individual projects or acquisition programs of record. The services would then be able to select and fund prototyping projects during the year of execution without waiting the 2–3 years required for the typical budget process or initiation of a new program of record. The section also would require each of the military services to establish or identify a board to oversee this flexible funding, comprising senior officials with expertise in requirements, research and development, and acquisition. The boards would be required to produce strategic plans every 3 years and annually recommend specific prototype projects based on high priority warfighter needs and emerging technologies. Further, the section would require prototype projects to be selected through a merit-based process, which would allow for subsequent streamlined procurement contracting and special transfer authority to fund the initial production for up to 2 years until follow-on production funding can be obtained through the regular budget process. Prototype projects and production transfer authority initially would be limited to $50 million for each project.

Section 1703—Cost, Schedule, and Performance of Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would require the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, to assign program cost and fielding targets when major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs) are initiated. Requiring the Secretary to establish such targets would ensure that the Secretary retains a strategic role in optimizing capability investment and resource allocation across the Department of Defense. The establishment of such targets also would ensure early coordination on programs among key stakeholders, including the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, and the military services. The targets would promote early trade-offs among program cost, schedule, and performance objectives to reduce the likelihood of subsequent cost growth and schedule delays. They would also create key metrics against which to hold accountable the services that are executing acquisition programs. To further improve accountability, the Chief of the military service responsible for developing a program's requirements would determine that such requirements are necessary and realistic before submission to the Joint Requirements Oversight Council for approval. If a program exceeds its targets, the milestone decision authority would have to request relief from the Secretary before granting Milestone B approval.

This section also would require that an independent technical risk assessment be conducted by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics prior to program milestones decisions. Assessments at Milestone A would identify critical technologies that need to be matured, while assessments for later milestones identify the maturity levels of such critical technologies.

This section would also expand delegation of acquisition program management to the services, by directing that the service acquisition executives be the milestone decision authority for joint programs being initiated after October 1, 2019. Further delegation of program execution would reduce redundant management structures and, when combined with additional transparency and enforcement mechanisms established elsewhere in this title, further hold the services accountable for program outcomes.

Section 1704—Transparency in Major Defense Acquisition Programs

This section would require the milestone decision authority for a major defense acquisition program to provide a new "acquisition scorecard" report to the congressional defense committees and, when appropriate, to congressional intelligence committees at each milestone decision point. The scorecards would present key decision metrics, including the program's cost and fielding targets, cost and schedule estimates, and evaluations of technical risks. The scorecards would include both military service and independent assessments, thereby highlighting any differing views of programmatic, schedule, or technical risks. Importantly, the decision metrics in the scorecards would be extracted from reports and assessments conducted for milestone decisions pursuant to other statute. The committee therefore intends that scorecards will be short (2–3 pages) summary documents produced with very limited data collection or bureaucracy.

Section 1705—Amendments Relating to Technical Data Rights

This section would make several amendments to technical data rights set forth in section 2320 of title 10, United States Code. First, this section would delineate types of interfaces and specify the rights provided to the U.S. Government in such interfaces. The U.S. Government would have government purpose rights in technical data related to a major system interface developed either at private expense or with a mix of Federal and private funds and used in a modular open system approach (MOSA) required elsewhere in this title. This section also would clarify that the U.S. Government has limited rights to technical data pertaining to a general interface between an item or process and other items or processes developed exclusively at private expense. The U.S. Government would have government purpose rights in the technical data of a general interface developed with a mix of Federal and private funds unless the Secretary of Defense determines that the negotiation of different rights would be in the best interest of the United States.

Second, this section would specify that the U.S. Government has limited rights to the detailed manufacturing and process data of major system components used in MOSA and developed exclusively at private expense. Third, this section would require the U.S. Government and Department of Defense contractors to negotiate for data rights when items or processes are developed with a mix of Federal and private funds. Currently, the U.S. Government is entitled to government purpose rights when items or processes are developed with mixed funding unless the Secretary determines negotiated rights are in the best interest of the United States. Finally, this section would limit deferred ordering of technical data to 6 years after delivery of the last item on a contract and to technical data generated, not utilized, in the performance of the contract. Currently, the Department may require the delivery of technical data generated or utilized in the performance of a contract at any time after completion of the contract. The committee expects the Department to develop its sustainment strategies and plans for

technical data earlier in the acquisition process so it depends upon deferred ordering less frequently.

The committee notes that the use of MOSA required elsewhere in this title relies upon the ability of major system components to be added, removed, or replaced as needed throughout the life cycle of the major weapon system due to evolving technology, threats, sustainment, and other factors. Therefore, major system interfaces that share a boundary between major system components and major system platforms are critical, and it is imperative that the government have appropriate access to the technical data of such interfaces. It is the committee's intent that any contractor would be able to develop a major system component that properly integrates into and meets the form, fit, and function requirements of a weapon system. The committee also intends that detailed technical data internal to privately funded major system components remain proprietary so that industry can protect the intellectual property of their components. The committee understands the importance of technical precision in the implementation of MOSA, particularly with regard to establishing clear delineation of major system platforms, major system interfaces, and major system components. As such, the committee urges the Department to carefully consider and take input from industry on the meanings and implications of these key terms. The committee expects the Department to include this consideration in its review of the MOSA authorities and its briefing on the implementation of MOSA required elsewhere in this report.

The committee notes that section 813 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) established a government-industry advisory panel to review the rights in technical data conveyed in sections 2320 and 2321 of title 10, United States Code, and the regulations implementing such sections. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to extend the duration of the panel and to provide the panel's final report and the Secretary's recommendations to the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2017. Additionally, the committee directs the panel to develop recommendations for changes to sections 2320 and 2321 of title 10, United States Code, and the regulations implementing such sections. In conducting its review, the committee directs the panel to consider the appropriate technical data rights for the U.S. Government and Department of Defense contractors to support the modular open system approach required elsewhere in this title.

TITLE XVIII—MATTERS RELATING TO SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Nonapplicability to Defense Production Act

The committee notes that nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the operations of title III of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50a U.S.C. 2091) as in effect before the enactment of this Act.

Review of Surety Bonds Required by Federal Contractors

Section 874 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) provided reforms to improve the quality and availability of surety bonds required by Federal contractors. Given these improvements, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the use of surety bonds as they apply to Federal small business procurement contracts. The review shall examine:

(1) How frequently bonding requirements are waived by Federal agencies;

(2) The standards and processes for waiving the requirements;

(3) The review processes for such waivers;

(4) Any difference in results between instances in which requirements were or were not waived; and

(5) The whistleblower process when fraud related to surety bonds is reported.

The committee further directs the Comptroller General to provide a final report to the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee of the Senate and the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives by June 30, 2017.

Review of the Office of Government Contracting and Business Development of the Small Business Administration

The committee has heard concerns about inefficiencies, duplication, and gaps in the Small Business Administration's programs intended to ensure that small business prime contractors are indeed small and qualify for the various procurement programs from which they benefit. Furthermore, numerous reforms to these programs enacted in the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 have not been implemented in a timely fashion. The committee, therefore, directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a comprehensive review of the operations of the Office of Government Contracting and Business Development at the Small Business Administration. The review shall assess:

(1) The extent to which the personnel of the Small Business Administration who carry out procurement and business development programs report to the Office of Government Contracting and Business Development;

(2) Whether greater efficiency and consistency in the certification process of procurement and business development programs could be achieved by creating a single organizational unit of employees to process all certifications required by procurement and business development programs;

(3) Whether greater efficiency and efficacy in the performance of procurement and business development programs could be achieved by improving the alignment of the field personnel assigned to such programs;

(4) How the Office of Government Contracting and Business Development could improve its staffing of regulatory drafting functions and its coordination with the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council to ensure timely rulemaking by the Small Business Administration; and

(5) Any other areas in which the Comptroller General determines that the Small Business Administration could improve its performance with respect to procurement and business development programs.

The committee further directs that the Comptroller General to provide a final report to the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee of the Senate and the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives by June 30, 2017. The committee intends, for purposes of this report, the term "procurement and business development program" to mean a program related to procurement or business development established under section 7, 8, 15, 31, 36, 44, 45, or 46 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631).

Small Business Subcontractor Transparency

Small businesses are an essential part of a healthy and balanced defense industrial base. In October 2015, the Small Business Administration proposed a rule (Federal Register Document 2015–25234) to ensure tracking of small business subcontractors at multiple tiers on contracts with individual subcontracting plans, consistent with section 1614 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66). However, the rule does not appear to address the lack of subcontracting transparency, nor how lower-tier small business subcontractors will be counted towards agency subcontracting goals. It is the intent of the committee that any subcontractor tracking mechanisms created in conjunction with section 1614 of Public Law 113–66 also be used to facilitate the small-business scorecard program set forth in section 868 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services and Small Business of the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2017, on the status of the actions required under section 1614(c) of Public Law 113–66.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—IMPROVING TRANSPARENCY AND CLARITY FOR SMALL BUSINESSES

Section 1801—Plain Language Rewrite of Requirements for Small Business Procurements

This section would amend section 15(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(a)) to revise existing statute without changing its meaning. The revision would better organize the section and would modernize terms consistent with those in titles 10 and 41, United States Code. Since this section would not change the meaning of the existing statute, the committee notes it should not result in revisions to regulations or policies.

Section 1802—Improving Reporting on Small Business Goals

This section would amend section 15(h) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(h)) to require the Small Business Administration, using data already required to be collected from contractors, to track companies that outgrow or no longer qualify for a small

business program, as well as identify how prime contracting goals are met. The Small Business Administration would provide this information in its annual report, but only after relevant data systems have been modified to facilitate data collection and reporting. The committee expects the Office of Small Business Programs at the Department of Defense to take a leadership role in ensuring that the systems are appropriately modified.

Section 1803—Transparency in Small Business Goals

This section would amend section 15(h) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(h)) to require the Administrator of the General Services Administration to issue an annual report on the share of total contract value awarded to small businesses. The annual report would not exclude any contracts from the total contract value.

Section 1804—Uniformity in Procurement Terminology

This section would amend section 3(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(m)) and section 15(j) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(j)) to update procurement terminology consistent with the Federal Acquisition Regulation and with terminology used in titles 10 and 41, United States Code.

SUBTITLE B—CLARIFYING THE ROLES OF SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCATES

Section 1811—Scope of Review by Procurement Center Representatives

This section would amend section 15(l) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(l)) to reverse a regulatory change made by the Small Business Administration during enactment of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–240) and to ensure that procurement center representatives review consolidated contracts or task orders that are fully or partially set aside or reserved for small business. This section would also authorize the Small Business Administrator to limit reviews by procurement center representatives of certain types of contracts, such as foreign military sales, contingency operation contracts, or humanitarian operations, unless the contracting agency requests such a review.

Section 1812—Responsibilities of Commercial Market Representatives

This section would amend section 4(h) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633(h)), to provide a clear definition of the duties and responsibilities of the commercial market representatives employed by the Small Business Administration. Responsibilities would include providing assistance to small business concerns seeking subcontracting opportunities on Federal contracts and assisting prime contractors with meeting the subcontracting obligations found in section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)).

Section 1813—Duties of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization

This section would amend section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)) to revise the duties of the Offices of Small and Disadvantaged Utilization in Federal agencies. The offices would be authorized to provide assistance to service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses and participants in the Historically Underutilized Business Zone program which are not included in the current list of small business programs. The offices also would review annual summaries of Government credit card purchases to ensure compliance with the Small Business Act.

Section 1814—Improving Contractor Compliance

This section would amend sections 15 and 45 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644 and 15 U.S.C. 657r), and section 831(e)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510), to promote the availability of existing programs that assist small contractors attempting to comply with Federal regulations. The Small Business Administration would develop a list of no-cost compliance assistance programs for small contractors which would be distributed through the Small Business Administration and federal agency small-business offices to small contractors. This section would also require that any mentor-protégé agreement approved by the Small Business Administration or the Department of Defense address the provision of compliance assistance to the protégé firm.

Section 1815—Responsibilities of Business Opportunity Specialists

This section would amend section 4(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 633(g)) to add a job description and reporting hierarchy for business opportunity specialists of the Small Business Administration.

SUBTITLE C—STRENGTHENING OPPORTUNITIES FOR COMPETITION IN SUBCONTRACTING

Section 1821—Good Faith in Subcontracting

This section would amend section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) to improve compliance with subcontracting requirements. This section would clarify that failure to provide contractual documentation showing compliance with a subcontracting plan is a material contract breach, just as existing law states that failing to comply with a subcontracting plan is a material breach. Offices of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization would be authorized to review subcontracting plans, as is the current practice in the Department of Defense. The Small Business Administration would be required to provide examples of activities that would be considered a failure to make a good-faith effort to comply with a subcontracting plan.

Section 1822—Pilot Program To Provide Opportunities for Qualified Subcontractors To Obtain Past Performance Ratings

This section would establish a 3-year pilot program in which small, first-tier subcontractors could obtain past-performance credit from the Small Business Administration. The Small Business Administration would coordinate past-performance requests with the relevant Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization and the prime contractor. If all parties agree, the subcontractor would be assigned a favorable past-performance rating; otherwise, the subcontractor would retain a neutral performance rating. The Comptroller General of the United States would be required to review the results of the pilot program to assess whether it helped small subcontractors transition to prime contracting.

SUBTITLE D—MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAMS

Section 1831—Amendments to the Mentor-Protege Program of the Department of Defense

This section would amend section 831 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510), to require the Small Business Administration to determine whether a prospective protégé firm is affiliated with its proposed mentor prior to approval of a mentor-protégé agreement. The same requirement would be removed from the Department of Defense.

Section 1832—Improving Cooperation between the Mentor-Protege Programs of the Small Business Administration and the Department of Defense

This section would amend section 45(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657r(b)) to require the Department of Defense to obtain approval from the Administrator of the Small Business Administration prior to carrying out a mentor-protégé program.

SUBTITLE E—WOMEN'S BUSINESS PROGRAMS

Section 1841—Office of Women's Business Ownership

This section would amend section 29(g) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(g)) to clarify the duties of the Small Business Administration's Office of Women's Business Ownership, and to require that the office establish an accreditation program for its grant recipients.

Section 1842—Women's Business Center Program

This section would amend section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656), relating to the Women's Business Center Program, to provide definitions of key terms relating to eligibility, to adjust the statutory cap on grants and requirement for matching funds by $0.035 million, to establish a mechanism for use of unobligated grant funds at the end of the fiscal year, and to improve oversight of grant recipients. This section would also require longer term planning, provide for continued authorization levels, and improve the application process.

Section 1843—Matching Requirements Under Women's Business Center Program

This section would amend section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656), relating to the Women's Business Center Program, to limit the ability of the Administrator to waive the requirement for matching funds by grant recipients, and to provide that excess non-Federal dollars obtained by a grant recipient will not be subject to part 200 of title 2, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulations.

SUBTITLE F—SCORE PROGRAM

Section 1851—SCORE Reauthorization

This section would amend section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) to authorize the SCORE program through fiscal year 2018, and to permit the current level of appropriations to extend through that period.

Section 1852—SCORE Program

This section would amend sections 8(b) and 8(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)–(c)) to rename the Service Corps of Retired Executives program, the "SCORE" program. This section would provide definitions for terms used in the SCORE program, require an annual report on the effectiveness of the program, and direct the Small Business Administration to establish standards protecting the information of entrepreneurs counseled by SCORE. Finally, this section would direct SCORE to utilize webinars and electronic mentoring as a way to increase SCORE's presence, and to engage in longer term strategic planning.

SUBTITLE G—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 1861—Improving Education on Small Business Regulations

This section would amend section 15 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644) to require the Small Business Administration to annually share a list of regulatory changes affecting small-business contracting with entities responsible for training acquisition personnel, such as the Federal Acquisition Institute and the Defense Acquisition University, and to entities providing technical assistance to small contractors. This section would also require that the applicable entities periodically update training materials.

Section 1862—Protecting Task Order Competition

This section would amend section 4106(f) of title 41, United States Code, to maintain a consistent approach to task-order protests between civilian and defense agencies. In section 843 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), the Government Accountability Office was authorized to decide certain bid protests until September 30, 2016. In section 830 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), the September 30, 2016, sunset was repealed as it applied to the Department of Defense. This section would repeal the sunset as it applies to other Federal agencies.

Section 1863—Improvements to Size Standards for Small Agricultural Producers

This section would amend section 18(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 647(b)) to revise the definition of an agricultural enterprise. This section would also amend section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a)) to authorize the Small Business Administration to establish different size standards for various types of agricultural enterprises. Size standards would be established according to the existing method and appeals process by which the Small Business Administration establishes other size standards.

Section 1864—Uniformity in Service-Disabled Veteran Definitions

This section would amend section 3(q) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(q)) and section 8127 of title 38, United States Code, to standardize definitions for veteran-owned small businesses (VOSBs) and service-disabled veteran-owned small businesses (SDVOSBs). This section would also require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to use the regulations established by the Small Business Administration for establishing ownership and control of VOSBs and SDVOSBs. The Secretary would continue to determine whether individuals are veterans or service-disabled veterans and would be responsible for verification of applicant firms. Challenges to the status of a VOSB or SDVOSB based upon issues of ownership or control would be decided by the administrative judges at the Office of Hearings and Appeals of the Small Business Administration. The committee notes this section would not affect the Department of Defense.

Section 1865—Required Reports Pertaining to Capital Planning and Investment Control

This section would require the Small Business Administration to provide information regarding certain Federal, major information technology investments to the Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee of the Senate and the Small Business Committee of the House of Representatives. Section 832 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) required that this information be provided by Federal agencies to the Office of Management and Budget and be made public.

Section 1866—Office of Hearings and Appeals

This section would amend sections 3(a) and 5(i) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a) and 15 U.S.C. 634(i)) to clarify that the Office of Hearings and Appeals will not hear appeals on programs not found in the Small Business Act. This section also would allow a grace period for appeals that occur before the Small Business Administration implements the requirements of this section.

Section 1867—Issuance of Guidance on Small Business Matters

This section would require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to issue guidance with respect to the changes made to the Small Business Act made in this title.

DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS

PURPOSE

Division B provides military construction, family housing, and related authorities in support of the military departments during fiscal year 2017. As recommended by the committee, division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of $7,827,591,000 for construction in support of the Active Forces, Reserve Components, defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization security infrastructure fund for fiscal year 2017.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND FAMILY HOUSING OVERVIEW

The Department of Defense requested $5,918,967,000 for military construction, $205,237,000 for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities, and $1,319,852,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $6,445,050,000 for military construction, $230,237,000 for BRAC activities, and $1,276,289,000 for family housing in fiscal year 2017. The Department of Defense also requested $134,040,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations military construction for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $133,591,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations military construction within title XXIX.

Section 2001—Short Title

This section would cite division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017."

Section 2002—Expiration of Authorizations and Amounts Required To Be Specified by Law

This section would ensure that the authorizations provided in titles XXI through XXVII and title XXIX of this Act shall expire on October 1, 2019, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2020, whichever is later.

Section 2003—Effective Date

This section would provide that titles XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV, XXVI, XXVII, and XXIX of this Act shall take effect on October 1, 2016, or the date of enactment of this Act, whichever is later.

TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $503,459,000 for Army military construction and $526,730,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $572,959,000 for military construction and $483,167,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Army but not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) $29.0 million for an Access Control Point at Fort Gordon, Georgia. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $29.0 million, an increase of $29.0 million, for this project.

(2) $23.0 million for a Facility/Company Operations Facility at Fort Belvoir, Virginia. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $23.0 million, an increase of $23.0 million, for this project.

(3) $10.6 million for a Company Operations Facility Tactical Equipment Maintenance at Fort Gordon, Georgia. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $10.6 million, an increase of $10.6 million, for this project.

(4) $6.9 million for a Fire Station at Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $6.9 million, an increase of $6.9 million, for this project.

In addition, the committee notes that the budget request for military construction and family housing includes $143.6 million for Family Housing New Construction at Camp Humphreys, Republic of Korea. Furthermore, the committee is aware that this is the first phase of proposed military family housing construction at Camp Humphreys, with a $153.0 million second phase planned for fiscal year 2019. Given the requirements that have been established by the Commander of U.S. Forces Korea to house command sponsored families on installation, and the timeline for the relocation of U.S. Forces Korea and Eighth Army to Camp Humphreys, the committee believes that combining the two phases into a single project will better meet the commander's requirements. In addition, the committee believes that combining the two phases into a single project will result in efficiencies in terms of the financial costs of the project and the construction timeline. Therefore, the committee recommends a total authorization of $297.0 million for Family Housing New Construction at Camp Humphreys, Republic of Korea. However, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 2017 only in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization of appropriations. Therefore, the committee recommends $100.0 million, a reduction of $43.6 million, for this project in fiscal year 2017.

Combat Aviation Hangar Sustainment

The committee is concerned that the Army's aging maintenance hangars that support its combat aviation units have not been sustained to the level necessary to meet minimal operational requirements at the Combat Aviation Brigades. The committee recognizes that there is a requirement for the Army to develop an integrated combat aviation maintenance infrastructure modernization plan to account for the operational needs informed by future basing and the Aviation Restructure Initiative. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, on the current condition of the Army's Combat Aviation hangar infrastructure. At a minimum, the briefing should provide a list of the locations and facilities where combat aviation hangars have a facility index rating below 80, the required cost and scope of work required to restore the facilities, and the extent to which the degraded facilities pose a risk to maintenance crews, a hazard to aircraft, and have an adverse impact on military readiness.

Former Fitzsimons Army Medical Center

The committee is aware that the Fitzsimmons Army Medical Center was closed as part of the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process. The committee is also aware that the Department of the Army's transfer of land to the University of Colorado for the purpose of building the Anschutz Medical Campus is a successful outcome of BRAC that created thousands of jobs and allowed the university and its hospital partners to build a "science city" that contributes to the State's economy, the health of its citizens, and the Nation's biomedical research infrastructure. However, the committee is aware that the Department of the Army and the Fitzsimmons Redevelopment Authority are engaged in negotiations on a claim over asbestos and other hazardous materials on the land directly north of the medical campus, which has delayed further development of the remaining property. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to continue working with the redevelopment authority with the goal of reaching a mutually agreeable solution that is in the best interest of the U.S. Government, protects the Department from future legal liability, and allows communities to move forward with the economic revitalization of this property. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than 30 days after completion of negotiations, on the terms of the claim settlement and the timeline and resources required by the Department to ensure continued revitalization of the property.

Relocation of the Defense Non-Tactical Generator and Rail Equipment Center

The Defense Non-Tactical Generator and Rail Equipment Center (DGRC) is currently located at Hill Air Force Base, Utah. This is the Department of Defense's sole organic capability for depot-level repair and maintenance of rail stock and rail equipment, as well as certain types of large-scale power generation equipment. DGRC currently services not only the Army's nationwide rail fleet, but

also rail equipment for the Air Force and the Navy. The committee agrees with the Secretary of the Army's decision on August 28, 2015, to relocate the DGRC. The committee notes that the two prior congressional-directed studies completed by the Army highlight a favorable business case for the Army to recapitalize the center's facilities instead of renovating the existing complex. The committee also notes that the Army Corps of Engineers initiated an environmental assessment in January 2016 to study four Army locations, to include Anniston Army Depot, Alabama; McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, Oklahoma; Red River Army Deport, Texas; and Tooele Army Depot, Utah. The committee understands that the Army expects to complete this environmental assessment in September 2016, with a final site selection to be made in the second quarter of fiscal year 2017. Upon completion of the required environmental assessment, the committee encourages the Army to expedite its plan for implementing the relocation. Finally, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide a decision to the House Committee on Armed Services no later than July 31, 2016, on the preferred alternative for the relocation of the DGRC, and a briefing no later than March 1, 2017, on the estimated timeline to complete the relocation, and the funding requirements, infrastructure investments, and plan for implementing the DGRC relocation.

Statue of Ulysses S. Grant at United States Military Academy

The committee notes that The Plain at the United States Military Academy contains statues of several famous West Point graduates, including Douglas MacArthur (class of 1903), George Patton (class of 1909), and Dwight Eisenhower (class of 1915), but does not include a statue of another consequential graduate, Ulysses S. Grant (class of 1843). The committee therefore encourages the Secretary of the Army to consider placing a statue of Ulysses S. Grant at West Point in time for the sesquicentennial of his inauguration as the 18th President of the United States. The committee believes that funding for any statue should come from non-Federal funds and include a viable construction plan approved by the Superintendent of the United States Military Academy.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2101—Authorized Army Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2102—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2017.

Section 2103—Authorization of Appropriations, Army

This section would authorize appropriations for Army military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2104—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) and authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2105—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects

This section would extend the authorization of certain projects originally authorized by section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) and previously extended in section 2107 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (division B of Public Law 114–92) until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2106—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Projects

This section would extend the authorization of certain projects originally authorized by section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,027,763 for Navy military construction and $394,926,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1,394,679,000 for military construction and $394,926,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction of funding for a project contained in the budget request submitted by the Department of Navy for military construction and family housing. Specifically, this reduction is:

(1) $6.2 million for an Energy Security Hospital Microgrid at Naval Base San Diego (Balboa Hospital), California. The committee notes that this project would only support the non-essential facilities providing support functions for training and that, in a loss of power, these facilities could be supported by manually balancing the electrical load. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $6.2 million, for this project.

In addition, the committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Navy but not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) $79.4 million for an Aircraft Maintenance Hangar at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Navy. Furthermore, the committee notes that this project is an emergent requirement due to the Department of the Navy's decision to realign an F–35 carrier squadron to the West Coast to support Pacific theater operational requirements. While the committee supports the full authorization for the project in the amount of $118.9 million, the committee only supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the military department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. Therefore, the committee recommends $79.4 million, an increase of $79.4 million, for this project.

(2) $73.0 million for a Seawolf Class Service Pier at Bangor, Washington. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Navy. Therefore, the committee recommends $73.0 million, an increase of $73.0 million, for this project.

(3) $66.0 million for an Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant at Naval Station Mayport, Florida. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Navy. Therefore, the committee recommends $66.0 million, an increase of $66.0 million, for this project.

(4) $53.0 million for an A-School Dormitory at Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Navy. Therefore, the committee recommends $53.0 million, an increase of $53.0 million, for this project.

(5) $40.0 million for an F–35 Aircraft Parking Apron at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Navy. Furthermore, the committee notes that this project is an emergent requirement due to the Department of the Navy's decision to realign an F–35 carrier squadron to the West Coast to support Pacific theater operational requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends $40.0 million, an increase of $40.0 million, for this project.

(6) $34.7 million for a Communications Complex and Infrastructure at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar, California. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Navy. Furthermore, the committee notes that this project is an emergent

requirement due to the Department of the Navy's decision to realign an F–35 carrier squadron to the West Coast to support Pacific theater operational requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends $34.7 million, an increase of $34.7 million, for this project.

(7) $27.0 million for a Chamber Field Magazine Recapitalization Phase 1 at Naval Station Norfolk, Virginia. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Navy. Therefore, the committee recommends $27.0 million, an increase of $27.0 million, for this project.

Coconut Rhinoceros Beetle

The committee notes that the coconut rhinoceros beetle is native to Southeast Asia and can cause extensive vegetation damage, primarily to coconut and other palms. The committee is aware that the coconut rhinoceros beetle was first detected in Guam in 2007 and in Hawaii in 2013, and is considered an invasive species to both of these locations. In coordination with Federal and local agencies, Joint Region Marianas and Navy Region Hawaii have developed programs focused on detecting, monitoring, controlling, and, to the extent practicable, eradicating the coconut rhinoceros beetle populations from military facilities and installations. The committee is aware that in fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the Department of the Navy contributed $3.5 million related to coconut rhinoceros beetle response in Guam and Hawaii, and projects to contribute an additional $2.4 million in fiscal year 2016 based on detection and identified response requirements. In addition, other Federal, State, and local agencies have contributed resources in support of the response. The committee encourages the Department of the Navy to continue supporting efforts to detect, monitor, control, and, to the extent practicable, eradicate coconut rhinoceros beetle populations.

Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Joint Military Training

The committee is aware of a proposal to increase joint military training capabilities on the islands of Tinian and Pagan in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands by developing additional live-fire ranges, training courses, and maneuver areas. This effort, led by the U.S. Marine Corps, is intended to address currently unfilled joint military training requirements in the Western Pacific. The committee is supportive of this initiative and believes it is critical to support training capabilities in the western Pacific that build and sustain military readiness.

The committee is aware, however, that concerns have been voiced about how this proposed initiative will be implemented, as well as about potential impacts on the environment, including specifically cultural and historic sites on the islands. The committee notes that, following an in-depth review of nearly 30,000 public comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement released on April 3, 2015, it was announced that a Revised Drafted Environmental Impact Statement would be developed and is expected to be released in 2017. The committee believes it is important for the

U.S. Marine Corps to use the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process to fully address the comments received from government officials of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the public regarding this proposed action.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than 30 days after publishing the Final Revised Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), on the outcome of the FEIS. At minimum, the briefing should explain the preferred course of action for the development of training capabilities on the islands of Tinian and Pagan, concerns that were raised through the NEPA process, and the proposed actions to mitigate the concerns that were raised through the NEPA process.

Implementation of Guam Munitions and Explosives of Concern Clearance Policy

The committee is aware that the Territory of Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands have World War II era Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) and Munitions and Explosives of Concern (MEC) distributed across the islands. The committee notes that the current Explosive Safety Submission for Guam and the Northern Marianas Islands was approved in June 2010, and amendment six was approved in June 2015. Due to the potential military construction cost and schedule increases associated with compliance with the amended Explosive Safety Submission, and after further analysis of the safety and construction requirements, the Chief of Naval Operations issued an Explosive Safety Exemption in March 2016 for construction projects in Guam and the Northern Marianas Islands related to the Defense Policy Review Initiative and realignment of U.S. Marines. The committee notes that this exemption will be reviewed every 6 months, as conditions on the ground are reassessed as MEC clearance and construction efforts progress.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide briefings to the House Committee on Armed Services upon completion of the reassessments that occur at 6 months and 12 months, respectively, after issuing the March 2016 exemption. At minimum, the briefings should address: any amendments to Explosive Safety Submission or changes to the Explosive Safety Exemption; the rational for those amendments or changes; and the impact such amendments or changes may have to the cost or schedule of construction projects in Guam and the Northern Marianas Islands. In addition, the briefings should include an update on technology demonstrations as well as other procedural or policy modifications that may be under consideration to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of UXO and MEC clearance in Guam and the Northern Marianas Islands.

Infrastructure Requirements To Support Marine Rotational Force—Darwin

The committee notes that the U.S. Marine Corps Distributed Laydown includes plans to deploy 2,500 Marines to Darwin, Commonwealth of Australia, and northern Australia to conduct exercises and training on a 6-month rotational basis. The committee

further notes that plans to rotate U.S. Marines to Darwin were first announced in November 2011, and that the first iteration of Marine Rotational Force—Darwin (MRF–D) deployed in 2012. The committee supports these rotations and believes the training and exercises conducted by the MRF–D has helped to increase military readiness and develop valuable partnerships with the Australian Defense Forces and other partner nations. However, the committee is concerned that the U.S. Marine Corps has yet to initiate planning and design for known infrastructure requirements to support the full complement of 2,500 Marines or programmed these requirements in the Future Years Defense Program. Of note, the committee is aware that the U.S. Air Force initiated design of an aircraft parking apron at Royal Australian Air Force Base Darwin and requested authorization for the construction of this aircraft parking apron in the fiscal year 2017 budget request. The committee is also aware that the U.S. Marine Corps has identified a requirement for an aircraft parking apron that would be located adjacent to the proposed U.S. Air Force parking apron. The committee believes there are financial and engineering benefits from designing the two aircraft parking aprons together and expects the U.S. Marine Corps to work with the U.S. Air Force on a collaborative design effort to meet the aircraft parking apron requirement.

In light of these concerns, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, on the status of the development of, and planning and programming for, the infrastructure requirements that will be necessary to support 2,500 Marines and their equipment in Darwin and the northern Australia training areas. At minimum the briefing should include a detailed plan for the infrastructure requirements necessary to support the MRF–D, the estimated cost, scope, and timeline for the required infrastructure investments, and the details of any cost-sharing arrangement with the Government of Australia for the infrastructure investments or other support for the MRF–D.

Port of Virginia Channel

The committee is aware that the Port of Virginia anticipates increasing cargo traffic utilizing the shipping channel, to include larger "Post-Panamax" container ships. These larger ships and the increased number of commercial users of the port adjacent to the naval station could complicate the movement of Navy ships that also use the channel. These larger ships also require anchorage in deepwater areas that are currently used for military training and exercises. The committee understands that the Port of Virginia is pursuing the possibility of working with Naval Station Norfolk to widen the channel and dredge new deepwater anchorages. The committee encourages the Navy to work with the Port of Virginia on this important issue. The committee further encourages the Secretary of the Navy to keep Congress updated on the changes in commercial traffic volume and patterns at the Port of Virginia, as well as the potential impact on the Navy's operations.

Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility

In January 2014, the U.S. Navy detected the release of an estimated 27,000 gallons of JP–8 jet fuel from an underground storage tank located at the Red Hill Fuel Storage Facility in Hawaii. The committee notes that there are three wells within a 1.4 mile radius of the Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility: a Navy well in addition to the Halawa shaft and the Moanalu well, both of which are operated by the Honolulu Board of Water Supply. In response to the fuel release, the U.S. Navy, Defense Logistics Agency, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and the Hawaii Department of Health negotiated an enforceable order, known as an Administrative Order on Consent, which was signed in September 2015. As part of the order, the committee notes that the Navy committed to further updates of its existing Ground Water Protection Plan, to include the installation of additional monitoring wells as needed and establishing response procedures in the event that contamination originating from the facility is found in any drinking water well. The U.S. Navy and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency confirm that drinking water remains in compliance with federal and state standards. As the U.S. Navy and Defense Logistics Agency continue to execute the Ground Water Protection Plan, the committee encourages close coordination and consultation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the Hawaii Department of Health, and the Honolulu Board of Water Supply regarding the presence of fuel constituents detected in monitoring efforts and the potential effects of those fuel constituents on human health.

Further, the committee notes that in accordance with the Administrative Order on Consent, the U.S. Navy and Defense Logistics Agency have undertaken a study to identify and evaluate various tank upgrade alternatives to determine the best available practicable technology, as approved by the Hawaii Department of Health and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to ensure the continued safe operation of the Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility and prevent future fuel leaks into the environment. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency and the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than 30 days after the regulatory agencies' approval of the completion of the Tank Upgrade Alternative decision document for application, of the best available practicable technology or technologies that will be used in the Red Hill Bulk Underground Fuel Storage Facility upgrade. The briefing should address the process for collecting proposals for the review of available technologies, the specific technologies that were evaluated, the reasons the technology or technologies have been selected, and, to the extent available, the estimated costs, scope of work, and construction timelines associated with each alternative. In addition, the briefing should compare the costs of implementing the technology or technologies that have been selected with the cost of the replacement or relocation of the existing storage tanks. Finally, the briefing should address any updates to Ground Water Protection Plan, as well as the latest data available from ground water monitoring and how any

detected levels of fuel constituents relate to state and Federal standards.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2201—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2202—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Department of the Navy for fiscal year 2017.

Section 2203—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2017.

Section 2204—Authorization of Appropriations, Navy

This section would authorize appropriations for Navy military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2205—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) and authorize the Secretary of the Navy to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2206—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2207—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, and originally included in section 2201 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66), until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018,

whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2208—Status of "Net Negative" Policy Regarding Navy Acreage on Guam

This section would require the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act regarding the status of the implementation of the "Net Negative" policy regarding the total number of acres of real property controlled by the Department of the Navy on the Territory of Guam.

TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $1,481,058,000 for Air Force military construction and $335,781,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1,502,723,000 for military construction and $335,781,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction of funding for several projects contained in the budget request submitted by the Department of the Air Force for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $82.3 million for an F–35A Aircraft Weather Shelter (Squadron #2) at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska. The committee supports the decision made by the Air Force through its strategic basing process to base two squadrons of F–35As at Eielson Air Force Base. However, the committee is concerned about the Air Force's ability and capacity to execute the number of new military construction projects included in the budget request, especially given limited construction time periods. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $82.3 million, for this project.

(2) $53.1 million for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Complex Consolidation, Phase 3 at Royal Air Force Base Croughton, United Kingdom. The committee notes that the Department of the Air Force has yet to obligate funding for the second phase of the project, which was authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). In addition, the committee notes that the Comptroller General of the United States has yet to submit a report reviewing the Department of Defense's construction and life-cycle cost estimating in their analysis of alternatives related to the basing decision for the complex. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $53.1 million, for this project.

In addition, the committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Air Force

but not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) $50.0 million for a Consolidated Communications Center at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $50.0 million, an increase of $50.0 million, for this project.

(2) $26.0 million for an E–3G Mission and Flight Simulator Training Facility at Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $26.0 million, an increase of $26.0 million, for this project.

(3) $17.0 million for Fire and Rescue Station at Joint Base Charleston, South Carolina. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $17.0 million, an increase of $17.0 million, for this project.

(4) $10.9 million for a Vandenberg Gate Complex at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $10.9 million, an increase of $10.9 million, for this project.

Air Force Remotely Piloted Aircraft Stationing, Basing, and Laydown Selection Process

The committee believes that the military departments' selection process for stationing, basing, and laydown decisions for units and missions should remain transparent, repeatable, and defendable in nature. The committee is supportive of the Air Force's strategic basing process and believes that it provides a thorough, consistent, and transparent process for basing decisions. With respect to basing decisions for remotely piloted aircraft (RPA), the committee believes that the Air Force should assess the ability of a military installation and its associated or adjacent training areas to support the unit or mission, the capacity of a military installation to accommodate the unit or mission, the costs associated with the stationing, basing, or laydown action, and encroachment and environmental considerations. Further, the committee is supportive of basing criteria that leverage available Air Force infrastructure and existing quality of life and base support facilities, and pairs RPA units with related missions.

Lincoln Laboratory Recapitalization

The committee recognizes the vital role that Lincoln Laboratory plays in conducting research and developing technologies that address critical national security challenges. In the committee report (H. Rept. 113–446) accompanying the Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, the committee noted its concern with the condition of Lincoln Laboratory's facilities at Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, and expressed

support for efforts to recapitalize these important facilities. The committee is aware that the Air Force intends to obligate up to $40.0 million in fiscal year 2017 for the planning and design of two military construction projects to support the recapitalization of facilities to support Lincoln Laboratory. The committee notes that the Future Year Defense Program submitted with the budget request for fiscal year 2017 included the first construction project, the Advanced Microelectronics Integration Facility at a cost of $225.0 million, currently programmed for fiscal year 2019. The committee commends the Secretary of the Air Force for programming these investments and for committing to the recapitalization of the facilities and Lincoln Laboratory. The committee supports these important recapitalization efforts in order to keep the Department of Defense and the military services at the cutting edge of technology.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2301—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2302—Family Housing

This section would authorize new construction and planning and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2017.

Section 2303—Improvements to Military Family Housing Units

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make improvements to existing units of family housing for fiscal year 2017.

Section 2304—Authorization of Appropriations, Air Force

This section would authorize appropriations for Air Force military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2305—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2016 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (division B of Public Law 114–92) to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2306—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed, originally provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239), and previously extended by section 2309 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2307—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed, originally provided by section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66), until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2308—Restriction on Acquisition of Property in Northern Mariana Islands

This section would prohibit the Secretary of the Air Force from using any of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to acquire property or interests in property at an unspecified location in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands until the congressional defense committees have received a report from the Secretary that provides the specific location of the property or interest in property to be acquired, the total cost, scope and location of military construction projects for divert activities and exercises at the location, and an analysis of any alternative locations considered, including other locations or interests within the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands or the Freely Associated States.

TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $2,056,091,000 for defense agency military construction and $62,415,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $1,929,643,000 for military construction and $62,415,000 for family housing for fiscal year 2017.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends reduction of funding for several projects contained in the budget request submitted by the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing. These reductions include:

(1) $55.0 million for the Longer Range Discrimination Radar System Complex, Phase 1, at Clear Air Force Station, Alaska. The budget request included $155.0 million to construct a complex supporting missile defense command and control components to defend the United States from ballistic missile attacks. The committee supports the requirement for this project and provides the full project authorization included in the budget request. However, the committee supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the Department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2017. Therefore, the committee recommends $100.0 million, a reduction of $55.0 million, for this project.

(2) $50.0 million for the NSAW Recapitalize Building #2, Increment 2 at Fort Meade, Maryland. The budget request included $195.0 million to support a new operations facility. The committee supports the requirement for this project, but only supports the authorization of appropriations in an amount equivalent to the ability of the Department to execute in the year of the authorization for appropriations. For this project, the committee believes that the Department of Defense has exceeded its ability to fully expend the funding in fiscal year 2017. Therefore, the committee recommends $145.0 million, a reduction of $50.0 million, for this project.

(3) $35.6 million for the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) Military Construction Planning and Design activities. The budget request included $71.6 million for the planning and design of military construction projects, to include the Next NGA West Campus. The committee is concerned that the site selection for the new campus has not occurred and that the requirements and scope for the construction of the new campus have yet to be well defined. Therefore, the committee recommends $36.0 million, a reduction of $35.6 million, for this project.

(4) $0.8 million for the Land Acquisition for Next NGA West Campus, St. Louis, Missouri. The budget request included $0.8 million to purchase a 182-acre land parcel in the Greater St. Louis Metropolitan Area to allow the construction of the Next NGA West campus. The committee is concerned that the budget request does not account for the actual cost of the land due to the fact that the site selection has yet to occur. The committee also believes that it would be more appropriate for the required land acquisition to be included in the request for authorization of the full scope of the military construction required for the Next NGA West campus. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds, a reduction of $0.8 million, for this project.

In addition, the committee recommends an increase of funding for a project not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. Specifically, this increase is:

(1) $15.0 million for the Missile Defense Agency Military Construction Planning and Design activities for an East Coast site for homeland missile defense. The budget request did not include funding for this project. The committee recommends $15.0 million, an increase of $15.0 million, for this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2401—Authorized Defense Agencies' Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized defense agencies' construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2402—Authorized Energy Conservation Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects valued at a cost greater than $3,000,000 at the amounts authorized for each project at a specific location. This section would also authorize the sum total of projects across various locations, each project of which is less than $3,000,000.

Section 2403—Authorization of Appropriations, Defense Agencies

This section would authorize appropriations for defense agencies' military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2404—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66), to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2405—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, originally authorized by section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239), and subsequently amended by section 2406 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92), until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2406—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, originally authorized by section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66), until October 1, 2017, or the date of enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $177,932,000 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program (NSIP) for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $177,932,000 for NSIP for fiscal year 2017.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2501—Authorized NATO Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this Act and the amount collected from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as a result of construction previously financed by the United States.

Section 2502—Authorization of Appropriations, NATO

This section would authorize appropriations for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $672,664,000 for military construction of National Guard and Reserve facilities for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $867,114,000 for military construction for fiscal year 2017.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Explanation of Funding Adjustments

The committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Army for the Army Reserve that were not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) $30.0 million for an Army Reserve Center in Phoenix, Arizona. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $30.0 million, an increase of $30.0 million, for this project.

(2) $29.0 million for an Equipment Concentration Site in Barstow, California. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $29.0 million, an increase of $29.0 million, for this project.

(3) $27.5 million for an Army Reserve Center at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $27.5 million, an increase of $27.5 million, for this project.

In addition, the committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Army for the Army National Guard that were not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) $31.0 million for a General Instruction Building at Camp Guernsey, Wyoming. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $31.0 million, an increase of $31.0 million, for this project.

(2) $20.0 million for an Access Control Point at Fort Indiantown Gap, Pennsylvania. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $20.0 million, an increase of $20.0 million, for this project.

(3) $16.5 million for a National Guard Readiness Center at Fort Carson, Colorado. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Army. Therefore, the committee recommends $16.5 million, an increase of $16.5 million, for this project.

In addition, the committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Air Force for the Air Force Reserves that were not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) $9.2 million for an Indoor Small Arms Range at Westover Air Force Reserve Base, Massachusetts. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $9.2 million, an increase of $9.2 million, for this project.

(2) $5.2 million for a Reserve Medical Training Facility at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $5.2 million, an increase of $5.2 million, for this project.

(3) $3.1 million for ADAL Life Support Facility at Hill Air Force Base, Utah. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $3.1 million, an increase of $3.1 million, for this project.

Finally, the committee recommends the inclusion of funding for several projects requested by the Department of the Air Force for the Air National Guard that were not contained in the budget request for military construction and family housing. These increases include:

(1) $6.0 million for an Indoor Small Arms Range at Toledo Express Airport, Ohio. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the

Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $6.0 million, an increase of $6.0 million, for this project.

(2) $5.0 million for a Control Facility at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland. The committee notes that this project was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $5.0 million, an increase of $5.0 million, for this project.

(3) $12.0 million for unspecified minor military construction at unspecified worldwide locations. The budget request included $17.5 million for unspecified minor military construction at unspecified worldwide locations. The committee notes that additional funding for unspecified minor military construction was included on a list of unfunded project requirements submitted by the Department of the Air Force. Therefore, the committee recommends $29.5 million, an increase of $12.0 million, for this project.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS AND AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 2601—Authorized Army National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2602—Authorized Army Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Army Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2603—Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2604—Authorized Air National Guard Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air National Guard construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2605—Authorized Air Force Reserve Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of authorized Air Force Reserve construction projects for fiscal year 2017. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis. The state list contained in this Act is intended to be the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

Section 2606—Authorization of Appropriations, National Guard and Reserve

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Guard and Reserve military construction at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—OTHER MATTERS

Section 2611—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2612—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2015 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2603 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2613—Modification of Authority To Carry Out Certain Fiscal Year 2016 Project

This section would modify the authority provided by section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (division B of Public Law 114–92) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make certain modifications to the scope of a previously authorized construction project.

Section 2614—Extension of Authorization of Certain Fiscal Year 2013 Project

This section would extend the authorization listed, originally provided by section 2603 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) and extended by section 2614 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (division B of Public Law 114–92) until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

Section 2615—Extension of Authorizations of Certain Fiscal Year 2014 Projects

This section would extend the authorizations listed, originally provided by sections 2602, 2603, 2604, and 2605 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) until October 1, 2017, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2018, whichever is later. This section was included in the President's request.

TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $205,237,000 for activities related to Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $230,237,000 for BRAC activities.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2701—Authorization of Appropriations for Base Realignment and Closure Activities Funded Through Department of Defense Base Closure Account

This section would authorize appropriations for ongoing activities that are required to implement the Base Realignment and Closure activities authorized by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (part A of title XXIX of Public Law 101–510), at the levels identified in section 4601 of division D of this Act.

Section 2702—Prohibition on Conducting Additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Round

This section would state that nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an additional Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round, affirming congressional intent to reject the budget request to authorize another BRAC round in 2019. This section also clarifies that this prohibition does not affect the authority of the Secretary of Defense to comply with any requirement under law, or with any request of a congressional defense committee, to conduct an analysis, study, or report of the infrastructure needs of the Department of Defense.

TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Aqueous Film-Forming Foam

The committee is aware that aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF), a synthetic foam to extinguish flammable liquid fuel fires, was developed in the mid-1960s. Since then, it has been used in both military and civilian firefighting operations. However, the committee is

aware that AFFF contains polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) and that the Federal regulatory agency issued in 2009 a Provisional Health Advisory covering perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) in drinking water. Furthermore, the committee is aware that the Department of Defense has sponsored a number of projects seeking to develop a better understanding of occurrences, potential remedial treatment, and toxicological effects of PFOA and PFOS. This includes two projects recently selected under the Department of Defense's Environmental Security Technology Certification Program regarding PFOAs and PFOSs that occur at military sites as well as how they can be reliably measured in the environment. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, no later than March 1, 2017, regarding the Department's efforts and initiatives in response to PFOAs and PFOSs. Specifically, the briefing should address: the Department's current policies regarding PFOA and PFAS; the programmatic approach being taken by the Department of Defense to identify, investigate, and respond to the presence of PFOA and PFAS at military installations; and the programmatic approach to the removal and replacement of PFOAs and PFOSs in AFFF firefighting foam.

Concept of Operations for Military Environmental Control Units

The committee is aware that a significant amount of fuel used at forward operating bases is consumed by environmental control units (ECUs). These ECUs are mostly used to simultaneously keep service members and major electronic systems cool in austere environments. Separately cooling service members and electronics may have the potential to achieve higher energy efficiency and lower costs. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, that details testing accomplished or planned to evaluate the potential efficiency and lower costs that may be obtained using a distributed cooling concept of operations versus legacy approaches. The briefing should specifically include a discussion of the potential benefits and savings possible using enclosed-sized ECU units and systems for equipment cooling, and should compare the size, weight, power, purchase, and overall operational costs of employing these units versus legacy expeditionary ECUs. In addition, the briefing should address the Department of Defense's organizations engaged in this testing and the organization designated as the office of primary responsibility.

Condition of Military Airfield Infrastructure

The committee believes that the military departments' airfields are crucial enablers of rapid mobility and power projection of the U.S. Armed Forces. The committee recognizes that the military departments have consistently taken risk in infrastructure investments over the past decade, due to budget reductions, and redirected funds from facility sustainment, restoration, and modernization to other budget priorities. The committee is concerned that the risk assumed in infrastructure investments has resulted in the deterioration of runways, taxiway pavements, parking ramps, and

aircraft hydrant fueling systems that may pose a safety risk to aircrews, a hazard to aircraft, and have an adverse impact on military operations and training. The committee believes that when prioritizing investments in airfield infrastructure, priority should be given to addressing infrastructure in the worst condition that directly supports military operations and training. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, on the current condition of military airfield infrastructure. At a minimum, the briefing should provide a list of the locations where the airfield infrastructure has a facility index rating below 80, the required cost and scope of work required to restore the locations with degraded airfield infrastructure, and the extent to which the degraded airfield infrastructure poses a risk to aircrews, a hazard to aircraft, and has an adverse impact on military operations and training.

Consultation With Federally-Recognized Indian Tribes

The committee is aware that the Department of Defense issued Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 4710.02 on September 14, 2006. This instruction implements policy, assigns responsibilities, and provides procedures for the Department of Defense's interactions with Federally-recognized Tribes. The committee believes that DODI 4710.02, when followed, provides a consistent and responsive framework for interacting with Federally-recognized Tribes on issues such as construction, training, over-flights, access to sacred sites and treaty-reserved resources, and management of religious and culturally significant sites. Unfortunately, the committee is concerned that the Department of Defense may not be complying with their own instruction and requirements for consultations with Federally-recognized Indian Tribes. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretaries of the military departments, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than March 1, 2017, that addresses compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and instructions regarding interactions with Federally-recognized Tribes. In addition, the briefing shall identify what actions could be taken, consistent with DODI 4710.02, to ensure that timely notice and appropriate consultation with tribes occurs prior to taking any actions that may have the potential to significantly affect protected tribal resources, treaty rights, or Indian lands protected by a statute, regulation, or executive order.

Contract Management of Problem Construction Projects

The committee notes that the Department of Defense maintains more than 560,000 facilities valued at nearly $880.00 billion. The Department invests in its infrastructure by using military construction to replace failing facilities and to construct new facilities to support new requirements. The Department uses facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization (FSRM) to maintain existing facilities in good order, restore facilities whose age is excessive or has been damaged, and alters facilities to implement new or higher standards to accommodate new functions or missions. Given the scope of the Department's real property inventory,

and the annual investments made in facilities, the committee notes that the majority of work on facilities is accomplished through contracts. The committee notes that there are some examples where projects may not have met construction quality standards or where a contractor defaulted on a project before the project could be completed. The committee is concerned that issues with construction quality and performance may have an adverse financial impact on the Department. The committee believes it is important for the Department of Defense to have a robust, cross-service plan for contract management and, when appropriate, recovering funds used for failed or failing construction contracts or projects that did not meet construction quality standards.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with each of the military services, to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than February 1, 2017, on the Department's policy for recovering funds from projects where quality standards were not met, a recent history on failed projects, terminated contracts and significant facilities with quality problems that occurred after beneficial occupancy, and the actions that the Department has taken on these projects to recover funding. Further, the briefing should identify the offices of primary responsibility and describe their levels of authority for recovering funds from failed projects or projects where the contractor has not meet quality standards, and how these offices share lessons learned. Finally, the briefing should address how the Department identifies and ensures poor performing contractors are kept from receiving future Government work.

Facility Industrial Control Systems

The committee is aware that Department of Defense facilities increasingly incorporate industrial control systems integrated into systems and equipment such as air conditioners, utility meters, and other programmable controllers. While these systems have the potential to improve facility energy management and reduce personnel and operating costs, the higher connectivity of these systems brings an increased threat from, and vulnerability to, cyberattacks. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has undertaken a number of initiatives to implement and promote secure procedures, adopt best government practices, and revise Department of Defense Unified Facility Criteria and Unified Facility Guide Specifications to address the cybersecurity vulnerabilities of industrial control systems. The committee encourages the facilities and installations community to continue these initiatives to mitigate the identified security risks to Department of Defense facilities. The committee also recognizes this as a growing area of concern, and encourages the Department's cybersecurity community to look more closely at these classes of vulnerabilities and how to modify tactics, techniques, and procedures to better position the cyber mission forces to deal with new and emerging threats proactively.

Improvement of Design-Build Selection Process

The committee continues to remain interested in the Department of Defense's use and implementation of the two-phase design-build

selection procedures. The committee notes that the Department provided a briefing to the committee on March 10, 2016, in compliance with a directive in the committee report (H. Rept. 114–102) to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. The briefing highlighted the implementation status of the updates to the Federal Acquisition Regulation that implemented the 2015 amendments to section 2305a, title 10, United States Code. The briefing addressed the number of design-build contracts exceeding $4.0 million awarded in fiscal year 2015 where more than five firms were advanced to step two, and all one-step design-build contracts awarded in fiscal year 2015. The committee will continue to closely monitor how these changes have affected the design, engineering, and construction industry and the Department's ability to award construction projects under this authority.

Innovative Construction Materials and Design Process for Military Engineering in Cold Regions

The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense may face challenges to operating in the Arctic, sub-Arctic, and other extreme cold environments, should the need for operations arise. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense is developing an implementation plan for the National Strategy for the Arctic Region. The committee notes that the implementation of the plan may entail engineering challenges such as ability to construct, maintain, and retrofit horizontal and vertical infrastructure in cold regions.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to perform an assessment of advanced adaptive construction techniques and innovative materials needed to address the challenges of changing physical environments which will enable the Department of Defense to rapidly project force in austere cold regions. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, no later than March 1, 2017, on the results of the assessment and the requirements for adaptive construction techniques and innovative materials for extreme cold environments.

Installation Access for Ride Sharing Services

The committee is aware that ride sharing services have increased in popularity in recent years. However, the committee notes that the Department of Defense has not issued guidance or policies regarding ride sharing services and their access to military installations. The committee remains concerned about the security of military installations and agrees with the Department's determination that drivers and occupants of ride sharing vehicles who do not have an authorized identification card or facility or installation physical access pass would be treated no differently than other visitors. Such individuals should be required to clear visitor control and screening protocols at each installation as directed by the Department of Defense and military department's policies for visitors to military installations or facilities. However, the committee believes more clear guidance from the Department of Defense may be necessary to assist installation commanders in their efforts to balance installation security and accommodate ride sharing services for the benefit of military personnel and civilians on their installations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than February 1, 2017, that outlines the rationale behind the decision to not provide new or updated guidance or policies regarding ride sharing services, details of the existing installation commander authorities to accommodate ride sharing services at Department of Defense installations and facilities, and explains the level of engagement the Department has had with the ride sharing service industry and the options discussed with the industry to aid in more consistent access procedures across all defense installations.

Live-Fire Small Arms Training Ranges

The committee is aware that U.S. military live-fire small arms training ranges, particularly those in the Pacific, face complicated operational safety and environmental concerns. Hazards, such as bullet ricochets and toxins from bullets and projectiles leeching into the natural water system, can have an environmental, safety, and economic impact on the local communities near these ranges. The committee is aware that there are commercially available technologies for live-fire small arms ranges that may provide a safer, more environmentally sound alternative to ensure the collection of spent bullets and other projectiles. The committee believes the implementation of such technologies could reduce operations and maintenance costs for the U.S. military and future environmental remediation costs of the ranges. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess available technologies and designs that can be incorporated into live-fire small arms training ranges and to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than March 1, 2017. The briefing shall address the technologies and designs assessed, how these technologies and designs may enhance range safety and mitigate adverse impacts to the environment, and the feasibility of incorporating these technologies and designs into live-fire small arms range construction.

Military Construction for Military Intelligence Facilities

The committee notes that a number of defense-wide agencies and branches of the military departments are members of the Intelligence Community and provide vital support to military operations. The committee strongly supports the work the men and women of the intelligence community do on a daily basis and recognizes the unique infrastructure requirements they have to support their mission. To that end, the committee notes that both title 10, United States Code and title 50, United States Code, provide construction authorities for members of the Intelligence Community, but there have been inconsistencies on funding construction requirements through the military construction program or the military intelligence program. The committee is concerned that insufficient policy and guidance is available to the military departments responsible for planning, programming and executing construction on military installations in support of members of the Intelligence Community. Further, the committee is concerned that existing policy and guidance may not ensure consistent use of authorities or program funding across the Department of Defense.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, to provide a briefing not later than December 1, 2016, to the House Committee on Armed Services, the House Committee on Appropriations, and the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, that outlines the current policies regarding the construction of military intelligence facilities, the Department's processes for determining, validating and prioritizing military intelligence facility projects, and the project programming guidance available to the military departments for determining the appropriate funding program for each project. In addition, the briefing should include a specific discussion on the use of military intelligence program funding for military construction, to include the benefits and impacts of restricting any military intelligence construction to this program, as well as the requirement for construction projects to be specifically authorized in law. Finally, the briefing should include a discussion on the existing statutory authorities used for the execution and management of military construction for military intelligence facilities.

Military Housing Privatization Initiative

The committee notes that the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (MHPI) has privatized more than 200,000 military homes since the program's inception in 1996. The program has helped significantly reduce the amount of inadequate on-base housing and has contributed to the quality of life for military families. The committee notes that each military department negotiated their own MPHI agreements with private developers on a project-by-project basis and, in most cases, the rental rates for MHPI housing are tied to a service member's Basic Allows for Housing (BAH) rate. The committee notes that recent changes to BAH, as well as changes to military force structure, may impact the viability of MHPI projects and the ability to adequately sustain and recapitalize housing units.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense has yet to issue policy or guidance to the military departments or the MHPI partners on how it plans to mitigate these impacts on MHPI projects. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than September 30, 2016, on its plan to maintain the viability of the MHPI program. At minimum, the briefing should include a discussion of the Department's plan and the alternatives considered for ensuring the continued viability of MHPI projects.

Modification of Guidance on Use of Airfield Pavement Markings

The committee is aware that Secretary of Defense has taken some actions to modify the Unified Facilities Guide Specifications for pavement markings and Department engineering technical letters on airfield pavement markings to permit the use of Type III category of retro-reflective beads in accordance with section 2851 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92). However, based on the Air Force's airfield rubber removal, airfield paint removal, and airfield restriping multi-installation contract solicitation, released on January 14, 2016, that did

not permit Type III category of retro-reflective beads, it appears that the Department's engineering organizations have not received sufficient guidance or methodologies to ensure they comply with section 2851.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services, not later than September 30, 2016, that details the full extent of actions taken to modify specifications, technical letters, and other Department guidance on airfield markings; the remaining actions to be taken to update additional Secretary of Defense guidance; and the outline of the Department's methodology to ensure that determination of the category of retro-reflective beads used on airfields is determined on an installation-by-installation basis, based on local conditions and the life-cycle maintenance costs of the pavement markings.

Okinawa Consolidation Plan

The committee remains supportive of the Consolidation Plan for Facilities and Areas in Okinawa that was announced in April 2013, and reaffirmed in the "2+2 agreement" on April 27, 2015. Under this plan, the United States will return certain facilities and areas on Okinawa as conditions are met, when replacement facilities are constructed, and as a sizable contingent of U.S. Marine Corps forces are relocated outside of Japan. The committee believes that implementation of this plan is crucial to the bilateral security interests of the United States and Japan.

The committee notes that some progress has been made toward implementing the Okinawa Consolidation Plan. This includes the lifting of restrictions on the expenditure of U.S. and Japanese funding for construction that will support the relocation of U.S. Marines from Okinawa to Guam, and the early returns of parcels of land on U.S. Marine Corps Air Station Futenma and Camp Kinser. However, the committee remains concerned with delays in the construction of the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF). The FRF is a crucial capability that is necessary before U.S. Marine Corps Air Station Futenma can be returned. Furthermore, the committee notes that construction on the FRF will be suspended, as part of a March 2016 agreement between the Government of Japan and Okinawa Prefectural Government, while the two sides resume negotiations over the issue.

While the committee appreciates the statements made by the Government of Japan reaffirming its commitment to implementation of the plan, the committee is disappointed that more progress has not been made on this issue since the landfill permit was signed for the construction of the FRF on December 27, 2013. The committee encourages continued progress by both the United States and Japan toward full implementation of the "2+2 agreement," and hopes that the Government of Japan and the Okinawa Prefectural Government will make progress on the FRF in the coming year. Until such time as the FRF is complete, the committee believes that it is important to invest in the infrastructure and facilities at Marine Corps Air Station Futenma to ensure they remain capable of supporting military training and operational requirements.

Overseas Infrastructure Long-Range Planning

The committee notes that the U.S. Armed Forces operate from a variety of overseas facilities that are categorized as enduring locations in the annual "Report to Congress on U.S. Global Defense Posture". Many of these locations support both steady-state and contingency employment of U.S. forces, providing reassurance to partners and allies, deterring potential adversaries, and enabling the rapid projection of forces if required. The committee is concerned that the Department of Defense continues to rely on temporary and expeditionary infrastructure to support steady-state personnel and operations at certain locations that have had a significant U.S. presence for more than a decade. Furthermore, the committee is concerned about the impact these temporary and expeditionary facilities may have on ability to conduct and support military operations, the maintenance and availability of weapon systems and equipment, and the quality of life for personnel. The committee believes that the rotational nature of the steady-state populations at these locations may adversely impact the ability to efficiently and effectively conduct long-term planning and programming of facilities to support the enduring military requirements. Finally, the committee is concerned that there may be a disconnect between the stated requirement for steady-state personnel, operations, and facilities compared to the actual situation on the ground.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services not later than February 1, 2017, on the development of facility requirements for overseas enduring locations supporting contingency operations. Specifically, the briefing should address what improvements are being made to improve the long-term planning and programming process, how that planning and programming factors in the actual steady-state population and operations, an overview of plans to transition from expeditionary to semi-permanent or permanent facilities, and whether new authorities or changes to existing authorities are required to support facility investments at overseas enduring locations.

Report on Military Construction Project Cost Estimating and Execution

Final costs in military construction project execution may vary from initial estimates for a number of reasons including scope, design, or other change orders; unanticipated project design changes; potentially unreliable design or cost estimating assumptions or methods; or for other reasons. It is critical for the Department of Defense to execute needed military construction projects to ensure mission capability and a safe and healthful operational and residential environment on military installations. At the same time, in an era of constrained fiscal resources, the committee is concerned that the Department and the military services demonstrate effective military construction project planning, cost estimating, and execution.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department of Defense's military construction cost estimating and project management processes and to

submit a report to the congressional defense committees by February 15, 2017, on the findings. The Comptroller may also provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by that date with a final report as soon as practicable thereafter. The Comptroller General's study should examine:

(1) The extent to which the Department of Defense and the military departments' systems, practices, and procedures for designing projects and producing cost estimates for military construction projects follow leading practices in this area and are used to support the Department of Defense's budget submissions;

(2) What is known about the quality of the Department of Defense's cost estimating performance over time;

(3) How the military departments execute scope and cost changes in military construction projects; and

(4) The extent to which trends in the execution of Department of Defense military construction projects since 2010 show any significant differences between project cost estimates and final cost at execution, including key elements of the projects and the reasons for those differences, if known.

Workforce Issues for Relocation of Marines to Guam

The committee notes that Guam will require additional construction capacity to support and sustain the relocation of Marines to Guam. Further, the committee is aware that the Department of Defense has indicated that once major construction activities commence on Guam, companies may need to rely on temporary H–2B visa workers for construction purposes. For this reason, the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–229) contained a provision that included Guam and Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands outside the national cap for H-type visa workers. However, the committee notes that recently the Guam Department of Labor indicates an increase in the number of denials for H–2B applications particularly for construction companies that are supporting military construction projects on Guam. There is concern that these denials could lead to delays in the program of record and, as such, the committee urges the Department of Defense to coordinate with other Federal agencies as appropriate to ensure that H–2B visa applications are appropriately processed and that there is sufficient workforce to meet construction demands.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND MILITARY FAMILY HOUSING

Section 2801—Modification of Criteria for Treatment of Laboratory Revitalization Projects as Minor Military Construction Projects

This section would amend section 2805(d) of title 10, United States Code, increasing the minor military construction threshold for laboratory revitalization projects from $4.0 million to $6.0 million. This section would further amend section 2805(d) by eliminating Secretary of Defense review and approval of projects, inserting a congressional notification and 21-day wait period, 14-day pe-

riod if notification is provided in an electronic medium, and striking the September 30, 2018, sunset clause.

Section 2802—Classification of Facility Conversion Projects as Repair Projects

This section would amend section 2811 of title 10, United States Code, to re-classify facility conversion as repair, thereby allowing all work within the existing dimensions of a facility to be considered repair.

Section 2803—Extension of Temporary, Limited Authority to Use Operation and Maintenance Funds for Construction Projects Outside the United States

This section would provide continued authority for the Secretary of Defense to use funds appropriated for Operation and Maintenance for military construction to meet temporary operational requirements during a time of declared war, national emergency, or contingency operation through the end of fiscal year 2017.

Section 2804—Extension of Temporary Authority for Acceptance and Use of Contributions for Certain Construction, Maintenance, and Repair Projects Mutually Beneficial to the Department of Defense and Kuwait Military Forces

This section would extend for 5 years the temporary project authority for acceptance and use of contributions for construction, maintenance, and repair projects mutually beneficial to the Department of Defense and Kuwait military forces from September 30, 2020, to September 30, 2025.

Section 2805—Notice and Reporting Requirements for Energy Conservation Construction Projects

This section would amend section 2914 of title 10, United States Code, to address gaps in the information contained in congressional notifications submitted by the Secretary of Defense for the Energy Conservation Investment Program. This section would also add an annual reporting requirement on the status of projects being executed under the program beginning with fiscal year 2017 and ending with fiscal year 2020.

Section 2806—Additional Entities Eligible for Participation in Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program

This section would expand the defense laboratory modernization pilot program to include a Department of Defense research, development, test, and evaluation facility that is not designated as a Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratory, but nonetheless is involved with developmental test and evaluation.

SUBTITLE B—REAL PROPERTY AND FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

Section 2811—Congressional Notification of In-Kind Contributions for Overseas Military Construction Projects

This section would establish a notification requirement for payment in-kind and in-kind contributions used for overseas military

construction projects and repeal the authorization requirement established for such projects in section 2803 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

Section 2812—Prohibition on Use of Military Installations To House Unaccompanied Alien Children

This section would prohibit any military installation, not including those installations located outside of the United States, from being used to house unaccompanied alien children.

Section 2813—Allotment of Space and Provision of Services to WIC Offices Operating on Military Installations

This section would authorize the Secretary of a military department to allot space and services on military installations to local agencies administering WIC programs to service members and their families.

Section 2814—Sense of Congress Regarding Need To Consult With State and Local Officials Prior to Acquisitions of Real Property

This section would express the sense of Congress regarding the need for the Department of Defense to consult with state and local officials prior to acquisitions of real property.

Section 2815—Sense of Congress Regarding Inclusion of Stormwater Systems and Components Within the Meaning of "Wastewater System" Under the Department of Defense Authority for Conveyance of Utility Systems

This section would express the sense of Congress that stormwater systems and components are included within the meaning of "wastewater system" under the Department of Defense authority for conveyance of utility systems in section 2688 of title 10, United States Code.

Section 2816—Assessment of Public Schools on Department of Defense Installations

This section would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the congressional defense committees a report that includes an update of the July 2011 assessment on the condition and capacity of elementary and secondary public schools on military installations.

SUBTITLE C—PROVISION RELATED TO ASIA-PACIFIC MILITARY REALIGNMENT

Section 2821—Limited Exceptions to Restriction on Development of Public Infrastructure in Connection With Realignment of Marine Corps Forces in Asia-Pacific Region

This section would amend restrictions placed on the development of civilian infrastructure on Guam to support the realignment of Marine Corps Forces in the Asia-Pacific region to allow the use of funds for infrastructure projects that are identified in the report of the Economic Adjustment Committee required by section 2822(d) of

the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66).

SUBTITLE D—LAND CONVEYANCES

Section 2831—Land Conveyances, High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program Facility and Adjacent Property, Gakona, Alaska

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey a parcel of real property, including any improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 1,158 acres near Gulkana Village, Alaska, and the High Frequency Active Auroral Research Program Facility to the University of Alaska for consideration. This section would also authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey a parcel of real property, including improvements thereon, consisting of approximately 4,259 acres near Gulkana Village, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Corporation.

Section 2832—Land Conveyance, Campion Air Force Radar Station, Galena, Alaska

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to convey, without consideration, public land consisting of approximately 1,300 acres, including improvements thereon, of the remaining land currently withdrawn by the Secretary of the Air Force at the former Campion Air Force Station, Alaska, to the Town of Galena for public purposes.

Section 2833—Exchange of Property Interests, San Diego Unified Port District, California

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to exchange approximately 0.33 acres in San Diego, California that contains 48 parking spaces, with the San Diego Unified Port District in return for property of equal value, and without encumbrances, that provides the rights to an equivalent number of parking spaces.

Section 2834—Release of Property Interests Retained in Connection With Land Conveyance, Eglin Air Force Base, Florida

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to release any and all exceptions, limitations, and conditions specified by the United States in the deeds conveying approximately 126 acres of real property in Okaloosa County, Florida, which were conveyed to the Air Force Enlisted Men's Widows and Dependents Home Foundations, Incorporated.

Section 2835—Land Exchange, Fort Hood, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to exchange land at Fort Hood, Texas, with the City of Copperas Cove, Texas, to support the city's efforts to improve arterial transportation routes in the vicinity of Fort Hood and to promote economic development.

Section 2836—Land Conveyance, P–36 Warehouse, Colbern United States Army Reserve Center, Laredo, Texas

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey, without consideration, to the Laredo Community College all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 725 square foot Historic Building, P–36 Quartermaster Warehouse, at Colbern United States Army Reserve Center, Laredo, Texas.

Section 2837—Land Conveyance, St. George National Guard Armory, St. George, Utah

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to covey, without consideration, to the State of Utah all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of public land in St. George, Utah, comprising approximately 70 acres, for the purpose of permitting the Utah National Guard to use the conveyed land for military purposes.

Section 2838—Release of Restrictions, Richland Innovation Center, Richland, Washington

This section would authorize the Secretary of Transportation, acting through the Maritime Administrator and in consultation with the Administrator of General Services, to release, for consideration, to the Port of Benton all remaining right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 71.5 acres, including any improvements thereon, in Richland, Washington.

SUBTITLE E—MILITARY LAND WITHDRAWALS

Section 2841—Bureau of Land Management Withdrawn Military Lands Under Military Land Withdrawal Act of 1999

This section would extend the public lands withdrawn for military purposes listed in the Military Lands Withdrawal Act of 1999 (title 30 of Public Law 106–65) until the Secretary of a military department determines a military purpose does not exist, or the Secretary of Interior permanently transfers the administrative jurisdiction to the Secretary of the military department concerned.

Section 2842—Permanent Withdrawal or Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction of Public Land, Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, California

This section would amend section 2979 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) to make permanent or authorize transfer of administrative jurisdiction of the public land withdrawal for Naval Air Weapons China Lake, California.

SUBTITLE F—MILITARY MEMORIALS, MONUMENTS, AND MUSEUMS

Section 2851—Cyber Center for Education and Innovation—Home of the National Cryptologic Museum

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to establish the Cyber Center for Education and Innovation—Home of the National Cryptologic Museum at Fort George G. Meade to be used for the identification, curation, storage, and public viewing of materials relating to the activities of the National Security Agency/Central Security Service, its predecessor or successor organizations, and the history of cryptology.

Section 2852—Renaming Site of the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park, Ohio

This section would modify the name of the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers Aviation Center, Dayton, Ohio, to the John W. Berry, Sr. Wright Brothers National Museum, Dayton, Ohio.

Section 2853—Support for Military Service Memorials and Museums Highlighting Role of Women in the Military

This section would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide financial support, subject to appropriation, for military service memorials and museums that highlight the role of women in the military. This section would also authorize the Secretary to enter into a contract with a non-profit organization for the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of exhibits, facilities, and programs, subject to a report from the Secretary to the congressional defense committees that describes how the use of such a contract will help educate and inform the public on the history and mission of the military, and is in the best interests of the Department of Defense.

Section 2854—Petersburg National Battlefield Boundary Modification

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the land and interest in land, only from willing sellers and without use of condemnation, to expand the boundary of the Petersburg National Battlefield. This section would also authorize a land swap of approximately 1.170-acres between the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army.

Section 2855—Amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act

This section would prohibit the designation of Federal property as a National Historic Landmark or for nomination to the World Heritage List if the head of the agency managing the Federal property objects to such inclusion or designation for reasons of national security. This section would also authorize the expedited removal of Federal property listed on the National Register of Historic Places if the managing agency of that Federal property submits a request to the Secretary of Interior for such removal for reasons of national security.

Section 2856—Recognition of the National Museum of World War II Aviation

This section would require a certification by the Secretary of the Air Force, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Army to allow recognition of the National Museum of World War II Aviation in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as America's National World War II Aviation Museum.

SUBTITLE G—DESIGNATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 2861—Designation of Portion of Moffett Federal Airfield, California, as Moffett Air National Guard Base

This section would designate the 111-acre cantonment area at Moffett Federal Airfield, California, utilized by the California Air National Guard as "Moffett Air National Guard Base."

Section 2862—Redesignation of Mike O'Callaghan Federal Medical Center

This section would rename the Mike O'Callaghan Federal Medical Center to the Mike O'Callaghan Military Medical Center by amending the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997 (division B of Public Law 104–201), as amended by section 8135(a) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1997 (section 101(b) of division A of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104–208), and as amended by section 2862 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81).

Section 2863—Transfer of Certain Items of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the Descendants of General Omar Bradley

This section would authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer certain items under the control of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the descendants of General Omar Bradley.

Section 2864—Protection and Recovery of Greater Sage Grouse

This section would delay any finding by the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the Greater Sage Grouse under clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of section 4(b)(3)(B) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(3)(B)) through September 30, 2025. In an effort to foster greater coordination between the States and the Federal Government regarding management plans for the Greater Sage Grouse, this section would prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from amending any Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal lands in a State in which the Governor of the State has notified the Secretaries concerned that the State has a State management plan in place. Lastly, this section would also require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to jointly submit an annual report to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives through 2026 on the effectiveness of the systems to monitor the status of Greater Sage Grouse on Federal lands under their jurisdiction.

Section 2865—Implementation of Lesser Prairie-Chicken Range-Wide Conservation Plan and Other Conservation Measures

This section would prohibit the Secretary of Interior from treating the Lesser Prairie Chicken as a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 before December 31, 2022.

Section 2866—Removal of Endangered Species Status for American Burying Beetle

This section would remove the endangered species status for the American Burying Beetle.

TITLE XXIX—OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SUMMARY

The budget request contained $134,040,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations military construction for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of $133,591,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations military construction for fiscal year 2017.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 2901—Authorized Navy Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of certain authorized Navy construction projects for fiscal year 2017. These projects represent a binding list of the specific projects authorized at these locations.

Section 2902—Authorized Air Force Construction and Land Acquisition Projects

This section would contain the list of certain authorized Air Force construction projects for fiscal year 2017. These projects represent a binding list of the specific projects authorized at these locations.

Section 2903—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations military construction at the levels identified in section 4602 and section 4603 of division D of this Act.

TITLE XXX—UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE ENCROACHMENT PREVENTION AND TEMPORARY CLOSURE AUTHORITIES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3001—Findings and Definitions

This section would summarize certain findings and provide the definitions for the Utah Test and Training Range Encroachment Prevention and Temporary Closure Authorities.

SUBTITLE A—UTAH TEST AND TRAINING RANGE

Section 3011—Management of BLM Land

This section would direct the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into a memorandum of agreement for the continued management of the Bureau of Land Management land by the Secretary of Interior for the preservation of the Utah Test and Training Range.

Section 3012—Temporary Closures

This section would provide the Secretary of the Air Force authority to take necessary action to temporarily close any road, trail, or other portion of Bureau of Land Management land in the Utah Test and Training Range for military operations, public safety, or national security.

Section 3013—Community Resource Group

This section would establish the Utah Test and Training Range Community Resource Group.

Section 3014—Liability

This section would not allow the United States to be held liable for an injury or damage to any individual or property suffered in the course of any mining, mineral, or geothermal activity, or any other authorized non-defense-related activity, conducted on the Bureau of Land Management land.

Section 3015—Effects of Subtitle

This section would clarify that nothing in this subtitle would affect existing training or weapons impact areas, military special use airspace, special recreational areas, historical trails, water rights or federally recognized Indian tribes.

SUBTITLE B—LAND EXCHANGE

Section 3021—Findings and Purpose

This section would state the key findings and define the purpose for the Land Exchange of certain Federal land and non-Federal land between the United States and the State of Utah.

Section 3022—Definitions

This section would define the key terms used in the subtitle.

Section 3023—Exchange of Federal Land and Non-Federal Land

This section would authorize the Secretary of Interior to exchange with the State of Utah all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain Federal land for all right, title, and interest in and to certain non-Federal land.

Section 3024—Status and Management of Non-Federal Land After Exchange

This section would require the non-Federal land transferred to the United States in the Cedar Mountain Wilderness to be administered as part of the Cedar Mountain Wilderness.

Section 3025—Hazardous Materials

This section would reaffirm that the cost of remedial actions related to hazardous materials on land acquired under this subtitle shall be paid by those entities responsible for the cost under applicable law.

SUBTITLE C—HIGHWAY RIGHTS-OF-WAY

Section 3031—Recognition and Transfer of Certain Highway Rights-of-Way

This section would recognize the existence and validity of certain highway rights-of-way and authorize the Secretary with administrative jurisdiction to convey, without consideration, to certain counties and the State of Utah as joint tenants, easements for motorized travel rights-of-way across Federal land for all highways as shown and described in the official transportation maps, but excludes any class D road located within the boundaries of Cedar Mountain Wilderness Area or any wilderness study area designated in law or by administrative action in any of the counties.

DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

The budget request for fiscal year 2017 contained $19.06 billion for atomic energy defense activities. The committee recommends $19.34 billion, an increase of $286.9 million to the budget request.

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2017 contained $12.88 billion for the programs of the National Nuclear Security Administration. The committee recommends $13.25 billion, an increase of $370.0 million to the budget request.

Weapons Activities

Attraction and retention of personnel within the nuclear security enterprise

The committee is aware of growing concerns across the nuclear security enterprise regarding the ability to attract and retain first-class technical, administrative, and managerial talent. As the laboratories and plants of the enterprise have undertaken cost cutting measures, for example moving from defined-benefit pension plans to defined-contribution 401(k) plans, as well as adjustments to salaries and benefits to align with federal regulations and market standards, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) may have eliminated several factors that incentivized top performing personnel to start or continue a career at NNSA. In addition, as the timelines for being granted a security clearance have lengthened, recent graduates or mid-career officials may be unwilling to wait a year or more to begin doing substantive, classified work. Furthermore, NNSA and its laboratories and plants must develop strategies for carrying out their long-term mission even with a much more mobile workforce.

While the committee supports, and in fact has mandated, efficiency measures at NNSA, the committee believes NNSA must not lose sight of the need to attract and retain the Nation's most talented workers. The laboratories and plants will continue to rely heavily on the unique and exciting nature of their national security work to attract and retain employees, but must have other tools at their disposal. Creative thinking and robust understanding of the incentives driving the current and future workforce is required.

To facilitate this effort, the committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security, together with the members of the National Nuclear Security Administration Council established by section 4102(b) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2512(b)) to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by October 31, 2016, regarding ongoing or potential actions and options for improving the attraction and retention of high-performing employees across the nuclear enterprise. The committee encourages the Administrator and the council to think creatively and interview high-performing current, new, and potential employees for their views. The committee further encourages examination of options that:

(1) Allow for mobility but encourage staying within or returning to the NNSA system;

(2) Enable and incentivize unique opportunities such as sabbaticals, higher education, personnel loans or temporary assign-

ments, and rotations among Federal service and partner organizations;

(3) Provide opportunities for mid-career workers to join the enterprise and directly contribute their outside experiences to its improvement;

(4) Provide meaningful work and training opportunities to employees waiting on approval of security clearances;

(5) Such other options as the Administrator or members of the Council consider appropriate.

Defense nuclear security and physical security infrastructure recapitalization

The budget request contained $670.1 million for Defense Nuclear Security at the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). This funding supports both day-to-day security operations across the nuclear security enterprise as well as sustainment and recapitalization of physical security infrastructure and equipment.

The committee continues to encourage the Department of Energy and NNSA's recent focus on improving physical security within the nuclear security enterprise. The committee believes NNSA's development and eventual implementation of a 10-year recapitalization plan for security infrastructure, coupled with examination and updates of security policies and practices, as well as initiation of the Center for Security Technology, Analysis, Response, and Testing (CSTART), are steps in the right direction. However, the committee is mindful of the large list of deferred security infrastructure and equipment recapitalization needs, which may total over $1.40 billion. As the committee has noted in the past, more than half of that amount is represented by the need to recapitalize the Perimeter Intrusion Detection and Assessment Systems (PIDAS) at the Y–12 National Security Complex and the Pantex Plant. The committee believes that acceleration of two protected area security projects at these facilities may lead to both improved security and significant cost savings over the course of the broader recapitalization effort. The committee therefore directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to submit to the congressional defense committees as part of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2018, a project data sheet in compliance with Department of Energy Order 413.3B for: (1) installation of a section of PIDAS at the Y–12 National Security Complex to significantly reduce the size of the protected area; and (2) the Material Staging Facility at the Pantex Plant. The Administrator should include in these materials an analysis and assessment of the potential long-term cost savings to NNSA from reduction in security and personnel costs, as well as reduction in the liability associated with upgrading antiquated PIDAS systems at each facility. For the Material Staging Facility, the committee expects the Administrator to consult with the Air Force to leverage similar protection strategies and lessons learned as the Air Force is pursuing its Weapons Storage Facility Investment Strategy.

Finally, the committee reiterates its belief that more must be done to clarify roles and responsibilities within NNSA's security program and ensure there are clear lines of authority and accountability, that security decision-making is risk-informed, that implementation of security practices and processes is appropriately standardized, and that oversight of security is consistent and ro-

bust. The committee notes that many reports and studies have made recommendations on this topic, but follow through and implementation has been lacking. Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator to review all relevant past studies, reports, and statutes and to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by November 30, 2016, on actions that will be taken to improve the Defense Nuclear Security program.

The committee recommends $730.1 million for Defense Nuclear Security, an increase of $60.0 million to the budget request. The committee expects $9.0 million of this increase to support CSTART efforts while the remainder is expended to accelerate efforts to recapitalize physical security infrastructure.

Deferred maintenance

The budget request contained $554.6 million for Recapitalization-Infrastructure and Safety, and $294.0 million for Maintenance and Repair of Facilities. Respectively, these programs fund efforts to reduce the large backlog of deferred maintenance across the nuclear security enterprise and day-to-day preventative or corrective maintenance activities. Combined, these programs are critical to arresting the declining state of the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) infrastructure.

Budget request justification materials submitted by NNSA indicate that NNSA's deferred maintenance backlog remains over $3.7 billion. The committee recognizes NNSA's efforts to prevent the deferred maintenance backlog from growing, but also notes the significant funding required to effectively address this challenge. The budget request justification materials highlight that of NNSA's thousands of facilities, 30 percent are over 60 years old, and 62 percent are deemed inadequate or substandard. Moreover, 12 percent of NNSA's facilities have been declared excess but must be maintained in a safe state because funds are not available for the facilities to be demolished.

The committee agrees with NNSA that infrastructure risk is becoming safety risk and mission risk. This fact is evidenced by the multiple infrastructure failures in 2015 that resulted in pauses in operations. These failures are increasing in frequency, severity, and unpredictability as the facilities age; in 2015 they included multiple fire suppression system breaks, multiple roof leaks and failures, and an antiquated electrical distribution panel catching fire. The committee continues to believe that the decrepit state of the nation's nuclear security enterprise infrastructure is unacceptable and must be urgently addressed. The nation cannot expect to attract and retain first-class scientists, engineers, and technicians to work in facilities that are falling apart. The committee also notes the importance of and NNSA's responsibility to make sufficient investments in preventative maintenance to ensure facilities do not fall into such states of disrepair.

The committee is encouraged that the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security have taken steps to prevent the backlog in deferred maintenance from growing even further. The committee also applauds actions by the Secretary and the Administrator to dispose of the Bannister Federal Complex in Kansas City, Missouri, and pursue alternative financing for an administra-

tive complex at the Pantex Plant. Such steps show the seriousness with which the deferred maintenance problem is being addressed, but the committee believes more must be done to actually reduce the total amount of backlog. Therefore, the committee recommends $674.6 million, an increase of $120.0 million, for Recapitalization-Infrastructure and Safety, and $324.0 million, an increase of $30.0 million, for Maintenance and Repair of Facilities.

Domestic uranium enrichment program

The committee notes the Department of Energy's October 2015 report on "Tritium and Enriched Uranium Management Plan Through 2060" and the Department's subsequent decision to modify its plans to enrich uranium to create unencumbered enriched uranium for defense purposes. Instead of building out an enrichment capability over the next 10 years, the Department now proposes to conduct near-term, smaller-scale research and development activities while developing its longer-term strategy. The committee notes that these actions have been enabled by the Department's identification of stocks of existing unencumbered uranium that it believes can be repurposed and used for tritium production and other defense needs. The Department states this modification would save $1.30 billion through fiscal year 2021, but may result in larger long-term costs. The committee is also aware that the National Nuclear Security Administration's Director for Cost Estimating and Program Evaluation intends to review costs and plans for domestic uranium enrichment.

The committee also notes the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) October 2014 report on "Interagency Review Needed to Update U.S. Position on Enriched Uranium That Can Be Used for Tritium Production," and GAO's significant oversight activities and expertise on these matters. The committee believes an independent GAO review and assessment would ensure the Department's actions are appropriate and its plans to meet defense requirements for enriched uranium are credible. Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 31, 2017, on a review and assessment of Department of Energy's October 2015 report, its subsequent actions, its plans for domestic uranium enrichment, and how the Department of Energy has addressed GAO's previous relevant recommendations. In particular, such review and assessment should examine the assumptions used by the Department in developing its plans; the alternatives considered by the Department, including the timelines, costs, and cost-savings related to such alternatives; the ability of the Department under its plan to meet defense requirements for enriched uranium into the future; and such other matters related to domestic uranium enrichment that the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

Funding prioritization within Weapons Activities

The budget request contained $9.24 billion for the Weapons Activities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). These programs support NNSA's central mission of ensuring and sustaining the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the U.S. nuclear weapon stockpile.

Within Weapons Activities, the committee continues to believe NNSA must emphasize programs and capabilities that directly support NNSA's deliverables to the Department of Defense. The committee believes NNSA has taken significant steps in this regard within its recent budget requests. Elsewhere in this title, the committee discusses its recommendation for funding for NNSA's core life extension programs.

As NNSA focuses on its concrete deliverables to the military, the committee seeks to ensure NNSA adequately addresses its longer term requirements and needs. Elsewhere in this title, the committee discusses its recommendations for increased funding for technology maturity and other future-focused programs, for deferred maintenance activities, and for NNSA's plutonium strategy.

Aside from these major recommendations described elsewhere, the committee recommends smaller adjustments to prioritize efforts and mitigate program risk within NNSA's Weapons Activities. For example, the committee recommends $47.1 million, an increase of $4.0 million, for Nuclear Survivability, to support an increased level of effort. To support other priorities, the committee also recommends $514.0 million, a decrease of $9.0 million, for the Inertial Confinement Fusion Ignition and High Yield program; $656.2 million, a decrease of $7.0 million, for Advanced Simulation and Computing program; and $55.0 million, a decrease of $14.0 million, for the Weapons Dismantlement and Disposition program.

Overall, the committee recommends $9.56 billion, an increase of $316.0 million, for Weapons Activities of the NNSA.

Future Years Nuclear Security Program funding

The committee notes that several senior administration and military officials have expressed concern that the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Fiscal Year 2019–2021 Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP), submitted to Congress with the budget request for fiscal year 2017, contains inadequate funding to meet NNSA's programmatic needs. As the Secretary of Energy described in a December 23, 2015, letter to the Director of the White House Office of Management and Budget, "the Administration has pursued a disciplined process in defining the requirements to meet the President's nuclear security and non-proliferation policy goals and to support the Navy," but the FYNSP "does not reflect the funding that we estimate is necessary to meet Administration requirements over the period of the FYNSP. We estimate that an additional $5.2 billion over FY2019–2021 is needed to establish a viable and sustainable program portfolio."

The Secretary's letter went on to state that the "FYNSP will lack credibility with Congress and stakeholders; within NNSA it will fuel uncertainty in program execution, creating the potential for cost and schedule growth across the nuclear security enterprise . . . For this Administration's national security legacy and for the next Administration's planning requirements, it would not be responsible to submit a budget with such obvious programmatic gaps . . . Failure to address these requirements in the near term will put the NNSA budget in an untenable position beginning in FY2018, will not provide an appropriate statement of the Obama Administration legacy, and will provide a misleading marker to the

next Administration as to the resource needs of the nuclear security enterprise."

Military officials have pointed to similar concerns with NNSA's future year funding. For instance, the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff expressed these concerns earlier this year. In an April 4, 2016, letter to the committee, the Vice Chairman stated, "future year funding to sustain the stockpile strategy is uncertain." The Vice Chairman continued, "I agree with [the Commander's] assessment and share his concern for the uncertainty of future funding levels within the nuclear security enterprise."

The committee believes the FYNSP is an important planning and transparency tool for both Congress and the administration, but that it is only as useful as it is accurate. The committee expects the administration to develop and submit FYNSP funding profiles that are accurate and correspond with the administration's programmatic plans for NNSA. As the Secretary has stated, inaccurate FYNSP numbers damage the administration's credibility, can lead to cost and schedule growth due to program uncertainty, leave a misleading marker of future budget requirements for the next administration, and could leave NNSA in an untenable budgetary position in fiscal year 2018 if the inaccurate FYNSP is followed.

Life extension programs

The budget request contained $1.34 billion for the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) nuclear weapon life extension programs (LEP). The committee continues to believe NNSA's primary focus must be its nuclear weapon stockpile stewardship program. Within that broad mission, the programs and deliverables directly supporting Department of Defense requirements must be paramount.

The committee highlights the value of the B61–12 LEP in producing a nuclear gravity bomb that will be both a tangible and credible extended deterrent for U.S. allies, as well as an important component of the United States' own strategic deterrent. The committee also notes the importance of the W76–1 LEP in delivering a nuclear warhead to the Navy that will soon comprise approximately 70 percent of the nation's operationally deployed strategic warheads. Furthermore, while not an official LEP, the W88 ALT 370 will produce a significantly modernized warhead, including a "refresh" of the weapon's conventional high explosives, that will ensure the W88 remains reliable for several decades.

Finally, the W80–4 LEP will produce a warhead for the future long-range standoff (LRSO) weapon, which supports the air leg of the nation's nuclear deterrent. The committee notes that NNSA's request for funding for the W80–4 LEP for fiscal year 2017 is $91.9 million less than was anticipated in last year's Future Years Nuclear Security Program. With this budget request, NNSA anticipates a very large jump in development activities and funding profile in fiscal year 2018 (funding is proposed to jump over 80 percent from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2018). The committee is concerned that this funding profile would create a significant risk of NNSA failing to meet its scheduled deliverables for the Depart-

ment of Defense, and therefore recommends an increase of $21.0 million to the budget request for the W80–4 LEP.

The committee recommends $1.36 billion, an increase of $21.0 million, for NNSA nuclear weapon life extension programs.

Plutonium strategy

The budget request contained $185.0 million for Plutonium Sustainment and $159.6 million for the Radiological Laboratory Utility Office Building (RLUOB) equipment installation line item project. Combined, these two budget lines provide much of the funding in fiscal year 2017 for achieving the nation's plutonium strategy and revitalizing plutonium pit production capabilities.

The committee continues to support the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) plutonium strategy, which intends to achieve the statutory pit production requirements and deadlines established by section 3112 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The committee is aware of discussions regarding modifications to these statutory requirements that would still produce an appropriate amount of pits necessary to meet requirements on the particular deadlines, but would focus some capacity on producing war reserve pits sooner to support the stockpile if needed. The committee is open to future discussions on this topic, but cautions NNSA not to plan or program for such changes until and unless the statute has been amended. Before the committee entertains suggestions on such changes, the committee expects NNSA to work closely with the relevant congressional committees to ensure such a proposal would be both comparable to current requirements and sufficiently funded.

The committee is also concerned about funding for Plutonium Sustainment and related efforts in fiscal year 2017 but more acutely in the Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP). As discussed elsewhere in this title, it appears that funding for certain key capabilities within NNSA's fiscal year 2017 FYNSP does not align with program plans or requirements. To enable long-term planning and oversight, the committee expects NNSA to develop and submit realistic FYNSPs that align with stated program plans and needs.

The committee recommends $191.0 million, an increase of $6.0 million, for Plutonium Sustainment to support mitigation of schedule risk in meeting statutory pit production requirements. The committee also recommends $159.6 million for the RLUOB equipment installation line item project, the full amount of the budget request.

Stockpile systems, surveillance and assessments, and Integrated Surety Architecture

The budget request contained $443.7 million for Stockpile Systems. This funding provides for, among other things, weapon maintenance, surveillance, and assessment activities. The fiscal year 2017 budget request proposes, over the Future Years Nuclear Security Program (FYNSP) from 2017 to 2021, a cumulative decrease from the fiscal year 2016 FYNSP of $181.1 million to Stockpile Systems to fund higher priority efforts within the National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Weapons Activities.

The budget request justification materials provided by NNSA state that "these reductions will not restrict NNSA's ability to annually assess system performance and reliability," but the committee is concerned about long-term trends in surveillance and assessment funding. The committee will continue to closely oversee surveillance and assessment activities to ensure they are provided the funding necessary to assure the reliability and safety of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

The budget request justification materials also state that the cut to the FYNSP for Stockpile Systems is the result of "most system-specific surety activities (Integrated Surety Architecture (ISA)) delayed beyond the FYNSP," and the committee understands that while more limited ISA activities will continue for nearer-term priority systems like the W88, others have been delayed by at least 3 years. While the committee recognizes the need to ensure robust funding for NNSA's life extension programs and other priority activities, the committee is concerned that this delay to the ISA program may be shortsighted. Once implemented, ISA will provide significant improvements in the surety of the stockpile that have been recommended by the JASON advisory group and identified by the Joint Integrated Lifecycle Surety tool, and must not be delayed too long. The committee encourages the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Chairman of the Nuclear Weapons Council, while also balancing other priorities for sustaining the nuclear stockpile, to reconsider the decision to defer the development and procurement of system-specific ISA as they develop the budget request for fiscal year 2018 and evaluate budget needs in the context of available funding.

The committee recommends $443.7 million for Stockpile Systems, the amount of the budget request.

Strategic commodities

The committee notes that the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has begun re-organizing its previously disparate programs related to critical nuclear material commodities such as uranium, plutonium, tritium, and lithium. Each of these strategic commodities is essential to sustainment and modernization of the nuclear weapons stockpile and each will require significant investment in infrastructure and technologies in the coming decade. Some of these programs are funded through multiple NNSA budget elements and activities are conducted at multiple sites around the nuclear security enterprise.

The committee believes that the success of these strategic commodity programs is dependent on the establishment and validation of key requirements for program customers, such as life extension programs and other stockpile programs, as well as careful coordination and integration to ensure that program requirements are met in a timely and cost effective way. Both tasks are impossible without the leadership and management of an individual or organization that is equipped with the right skills and authorities. To its credit, NNSA recognizes this challenge and has appointed what it calls commodity managers to execute these complex and multi-faceted programs. The committee is encouraged by NNSA's actions and seeks to reinforce and/or further improve NNSA's use of commodity managers. Accordingly, the committee directs the Comp-

troller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by January 15, 2017, containing an evaluation of NNSA's use of commodity managers. This review should:

(1) Identify roles, responsibilities, and qualifications for commodity managers, if any, as identified in Department of Energy and NNSA directives, policies, or other relevant guidance;

(2) Evaluate the process used by commodity managers to identify, validate, and track program requirements in terms of comprehensiveness, completeness, and risk management practices;

(3) Where possible, identify specific cases in which commodity managers have met with success or faced challenges in integrating program requirements with new capabilities, such as new facilities or technologies.

(4) Assess NNSA's efforts to document the role of its commodity managers as well as incorporate and share important lessons learned across the various commodity manager portfolios; and

(5) Include such other matters related to commodity managers as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

Technology maturation programs, prototypes program, and stockpile responsiveness program

The committee notes that the fiscal year 2017 budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) proposed major reductions to funding provided to technology maturation and development efforts within NNSA's Weapons Activities. This includes programs within Enhanced Surety, Additive Manufacturing, Component Manufacturing Development, and Research and Development (R&D) Certification and Safety. In total, the budget request proposed a $109.4 million (41 percent) reduction to technology maturation efforts compared to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2016.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces on February 11, 2016, the Administrator for Nuclear Security indicated that the administration proposed these reductions due to lack of funds. Furthermore, the budget request justification documents provided by NNSA stated that "the overall decrease to technology maturation reflects a realignment to address higher NNSA priorities."

The committee understands the need to prioritize scarce funding, but believes these cuts to be shortsighted. NNSA's goals for these technology maturation efforts include: "reduce life extension program development and qualification timescales and costs; address evolving threats to assure safety and security; reduce the time to develop, assess, qualify, and certify [weapons]; and develop and exercise a critically skilled workforce." NNSA has summarized that "the purpose of technology maturation is to reduce the lifecycle costs of the stockpile." Given the uncertain international environment and the growing costs of stockpile modernization, the committee believes the magnitude of the cuts proposed in these areas is too great.

Furthermore, these cuts are contrary to the intention and core purpose of recent congressionally mandated programs designed to ensure NNSA is responsive, efficient, and well-positioned for the future. These programs include the Stockpile Responsiveness Pro-

gram established by section 3112 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) and the Prototype Nuclear Weapons for Intelligence Estimates Program established by section 3115 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), as amended. These programs were established by Congress to help NNSA become more responsive to emergent problems and opportunities; reduce timelines and costs for weapons programs; continually exercise all relevant design and production capabilities and skills; and attract and retain world-class scientists, engineers, and technicians. But NNSA's proposed cuts to these programs and broader technology maturation efforts will lead to the opposite outcomes. For instance, in the budget request materials provided to the committee, NNSA stated that smaller cuts to these programs in fiscal year 2014 had "resulted in permanent loss" of key personnel, that the currently proposed cuts would result in "limited flexibility to react to unexpected opportunities of consequences," and that "reductions to early-stage technology development and production capability adds risk to life extension programs."

To address these concerns, the committee recommends $202.5 million, an increase of $46.0 million for R&D Certification and Safety; $111.0 million, an increase of $12.0 million, for Primary Assessment Technologies; $53.2 million, an increase of $16.0 million, for Enhanced Surety; and $77.6 million, an increase of $31.0 million, for Component Manufacturing Development.

Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation

Comptroller General assessment of project management processes and systems for defense nuclear nonproliferation programs

The National Nuclear Security Administration's (NNSA) Office of Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation (DNN) consists of four major operating programs: DNN Research and Development, Material Management and Minimization, Global Material Security, and Nonproliferation and Arms Control. The combined budget for these four programs is approximately $1.20 billion and the activities supported are widely varied and geographically dispersed. While a much smaller portion of NNSA's total budget than Weapons Activities, the committee believes some of the lessons learned from efforts to improve program management practices within Weapons Activities may have applications within DNN. For instance, the ability of major programs to track performance against concrete baseline goals, set and track schedule milestones and deliverables, and manage costs and resources.

With this goal, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees by February 28, 2017, that reviews and assesses the project and program management processes and systems used by the DNN operating programs and DNN senior leaders. In particular, the briefing should examine:

(1) The DNN, NNSA, and Department of Energy requirements, directives, and guidance that govern the processes and systems used by DNN for project and program management purposes and their key characteristics, attributes, and effectiveness;

(2) How DNN program managers use information and tools to make decisions, track important information and milestones, and whether the systems used are effective in allowing NNSA to manage project and program costs, schedules, deliverables, and results against established baselines;

(3) The transparency among DNN, the partners and contractors carrying out its work, NNSA and Department of Energy senior leadership, and Congress regarding costs, schedules, deliverables, and results;

(4) How DNN program management compares to Weapons Activities programs and what can be learned from efforts to improve program management practices within Weapons Activities; and

(5) Any other aspects of the DNN program and project management processes and systems the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response Program and emergency preparedness

The budget request contained $271.9 million for the Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response Program of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). This program is responsible for countering nuclear terror threats, responding to nuclear incidents worldwide, and providing the Department of Energy's emergency management capability.

The committee continues to highlight the importance and value of NNSA's programs that help counter and respond to nuclear terrorism threats. These programs leverage the unique technical knowledge and tools of NNSA's laboratories and provide direct support to the nation's warfighters. The committee appreciates and supports NNSA's inclusion of a significant increase in funding within the fiscal year 2017 budget request to recapitalize the secure mobile communications systems used by these programs. The committee believes NNSA and all other agencies and departments involved in this important mission must be provided the funding necessary to ensure robust and timely communications among field responders, technical support teams, and national leaders.

The committee notes its continuing concern with the state of the Department of Energy's emergency management program, and understands the Department and NNSA share these concerns and have been taking actions to remedy them. The November 2015 reorganization of the Office of Emergency Operations was one such step. The planned revision to Department of Energy Order 151.1C on the Comprehensive Emergency Management System is another such action. While undoubtedly necessary and useful steps in a long-term remedy, the committee is concerned these may be too bureaucratically focused to sufficiently address problems that are more deeply rooted in the culture and longstanding neglect of this important mission area. The committee encourages the Secretary of Energy and the Administrator for Nuclear Security to personally engage in leading and guiding efforts to address the deficiencies in emergency management and preparedness.

The committee recommends $271.9 million for the Nuclear Counterterrorism and Incident Response Program, the full amount of the budget request.

Naval Reactors

Naval Reactors program

The budget request contained $1.42 billion for the Naval Reactors program. Naval Reactors is responsible for all aspects of naval nuclear propulsion efforts, including reactor plant technology design and development, reactor plant operation and maintenance, and reactor retirement and disposal. The program ensures the safe and reliable operation of reactor plants in nuclear-powered submarines and aircraft carriers that comprise over 40 percent of the Navy's major combatants.

The committee has long been supportive of the Naval Reactors program and believes it is an exceptional example of a nuclear-related government program that is safety-focused, mission-driven, and well-managed. Due to this success, the committee and the Navy will continue to have very high expectations for performance by Naval Reactors, particularly as it safely stewards the Navy's ongoing nuclear mission and as it develops and delivers the Ohio-class replacement submarine's nuclear reactor. The committee will continue its oversight of these programs, as well as Naval Reactors' efforts to refuel its S8G land-based prototype and carry out the Spent Fuel Handling Recapitalization Project.

The committee recommends $1.42 billion for the Naval Reactors program, the amount of the budget request.

Federal Salaries and Expenses

Briefing on contracting strategy and plan

The committee notes that the Administrator for Nuclear Security has announced an intention to compete several of the management and operating (M&O) contracts of the nuclear security enterprise in the coming years. The committee also notes that several of the current M&O contracts have been granted 1-year extensions as the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) manages the workload anticipated from conducting concurrent competitions.

The committee continues to believe, as first articulated in section 3157 of H.R. 4310, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, as passed by the House, that competition of M&O contracts has resulted in significant increases in fees paid by the Federal Government and the Administrator should seek to minimize these fees when possible; that competition can be an important mechanism to help realize savings, improve performance, and hold contractors accountable; and that, when appropriate, the Administrator should carry out a competition, while also recognizing the unique nature of federally funded research and development centers intend a long-term and close relationship between the Government and such contractors.

The committee believes its ability to conduct oversight of contract competitions and NNSA's broader contracting strategy is vital to ensuring competitions are appropriately leveraged and the costs and benefits adequately weighed. Section 3121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239), as amended, is a critical tool in this regard. To continue its oversight, the committee directs the Administrator to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by December 1, 2016,

on NNSA's contracting strategy and any plans for competition of M&O contracts in the next 2 years. Such briefing should include discussion of the matters covered by section 3121 of Public Law 112–239, as amended.

Briefing on damage assessment of improper disposal of sensitive information

The committee notes reports that sensitive information relating to nuclear weapons components was disposed of improperly, possibly over the course of many years, at the Y–12 National Security Complex. The committee emphasizes the importance of protecting such information and is concerned that such a security lapse could have endured for so many years without coming to light and without corrective action.

The committee understands that the Administrator for Nuclear Security has requested a damage assessment to examine the implications of the improper disposal. The committee directs the Administrator for Nuclear Security to provide a briefing to the House Committee on Armed Services by September 30, 2016, on the results of this damage assessment. This briefing should include an assessment of the information that may have been compromised; any potential consequences of unauthorized persons gaining access to this information; the extent to which uncertainty about what information may have been exposed remains; and a description of measures put in place to prevent such a lapse from reoccurring.

Governance and management reform

The committee continues its efforts to encourage, stimulate, and conduct oversight of efforts to address longstanding governance and management problems at the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). The committee believes recent independent studies of these problems have been thorough and have created a comprehensive list of recommendations for the Department, NNSA, and Congress to pursue.

Based on its oversight, the committee believes the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Secretary of Energy have been taking initial steps in this regard. But the committee continues to stress that more must be done and that focused effort must be sustained for the long term and across administrations. The deep-rooted and systemic cultural, management, and trust problems that have been identified as root causes will not be fixed easily or quickly. The committee believes that the implementation and oversight mechanisms established by section 3137 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) will support this effort and ensure focus on governance and management is retained in a new administration and a new Congress.

Several of the independent studies of these issues identified a lack of trust among Department of Energy, NNSA, its management and operating partners, and Congress as a fundamental cause of many of the problems in the nuclear security enterprise. One advisory panel concluded that "demonstrated performance is the ultimate measure of success and the foundation for credibility and trust." The committee agrees and believes NNSA's recent success in executing its major life extension programs and other key deliverables will, with time, rebuild that trust. But, even as it en-

courages these efforts, the committee will continue to seek focused attention and action on implementing solutions to the long-term governance and management challenges. The committee expects the Administrator and the Secretary to address the requirements of section 3137 of Public Law 114–92 and submit the required plans and updates promptly. The committee looks forward to significant progress and continued engagement with the Administrator and the Secretary on this issue in the years ahead.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

Overview

The budget request for fiscal year 2017 contained $6.17 billion for environmental and other defense activities. The committee recommends $6.09 billion, a decrease of $83.1 million to the budget request.

Defense Environmental Cleanup

Hanford Site

The budget request for Defense Environmental Cleanup contained $716.8 million for defense-related cleanup activities at the Hanford Site and an additional $1.49 billion for the Office of River Protection also located at Hanford. As one of two primary production sites for plutonium during the Cold War, the long-term cleanup effort at the Hanford Site is a top priority for this cleanup program.

The committee supports an increased level of effort at the Hanford Site to accelerate the most critical cleanup efforts. Therefore, the committee recommends $769.8 million, an increase of $53.0 million, for cleanup activities at the Hanford Site, and $1.49 billion, the full amount requested, for the Office of River Protection.

Technology development

The budget request contained $30.0 million for the technology development program of the Office of Environmental Management. This program provides support to research and development (R&D) efforts that seek to develop new technologies to reduce cleanup costs and accelerate cleanup schedules.

The committee has long been supportive of technology development efforts within the defense environmental cleanup program because it believes that, since the program is expected to last until 2070 and cost hundreds of billions of dollars, even small amounts of funding invested in R&D have the potential to provide large cost savings to taxpayers through new or more efficient cleanup methods or alternative approaches. The committee supports the Department's efforts on R&D as a key component of the cleanup program, and notes that significant progress may not be possible without increased funding.

Elsewhere in this title, the committee includes a provision that would require a study by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to examine opportunities to enhance R&D efforts related to nuclear cleanup. The committee believes that such a study will support progress and provide an opportunity to increase focus on promising technology advances or alternative approaches.

The committee recommends $40.0 million, an increase of $10.0 million, for the technology development program to support the NAS study and increased R&D.

Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

The committee continues to monitor the efforts of the Department of Energy (DOE) to implement corrective actions and reopen the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in Carlsbad, New Mexico, following the incidents that occurred there in February 2014. As the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) noted in its recent annual report, "Resumption of waste disposal operations at WIPP is essential to eliminate the risks posed by transuranic waste stored across the DOE defense nuclear complex. Completing the extensive recovery actions needed to resume operations at WIPP in a timely manner while adequately protecting workers and the public is a challenging task."

The Department expects to resume limited waste emplacement operations at WIPP by the end of 2016, and expects it will not resume full simultaneous mining and emplacement operations until all capital construction projects are completed in at least 2021. As noted by the DNFSB, restarting emplacements is important to reducing the risks from waste currently stored throughout the DOE complex, but the committee cautions that resumption should not occur until the Department is satisfied it can be done safely and that repeat incidents will not occur. The committee will continue its oversight of the WIPP restart process and continues to urge the Department to ensure lessons learned from it are shared across the enterprise.

Defense Nuclear Waste Disposal

Defense nuclear waste repository

The budget request contained $15.3 million for consent based siting to develop a separate geological repository for high-level defense nuclear waste.

While the committee believes a pathway for final disposition of high-level defense waste from facilities such as the Hanford Site and the Savannah River Site is necessary, the committee is concerned that construction and operation of a defense-only repository would require significant funding from the already-oversubscribed national defense budget function. For instance, a preliminary assessment by the Government Accountability Office indicates that pursuing the Secretary of Energy's plan for two repositories (one for only defense waste and one for both defense and non-defense waste) could require many billions of additional dollars from the defense budget function when compared to a single repository solution. With the many defense priorities facing the Department of Energy in the next decade, the committee believes that the Secretary should not spend limited defense funding on a defense-only repository until the Secretary has developed an understanding of the costs and impacts to other priority programs within atomic energy defense activities. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds, a decrease of $15.3 million, for consent based siting.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

SUBTITLE A—NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS

Section 3101—National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would authorize appropriations for the National Nuclear Security Administration for fiscal year 2017, including funds for weapons activities, defense nuclear nonproliferation programs, naval reactor programs, and Federal Salaries and Expenses (formerly known as the Office of the Administrator), at the levels specified in the funding table in section 4701 of this Act.

This section would also authorize several new plant projects for the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Section 3102—Defense Environmental Cleanup

This section would authorize appropriations for defense environmental cleanup activities for fiscal year 2017 at the levels specified in the funding table in section 4701 of this Act.

This section would also authorize a new plant project for defense environmental cleanup activities.

Section 3103—Other Defense Activities

This section would authorize appropriations for Other Defense Activities for the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2017 at the levels specified in the funding table in section 4701 of this Act.

Section 3104—Nuclear Energy

This section would authorize appropriations for certain nuclear energy programs for the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2017 at the levels specified in the funding table in section 4701 of this Act.

SUBTITLE B—PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS, RESTRICTIONS, AND LIMITATIONS

Section 3111—Independent Acquisition Project Reviews of Capital Assets Acquisition Projects

This section would insert a new section, section 4733, into the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.) to require the Administrator for Nuclear Security and the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management to ensure that an independent entity conducts reviews of capital assets acquisition projects that have a total project cost of more than $500.0 million at various phases of the acquisition process. With respect to such reviews for a capital asset acquisition project that has not yet reached Critical Decision-1 approval in the acquisition process, this section would require such review to include best practices regarding an analysis of alternatives for the project and identify any deficiencies in such analysis of alternatives. Finally, this section would require the independent entity that conducts such reviews to have the appropriate expertise with respect to the project and the pertinent stage of the acquisition process.

Section 3112—Research and Development of Advanced Naval Nuclear Fuel System Based on Low-Enriched Uranium

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for the Department of Energy may be used for research and development (R&D) of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on low-enriched uranium (LEU). However, this section would also authorize, from within amounts authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for defense nuclear nonproliferation, $5.0 million for the Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors to commence initial planning and early R&D of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on LEU for aircraft carriers and submarines.

This section would also amend section 3118 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92) to clarify that, if the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Navy jointly determine to pursue R&D of an advanced naval nuclear fuel system based on LEU, the Secretaries shall ensure that funding for such efforts is requested in fiscal year 2018 and any future fiscal years only within a budget line within defense nuclear nonproliferation.

The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of the Navy have not yet submitted the determination, which was due in February 2016, as required by section 3118 of Public Law 114–92, regarding whether or not to continue to pursue this R&D program. The committee expects the Secretaries to submit this statutorily required determination expeditiously. The committee also expects that, if the Secretaries make a determination to continue the program, they carry it out only using funding from within the defense nuclear nonproliferation account. The committee believes such a program would need to fully explore whether an LEU-based fuel could meet military requirements, and assess the implications of such an LEU-based fuel for fleet size and logistics, costs, benefits to nonproliferation goals, lowered security costs, and enabling cutting-edge research for nuclear fuel scientists. The committee is aware of estimates that indicate that developing an LEU naval fuel and determining its viability could cost an estimated $2.00 billion and take at least 10 to 15 years, and that at least another 10 years (and potentially additional time and funding) beyond that would be required to deploy an operational naval nuclear reactor with this fuel. The committee recognizes the potential benefits of this R&D program, but also notes that resultant costs and operational impacts of such a fuel are also unknown but likely considerable. The committee believes the Secretaries and Congress should carefully weigh the potential opportunities and benefits, as well as the potential risks and costs of this path.

Section 3113—Disposition of Weapons-Usable Plutonium

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to carry out construction and project support activities for the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility with any funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available for such purposes for fiscal year 2017, as well as any funds made available for such purposes in any prior fiscal years that are unobligated. The Secretary would be allowed to waive this requirement to carry out construc-

tion and project support activities related to MOX if the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees the following, and waits a period of 15 days:

(1) An updated performance baseline for construction and project support activities relating to the MOX facility as required by section 3119(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92);

(2) Notification that the Secretary has sought to enter into consultations with any relevant State or government of a foreign country necessary to pursue an alternative option for carrying out the plutonium disposition program, including a comprehensive description of the status of such consultations and a detailed plan and schedule for concluding such consultations;

(3) The commitment of the Secretary to remove plutonium from South Carolina and ensure a sustainable future for the Savannah River Site; and

(4) Either a notification that the prime contractor of the MOX facility has not submitted a proposal for a fixed-price contract, within 3 months of the Secretary requesting such a proposal, for completing construction and project support activities for the MOX facility, or a certification that such proposal from the prime contractor is materially deficient or non-responsive or that an alternative option exists for carrying out the plutonium disposition program and the total lifecycle cost of such alternative option would be less than approximately half of the estimated remaining lifecycle cost of the mixed-oxide fuel program.

Section 3114—Design Basis Threat

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to update, by August 31, 2016, Department of Energy Order 470.3B relating to the design basis threat for protecting nuclear weapons, special nuclear material, and other critical assets in the custody of the Department of Energy. This section would also express the sense of Congress regarding the need for the Intelligence Community, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Defense to regularly review and assess threats to U.S. nuclear assets to inform adjustments to security postures.

Section 3115—Prohibition on Availability of Funds for Provision of Certain Assistance to Russian Federation

This section would provide that none of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017, or any prior fiscal year, for atomic energy defense activities may be obligated or expended to enter into a contract with, or otherwise provide assistance to, the Russian Federation. The Secretary of Energy, without delegation, would be provided the authority to waive this prohibition if the Secretary determines it is required to meet requirements that are new and emergency in nature and the Secretary submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees containing notification that such waiver is in the national security interest of the United States, a justification for such waiver including an explanation for why the requirements are new and emergency in nature, a certification that there is no backlog of deferred maintenance with respect to physical security equip-

ment and related infrastructure at each Department of Energy defense nuclear facility, and a period of 15 days elapses.

Section 3116—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Federal Salaries and Expenses

This section would provide that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for the National Nuclear Security Administration for defense-related Federal Salaries and Expenses, not more than 90 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of Energy submits to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees the updated plan and description of the determination of the Secretary required by section 4509(a) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2660(a)). The updated plan would be regarding the designing and building of prototypes of nuclear weapons for intelligence purposes that is required by section 4509(a) to be submitted at the same time as the budget request for fiscal year 2018.

The committee emphasizes that the design and production of these prototypes must adhere closely to intelligence-derived information on foreign nuclear weapons designs and types.

Section 3117—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Defense Environmental Cleanup Program Direction

This section would provide that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for program direction purposes within the defense environmental cleanup program, not more than 90 percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which the Secretary of Energy submits to Congress the future-years defense environmental cleanup plan required during calendar year 2017 pursuant to section 4402A of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2582A).

The committee notes that while the requirement for development and submission of a future-years defense environmental cleanup plan was created 5 years ago by section 3116 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), the Secretary of Energy has yet to carry out this requirement. The committee believes that 5-year budget plans, such as those created by both the National Nuclear Security Administration and the Department of Defense, are imperfect but useful planning and transparency tools. The committee expects the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, to submit the future-years defense environmental cleanup plan as required.

Section 3118—Limitation on Availability of Funds for Acceleration of Nuclear Weapons Dismantlement

This section would provide that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2017–21 for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), not more than $56.0 million may be obligated or expended in each such fiscal year to carry out nuclear weapons dismantlement and disposition activities.

This section would also prohibit any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2017–21 for NNSA to be obligated or expended to accelerate the nuclear weapons dismantlement activities of NNSA beyond the rate contained in the dismantlement schedule prescribed by the Administrator for Nuclear Security in table 2–7 of the annex of the Fiscal Year 2016 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Plan (SSMP) submitted by the Administrator to the congressional defense committees in March 2015.

This section would further prohibit any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for any of fiscal years 2017–21 for NNSA to be obligated or expended to dismantle or dispose of a W84 nuclear weapon.

Finally, this section would include two exceptions to the prohibitions regarding the W84 and dismantlement schedule contained in table 2–7 of the SSMP. The first exception would allow the dismantlement of W84 weapons or weapons not included in table 2–7 if the Administrator certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that:

(1) The components of such weapons are directly required for the purposes of a current life extension program; or

(2) Such dismantlement is necessary to conduct maintenance or surveillance of the nuclear weapons stockpile or to ensure the safety or reliability of the nuclear weapons stockpile.

The second exception would allow the dismantlement of a nuclear weapon if the President certifies in writing to the congressional defense committees that:

(1) Such dismantlement is being carried out pursuant to a nuclear arms reduction treaty or similar international agreement that requires such dismantlement; and

(2) Such treaty or international agreement has entered into force after the date of enactment of this Act and was approved with the advice and consent of the Senate or by an Act of Congress.

Section 3119—Annual Certification of Shipments to Waste Isolation Pilot Plant

This section would require, during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy to certify to the congressional defense committees by February 1 of each year that the management and operating contractors of the nuclear security enterprise have certified to the Administrator for Nuclear Security that they are aware of the contents of each container shipped by the contractor to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) in sufficient detail. This is to ensure that the container is handled properly to prevent the release of radiation or contamination. This section would also require the Secretary to certify that the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management are aware, for the facilities under their purview, of the contents of each container shipped to WIPP in sufficient detail.

SUBTITLE C—PLANS AND REPORTS

Section 3121—Clarification of Annual Report and Certification on Status of Security of Atomic Energy Defense Facilities

This section would amend section 4506(b)(1)(B) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2657) to clarify that the report submitted by the Secretary of Energy pursuant to that section must contain the Secretary's written certification that certain atomic energy defense facilities are secure and that the security measures at such facilities meet the security standards and requirements of the Department of Energy.

Section 3122—Annual Report on Service Support Contracts of the National Nuclear Security Administration

This section would amend section 3241A(f) of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C. 2441a(f)) to add a new paragraph that requires the Administrator to submit, with the report required by such section, information regarding the cost of service support contracts of the National Nuclear Security Administration and identification of the program or program direction accounts that support each such contract.

Section 3123—Repeal of Certain Reporting Requirements

This section would repeal two reporting requirements. These include:

(1) Biennial reports on a plan to protect against release of certain information as required by section 4522(e) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2672(e));

(2) A report by the Comptroller General of the United States on the National Nuclear Security Administration's scientific engagement for nonproliferation program.

Section 3124—Independent Assessment of Technology Development Under Defense Environmental Cleanup Program

This section would require the Secretary of Energy to seek to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences, within 60 days following the date of the enactment of this Act, to conduct an independent assessment of the defense environmental cleanup program. Such assessment would be required to include a review of the technology development efforts of the defense environmental cleanup program, including an assessment of the process by which the Secretary identifies and chooses technologies to pursue under the program. Such assessment would also include a comprehensive review of technologies or alternative approaches to defense environmental cleanup efforts that could reduce long-term costs, accelerate schedules, or mitigate uncertainties, vulnerabilities, or risks relating to such efforts; or otherwise significantly improve the defense environmental cleanup program. The National Academy of Sciences would be required to submit a report of the assessment to the Secretary and the congressional defense committees by September 30, 2017.

The committee recommends this provision to provide a comprehensive and independent assessment by national experts on

how to strengthen technology development efforts and what technologies or alternative approaches may warrant investigation or application. Elsewhere in this title, the committee recommends a funding increase to technology development efforts for the defense environmental cleanup program. The committee believes increased funding and the recommendations from national experts at the National Academy of Sciences can bring renewed attention and focus to the program.

Section 3125—Updated Plan for Verification and Monitoring of Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Fissile Material

This section would require the President to submit to the appropriate congressional committees, within 90 days of enactment of this Act, a comprehensive and detailed update to the plan for verification and monitoring of nuclear weapons and fissile material required by section 3133(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The updated plan would be required to be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

This section would also require that, of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Defense for supporting the Executive Office of the President, $10.0 million may not be obligated or expended until the date on which the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees the updated plan required by this section. Finally, this section would also require the President to provide an interim briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives (and any other appropriate congressional committee upon request) an interim briefing on the updated plan within 30 days of enactment of this Act.

The committee notes that the Administration delivered, in response to the reporting requirement contained in section 3133(a) of Public Law 113–291, a classified report consisting of less than two full pages describing the interagency coordination mechanisms for verification and monitoring. Despite being delivered to Congress 10 months after enactment of that Act, and a month after the report was due to Congress, the report was not responsive to the congressional requirement and failed to address many of the required elements, including: an interagency road map for verification and monitoring with respect to policy, operations, and research and development (R&D); identification of requirements for verification and monitoring (including funding requirements); and recommendations for building cooperation and transparency to improve inspections and monitoring.

The committee is also not aware of any relevant consultations, related to writing this report, with the entities that should have had significant input into this report, including relevant Federal Government agencies, military services, national laboratories, academia, or industry.

The committee notes the importance of this issue to stem and detect nuclear proliferation, and questions why the administration has not accorded the attention and priority to this requirement as would be warranted to enhance planning on efforts to support nu-

clear nonproliferation. This report requirement resulted from recommendations made by a January 2014 Defense Science Board report titled, "Assessment of Nuclear Monitoring and Verification Technologies," which found that "for the first time since the early decades of the nuclear era, the nation needs to be equally concerned about both 'vertical' proliferation (the increase in capabilities of existing nuclear states) and 'horizontal' proliferation (an increase in the number of states and nonstate actors possessing or attempting to possess nuclear weapons)" and that "[t]hese factors, and others . . . led the Task Force to observe that monitoring for proliferation should be a top national security objective—but one for which the nation is not yet organized or fully equipped to address."

The committee expects that the administration will deliver a comprehensive and detailed updated report that responds to each element of the report requirement in section 3133(a) of Public Law 113–291, and that meaningful consultations with agencies, military services, national laboratories, industry, and academia will take place.

To ensure that the administration provides the necessary focus and attention to developing the required plan and road map, the committee recommends that the Administration provide an interim briefing on the plan of work for the report and any interim findings.

TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

OVERVIEW

The budget request contained $31.0 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2017. The committee recommends $31.0 million, the amount of the budget request.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3201—Authorization

This section would authorize $31.0 million for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for fiscal year 2017.

TITLE XXXIII—NUCLEAR ENERGY INNOVATION CAPABILITIES

Section 3301—Short Title

This section would cite the title of this Act as the "Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act."

Section 3302—Nuclear Energy

This section would amend section 951 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271) regarding the Department of Energy's civilian nuclear energy research and development mission to ensure that the Department enables the private sector to partner with na-

tional laboratories for the purpose of developing novel reactor concepts.

Section 3303—Nuclear Energy Research Programs

This section would make technical changes to section 952 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16272) to strike outdated language.

Section 3304—Advanced Fuel Cycle Initiative

This section would make technical changes to section 953(a) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16273(a)) to strike outdated language.

Section 3305—University Nuclear Science and Engineering Support

This section would make technical changes to section 954(d)(4) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16274(d)(4)).

Section 3306—Department of Energy Civilian Nuclear Infrastructure and Facilities

This section would amend section 955 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16275) to provide the Department of Energy statutory direction for a reactor-based fast neutron source that would operate as an open-access user facility to enable academic and proprietary research in the United States.

Section 3307—Security of Nuclear Facilities

This section would make technical changes to section 956 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16276) to strike outdated language.

Section 3308—High-Performance Computation and Supportive Research

This section would amend section 957 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16277) to provide programmatic authority for the Department of Energy to leverage its supercomputing infrastructure to accelerate nuclear energy research and development capabilities for advanced fission and fusion reactor technologies.

Section 3309—Enabling Nuclear Energy Innovation

This section would amend subtitle E of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271) to add a new section that would authorize the Secretary of Energy to enable the private sector to construct and operate privately-funded reactor prototypes at Department of Energy sites.

Section 3310—Budget Plan

This section would amend subtitle E of title IX of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271) to require the Department of Energy to produce a transparent and strategic 10-year plan for prioritizing nuclear research and development programs while considering budget constraints.

Section 3311—Conforming Amendments

This section would make conforming changes to the table of contents of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16271).

TITLE XXXIV—NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3401—Authorization of Appropriations

This section would authorize $14,950,000 for fiscal year 2017 for operation and maintenance of the Naval Petroleum Reserves.

TITLE XXXV—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

ITEMS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Non-Availability of Vessels

It has come to the attention of the committee that in cases where Federal departments or agencies shipping government-impelled cargoes determine that a commercial vessel of the United States is not available at fair and reasonable rates, and instead ship such cargoes on foreign-flag vessels, those cargoes are not being counted as having been shipped on foreign-flag vessels for purposes of calculating compliance with section 55305 of title 46, United States Code. The committee is greatly concerned by this misinterpretation, and believes that a determination of nonavailability of privately owned vessels of the United States by any Federal departments or agencies should not reduce the gross tonnage required to be transported on privately-owned commercial vessels of the United States pursuant to section 55305 of title 46, United States Code.

Recycling United States Vessels in the United States

The committee supports the dismantlement of U.S. government vessels in U.S. facilities as well as obsolete government vessels that are contracted for recycling through the Maritime Administration. The proceeds gained by the Maritime Administration sales are non-appropriated funds and the committee believes that these funds will continue to grow and that they should be distributed to the maritime schools and heritage organizations more frequently.

Therefore, the committee directs the Maritime Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, to submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by October 1, 2016 that lists all government-owned vessels that are currently available for dismantlement; a list of vessels that are expected to be declared obsolete and dismantled in the next five years; and the government's plan for dismantling these vessels in the United States. This report shall also include the Maritime Administration's plan for the timely distribution of the proceeds it currently has in its ship disposal accounts, as well as a projection of future distributions.

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 3501—Authorization of the Maritime Administration

This section would authorize appropriations for the national security aspects of the merchant marine for fiscal year 2017.

Section 3502—Authority To Make Pro Rata Annual Payments Under Operating Agreements for Vessels Participating in Maritime Security Fleet

This section would amend subsection (d) of section 53106 of title 46, United States Code, to permit the Secretary of Transportation to make a pro rata reduction in the amounts paid to vessel owners or operators under operating agreements under chapter 531 of that title if appropriations are insufficient to make full payment of the amounts authorized and agreed to under subsection (a) of section 53106.

Section 3503—Authority To Extend Certain Age Restrictions Relating to Vessels in the Maritime Security Fleet

This section would amend section 53102 of title 46, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of Transportation, to extend the 20- and 25-year age restrictions applicable to a "participating fleet vessel" found in subsection (5)(A)(ii) of section 53101, and subsection (c)(3) of section 53106 of title 46, United States Code, for a period of up to 5 years, when the Secretaries jointly determine that it would be in the national interest to do so.

This section would also provide additional technical and conforming changes.

Section 3504—Corrections to Provisions Enacted by Coast Guard Authorization Acts

This section would make technical and conforming corrections to provisions of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2015 (Public Law 114–120).

Section 3505—Status of National Defense Reserve Fleet Vessels

This section would codify the legal status of National Defense Reserve Fleet (NDRF) vessels and provide clarity in situations involving foreign countries. This section would also clarify that U.S. Maritime Administration's training ships, which are part of the NDRF, are public vessels. Finally, this provision would make clear that NDRF vessels remain "vessels" within the meaning of section 3 of title 1, United States Code, until they are delivered to a dismantling facility.

Section 3506—NDRF National Security Multi-Mission Vessel

This section would provide authority to the Maritime Administrator to enter into a contract for a National Security Multi-Mission Vessel.

Section 3507—United States Merchant Marine Academy

This section would amend section 51301 of title 46, United States Code, to codify the qualifications for appointment to the position of Superintendent of the Merchant Marine Academy.

Section 3508—Use of National Defense Reserve Fleet Scrapping Proceeds

This section would increase the apportionment of National Defense Reserve Fleet scrapping proceeds to the National Maritime Heritage Grant Program.

Section 3509—Floating Dry Docks

This section amends section 55122 of title 46, United States Code, to exempt certain floating dry docks from limitations imposed by such section 55122.

TITLE XXXVI—BALLAST WATER

Section 3601—Short Title

This section would cite this title as the "Vessel Incidental Discharge Act".

Section 3602—Definitions

This section would provide definitions for the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act.

Section 3603—Regulation and Enforcement

This section would establish and implement national standards and requirements for the regulation of discharges incidental to the normal operations of a vessel for the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act.

Section 3604—Uniform National Standards and Requirements for the Regulation of Discharges Incidental to the Normal Operation of a Vessel

This section would provide ballast water uniform national standards and requirements for the regulation of discharges incidental to the normal operations of a vessel for the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act.

Section 3605—Treatment Technology Certification

This section would establish a technology certification process for ballast water treatment technology.

Section 3606—Exemptions

This section would establish exemptions to ballast water discharge for the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act.

Section 3607—Alternative Compliance Program

This section would establish an alternative compliance program for ballast water discharge for the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act.

Section 3608—Judicial Review

This section would establish the process of judicial review for a final regulation promulgated under the Vessel Incidental Discharge Act.

Section 3609—Effect on State Authority

This section would prohibit a state or political subdivision from adopting or enforcing any statute or regulation of the State or subdivision with respect to a discharge incidental to the normal operation of a vessel after the date of enactment of this Act.

Section 3610—Application With Other Statutes

The section would state that this title shall be the exclusive statutory authority for regulation by the Federal Government of discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel to which this title applies.

DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES

Section 4001—Authorization of Amounts in Funding Tables

This section would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming guidance in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, this section would also require that a decision by an Agency Head to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and section 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
National Defense Funding, Base Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations			
Title I—Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	3,614,787	34,020	3,648,807
Missile Procurement, Army	1,519,966	172,210	1,692,176

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	2,265,177	376,134	2,641,311
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	1,513,157	217,963	1,731,120
Other Procurement, Army	5,873,949	599,528	6,473,477
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	14,109,148	–72,300	14,036,848
Weapons Procurement, Navy	3,209,262		3,209,262
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	664,368		664,368
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy	18,354,874	–773,138	17,581,736
Other Procurement, Navy	6,338,861	–65,900	6,272,961
Procurement, Marine Corps	1,362,769		1,362,769
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	13,922,917	13,700	13,936,617
Missile Procurement, Air Force	2,426,621		2,426,621
Space Procurement, Air Force	3,055,743	27,100	3,082,843
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	1,677,719		1,677,719
Other Procurement, Air Force	17,438,056		17,438,056
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,524,918	410,700	4,935,618
Joint Urgent Operational Needs Fund	99,300	–99,300	0
National Guard & Reserve Equipment		250,000	250,000
Subtotal, Title I—Procurement	**101,971,592**	**1,090,717**	**103,062,309**
Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	7,515,399	3,900	7,519,299
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	17,276,301	63,100	17,339,401
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	28,112,251	–7,230	28,105,021
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	18,308,826	168,300	18,477,126
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense	178,994	10,000	188,994
Subtotal, Title II—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**71,391,771**	**238,070**	**71,629,841**
Title III—Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	33,809,040	26,400	33,835,440
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	2,712,331	–6,600	2,705,731
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	6,825,370	–26,276	6,799,094
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	39,483,581	–569,200	38,914,381
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	5,954,258	–37,200	5,917,058
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	927,656	–26,600	901,056
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	270,633	–800	269,833
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	37,518,056	–817,635	36,700,421
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	3,067,929	–59,700	3,008,229
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	6,703,578	–115,176	6,588,402
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	32,571,590	–360,430	32,211,160
US Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, Defense	14,194		14,194
Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster and Civic Aid	105,125		105,125
Cooperative Threat Reduction	325,604		325,604
Environmental Restoration, Army	170,167		170,167
Environmental Restoration, Navy	281,762		281,762
Environmental Restoration, Air Force	371,521		371,521
Environmental Restoration, Defense	9,009		9,009
Environmental Restoration, Formerly Used Sites	197,084		197,084
Subtotal, Title III—Operation and Maintenance	**171,318,488**	**–1,993,217**	**169,325,271**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Title IV—Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	128,902,332	–419,418	128,482,914
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	6,366,908		6,366,908
Subtotal, Title IV—Military Personnel	**135,269,240**	**–419,418**	**134,849,822**
Title XIV—Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	56,469		56,469
Working Capital Fund, Air Force	63,967		63,967
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	37,132		37,132
Working Capital Fund, DECA	1,214,045		1,214,045
National Defense Sealift Fund		85,000	85,000
National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund		773,138	773,138
Chemical Agents & Munitions Destruction	551,023		551,023
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	844,800	30,000	874,800
Office of the Inspector General	322,035		322,035
Defense Health Program	33,467,516	–419,500	33,048,016
Subtotal, Title XIV—Other Authorizations	**36,556,987**	**468,638**	**37,025,625**
Total, Division A: Department of Defense Authorizations	**516,508,078**	**–615,210**	**515,892,868**
Division B: Military Construction Authorizations			
Military Construction			
Army	503,459	69,500	572,959
Navy	1,027,763	366,916	1,394,679
Air Force	1,481,058	21,665	1,502,723
Defense-Wide	2,056,091	–126,448	1,929,643
NATO Security Investment Program	177,932		177,932
Army National Guard	232,930	67,500	300,430
Army Reserve	68,230	86,500	154,730
Navy and Marine Corps Reserve	38,597		38,597
Air National Guard	143,957	23,000	166,957
Air Force Reserve	188,950	17,450	206,400
Subtotal, Military Construction	**5,918,967**	**526,083**	**6,445,050**
Family Housing			
Construction, Army	200,735	–43,563	157,172
Operation & Maintenance, Army	325,995		325,995
Construction, Navy and Marine Corps	94,011		94,011
Operation & Maintenance, Navy and Marine Corps	300,915		300,915
Construction, Air Force	61,352		61,352
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	274,429		274,429
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	59,157		59,157
improvement Fund	3,258		3,258
Subtotal, Family Housing	**1,319,852**	**–43,563**	**1,276,289**
Base Realignment and Closure			
Base Realignment and Closure—Army	14,499	10,000	24,499
Base Realignment and Closure—Navy	134,373	15,000	149,373
Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force	56,365		56,365

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Subtotal, Base Realignment and Closure	**205,237**	**25,000**	**230,237**
Undistributed Adjustments			
Prior Year Savings	0	–257,576	–257,576
Subtotal, Undistributed Adjustments	**0**	**–257,576**	**–257,576**
Total, Division B: Military Construction Authorizations	**7,444,056**	**249,944**	**7,694,000**
Total, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**523,952,134**	**–365,266**	**523,586,868**
Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations			
Function 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
Environmental and Other Defense Activities			
Nuclear Energy	151,876	–15,260	136,616
Weapons Activities	9,243,147	316,000	9,559,147
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	1,807,916	94,000	1,901,916
Naval Reactors	1,420,120		1,420,120
Federal salaries and expenses	412,817	–40,000	372,817
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5,382,050	–92,100	5,289,950
Other Defense Activities	791,552	9,000	800,552
Subtotal, Environmental and Other Defense Activities	**19,209,478**	**271,640**	**19,481,118**
Independent Federal Agency Authorization			
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board	31,000		31,000
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	**31,000**	**0**	**31,000**
Subtotal, 053, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**19,240,478**	**271,640**	**19,512,118**
Function 054, Defense-Related Activities			
Other Agency Authorizations			
Maritime Security Program	211,000	88,997	299,997
Subtotal, Independent Federal Agency Authorization	**211,000**	**88,997**	**299,997**
Subtotal, 054, Defense-Related Activities	**211,000**	**88,997**	**299,997**
Subtotal, Division C: Department of Energy National Security Authorization and Other Authorizations	**19,451,478**	**360,637**	**19,812,115**
Total, National Defense Funding, Base Budget Request	**543,403,612**	**–4,629**	**543,398,983**
National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations			
National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations Budget Request			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	235,131	–4,420	230,711
Missile Procurement, Army	482,817	–172,210	310,607
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army	153,544	–131,134	22,410
Procurement of Ammunition, Army	301,523	–213,063	88,460
Other Procurement, Army	1,211,110	–612,028	599,082
Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund	295,000	–25,000	270,000
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	358,830		358,830
Weapons Procurement, Navy	8,600		8,600
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps	66,229		66,229
Other Procurement, Navy	64,877		64,877
Procurement, Marine Corps	118,939		118,939
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	679,969	–25,600	654,369
Missile Procurement, Air Force	154,845		154,845
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	164,408		164,408
Other Procurement, Air Force	3,696,281		3,696,281
Procurement, Defense-Wide	234,434		234,434
Subtotal, Procurement	**8,226,537**	**–1,183,455**	**7,043,082**
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	100,489		100,489
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	40,333		40,333
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Air Force	32,905		32,905
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Defense-Wide	162,419		162,419
Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**336,146**	**0**	**336,146**
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	13,724,112	–5,197,330	8,526,782
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	24,120	–6,594	17,526
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	66,907	–19,392	47,515
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund	3,448,715	–1,168,747	2,279,968
Iraq Train & Equip Fund	630,000	–217,913	412,087
Syria Train & Equip Fund	250,000	–98,497	151,503
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	5,345,875	–2,226,518	3,119,357
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	944,359	–331,293	613,066
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve	26,265	–10,448	15,817
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve	3,304	–1,302	2,002
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	9,374,830	–3,683,011	5,691,819
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve	57,586	–22,788	34,798
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard	20,000	–7,880	12,120
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	5,944,129	–2,239,278	3,704,851
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**39,860,202**	**–15,230,991**	**24,629,211**
Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	3,499,293	–1,299,721	2,199,572
Subtotal, Military Personnel	**3,499,293**	**–1,299,721**	**2,199,572**
Other Authorizations			
Working Capital Fund, Army	46,833	–18,452	28,381
Working Capital Fund, Defense-Wide	93,800	–36,956	56,844

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	191,533		191,533
Office of the Inspector General	22,062		22,062
Defense Health Program	331,764	–130,711	201,053
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund	1,000,000	–250,000	750,000
Ukraine Security Assistance		150,000	150,000
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	**1,685,992**	**–286,119**	**1,399,873**
Military Construction			
Army	18,900		18,900
Navy	21,400		21,400
Air Force	88,740	–449	88,291
Defense-Wide	5,000		5,000
Subtotal, Military Construction	**134,040**	**–449**	**133,591**
Subtotal, Overseas Contingency Operations	**53,742,210**	**–18,000,735**	**35,741,475**
Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**53,742,210**	**–18,000,735**	**35,741,475**
Total, National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations Budget Request	**53,742,210**	**–18,000,735**	**35,741,475**
National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations Funding for Base Requirements			
Function 051, Department of Defense-Military			
Procurement			
Aircraft Procurement, Army	78,040	1,060,200	1,138,240
Missile Procurement, Army	150,000	196,100	346,100
Weapons & Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army		267,100	267,100
Procurement of Ammunition, Army		287,700	287,700
Other Procurement, Army	161,900	106,800	268,700
Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Fund	113,272		113,272
Aircraft Procurement, Navy	34,200	3,177,800	3,212,000
Weapons Procurement, Navy		127,100	127,100
Procurement of Ammunition, Navy & Marine Corps		77,200	77,200
Shipbuilding & Conversion, Navy		2,267,000	2,267,000
Other Procurement, Navy	59,329	118,900	178,229
Procurement, Marine Corps		54,800	54,800
Aircraft Procurement, Air Force	179,430	1,699,600	1,879,030
Missile Procurement, Air Force	184,700		184,700
Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force	323,000		323,000
Procurement, Defense-Wide	4,000		4,000
Subtotal, Procurement	**1,287,871**	**9,440,300**	**10,728,171**
Research, Development, Test and Evaluation			
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Army	33	63,700	63,733
Research, Development, Test & Evaluation, Navy	37,990	50,400	88,390
Operational Test & Evaluation, Defense		300,000	300,000
Subtotal, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation	**38,023**	**414,100**	**452,123**

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Operation and Maintenance			
Operation & Maintenance, Army	1,586,475	2,294,934	3,881,409
Operation & Maintenance, Army Reserve	14,559	220,900	235,459
Operation & Maintenance, Army National Guard	60,128	326,100	386,228
Operation & Maintenance, Navy	1,481,516	1,300,740	2,782,256
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps	300,000	189,050	489,050
Operation & Maintenance, Navy Reserve		12,100	12,100
Operation & Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve		7,700	7,700
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force	124,000	1,038,700	1,162,700
Operation & Maintenance, Air Force Reserve		20,500	20,500
Operation & Maintenance, Air National Guard		171,500	171,500
Operation & Maintenance, Defense-Wide	38,044		38,044
Subtotal, Operation and Maintenance	**3,604,722**	**5,582,224**	**9,186,946**
Military Personnel			
Military Personnel Appropriations	62,965	2,509,750	2,572,715
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions		49,900	49,900
Subtotal, Military Personnel	**62,965**	**2,559,650**	**2,622,615**
Other Authorizations			
Drug Interdiction and Counter Drug Activities	23,800		23,800
Subtotal, Other Authorizations	**23,800**	**0**	**23,800**
Military Construction			
Navy	38,409		38,409
Subtotal, Military Construction	**38,409**	**0**	**38,409**
Subtotal, 051, Department of Defense-Military	**5,055,790**	**17,996,274**	**23,052,064**
Total, National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations Funding for Base Requirements	**5,055,790**	**17,996,274**	**23,052,064**
Total, National Defense Funding, Overseas Contingency Operations	**58,798,000**	**–4,461**	**58,793,539**
Total, National Defense	**602,201,612**	**–9,090**	**602,192,522**
MEMORANDUM: BASE BUDGET REQUIREMENTS			
Base Funding	543,403,612	–4,629	543,398,983
Overseas Contingency Operations Funding for Base Requirements	5,055,790	17,996,274	23,052,064
Total, Base Budget Requirements	**548,459,402**	**17,991,645**	**566,451,047**
MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS			
Title XIV—Armed Forces Retirement Home (Function 600)	64,300		64,300
Title XXXIV—Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves (Function 270)	14,950		14,950
Title XXXV—Maritime Administration (Function 400)	208,146		208,146
MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADD)			

SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Title X—General Transfer Authority	[5,000,000]		[5,000,000]
Title XV—Special Transfer Authority	[4,500,000]		[4,500,000]
MEMORANDUM: DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS NOT UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE (NON-ADD)			
Defense Production Act	[44,605]		[44,605]

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Summary, Discretionary Authorizations Within the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee			
SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (051)	**523,952,134**	**–365,266**	**523,586,868**
SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE PROGRAMS (053)	**19,240,478**	**271,640**	**19,512,118**
SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)	**211,000**	**88,997**	**299,997**
TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)—BASE BILL	**543,403,612**	**–4,629**	**543,398,983**
TOTAL, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS	**58,798,000**	**–4,461**	**58,793,539**
GRAND TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE	**602,201,612**	**–9,090**	**602,192,522**
Base National Defense Discretionary Programs that are Not In the Jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee or Do Not Require Additional Authorization (CBO Reestimate of FY 2017 Request)			
Defense Production Act Purchases	44,000		44,000
Indefinite Account: Disposal Of DOD Real Property	8,000		8,000
Indefinite Account: Lease Of DOD Real Property	37,000		37,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**89,000**		**89,000**
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program	103,000		103,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**103,000**		**103,000**
Other Discretionary Programs	7,750,000		7,750,000
Other Discretionary Programs—proposed rescission (FBI S&E)	–133,000		–133,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**7,617,000**		**7,617,000**
Total Defense Discretionary Adjustments (050)	**7,809,000**		**7,809,000**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	582,839,134	–369,727	582,469,407
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	19,343,478	271,640	19,615,118
Defense-Related Activities (054)	7,828,000	88,997	7,916,997
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary	**610,010,612**	**–9,090**	**610,001,522**
National Defense Mandatory Programs, Current Law (CBO Reestimate of FY 2017 Request)			
Concurrent receipt accrual payments to the Military Retirement Fund	7,575,000		7,575,000
Revolving, trust and other DOD Mandatory	1,463,000		1,463,000
Offsetting receipts	–1,856,000		–1,856,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 051	**7,182,000**		**7,182,000**

NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Energy employees occupational illness compensation programs and other	1,169,000		1,169,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 053	**1,169,000**		**1,169,000**
Radiation exposure compensation trust fund	62,000		62,000
Payment to CIA retirement fund and other	514,000		514,000
Subtotal, Budget Sub-Function 054	**576,000**		**576,000**
Total National Defense Mandatory (050)	**8,927,000**		**8,927,000**
Budget Authority Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory			
Department of Defense--Military (051)	590,021,134	–369,727	589,651,407
Atomic Energy Defense Activities (053)	20,512,478	271,640	20,784,118
Defense-Related Activities (054)	8,404,000	88,997	8,492,997
Total BA Implication, National Defense Discretionary and Mandatory	**618,937,612**	**–9,090**	**618,928,522**

TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
001	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT	3	57,529			3	57,529
003	MQ–1 UAV		55,388		29,600		84,988
	Ground Mounted Airspace Deconfliction Radar				[29,600]		
	ROTARY						
006	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	48	803,084			48	803,084
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		185,160				185,160
008	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)	36	755,146			36	755,146
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		174,107				174,107
010	UH–60 BLACK HAWK A AND L MODELS	38	46,173			38	46,173
011	CH–47 HELICOPTER	22	556,257			22	556,257
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		8,707				8,707
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
013	MQ–1 PAYLOAD (MIP)		43,735				43,735
015	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		94,527				94,527
016	AH–64 MODS		137,883				137,883
017	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)		102,943				102,943
018	GRCS SEMA MODS (MIP)		4,055				4,055
019	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP)		6,793				6,793

020	EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP)		13,197			13,197
021	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS		17,526			17,526
022	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS		10,807			10,807
023	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN		74,752			74,752
024	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE		69,960			69,960
025	GATM ROLLUP		45,302			45,302
026	RQ–7 UAV MODS		71,169			71,169
027	UAS MODS		21,804	4,420		26,224
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[4,420]		
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS					
028	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT		67,377			67,377
029	SURVIVABILITY CM		9,565			9,565
030	CMWS		41,626			41,626
	OTHER SUPPORT					
032	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,007			7,007
033	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		48,234			48,234
034	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS		30,297			30,297
035	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL		50,405			50,405
036	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,217			1,217
037	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET		3,055			3,055
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**147**	**3,614,787**	**34,020**	**147**	**3,648,807**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY					
	SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM					
001	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD)		126,470			126,470
002	MSE MISSILE	85	423,201		85	423,201
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,319			19,319
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM					
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	155	42,013		155	42,013
005	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MSLS (JAGM)	324	64,751		324	64,751
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		37,100			37,100
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS					

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
007	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	309	73,508		15,567	309	89,075
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[15,567]		
008	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	595	64,922		80,652	595	145,574
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[80,652]		
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,949				19,949
010	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	1,068	172,088		75,991	1,068	248,079
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[75,991]		
011	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR)	1,704	18,004			1,704	18,004
	MODIFICATIONS						
013	PATRIOT MODS		197,107				197,107
014	ATACMS MODS		150,043				150,043
015	GMLRS MOD		395				395
017	AVENGER MODS		33,606				33,606
018	ITAS/TOW MODS		383				383
019	MLRS MODS		34,704				34,704
020	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS		1,847				1,847
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
021	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		34,487				34,487
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
022	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS		4,915				4,915
024	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT		1,154				1,154
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**4,240**	**1,519,966**		**172,210**	**4,240**	**1,692,176**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	STRYKER VEHICLE		71,680				71,680

	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES					
002	STRYKER (MOD)		74,348			74,348
003	STRYKER UPGRADE		444,561			444,561
005	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD)		276,433			276,433
006	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109A6 (MOD)		63,138			63,138
007	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	36	469,305	125,184	36	594,489
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[125,184]		
008	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)	22	91,963		22	91,963
009	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)		3,465	5,950		9,415
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[5,950]		
010	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE		2,928			2,928
011	M88 FOV MODS		8,685			8,685
012	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE	9	64,752		9	64,752
013	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)		480,166			480,166
014	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM			172,200		172,200
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[172,200]		
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES					
016	INTEGRATED AIR BURST WEAPON SYSTEM FAMILY		9,764			9,764
017	MORTAR SYSTEMS		8,332			8,332
018	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM)		3,062			3,062
019	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM		992			992
020	CARBINE		40,493			40,493
021	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION		25,164			25,164
	MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH					
022	MK–19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS		4,959			4,959
023	M777 MODS		11,913			11,913
024	M4 CARBINE MODS		29,752			29,752
025	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS		48,582			48,582
026	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS		1,179			1,179
027	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS		1,784			1,784
028	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS		971			971
029	M119 MODIFICATIONS		6,045			6,045

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
030	MORTAR MODIFICATION		12,118				12,118
031	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		3,157				3,157
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
032	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (WOCV-WTCV)		2,331				2,331
035	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG)		3,155				3,155
036	BRADLEY PROGRAM				72,800		72,800
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[72,800]		
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**67**	**2,265,177**		**376,134**	**67**	**2,641,311**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES		40,296				40,296
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		39,237		9,642		48,879
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[9,642]		
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES		5,193				5,193
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		46,693		5,998		52,691
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[5,998]		
005	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES		7,000		1,077		8,077
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[1,077]		
006	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		7,753		27,234		34,987
	Program reduction				[–1,300]		
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[28,534]		
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES		47,000				47,000
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES		118,178		–2,677		115,501
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[7,423]		
	Unobligated balances				[–10,100]		

	MORTAR AMMUNITION			
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	69,784		69,784
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	36,125	2,677	38,802
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[2,677]	
011	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	69,133		69,133
	TANK AMMUNITION			
012	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES	120,668	8,999	129,667
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[8,999]	
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION			
013	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES	64,800		64,800
014	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	109,515	20,348	129,863
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[20,348]	
015	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	39,200	140	39,340
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[140]	
016	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	70,881	24,655	95,536
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[24,655]	
	MINES			
017	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES		16,866	16,866
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[16,866]	
	NETWORKED MUNITIONS			
018	SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		10,353	10,353
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[10,353]	
	ROCKETS			
019	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	38,000	63,210	101,210
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[63,210]	
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	87,213		87,213
	OTHER AMMUNITION			
021	CAD/PAD, ALL TYPES	4,914		4,914
022	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	6,380	6,373	12,753
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[6,373]	
023	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	22,760	4,143	26,903
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[4,143]	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
024	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		10,666		1,852		12,518
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[1,852]		
025	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES		7,412				7,412
	MISCELLANEOUS						
026	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES		12,726				12,726
027	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		6,100		773		6,873
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[773]		
028	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION (AMMO)		10,006				10,006
029	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT		17,275		–3,700		13,575
	Program reduction- excess carryover				[–3,700]		
030	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO)		14,951				14,951
	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT						
032	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		222,269		20,000		242,269
	Program increase				[20,000]		
033	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION		157,383				157,383
034	ARMS INITIATIVE		3,646				3,646
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**1,513,157**		**217,963**		**1,731,120**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
001	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS		3,733				3,733
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:		3,716		4,180		7,896
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[4,180]		
003	HI MOB MULTI-PURP WHLD VEH (HMMWV)				50,000		50,000
	HMMWV M997A3 ambulance recapitalization for Active Component				[50,000]		
004	GROUND MOBILITY VEHICLES (GMV)		4,907				4,907

006	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	1,828	587,514		1,828	587,514	
007	TRUCK, DUMP, 20T (CCE)		3,927			3,927	
008	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	8	53,293	147,476	8	200,769	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[147,476]			
009	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP		7,460			7,460	
010	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	430	39,564	6,122	430	45,686	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[6,122]			
011	PLS ESP		11,856	106,358		118,214	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[106,358]			
012	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV			76,561		76,561	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[76,561]			
013	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS		49,751	27,119		76,870	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[27,119]			
014	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		64,000	–6,544		57,456	
	Program reduction			[–10,000]			
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[3,456]			
015	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS		10,611			10,611	
	NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES						
016	HEAVY ARMORED SEDAN		394			394	
018	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER		1,755			1,755	
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
019	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK		427,598	6,572		434,170	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[6,572]			
020	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM		58,250			58,250	
021	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY		5,749			5,749	
022	JCSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM)		5,068			5,068	
	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
023	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS		143,805			143,805	
024	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS		36,580			36,580	
025	SHF TERM		1,985	24,000		25,985	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO			[24,000]			
027	SMART-T (SPACE)		9,165			9,165	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	COMM—C3 SYSTEM						
031	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS)		2,530				2,530
	COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS						
033	HANDHELD MANPACK SMALL FORM FIT (HMS)	5,656	273,645			5,656	273,645
034	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)		25,017				25,017
035	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2)		12,326				12,326
037	TRACTOR DESK		2,034				2,034
038	TRACTOR RIDE		2,334				2,334
039	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT		1,985				1,985
040	SPIDER FAMILY OF NETWORKED MUNITIONS INCR		10,796				10,796
042	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM		3,607				3,607
043	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE		14,295				14,295
045	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE		19,893				19,893
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM						
047	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,388				1,388
048	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT		5,494				5,494
	INFORMATION SECURITY						
049	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS		2,978				2,978
051	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)		131,356		1,928		133,284
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[1,928]		
052	DEFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS		15,132				15,132
	COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS						
053	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS		27,452				27,452
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS						
054	INFORMATION SYSTEMS		122,055				122,055
055	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1	4,286			1	4,286

056	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM	131,794		131,794
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)			
059	JTT/CIBS-M	5,337		5,337
062	DCGS-A (MIP)	242,514		242,514
063	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS)	4,417		4,417
064	TROJAN (MIP)	17,455	160	17,615
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[160]	
065	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP)	44,965		44,965
066	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)	7,658		7,658
067	CLOSE ACCESS TARGET RECONNAISSANCE (CATR)	7,970		7,970
068	MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM-M	545		545
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)			
070	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR	74,038	25,892	99,930
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[25,892]	
071	EW PLANNING & MANAGEMENT TOOLS (EWPMT)	3,235		3,235
072	AIR VIGILANCE (AV)	733		733
074	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE	1,740		1,740
075	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES	455		455
076	CI MODERNIZATION	176		176
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)			
077	SENTINEL MODS	40,171		40,171
078	NIGHT VISION DEVICES	163,029		163,029
079	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF	15,885		15,885
080	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS	48,427	4,270	52,697
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[4,270]	
081	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS)	55,536		55,536
082	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP	4,187		4,187
085	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P)	137,501		137,501
086	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS)	50,726		50,726
087	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR)	28,058		28,058
088	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMBC XM32	5,924		5,924
089	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM	22,331	290	22,621

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[290]		
090	COUNTERFIRE RADARS		314,509		–33,000		281,509
	Unit cost savings				[–33,000]		
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS						
091	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY		8,660				8,660
092	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS		54,376		69,958		124,334
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[69,958]		
093	IAMD BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM		204,969				204,969
094	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS)		4,718				4,718
095	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE		11,063				11,063
096	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS)		151,318				151,318
097	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A)		155,660				155,660
098	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP		4,214				4,214
099	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET		16,185				16,185
100	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (ENFIRE)		1,565				1,565
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION						
101	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION		17,693				17,693
102	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		107,960				107,960
103	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM		6,416				6,416
104	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP)		58,614				58,614
105	CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM		986				986
106	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS)		23,828				23,828
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)						
107	TACTICAL DIGITAL MEDIA		1,191				1,191
108	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)		1,995		96		2,091
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[96]		

	ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT			
109	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E)	403		403
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS			
110A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,436		4,436
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT			
111	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS	2,966		2,966
112	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE)	9,795		9,795
114	CBRN DEFENSE	17,922	1,841	19,763
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[1,841]	
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT			
115	TACTICAL BRIDGING	13,553	26,000	39,553
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[26,000]	
116	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON	25,244		25,244
117	BRIDGE SUPPLEMENTAL SET	983		983
118	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP	25,176		25,176
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT			
119	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS)	39,350		39,350
120	AREA MINE DETECTION SYSTEM (AMDS)	10,500		10,500
121	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS)	274		274
122	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS)	2,951		2,951
123	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION	1,949		1,949
124	ROBOTICS AND APPLIQUE SYSTEMS	5,203	268	5,471
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[268]	
125	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT)	5,570		5,570
126	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS	6,238		6,238
127	< $5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT	836		836
128	FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS	3,171	280	3,451
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[280]	
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
129	HEATERS AND ECU'S	18,707	894	19,601
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[894]	
130	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT	2,112		2,112

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
131	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS)		10,856				10,856
132	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM		32,419				32,419
133	MOBILE SOLDIER POWER		30,014				30,014
135	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		12,544		2,665		15,209
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[2,665]		
136	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM		18,509				18,509
137	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS		29,384		9,789		39,173
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[9,789]		
138	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)				300		300
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[300]		
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
139	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		4,487		4,800		9,287
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[4,800]		
140	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER		42,656		20,820		63,476
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[20,820]		
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
141	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		59,761		5,763		65,524
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[5,763]		
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
142	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		35,694		–1,891		33,803
	Program reduction				[–3,500]		
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[1,609]		
143	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)		2,716		145		2,861
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[145]		
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
144	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		1,742		3,047		4,789

	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[3,047]	
145	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING	26,233		26,233
147	HYDRAULIC EXCAVATOR	1,123		1,123
148	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		4,426	4,426
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[4,426]	
149	ALL TERRAIN CRANES	65,285		65,285
151	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)	1,743	2,900	4,643
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[2,900]	
152	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP	2,779		2,779
154	CONST EQUIP ESP	26,712	–3,500	23,212
	Program reduction		[–3,500]	
155	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)	6,649	96	6,745
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[96]	
	RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT			
156	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP	21,860	–5,000	16,860
	Program reduction		[–5,000]	
157	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL)	1,967		1,967
	GENERATORS			
158	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP	113,266	12,461	125,727
	Program decrease		[–7,500]	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[19,961]	
159	TACTICAL ELECTRIC POWER RECAPITALIZATION	7,867		7,867
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT			
160	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS	2,307	846	3,153
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[846]	
	TRAINING EQUIPMENT			
161	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT	75,359		75,359
162	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM	253,050		253,050
163	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER	48,271		48,271
164	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER	40,000		40,000
165	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING	11,543		11,543
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)			

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
166	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT		4,963				4,963
167	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE)		29,781				29,781
168	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)		6,342		1,140		7,482
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO				[1,140]		
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
169	M25 STABILIZED BINOCULAR		3,149				3,149
170	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		18,003				18,003
171	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3)		44,082				44,082
172	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT		2,168				2,168
173	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA–3)		67,367				67,367
174	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH)		1,528				1,528
175	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING		8,289				8,289
177	TRACTOR YARD		6,888				6,888
	OPA2						
179	INITIAL SPARES—C&E		27,243				27,243
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**7,923**	**5,873,949**		**599,528**	**7,923**	**6,473,477**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
003	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV	4	890,650			4	890,650
004	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		80,908				80,908
005	JSF STOVL	16	2,037,768			16	2,037,768
006	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		233,648				233,648
007	CH–53K (HEAVY LIFT)	2	348,615			2	348,615
008	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		88,365				88,365
009	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)	16	1,264,134			16	1,264,134

010	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		19,674			19,674	
011	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)	24	759,778		24	759,778	
012	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		57,232			57,232	
014	MH–60R (MYP)		61,177	–35,000		26,177	
	Line shutdown costs—early to need			[–35,000]			
016	P–8A POSEIDON	11	1,940,238		11	1,940,238	
017	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		123,140			123,140	
018	E–2D ADV HAWKEYE	6	916,483		6	916,483	
019	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		125,042			125,042	
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
020	JPATS		5,849			5,849	
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
021	KC–130J	2	128,870		2	128,870	
022	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		24,848			24,848	
023	MQ–4 TRITON	2	409,005		2	409,005	
024	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		55,652			55,652	
025	MQ–8 UAV	1	72,435		1	72,435	
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
029	AEA SYSTEMS		51,900			51,900	
030	AV–8 SERIES		60,818			60,818	
031	ADVERSARY		5,191			5,191	
032	F–18 SERIES		1,023,492	–37,300		986,192	
	Unobligated balances			[–37,300]			
034	H–53 SERIES		46,095			46,095	
035	SH–60 SERIES		108,328			108,328	
036	H–1 SERIES		46,333			46,333	
037	EP–3 SERIES		14,681			14,681	
038	P–3 SERIES		2,781			2,781	
039	E–2 SERIES		32,949			32,949	
040	TRAINER A/C SERIES		13,199			13,199	
041	C–2A		19,066			19,066	
042	C–130 SERIES		61,788			61,788	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
043	FEWSG		618				618
044	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES		9,822				9,822
045	E–6 SERIES		222,077				222,077
046	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES		66,835				66,835
047	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		16,497				16,497
048	T–45 SERIES		114,887				114,887
049	POWER PLANT CHANGES		16,893				16,893
050	JPATS SERIES		17,401				17,401
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		143,773				143,773
052	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES		164,839				164,839
053	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM		4,403				4,403
054	ID SYSTEMS		45,768				45,768
055	P–8 SERIES		18,836				18,836
056	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION		5,676				5,676
057	MQ–8 SERIES		19,003				19,003
058	RQ–7 SERIES		3,534				3,534
059	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		141,545				141,545
060	F–35 STOVL SERIES		34,928				34,928
061	F–35 CV SERIES		26,004				26,004
062	QRC		5,476				5,476
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,407,626				1,407,626
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
064	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT		390,103				390,103
065	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		23,194				23,194
066	WAR CONSUMABLES		40,613				40,613

067	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		860			860	
068	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		36,282			36,282	
069	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		1,523			1,523	
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**84**	**14,109,148**	**–72,300**	**84**	**14,036,848**	
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
001	TRIDENT II MODS		1,103,086			1,103,086	
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
002	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		6,776			6,776	
	STRATEGIC MISSILES						
003	TOMAHAWK	100	186,905		100	186,905	
	TACTICAL MISSILES						
004	AMRAAM	163	204,697		163	204,697	
005	SIDEWINDER	152	70,912		152	70,912	
006	JSOW		2,232			2,232	
007	STANDARD MISSILE	125	501,212		125	501,212	
008	RAM	90	71,557		90	71,557	
009	JOINT AIR GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	96	26,200		96	26,200	
012	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM)	24	3,316		24	3,316	
013	AERIAL TARGETS		137,484			137,484	
014	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT		3,248			3,248	
015	LRASM	10	29,643		10	29,643	
	MODIFICATION OF MISSILES						
016	ESSM	75	52,935		75	52,935	
018	HARM MODS		178,213			178,213	
019	STANDARD MISSILES MODS		8,164			8,164	
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
020	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		1,964			1,964	
021	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON		36,723			36,723	
	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
022	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		59,096			59,096	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
023	SSTD		5,910				5,910
024	MK–48 TORPEDO	11	44,537			11	44,537
025	ASW TARGETS		9,302				9,302
	MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP						
026	MK–54 TORPEDO MODS		98,092				98,092
027	MK–48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS		46,139				46,139
028	QUICKSTRIKE MINE		1,236				1,236
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
029	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		60,061				60,061
030	ASW RANGE SUPPORT		3,706				3,706
	DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION						
031	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		3,804				3,804
	GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
032	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS		18,002				18,002
	MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS						
033	CIWS MODS		50,900				50,900
034	COAST GUARD WEAPONS		25,295				25,295
035	GUN MOUNT MODS		77,003				77,003
036	LCS MODULE WEAPONS	24	2,776			24	2,776
038	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS		15,753				15,753
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
040	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		62,383				62,383
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**870**	**3,209,262**			**870**	**3,209,262**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC						

	NAVY AMMUNITION			
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS	91,659		91,659
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	65,759		65,759
003	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION	8,152		8,152
004	PRACTICE BOMBS	41,873		41,873
005	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES	54,002		54,002
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES	57,034		57,034
007	JATOS	2,735		2,735
009	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION	19,220		19,220
010	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION	30,196		30,196
011	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION	39,009		39,009
012	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO	46,727		46,727
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION	9,806		9,806
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION	2,900		2,900
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION			
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION	27,958		27,958
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES	14,758		14,758
018	60MM, ALL TYPES	992		992
020	120MM, ALL TYPES	16,757		16,757
021	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	972		972
022	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES	14,186		14,186
023	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES	68,656		68,656
024	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	1,700		1,700
025	FUZE, ALL TYPES	26,088		26,088
027	AMMO MODERNIZATION	14,660		14,660
028	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	8,569		8,569
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC	**664,368**		**664,368**
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY			
	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE SHIPS			
001	OHIO REPLACEMENT SUBMARINE ADVANCE PROCUREMENT	773,138	–773,138	0
	Transfer to Title XIV National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund		[–773,138]	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	OTHER WARSHIPS						
002	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM		1,291,783				1,291,783
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,370,784				1,370,784
004	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE	2	3,187,985			2	3,187,985
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		1,767,234				1,767,234
006	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS		1,743,220				1,743,220
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		248,599				248,599
008	DDG 1000		271,756				271,756
009	DDG–51	2	3,211,292			2	3,211,292
011	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP	2	1,125,625			2	1,125,625
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
016	LHA REPLACEMENT	1	1,623,024			1	1,623,024
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
020	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		73,079				73,079
022	MOORED TRAINING SHIP	1	624,527			1	624,527
025	OUTFITTING		666,158				666,158
026	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR	2	128,067			2	128,067
027	SERVICE CRAFT		65,192				65,192
028	LCAC SLEP		1,774				1,774
029	YP CRAFT MAINTENANCE/ROH/SLEP		21,363				21,363
030	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS		160,274				160,274
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY	**10**	**18,354,874**		**–773,138**	**10**	**17,581,736**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT						
003	SURFACE POWER EQUIPMENT		15,514				15,514

004	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED)	40,132	40,132
	GENERATORS		
005	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E	29,974	29,974
	NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT		
006	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT	63,942	63,942
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT		
008	SUB PERISCOPE, IMAGING AND SUPT EQUIP PROG	136,421	136,421
009	DDG MOD	367,766	367,766
010	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT	14,743	14,743
011	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD	2,140	2,140
012	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE	24,939	24,939
014	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	20,191	20,191
015	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	8,995	8,995
016	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	66,838	66,838
017	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	54,823	54,823
018	SUBMARINE BATTERIES	23,359	23,359
019	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	40,321	40,321
020	DDG 1000 CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	33,404	33,404
021	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	15,836	15,836
022	DSSP EQUIPMENT	806	806
024	LCAC	3,090	3,090
025	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS	24,350	24,350
026	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	88,719	88,719
027	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS	2,873	2,873
028	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM	6,043	6,043
	REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT		
030	REACTOR COMPONENTS	342,158	342,158
	OCEAN ENGINEERING		
031	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT	8,973	8,973
	SMALL BOATS		
032	STANDARD BOATS	43,684	43,684
	PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT		

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
034	OPERATING FORCES IPE		75,421				75,421
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
035	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS		172,718				172,718
036	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT		27,840		–10,000		17,840
	RMMV program restructure				[–10,000]		
037	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES		57,146		–36,400		20,746
	RMMV program restructure				[–36,400]		
038	LCS ASW MISSION MODULES		31,952		–10,000		21,952
	Early to need				[–10,000]		
039	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES		22,466				22,466
	LOGISTIC SUPPORT						
041	LSD MIDLIFE		10,813				10,813
	SHIP SONARS						
042	SPQ–9B RADAR		14,363				14,363
043	AN/SQQ–89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM		90,029				90,029
045	SSN ACOUSTIC EQUIPMENT		248,765				248,765
046	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,163				7,163
	ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT						
048	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM		21,291				21,291
049	SSTD		6,893				6,893
050	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM		145,701				145,701
051	SURTASS		36,136				36,136
	ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT						
053	AN/SLQ–32		274,892				274,892
	RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT						
054	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT		170,733				170,733

055	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS)	958	958
	OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
057	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY	22,034	22,034
059	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS)	12,336	12,336
060	ATDLS	30,105	30,105
061	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS)	4,556	4,556
062	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT	56,675	56,675
063	SHALLOW WATER MCM	8,875	8,875
064	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE)	12,752	12,752
065	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE	4,577	4,577
066	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP	8,972	8,972
	AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
069	ASHORE ATC EQUIPMENT	75,068	75,068
070	AFLOAT ATC EQUIPMENT	33,484	33,484
076	ID SYSTEMS	22,177	22,177
077	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	14,273	14,273
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT		
080	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS	27,927	27,927
081	DCGS-N	12,676	12,676
082	CANES	212,030	212,030
083	RADIAC	8,092	8,092
084	CANES-INTELL	36,013	36,013
085	GPETE	6,428	6,428
087	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY	8,376	8,376
088	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION	3,971	3,971
089	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	58,721	58,721
	SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS		
090	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS	17,366	17,366
091	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION	102,479	102,479
092	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER $5M	10,403	10,403
	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS		
093	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT	34,151	34,151

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
094	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT		64,529				64,529
	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS						
095	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS		14,414				14,414
096	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT)		38,365				38,365
	SHORE COMMUNICATIONS						
097	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT		4,156				4,156
	CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT						
099	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		85,694				85,694
100	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM		920				920
	CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT						
101	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP		21,098				21,098
	OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT						
102	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT		32,291				32,291
	SONOBUOYS						
103	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES		162,588				162,588
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
104	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		58,116				58,116
105	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		120,324				120,324
106	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT		29,253				29,253
107	DCRS/DPL		632				632
108	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES		29,097				29,097
109	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		39,099				39,099
	SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT						
110	SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT		6,191				6,191
	SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT						
111	SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		320,446		–9,500		310,946

	Program execution		[–9,500]	
112	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	71,046		71,046
	FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
113	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP	215,138		215,138
	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
114	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS	130,715		130,715
115	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	26,431		26,431
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
116	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP	11,821		11,821
117	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	6,243		6,243
	OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE			
118	SUBMARINE TRAINING DEVICE MODS	48,020		48,020
120	SURFACE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	97,514		97,514
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
121	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES	8,853		8,853
122	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS	4,928		4,928
123	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP	18,527		18,527
124	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT	13,569		13,569
125	TACTICAL VEHICLES	14,917		14,917
126	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT	7,676		7,676
127	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT	2,321		2,321
128	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION	12,459		12,459
129	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES	1,095		1,095
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
131	SUPPLY EQUIPMENT	16,023		16,023
133	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION	5,115		5,115
134	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS	295,471		295,471
	TRAINING DEVICES			
136	TRAINING AND EDUCATION EQUIPMENT	9,504		9,504
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT			
137	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	37,180		37,180
139	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	4,128		4,128

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
141	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		1,925				1,925
142	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		4,777				4,777
143	C4ISR EQUIPMENT		9,073				9,073
144	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		21,107				21,107
145	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		100,906				100,906
146	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY		67,544				67,544
	OTHER						
150	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE		98,216				98,216
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
150A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		9,915				9,915
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
151	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		199,660				199,660
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**6,338,861**		**–65,900**		**6,272,961**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
001	AAV7A1 PIP		73,785				73,785
002	LAV PIP		53,423				53,423
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
003	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		3,360				3,360
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER		3,318				3,318
005	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM		33,725				33,725
006	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		8,181				8,181
	OTHER SUPPORT						
007	MODIFICATION KITS		15,250				15,250
	GUIDED MISSILES						

009	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE		9,170		9,170
010	JAVELIN		1,009		1,009
011	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW		24,666		24,666
012	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H)		17,080		17,080
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS				
015	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C		47,312		47,312
	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT				
016	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT		16,469		16,469
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)				
019	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		7,433		7,433
020	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS		15,917		15,917
	RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
021	RADAR SYSTEMS		17,772		17,772
022	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	3	123,758	3	123,758
023	RQ–21 UAS	4	80,217	4	80,217
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)				
024	GCSS-MC		1,089		1,089
025	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM		13,258		13,258
026	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		56,379		56,379
029	RQ–11 UAV		1,976		1,976
031	DCGS-MC		1,149		1,149
032	UAS PAYLOADS		2,971		2,971
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)				
034	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN)		76,302		76,302
035	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		41,802		41,802
036	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS		90,924		90,924
037	RADIO SYSTEMS		43,714		43,714
038	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS		66,383		66,383
039	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT		30,229		30,229
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
039A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		2,738		2,738
	ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
041	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES		88,312				88,312
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
043	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS		13,292				13,292
045	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE	192	113,230			192	113,230
046	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS		2,691				2,691
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
048	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT		18				18
050	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS		78				78
051	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED		17,973				17,973
052	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		7,371				7,371
053	EOD SYSTEMS		14,021				14,021
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
054	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT		31,523				31,523
	GENERAL PROPERTY						
058	TRAINING DEVICES		33,658				33,658
060	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT		21,315				21,315
061	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITV)		9,654				9,654
	OTHER SUPPORT						
062	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		6,026				6,026
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
064	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		22,848				22,848
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**199**	**1,362,769**			**199**	**1,362,769**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
001	F–35	43	4,401,894			43	4,401,894

002	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		404,500		404,500
	TACTICAL AIRLIFT				
003	KC–46A TANKER	15	2,884,591	15	2,884,591
	OTHER AIRLIFT				
004	C–130J	2	145,655	2	145,655
006	HC–130J	4	317,576	4	317,576
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		20,000		20,000
008	MC–130J	6	548,358	6	548,358
009	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		50,000		50,000
	HELICOPTERS				
010	UH–1N REPLACEMENT		18,337		18,337
	MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT				
012	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C	6	2,637	6	2,637
	OTHER AIRCRAFT				
013	TARGET DRONES	41	114,656	41	114,656
014	RQ–4		12,966		12,966
015	MQ–9		122,522		122,522
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT				
016	B–2A		46,729		46,729
017	B–1B		116,319		116,319
018	B–52		109,020		109,020
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT				
020	A–10		1,289		1,289
021	F–15		105,685		105,685
022	F–16		97,331		97,331
023	F–22A		163,008		163,008
024	F–35 MODIFICATIONS		175,811		175,811
025	INCREMENT 3.2B		76,410		76,410
026	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		2,000		2,000
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT				
027	C–5		24,192		24,192
029	C–17A		21,555		21,555

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
030	C–21		5,439				5,439
031	C–32A		35,235				35,235
032	C–37A		5,004				5,004
	TRAINER AIRCRAFT						
033	GLIDER MODS		394				394
034	T–6		12,765				12,765
035	T–1		25,073				25,073
036	T–38		45,090				45,090
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
037	U–2 MODS		36,074				36,074
038	KC–10A (ATCA)		4,570				4,570
039	C–12		1,995				1,995
040	VC–25A MOD		102,670				102,670
041	C–40		13,984				13,984
042	C–130		9,168	50	72,500	50	81,668
	8–Bladed Propellers				[16,000]		
	Electronic Propeller Control Systems				[13,500]		
	In-flight Propeller Balancing System Certification				[1,500]		
	T56 3.5 Engine Upgrade Kits			[50]	[41,500]		
043	C–130J MODS		89,424				89,424
044	C–135		64,161				64,161
045	COMPASS CALL MODS		130,257		–70,400		59,857
	Program restructure				[–70,400]		
046	RC–135		211,438				211,438
047	E–3		82,786				82,786
048	E–4		53,348				53,348

049	E–8		6,244			6,244	
050	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM		223,427			223,427	
051	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	3	4,673		3	4,673	
052	H–1		9,007			9,007	
054	H–60		91,357			91,357	
055	RQ–4 MODS		32,045			32,045	
056	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		30,767			30,767	
057	OTHER AIRCRAFT		33,886			33,886	
059	MQ–9 MODS		141,929			141,929	
060	CV–22 MODS		63,395			63,395	
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
061	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		686,491	–13,200		673,291	
	Compass Call program restructure			[–13,200]			
	COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
062	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP		121,935			121,935	
	POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT						
063	B–2A		154			154	
064	B–2A		43,330			43,330	
065	B–52		28,125			28,125	
066	C–17A		23,559			23,559	
069	F–15		2,980			2,980	
070	F–16		15,155	24,800		39,955	
	Additional mission trainers			[24,800]			
071	F–22A		48,505			48,505	
074	RQ–4 POST PRODUCTION CHARGES		99			99	
	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS						
075	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS		14,126			14,126	
	WAR CONSUMABLES						
076	WAR CONSUMABLES		120,036			120,036	
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES						
077	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		1,252,824			1,252,824	
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
077A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		16,952				16,952
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**120**	**13,922,917**	**50**	**13,700**	**170**	**13,936,617**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC						
001	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC		70,247				70,247
	TACTICAL						
002	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE	360	431,645			360	431,645
003	LRASM0	20	59,511			20	59,511
004	SIDEWINDER (AIM–9X)	287	127,438			287	127,438
005	AMRAAM	256	350,144			256	350,144
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	284	33,955			284	33,955
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	312	92,361			312	92,361
	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES						
008	INDUSTR'L PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION		977				977
	CLASS IV						
009	ICBM FUZE MOD		17,095				17,095
010	MM III MODIFICATIONS		68,692				68,692
011	AGM–65D MAVERICK		282				282
013	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)		21,762				21,762
014	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB		15,349				15,349
	MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
015	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		81,607				81,607
	SPECIAL PROGRAMS						
030	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS		46,125				46,125
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						

030A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,009,431			1,009,431	
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**1,519**	**2,426,621**		**1,519**	**2,426,621**	
	SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	SPACE PROGRAMS						
001	ADVANCED EHF		645,569			645,569	
002	AF SATELLITE COMM SYSTEM		42,375			42,375	
003	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS		26,984			26,984	
004	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	16	88,963		16	88,963	
005	WIDEBAND GAPFILLER SATELLITES(SPACE)		86,272	30,000		116,272	
	Pilot Program			[30,000]			
006	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT		34,059			34,059	
007	GLOBAL POSTIONING (SPACE)		2,169			2,169	
008	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC)		46,708			46,708	
009	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE)		13,171	–2,900		10,271	
	Excess to Need			[–2,900]			
010	MILSATCOM		41,799			41,799	
011	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH CAPABILITY		768,586			768,586	
012	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE)	5	737,853		5	737,853	
013	SBIR HIGH (SPACE)		362,504			362,504	
014	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM		4,395			4,395	
015	SPACE MODS		8,642			8,642	
016	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE		123,088			123,088	
	SSPARES						
017	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		22,606			22,606	
	TOTAL SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**21**	**3,055,743**	**27,100**	**21**	**3,082,843**	
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS		18,734			18,734	
	CARTRIDGES						
002	CARTRIDGES		220,237			220,237	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	BOMBS						
003	PRACTICE BOMBS		97,106				97,106
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		581,561				581,561
005	MASSIVE ORDNANCE PENETRATOR (MOP)		3,600				3,600
006	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	12,133	303,988			12,133	303,988
	OTHER ITEMS						
007	CAD/PAD		38,890				38,890
008	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD)		5,714				5,714
009	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		740				740
010	MODIFICATIONS		573				573
011	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		5,156				5,156
	FLARES						
012	FLARES		134,709				134,709
	FUZES						
013	FUZES		229,252				229,252
	SMALL ARMS						
014	SMALL ARMS		37,459				37,459
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**12,133**	**1,677,719**			**12,133**	**1,677,719**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		14,437				14,437
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES						
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		24,812				24,812
003	CAP VEHICLES		984				984
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		11,191				11,191

	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES			
005	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES	5,361		5,361
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	4,623		4,623
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT			
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES	12,451	–5,000	7,451
	Program reduction		[–5,000]	
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT			
008	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	18,114		18,114
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT			
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP	2,310		2,310
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION	46,868		46,868
	COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)			
012	COMSEC EQUIPMENT	72,359		72,359
	INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS			
014	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT	6,982		6,982
015	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT	30,504		30,504
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS			
016	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS	55,803		55,803
017	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM	2,673		2,673
018	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED	5,677		5,677
019	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS	1,163		1,163
020	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST	21,667		21,667
021	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL	39,803		39,803
022	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX	24,618		24,618
023	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	15,868		15,868
025	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN)	9,331		9,331
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS			
026	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	41,779		41,779
027	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS	15,729		15,729
028	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL	9,814		9,814
029	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM	99,460		99,460
030	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	34,850		34,850

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
031	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N		198,925				198,925
032	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE (WAS)		6,943				6,943
033	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		19,580				19,580
034	GCSS-AF FOS		1,743				1,743
036	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM		9,659				9,659
037	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS		15,474				15,474
038	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) 10.2		30,623				30,623
	AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS						
039	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS		40,043				40,043
040	AFNET		146,897				146,897
041	JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE)		5,182				5,182
042	USCENTCOM		13,418				13,418
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
052	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		109,836				109,836
053	RADIO EQUIPMENT		16,266				16,266
054	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT		7,449				7,449
055	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE		109,215				109,215
	MODIFICATIONS						
056	COMM ELECT MODS		65,700				65,700
	PERSONAL SAFETY & RESCUE EQUIP						
058	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		54,416				54,416
	DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ						
059	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP		7,344				7,344
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
060	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT		6,852		5,000		11,852
	Program increase				[5,000]		

063	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT		8,146		8,146
064	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		28,427		28,427
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS				
066	DARP RC135		25,287		25,287
067	DCGS-AF		169,201		169,201
069	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM		576,710		576,710
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS				
070A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		15,119,705		15,119,705
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				
072	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		15,784		15,784
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**17,438,056**		**17,438,056**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE				
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS				
037	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD	39	29,211	39	29,211
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA				
036	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP)		4,399		4,399
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS				
040	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS		24,979		24,979
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA				
006	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY		21,347		21,347
007	TELEPORT PROGRAM		50,597		50,597
008	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		10,420		10,420
009	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES)		1,634		1,634
010	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK		87,235		87,235
011	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE		4,528		4,528
012	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY		36,846		36,846
013	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE		599,391		599,391
015	JOINT REGIONAL SECURITY STACKS (JRSS)		150,221		150,221
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA				
017	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		2,055		2,055
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
020	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		1,057				1,057
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA						
001	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,964				2,964
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS						
038	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS		7,988				7,988
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY						
023	THAAD	24	369,608			24	369,608
024	AEGIS BMD	35	463,801		65,000	35	528,801
	Increasing BMD capability for Aegis Ships				[65,000]		
025	BMDS AN/TPY–2 RADARS		5,503				5,503
026	ARROW UPPER TIER				120,000		120,000
	Increase for Arrow 3 Coproduction subject to Title XVI				[120,000]		
027	DAVID'S SLING				150,000		150,000
	Increase for DSWS Coproduction subject to Title XVI				[150,000]		
028	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III		57,493		25,000		82,493
	Classified adjustment				[25,000]		
029	IRON DOME		42,000		20,000		62,000
	Increase for Coproduction of Iron Dome Tamir Interceptors subject to Title XVI.				[20,000]		
030	AEGIS BMD HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE	6	50,098			6	50,098
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA						
003	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION		14,232				14,232
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY						
021	VEHICLES		200				200
022	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT		6,437				6,437
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA						

019	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS		288			288
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA					
002	MAJOR EQUIPMENT		92			92
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DMACT					
018	MAJOR EQUIPMENT	4	8,060		4	8,060
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
040A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		568,864			568,864
	AVIATION PROGRAMS					
042	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT		150,396	18,600		168,996
	Program increase			[18,600]		
043	UNMANNED ISR		21,190			21,190
045	NON-STANDARD AVIATION		4,905			4,905
046	U–28		3,970			3,970
047	MH–47 CHINOOK		25,022			25,022
049	CV–22 MODIFICATION		19,008			19,008
051	MQ–9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE		10,598			10,598
053	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE		213,122			213,122
054	AC/MC–130J		73,548	12,100		85,648
	A-kits for 105mm integration			[12,100]		
055	C–130 MODIFICATIONS		32,970			32,970
	SHIPBUILDING					
056	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS		37,098			37,098
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS					
057	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M		105,267			105,267
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					
058	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		79,963			79,963
059	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS		13,432			13,432
060	OTHER ITEMS <$5M		66,436			66,436
061	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS		55,820			55,820
062	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		107,432			107,432
063	TACTICAL VEHICLES		67,849			67,849
064	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <$5M		245,781			245,781

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
065	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS		19,566				19,566
066	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES		3,437				3,437
067	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE		17,299				17,299
069	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		219,945				219,945
	CBDP						
070	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS		148,203				148,203
071	CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION		161,113				161,113
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE	**108**	**4,524,918**		**410,700**	**108**	**4,935,618**
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND						
001	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		99,300		–99,300		0
	Program decrease				[–99,300]		
	TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND		**99,300**		**–99,300**		**0**
	NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT						
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
007	MISCELLANEOUS EQUIPMENT				250,000		250,000
	Program increase				[250,000]		
	TOTAL NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE EQUIPMENT				**250,000**		**250,000**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**27,441**	**101,971,592**	**50**	**1,090,717**	**27,491**	**103,062,309**

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
015	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP)		21,400				21,400
020	EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP)	2	42,700			2	42,700
026	RQ–7 UAV MODS		1,775				1,775
027	UAS MODS		4,420		–4,420		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–4,420]		
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
030	CMWS		56,115				56,115
031	CIRCM		108,721				108,721
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**2**	**235,131**		**–4,420**	**2**	**230,711**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	2,570	305,830			2,570	305,830
	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
007	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY	83	15,567		–15,567	83	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–15,567]		
008	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY	815	80,652		–80,652	815	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–80,652]		
010	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)	698	75,991		–75,991	698	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–75,991]		
012	LETHAL MINIATURE AERIAL MISSILE SYSTEM (LMAMS	10	4,777			10	4,777
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**4,176**	**482,817**		**–172,210**	**4,176**	**310,607**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
007	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	12	125,184		–125,184	12	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–125,184]		
009	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD)		5,950		–5,950		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–5,950]		
014	ABRAMS UPGRADE PROGRAM		0				0
	Army requested realignment (ERI)				[172,200]		
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–172,200]		
	WEAPONS & OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES						
017	MORTAR SYSTEMS		22,410				22,410
	SUPPORT EQUIPMENT & FACILITIES						
036	BRADLEY PROGRAM						0
	Army requested realignment (ERI)				[72,800]		
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–72,800]		
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY	**12**	**153,544**		**–131,134**	**12**	**22,410**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES		9,642		–9,642		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–9,642]		
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES		6,607		–5,998		609
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–5,998]		
005	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES		1,077		–1,077		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–1,077]		
006	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES		28,534		–28,534		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–28,534]		

007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES	20,000		20,000
008	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES	7,423	–7,423	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–7,423]	
	MORTAR AMMUNITION			
009	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	10,000		10,000
010	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES	2,677	–2,677	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–2,677]	
	TANK AMMUNITION			
012	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES	8,999	–8,999	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–8,999]	
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION			
014	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES	30,348	–20,348	10,000
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–20,348]	
015	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982	140	–140	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–140]	
016	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL	29,655	–24,655	5,000
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–24,655]	
	MINES			
017	MINES & CLEARING CHARGES, ALL TYPES	16,866	–16,866	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–16,866]	
	NETWORKED MUNITIONS			
018	SPIDER NETWORK MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	10,353	–10,353	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–10,353]	
	ROCKETS			
019	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	63,210	–63,210	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–63,210]	
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES	42,851		42,851
	OTHER AMMUNITION			
022	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES	6,373	–6,373	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–6,373]	
023	GRENADES, ALL TYPES	4,143	–4,143	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–4,143]	

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
024	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES		1,852		–1,852		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–1,852]		
	MISCELLANEOUS						
027	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES		773		–773		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–773]		
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY		**301,523**		**–213,063**		**88,460**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
002	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED:		4,180		–4,180		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–4,180]		
008	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	643	147,476		–147,476	643	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–147,476]		
010	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV)	51	6,122		–6,122	51	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–6,122]		
011	PLS ESP		106,358		–106,358		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–106,358]		
012	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV		203,766		–76,561		127,205
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–76,561]		
013	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS		101,154		–27,119		74,035
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–27,119]		
014	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP		155,456		–3,456		152,000
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–3,456]		
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
019	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK		9,572		–6,572		3,000
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–6,572]		

	COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS					
025	SHF TERM		24,000	–24,000		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–24,000]		
	COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM					
047	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE		1,550			1,550
	INFORMATION SECURITY					
051	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC)		1,928	–1,928		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–1,928]		
	COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS					
056	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM		20,510			20,510
	ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)					
062	DCGS-A (MIP)		33,032			33,032
064	TROJAN (MIP)		3,305	–160		3,145
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–160]		
066	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARCS)		7,233			7,233
069	BIOMETRIC TACTICAL COLLECTION DEVICES (MIP)		5,670			5,670
	ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)					
070	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR		25,892	–25,892		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–25,892]		
074	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE		11,610			11,610
075	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES		23,890			23,890
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)					
080	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS		4,270	–4,270		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–4,270]		
089	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM		2,572	–290		2,282
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–290]		
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS					
092	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS	31	69,958	–69,958	31	0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–69,958]		
	ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION					
102	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP		9,900			9,900
	ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)					

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
108	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT)		96		–96		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–96]		
	CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT						
114	CBRN DEFENSE		1,841		–1,841		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–1,841]		
	BRIDGING EQUIPMENT						
115	TACTICAL BRIDGING		26,000		–26,000		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–26,000]		
	ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT						
124	ROBOTICS AND APPLIQUE SYSTEMS		268		–268		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–268]		
128	FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS		280		–280		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–280]		
	COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
129	HEATERS AND ECU'S		894		–894		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–894]		
134	FORCE PROVIDER		53,800				53,800
135	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT		2,665		–2,665		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–2,665]		
136	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM		2,400				2,400
137	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS		9,789		–9,789		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–9,789]		
138	ITEMS LESS THAN $5M (ENG SPT)		300		–300		0
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base				[–300]		
	PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT						
139	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT		4,800		–4,800		0

	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–4,800]			
140	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER	174	78,240	–20,820	174	57,420	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–20,820]			
	MEDICAL EQUIPMENT						
141	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL		5,763	–5,763		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–5,763]			
	MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT						
142	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS		1,609	–1,609		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–1,609]			
143	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (MAINT EQ)		145	–145		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–145]			
	CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT						
144	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE)		3,047	–3,047		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–3,047]			
148	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED		4,426	–4,426		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–4,426]			
151	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE)		2,900	–2,900		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–2,900]			
155	ITEMS LESS THAN $5.0M (CONST EQUIP)		96	–96		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–96]			
	GENERATORS						
158	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		21,861	–19,961		1,900	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–19,961]			
	MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
160	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS		846	–846		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–846]			
	TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)						
168	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD)		1,140	–1,140		0	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base			[–1,140]			
	OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
170	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		8,500			8,500	
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**899**	**1,211,110**	**–612,028**	**899**	**599,082**	

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	RAPID ACQUISITION AND THREAT RESPONSE		232,200		–25,000		207,200
	Program decrease				[–25,000]		
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE						
002	MISSION ENABLERS		62,800				62,800
	TOTAL JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND		**295,000**		**–25,000**		**270,000**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
002	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET	2	184,912			2	184,912
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
026	STUASL0 UAV	4	70,000			4	70,000
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
037	EP–3 SERIES		7,505				7,505
047	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT		14,869				14,869
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		70,780				70,780
059	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY		8,740				8,740
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS		1,500				1,500
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP & FACILITIES						
065	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES		524				524
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**6**	**358,830**			**6**	**358,830**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY						

	TACTICAL MISSILES				
010	HELLFIRE	100	8,600	100	8,600
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**100**	**8,600**	**100**	**8,600**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC				
	NAVY AMMUNITION				
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		40,366		40,366
002	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		8,860		8,860
006	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES		7,060		7,060
013	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION		1,122		1,122
014	AMMUNITION LESS THAN $5 MILLION		3,495		3,495
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION				
015	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION		1,205		1,205
017	40 MM, ALL TYPES		539		539
018	60MM, ALL TYPES		909		909
020	120MM, ALL TYPES		530		530
022	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES		469		469
023	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES		1,196		1,196
024	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES		261		261
025	FUZE, ALL TYPES		217		217
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC		**66,229**		**66,229**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY				
	OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT				
081	DCGS-N		12,000		12,000
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
116	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		40,000		40,000
	CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
124	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT		630		630
	SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				
133	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION		25		25
	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
137	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		10,562				10,562
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS						
150A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		1,660				1,660
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**64,877**				**64,877**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
006	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER $5 MILLION		572				572
	GUIDED MISSILES						
010	JAVELIN	9	1,606			9	1,606
	OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)						
018	MODIFICATION KITS		2,600				2,600
	COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)						
019	ITEMS UNDER $5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC)		2,200				2,200
	INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)						
026	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT		20,981				20,981
029	RQ–11 UAV		3,817				3,817
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
035	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES		2,600				2,600
037	RADIO SYSTEMS		9,563				9,563
	ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT						
053	EOD SYSTEMS		75,000				75,000
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS	**9**	**118,939**			**9**	**118,939**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	OTHER AIRLIFT						

004	C–130J	1	73,000		1	73,000
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
015	MQ–9	12	273,600		12	273,600
	STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT					
019	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES		135,801			135,801
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT					
020	A–10		23,850			23,850
	OTHER AIRCRAFT					
047	E–3		6,600			6,600
056	HC/MC–130 MODIFICATIONS		13,550			13,550
057	OTHER AIRCRAFT		7,500			7,500
059	MQ–9 MODS		112,068			112,068
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS					
061	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS		25,600	–25,600		0
	Compass Call Program Restructure			[–25,600]		
	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES					
077	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES		8,400			8,400
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**13**	**679,969**	**–25,600**	**13**	**654,369**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE					
	TACTICAL					
006	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE	1,252	145,125		1,252	145,125
	CLASS IV					
011	AGM–65D MAVERICK		9,720			9,720
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**1,252**	**154,845**		**1,252**	**154,845**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE					
	CARTRIDGES					
002	CARTRIDGES		9,830			9,830
	BOMBS					
004	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS		7,921			7,921
006	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	6,033	140,126		6,033	140,126

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	FLARES						
012	FLARES		6,531				6,531
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**6,033**	**164,408**			**6,033**	**164,408**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES						
001	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES		2,003				2,003
	CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES						
002	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE		9,066				9,066
004	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		12,264				12,264
	SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES						
006	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		16,789				16,789
	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT						
007	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES		48,590				48,590
	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT						
008	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		2,366				2,366
	BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT						
009	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP		6,468				6,468
010	ITEMS LESS THAN $5 MILLION		9,271				9,271
	ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS						
016	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS		42,650				42,650
	SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS						
029	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM		7,500				7,500
033	C3 COUNTERMEASURES		620				620
	ORGANIZATION AND BASE						
052	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT		8,100				8,100

	MODIFICATIONS					
056	COMM ELECT MODS		3,800			3,800
	BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT					
061	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT		53,900			53,900
	SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS					
067	DCGS-AF		800			800
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
070A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		3,472,094			3,472,094
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE		**3,696,281**			**3,696,281**
	PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE					
	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA					
007	TELEPORT PROGRAM		1,900			1,900
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS					
040A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS		32,482			32,482
	AVIATION PROGRAMS					
041	MC–12		5,000			5,000
043	UNMANNED ISR		11,880			11,880
046	U–28		38,283			38,283
	AMMUNITION PROGRAMS					
057	ORDNANCE ITEMS <$5M		52,504			52,504
	OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS					
058	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS		22,000			22,000
060	OTHER ITEMS <$5M		11,580			11,580
062	SPECIAL PROGRAMS		13,549			13,549
063	TACTICAL VEHICLES		3,200			3,200
069	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS		42,056			42,056
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		**234,434**			**234,434**
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**12,502**	**8,226,537**	**–1,183,455**	**12,502**	**7,043,082**

SEC. 4103. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4103. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	FIXED WING						
003	MQ–1 UAV				95,100		95,100
	Army unfunded requirement				[95,100]		
	ROTARY						
005	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH)			17	110,000	17	110,000
	Army unfunded requirement (ARI)			[17]	[110,000]		
006	AH–64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN	4	78,040	5	190,000	9	268,040
	Army unfunded requirement (ARI)			[5]	[190,000]		
007	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			10	72,900	10	72,900
	Army unfunded requirement (ARI)			[10]	[72,900]		
008	UH–60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP)			36	440,200	36	440,200
	Army unfunded requirement (ARI)			[36]	[440,200]		
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
017	CH–47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP)				102,000		102,000
	Army unfunded requirement (ARI)				[102,000]		
	GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS						
028	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT				22,000		22,000
	Army unfunded requirement-modernized warning system (ARI)				[22,000]		
029	SURVIVABILITY CM				28,000		28,000
	Army unfunded requirement-assured PNT (ARI)				[28,000]		
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**4**	**78,040**	**68**	**1,060,200**	**72**	**1,138,240**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM						
004	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY	1,485	150,000			1,485	150,000

	ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS						
007	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY			591	104,200	591	104,200
	Army unfunded requirement			[591]	[104,200]		
010	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS)			1158	76,000	1,158	76,000
	Army unfunded requirement			[1,158]	[76,000]		
	MODIFICATIONS						
014	ATACMS MODS			17	15,900	17	15,900
	Army unfunded requirement			[17]	[15,900]		
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**1,485**	**150,000**	**1,766**	**196,100**	**3,251**	**346,100**
	PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY						
	MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES						
008	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES)			16	72,000	16	72,000
	Army unfunded requirement			[16]	[72,000]		
013	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD)				140,000		140,000
	Army unfunded requirement—Industrial base risk mitigation				[60,000]		
	Army unfunded requirement—Vehicle APS				[80,000]		
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
036A	UNDISTRIBUTED				55,100		55,100
	Additional funding to support increase in Army end strength				[55,100]		
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY			**16**	**267,100**	**16**	**267,100**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY						
	SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION						
001	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES				4,000		4,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[4,000]		
002	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES				14,000		14,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[14,000]		
003	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES				9,000		9,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[9,000]		
004	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES				21,000		21,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[21,000]		

SEC. 4103. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
005	CTG, 20MM, ALL TYPES				14,000		14,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[14,000]		
007	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES				8,200		8,200
	Army unfunded requirement				[8,200]		
	MORTAR AMMUNITION						
011	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES				30,000		30,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[30,000]		
	TANK AMMUNITION						
012	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES				35,000		35,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[35,000]		
	ARTILLERY AMMUNITION						
015	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982			332	23,500	332	23,500
	Army unfunded requirement			[332]	[23,500]		
016	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL				10,000		10,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[10,000]		
	ROCKETS						
019	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES				30,000		30,000
	Army unfunded requirement				[30,000]		
020	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES			44606	42,500	44,606	42,500
	Army unfunded requirement			[44,106]	[27,500]		
	Army unfunded requirement- guided hydra rockets			[500]	[15,000]		
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
034A	UNDISTRIBUTED				46,500		46,500
	Additional funding to support increase in Army end strength				[46,500]		
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY			**44,938**	**287,700**	**44,938**	**287,700**

	OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY						
	TACTICAL VEHICLES						
008	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV)	449	152,000			449	152,000
	COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS						
019	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK				80,000		80,000
	BBA Restoration—2BCTs - Increment 2				[80,000]		
	ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)						
080	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS				8,400		8,400
	Army unfunded requirement- CRAM Upgrades and MODS				[8,400]		
	GENERATORS						
158	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP		9,900				9,900
	UNDISTRIBUTED						
180	UNDISTRIBUTED				18,400		18,400
	Additional funding to support increase in Army end strength				[18,400]		
	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY	**449**	**161,900**		**106,800**	**449**	**268,700**
	JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND						
	NETWORK ATTACK						
001	RAPID ACQUISITION AND THREAT RESPONSE		113,272				113,272
	TOTAL JOINT IMPROVISED-THREAT DEFEAT FUND		**113,272**				**113,272**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	COMBAT AIRCRAFT						
002	F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET			14	1,400,000	14	1,400,000
	Navy unfunded requirement			[14]	[1,400,000]		
003	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER CV			4	540,000	4	540,000
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement			[2]	[270,000]		
	Navy unfunded requirement			[2]	[270,000]		
005	JSF STOVL			2	254,200	2	254,200
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement			[2]	[254,200]		
009	V–22 (MEDIUM LIFT)			2	150,000	2	150,000
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement			[2]	[150,000]		

SEC. 4103. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
011	H–1 UPGRADES (UH–1Y/AH–1Z)			2	57,000	2	57,000
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- AH–1Zs			[2]	[57,000]		
	AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT						
019A	C–40A			4	415,000	4	415,000
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement			[2]	[207,500]		
	Navy unfunded requirement			[2]	[207,500]		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
023	MQ–4 TRITON			1	95,000	1	95,000
	Additional system—ISR shortfalls			[1]	[95,000]		
025	MQ–8 UAV			4	47,500	4	47,500
	Scope Increase			[4]	[47,500]		
	MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT						
034	H–53 SERIES				16,100		16,100
	Accelerate readiness improvement				[2,800]		
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- degraded visual environment				[13,300]		
035	SH–60 SERIES		3,000				3,000
036	H–1 SERIES		3,740		23,400		27,140
	Accelerate readiness improvement				[23,400]		
051	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT		27,460				27,460
059	V–22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY				39,300		39,300
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- SPMAGTF- C4 UUNS				[39,300]		
	AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS						
063	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS				140,300		140,300
	KC–130J spares				[36,000]		
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- F35 B spares				[91,000]		
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- F35 C spares				[13,300]		

	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY	**34,200**	**33**	**3,177,800**	**33**	**3,212,000**
	WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY					
	STRATEGIC MISSILES					
003	TOMAHAWK		98	76,000	98	76,000
	Scope Increase		[98]	[76,000]		
	TACTICAL MISSILES					
005	SIDEWINDER		75	33,000	75	33,000
	Navy unfunded requirement		[75]	[33,000]		
015A	LCS OVER-THE-HORIZON MISSILE		8	18,100	8	18,100
	Navy unfunded requirement		[8]	[18,100]		
	TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**181**	**127,100**	**181**	**127,100**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC					
	NAVY AMMUNITION					
001	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS			58,000		58,000
	Navy unfunded requirement—JDAM components			[58,000]		
	MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION					
023	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES			19,200		19,200
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- GMLRS AW munitions			[19,200]		
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC			**77,200**		**77,200**
	SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY					
	OTHER WARSHIPS					
003	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)			263,000		263,000
	Advance Procurement for CVN–81			[263,000]		
005	ADVANCE PROCUREMENT (CY)		0	85,000		85,000
	Long-lead Time Materiel Orders			[85,000]		
009	DDG–51		1	433,000	1	433,000
	Scope Increase		[1]	[433,000]		
011	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP		1	384,700	1	384,700
	Scope Increase		[1]	[384,700]		

SEC. 4103. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS						
012A	AMPHIBIOUS SHIP REPLACEMENT LX(R)			1	856,000	1	856,000
	Procurement of LX (R)			[1]	[856,000]		
	AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST						
026	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR			3	165,000	3	165,000
	Scope Increase			[3]	[165,000]		
028	LCAC SLEP			4	80,300	4	80,300
	Scope Increase			[4]	[80,300]		
	TOTAL SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY			**10**	**2,267,000**	**10**	**2,267,000**
	OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY						
	OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT						
009	DDG MOD			1	65,000	1	65,000
	Scope Increase			[1]	[65,000]		
	SMALL BOATS						
032	STANDARD BOATS				20,000		20,000
	Program Acceleration				[20,000]		
	OTHER SHIP SUPPORT						
039A	LCS LAUNCHER			2	24,900	2	24,900
	Navy unfunded requirement			[2]	[24,900]		
	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
104	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT				9,000		9,000
	Navy unfunded requirement—Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range.				[9,000]		
	OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT						
116	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP		59,329				59,329

	TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY		**59,329**	**3**	**118,900**	**3**	**178,229**
	PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS						
	ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS						
004	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER				14,000		14,000
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- chrome tubes				[14,000]		
	OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)						
036	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS				40,800		40,800
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- SPMAGTF—C4 UUNS				[40,800]		
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS				**54,800**		**54,800**
	AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL FORCES						
001	F–35			5	690,500	5	690,500
	Air Force unfunded requirement			[5]	[690,500]		
	OTHER AIRLIFT						
004	C–130J			3	271,500	3	271,500
	Scope Increase			[3]	[271,500]		
	HELICOPTERS						
010	UUH–1N REPLACEMENT				80,000		80,000
	Program increase to address urgent need				[80,000]		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
015	MQ–9	12	179,430			12	179,430
015A	EC–130H			1	103,000	1	103,000
	Scope increase			[1]	[103,000]		
	TACTICAL AIRCRAFT						
020	A–10				218,500		218,500
	A–10 wing upgrades				[120,000]		
	Air Force unfunded requirement- A–10 antijam GPS				[10,300]		
	Air Force unfunded requirement- A–10 situation awareness upgrade kits.				[23,200]		

SEC. 4103. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request		House Change		House Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	Air Force unfunded requirement- ASE radar warning receiver upgrades.				[65,000]		
021	F–15				60,400		60,400
	Air Force unfunded requirement- ASE radar warning receiver upgrades.				[60,400]		
022	F–16				187,500		187,500
	Air Force unfunded requirement- antijam GPS				[5,000]		
	Air Force unfunded requirement- missile warning system				[12,000]		
	Air Force unfunded requirement- radar warning receiver upgrades				[170,500]		
	OTHER AIRCRAFT						
049	E–8			2	17,500	2	17,500
	Additional 2 PME-DMS kits			[2]	[17,500]		
054	H–60				70,700		70,700
	Air Force unfunded requirement- ASE radar warning receivers				[70,700]		
	TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**12**	**179,430**	**11**	**1,699,600**	**23**	**1,879,030**
	MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE						
	TACTICAL						
007	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB	4,195	167,800			4,195	167,800
	CLASS IV						
011	AGM–65D MAVERICK		16,900				16,900
	TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE	**4,195**	**184,700**			**4,195**	**184,700**
	PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE						
	ROCKETS						
001	ROCKETS		60,000				60,000

		BOMBS						
006		JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	12,498	263,000			12,498	263,000
		TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE	**12,498**	**323,000**			**12,498**	**323,000**
		PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE						
		MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA						
007		TELEPORT PROGRAM		2,000				2,000
016		DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS NETWORK		2,000				2,000
		TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE		**4,000**				**4,000**
		TOTAL PROCUREMENT	**18,643**	**1,287,871**	**47,026**	**9,440,300**	**65,669**	**10,728,171**

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 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	12,381		12,381
002	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	253,116		253,116
003	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	69,166		69,166
004	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS	94,280		94,280
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**428,943**		**428,943**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
005	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY	31,533		31,533
006	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY	36,109		36,109
007	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP	6,995		6,995
008	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY	65,914		65,914
009	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	25,466		25,466
010	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY	44,313		44,313
011	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	28,803		28,803
012	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION	27,688		27,688
013	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY	67,959		67,959
014	0602618A	BALLISTICS TECHNOLOGY	85,436		85,436
015	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY	3,923		3,923
016	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,545		5,545
017	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	53,581		53,581
018	0602705A	ELECTRONICS AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES	56,322		56,322
019	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY	36,079		36,079
020	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS	26,497		26,497
021	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	23,671		23,671
022	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY	22,151		22,151
023	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	37,803		37,803
024	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY	13,811		13,811
025	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	67,416		67,416
026	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY	26,045		26,045
027	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY	37,403	5,000	42,403
		Program Increase		[5,000]	
028	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	77,111		77,111

		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**907,574**	**5,000**	**912,574**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
029	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	38,831		38,831
030	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	68,365		68,365
031	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	94,280		94,280
032	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	68,714		68,714
033	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	122,132		122,132
034	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	3,904		3,904
035	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	14,417		14,417
037	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE	8,074	13,300	21,374
		See classified annex		[13,300]	
038	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS	18,969		18,969
039	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE	11,910		11,910
040	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	27,686		27,686
041	0603130A	TRACTOR NAIL	2,340		2,340
042	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS	2,470		2,470
043	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	27,893		27,893
044	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	52,190		52,190
045	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE	11,107		11,107
046	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	177,190	2,000	179,190
		Program increase		[2,000]	
047	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	17,451		17,451
048	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM	5,839		5,839
049	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	44,468		44,468
050	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	11,137		11,137
051	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	20,684		20,684
052	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	44,239		44,239
053	0603794A	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	35,775		35,775
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**930,065**	**15,300**	**945,365**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
054	0603305A	ARMY MISSLE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	9,433		9,433
055	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	23,056		23,056
056	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV	72,117		72,117
057	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV	28,244		28,244
058	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION	40,096		40,096
059	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY	10,506		10,506
060	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV	15,730		15,730
061	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	10,321		10,321
062	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL	7,785		7,785
063	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	2,300		2,300
064	0603801A	AVIATION—ADV DEV	10,014		10,014
065	0603804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV	20,834		20,834
066	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV	33,503	7,500	41,003
		Program increase		[7,500]	
067	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	31,120		31,120
068	0604100A	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES	6,608		6,608
069	0604114A	LOWER TIER AIR MISSILE DEFENSE (LTAMD) SENSOR	35,132		35,132
070	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	70,047		70,047
071	0604120A	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT)	83,279		83,279
073	0305251A	CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS FORCES AND FORCE SUPPORT	40,510		40,510
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**550,635**	**7,500**	**558,135**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
074	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONICS	83,248		83,248
075	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	34,642		34,642
077	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVR)	12,172		12,172
078	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM	3,958		3,958

079	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE	12,525		12,525
080	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS	66,943		66,943
082	0604611A	JAVELIN	20,011		20,011
083	0604622A	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES	11,429		11,429
084	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL	3,421		3,421
085	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV)	39,282		39,282
086	0604642A	LIGHT TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES	494		494
087	0604645A	ARMORED SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION (ASM)—ENG DEV	9,678		9,678
088	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	84,519		84,519
089	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT	2,054		2,054
090	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	30,774		30,774
091	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV	53,332	8,000	61,332
		Program increase- all digital radar technology for CRAM		[8,000]	
092	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	17,887		17,887
093	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT	8,813		8,813
094	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV	10,487		10,487
095	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE	15,068		15,068
096	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION	89,716		89,716
097	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV	80,365		80,365
098	0604804A	LOGISTICS AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	75,098	11,100	86,198
		Program Increase- next generation signature management		[11,100]	
099	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV	4,245		4,245
100	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV	41,124		41,124
101	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV	39,630		39,630
102	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE	205,590		205,590
103	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT	15,983		15,983
104	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS)	6,805		6,805
105	0604823A	FIREFINDER	9,235		9,235
106	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEM/VAL	12,393		12,393
107	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD	1,756		1,756
108	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	74,236		74,236
109	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPPS-A)	155,584		155,584

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
110	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV)	184,221		184,221
111	0605029A	INTEGRATED GROUND SECURITY SURVEILLANCE RESPONSE CAPABILITY (IGSSR-C)	4,980		4,980
112	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	15,041		15,041
113	0605031A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN)	16,014		16,014
114	0605032A	TRACTOR TIRE	27,254		27,254
115	0605033A	GROUND-BASED OPERATIONAL SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—EXPEDITIONARY (GBOSS-E)	5,032		5,032
116	0605034A	TACTICAL SECURITY SYSTEM (TSS)	2,904		2,904
117	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM)	96,977		96,977
118	0605036A	COMBATING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION (CWMD)	2,089		2,089
119	0605041A	DEFENSIVE CYBER TOOL DEVELOPMENT	33,836		33,836
120	0605042A	TACTICAL NETWORK RADIO SYSTEMS (LOW-TIER)	18,824		18,824
121	0605047A	CONTRACT WRITING SYSTEM	20,663		20,663
122	0605051A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT	41,133		41,133
123	0605052A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INC 2—BLOCK 1	83,995		83,995
125	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS)	5,028		5,028
126	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	42,972		42,972
128	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD)	252,811		252,811
131	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP)	4,955		4,955
132	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	11,530		11,530
133	0605830A	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT	2,142		2,142
134	0210609A	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM)	41,498		41,498
135	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12	4,273		4,273
136	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	14,425		14,425
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**2,265,094**	**19,100**	**2,284,194**
		RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
137	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	25,675		25,675

138	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	19,122	19,122
139	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	84,777	84,777
140	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER	20,658	20,658
141	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL	236,648	236,648
142	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM	25,596	25,596
144	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES	293,748	293,748
145	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS	52,404	52,404
146	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS	38,571	38,571
147	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION	4,665	4,665
148	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RDT&E ACTIVITIES	6,925	6,925
149	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS	21,677	21,677
150	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS	12,415	12,415
151	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING	49,684	49,684
152	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER	55,905	55,905
153	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG	7,959	7,959
154	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES	51,822	51,822
155	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES	33,323	33,323
156	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY	40,545	40,545
157	0605857A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT	2,130	2,130
158	0605898A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	49,885	49,885
159	0303260A	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION INITIATIVE	2,000	2,000
		SUBTOTAL RDT&E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,136,134**	**1,136,134**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		
161	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	9,663	9,663
162	0603813A	TRACTOR PULL	3,960	3,960
163	0605024A	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	3,638	3,638
164	0607131A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	14,517	14,517
165	0607133A	TRACTOR SMOKE	4,479	4,479
166	0607134A	LONG RANGE PRECISION FIRES (LRPF)	39,275	39,275
167	0607135A	APACHE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	66,441	66,441
168	0607136A	BLACKHAWK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	46,765	46,765

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
169	0607137A	CHINOOK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	91,848		91,848
170	0607138A	FIXED WING PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	796		796
171	0607139A	IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM	126,105		126,105
172	0607140A	EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FROM NIE	2,369		2,369
173	0607141A	LOGISTICS AUTOMATION	4,563		4,563
174	0607665A	FAMILY OF BIOMETRICS	12,098		12,098
175	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT	49,482		49,482
176	0202429A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT—COCOM EXERCISE	45,482	–43,000	2,482
		Program reduction		[–43,000]	
178	0203728A	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOCS)	30,455		30,455
179	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	316,857		316,857
180	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM	4,031		4,031
181	0203744A	AIRCRAFT MODIFICATIONS/PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	35,793		35,793
182	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	259		259
183	0203758A	DIGITIZATION	6,483		6,483
184	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	5,122		5,122
185	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS	7,491		7,491
186	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD	20,333		20,333
188	0205410A	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT	124		124
190	0205456A	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM	69,417		69,417
191	0205778A	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS)	22,044		22,044
192	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM	12,649		12,649
194	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	11,619		11,619
195	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	38,280		38,280
196	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	27,223		27,223
197	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE)	18,815		18,815
198	0303150A	WWMCCS/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	4,718		4,718

202	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,218		8,218
203	0305206A	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	11,799		11,799
204	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	32,284		32,284
205	0305219A	MQ–1C GRAY EAGLE UAS	13,470		13,470
206	0305232A	RQ–11 UAV	1,613		1,613
207	0305233A	RQ–7 UAV	4,597		4,597
209	0310349A	WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING	4,867		4,867
210	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES	62,287		62,287
210A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	4,625		4,625
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**1,296,954**	**–43,000**	**1,253,954**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**7,515,399**	**3,900**	**7,519,299**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	101,714	20,000	121,714
		Program increase		[20,000]	
002	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH	18,508		18,508
003	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	422,748		422,748
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**542,970**	**20,000**	**562,970**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602114N	POWER PROJECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	41,371		41,371
005	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH	158,745		158,745
006	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY	51,590		51,590
007	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH	41,185		41,185
008	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	45,467		45,467
009	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH	118,941		118,941
010	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH	42,618	32,000	74,618
		Service Life Extension Program—AGOR		[32,000]	
011	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH	6,327		6,327
012	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	126,313		126,313

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
013	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH	165,103		165,103
014	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH	33,916		33,916
015	0602898N	SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT—ONR HEADQUARTERS	29,575		29,575
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**861,151**	**32,000**	**893,151**
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
016	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	96,406	10,000	106,406
		Program increase for common mount		[10,000]	
017	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	48,438		48,438
018	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	26,421		26,421
019	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD)	140,416		140,416
020	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	13,117		13,117
021	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	249,092		249,092
022	0603680N	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	56,712		56,712
023	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	4,789		4,789
024	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	25,880		25,880
025	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS	60,550	5,000	65,550
		Program Increase		[5,000]	
026	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	15,167		15,167
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**736,988**	**15,000**	**751,988**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
027	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS	48,536		48,536
028	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY	5,239		5,239
030	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS	1,519		1,519
031	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,041		7,041
032	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE	3,274		3,274

033	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY	57,034	15,000	72,034
		Program Increase		[15,000]	
034	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES	165,775		165,775
035	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE	87,066		87,066
036	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,605		7,605
037	0603525N	PILOT FISH	132,068		132,068
038	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	14,546		14,546
039	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER	115,435		115,435
040	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL	702		702
041	0603553N	SURFACE ASW	1,081		1,081
042	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	100,565		100,565
043	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS	8,782		8,782
044	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN	14,590		14,590
045	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES	15,805		15,805
046	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	453,313		453,313
047	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS	36,655		36,655
048	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE	367,016		367,016
049	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LCS)	51,630		51,630
050	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	23,530		23,530
051	0603595N	OHIO REPLACEMENT	700,811		700,811
052	0603596N	LCS MISSION MODULES	160,058	–30,900	129,158
		Program Restructure		[–30,900]	
053	0603597N	AUTOMATED TEST AND ANALYSIS		8,000	8,000
		Program increase		[8,000]	
054	0603599N	FRIGATE DEVELOPMENT	84,900		84,900
055	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	8,342		8,342
056	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES	158,682		158,682
057	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM	1,303		1,303
058	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	46,911		46,911
060	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,556		4,556
061	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION	20,343		20,343
062	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM	52,479		52,479

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
063	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT	5,458		5,458
064	0603734N	CHALK CORAL	245,860		245,860
065	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY	3,089		3,089
066	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE	323,526		323,526
067	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA	318,497		318,497
068	0603751N	RETRACT ELM	52,834		52,834
069	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN	48,116		48,116
070	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES	13,619		13,619
071	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	9,867		9,867
072	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY	6,015		6,015
073	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING	27,904		27,904
074	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEM/VAL	104,144		104,144
075	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS	32,700		32,700
076	0604112N	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80)	70,528		70,528
077	0604122N	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS)	3,001		3,001
078	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	34,920		34,920
080	0604292N	MH-XX	1,620		1,620
081	0604454N	LX (R)	6,354		6,354
082	0604536N	ADVANCED UNDERSEA PROTOTYPING	78,589		78,589
084	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	9,910		9,910
085	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT	23,971		23,971
086	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT	252,409		252,409
087	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH	23,197		23,197
088	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP	9,110		9,110
089	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP	437		437
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**4,662,867**	**–7,900**	**4,654,967**

		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		
090	0603208N	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT	19,938	19,938
091	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT	6,268	6,268
092	0604214N	AV–8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV	33,664	33,664
093	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT	1,300	1,300
094	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT	5,275	5,275
095	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING	3,875	3,875
096	0604221N	P–3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	1,909	1,909
097	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM	13,237	13,237
098	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM	36,323	36,323
099	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE	363,792	363,792
100	0604245N	H–1 UPGRADES	27,441	27,441
101	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS	34,525	34,525
102	0604262N	V–22A	174,423	174,423
103	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	13,577	13,577
104	0604269N	EA–18	116,761	116,761
105	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	48,766	48,766
106	0604273N	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT	338,357	338,357
107	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ)	577,822	577,822
108	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY)	2,365	2,365
109	0604282N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) INCREMENT II	52,065	52,065
110	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING	282,764	282,764
111	0604311N	LPD–17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	580	580
112	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)	97,622	97,622
113	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS	120,561	120,561
114	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM	45,622	45,622
116	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	25,750	25,750
118	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS	85,868	85,868
119	0604503N	SSN–688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION	117,476	117,476
120	0604504N	AIR CONTROL	47,404	47,404
121	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS	112,158	112,158
122	0604518N	COMBAT INFORMATION CENTER CONVERSION	6,283	6,283

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
123	0604522N	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM	144,395		144,395
124	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN	113,013		113,013
125	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM	43,160		43,160
126	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E	65,002	20,000	85,002
		CVN Design		[20,000]	
127	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES	3,098		3,098
128	0604580N	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM)	97,920		97,920
129	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT	10,490		10,490
130	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT	20,178		20,178
131	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	7,369		7,369
132	0604703N	PERSONNEL, TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS	4,995		4,995
133	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS	412		412
134	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL)	134,619		134,619
135	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL)	114,475	–9,000	105,475
		Program Execution		[–9,000]	
136	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW)	114,211		114,211
137	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING	11,029		11,029
138	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT	9,220		9,220
139	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM	42,723		42,723
140	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	531,426		531,426
141	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD	528,716		528,716
142	0604810M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—MARINE CORPS	74,227		74,227
143	0604810N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—NAVY	63,387		63,387
144	0605013M	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,856		4,856
145	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	97,066		97,066
146	0605024N	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	2,500		2,500
147	0605212N	CH–53K RDTE	404,810		404,810

148	0605215N	MISSION PLANNING	33,570		33,570
149	0605217N	COMMON AVIONICS	51,599		51,599
150	0605220N	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC)	11,088		11,088
151	0605327N	T-AO (X)	1,095		1,095
152	0605414N	MQ-XX	89,000	–12,000	77,000
		Excess Obligation		[–12,000]	
153	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM)	17,880		17,880
154	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA)	59,126		59,126
155	0605504N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME (MMA) INCREMENT III	182,220		182,220
156	0204202N	DDG–1000	45,642		45,642
159	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP	676		676
160	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS	36,747		36,747
161	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM	35,002		35,002
162	0306250M	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,942		4,942
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**6,025,655**	**–1,000**	**6,024,655**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
163	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	16,633		16,633
164	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	36,662		36,662
165	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	42,109		42,109
166	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION	2,998		2,998
167	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY	3,931		3,931
168	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES	46,634		46,634
169	0605285N	NEXT GENERATION FIGHTER	1,200		1,200
171	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES	903		903
172	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	87,077		87,077
173	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT	3,597		3,597
174	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT	62,811		62,811
175	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT	106,093		106,093
176	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	349,146		349,146
177	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY	18,160		18,160
178	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT	9,658		9,658

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
179	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT	6,500		6,500
180	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT	22,247		22,247
181	0605898N	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	16,254		16,254
182	0606355N	WARFARE INNOVATION MANAGEMENT	21,123		21,123
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**853,736**		**853,736**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
188	0607658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY (CEC)	84,501		84,501
189	0607700N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL	2,970		2,970
190	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT	136,556		136,556
191	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	33,845		33,845
192	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	9,329		9,329
193	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	17,218		17,218
195	0204136N	F/A–18 SQUADRONS	189,125		189,125
196	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL)	48,225		48,225
197	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT	21,156		21,156
198	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC)	71,355		71,355
199	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	58,542		58,542
200	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT)	13,929		13,929
201	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR)	83,538		83,538
202	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	38,593		38,593
203	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT	1,122		1,122
204	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT	99,998		99,998
205	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT	48,635		48,635
206	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS	124,785		124,785
207	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION	24,583		24,583
208	0205632N	MK–48 ADCAP	39,134		39,134

209	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS	120,861		120,861
210	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS	101,786		101,786
211	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	82,159		82,159
212	0206335M	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S)	11,850		11,850
213	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS	47,877		47,877
214	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT	13,194		13,194
215	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP)	17,171		17,171
216	0206629M	AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT VEHICLE	38,020		38,020
217	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	56,285		56,285
218	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	40,350		40,350
219	0219902M	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM—MARINE CORPS (GCSS-MC)	9,128		9,128
223	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE)	37,372		37,372
224	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED AFLOAT NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES)	23,541		23,541
225	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	38,510		38,510
228	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES	6,019		6,019
229	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES	8,436		8,436
230	0305205N	UAS INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY	36,509		36,509
231	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	2,100		2,100
232	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	44,571		44,571
233	0305220N	MQ–4C TRITON	111,729		111,729
234	0305231N	MQ–8 UAV	26,518		26,518
235	0305232M	RQ–11 UAV	418		418
236	0305233N	RQ–7 UAV	716		716
237	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASL0)	5,071		5,071
238	0305239M	RQ–21A	9,497		9,497
239	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT	77,965		77,965
240	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP)	11,181		11,181
241	0305421N	RQ–4 MODERNIZATION	181,266		181,266
242	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT	4,709		4,709
243	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	49,322	5,000	54,322
		MH–60 Fleet Mid-Life Upgrades		[5,000]	
245	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARITECH)	3,204		3,204

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
245A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,228,460		1,228,460
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**3,592,934**	**5,000**	**3,597,934**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**17,276,301**	**63,100**	**17,339,401**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601102F	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	340,812		340,812
002	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	145,044		145,044
003	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	14,168		14,168
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**500,024**		**500,024**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
004	0602102F	MATERIALS	126,152	5,000	131,152
		Precision measuring tools		[5,000]	
005	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	122,831	5,000	127,831
		Reusable Hypersonic vehicle structures development		[5,000]	
006	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	111,647	5,000	116,647
		Human-Machine Teaming		[5,000]	
007	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	185,671		185,671
008	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	155,174		155,174
009	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	117,915		117,915
010	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	109,649		109,649
011	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	127,163		127,163
012	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	161,650		161,650
013	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	42,300		42,300
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,260,152**	**15,000**	**1,275,152**

		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
014	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	35,137	10,000	45,137
		Metals Affordability Initiative		[10,000]	
015	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)	20,636		20,636
016	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS	40,945		40,945
017	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO	130,950		130,950
018	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY	94,594	5,000	99,594
		Silicon Carbide for aerospace power application		[5,000]	
019	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY	58,250		58,250
020	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY	61,593		61,593
021	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSSS)	11,681		11,681
022	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	26,492		26,492
023	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	102,009		102,009
024	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	39,064		39,064
025	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	46,344		46,344
026	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	58,110		58,110
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**725,805**	**15,000**	**740,805**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
027	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	5,598		5,598
028	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY	7,534		7,534
029	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY	24,418		24,418
030	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	4,333		4,333
032	0603830F	SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM	32,399		32,399
033	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEM/VAL	108,663		108,663
035	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE—BOMBER	1,358,309		1,358,309
036	0604257F	ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY AND SENSORS	34,818		34,818
037	0604317F	TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	3,368		3,368
038	0604327F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM	74,308		74,308
039	0604422F	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON	118,953	–5,000	113,953
		Transfer Cloud Characterization and Theater Weather Imagery to NRO		[–5,000]	

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
040	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	9,901		9,901
041	0604776F	DEPLOYMENT & DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE R&D	25,890		25,890
042	0604857F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE	7,921	20,000	27,921
		Responsive Launch and Reconstitution		[20,000]	
043	0604858F	TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM	347,304		347,304
044	0605230F	GROUND BASED STRATEGIC DETERRENT	113,919		113,919
046	0207110F	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE	20,595	–5,000	15,595
		Program reduction		[–5,000]	
047	0207455F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR)	49,491	–10,000	39,491
		Excess funding to need		[–10,000]	
048	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	278,147		278,147
049	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK EXECUTIVE AGENT (CDL EA)	42,338		42,338
050	0306250F	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	158,002		158,002
051	0306415F	ENABLED CYBER ACTIVITIES	15,842		15,842
052	0901410F	CONTRACTING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SYSTEM	5,782		5,782
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**2,847,833**		**2,847,833**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
054	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	12,476		12,476
055	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	82,380		82,380
056	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	8,458		8,458
057	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	54,838		54,838
058	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	34,394		34,394
059	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	23,945		23,945
060	0604426F	SPACE FENCE	168,364		168,364
061	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	9,187		9,187
062	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	181,966		181,966

063	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	20,312		20,312
064	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,503		2,503
065	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	53,680		53,680
066	0604618F	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION	9,901		9,901
067	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	7,520		7,520
068	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	77,409		77,409
069	0604800F	F–35—EMD	450,467		450,467
070	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	296,572	–196,572	100,000
		Launch System Investment (launch vehicle, upper stage, strap-on motor, or related infrastructure).		[100,000]	
		Next Generation Launch System Investment		[–296,572]	
070A	0604XXXF	ROCKET PROPULSION SYSTEM		220,000	220,000
		Rocket Propulsion System Replacement of RD–180		[220,000]	
071	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	95,604		95,604
072	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	189,751		189,751
073	0605030F	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTNC)	1,131		1,131
074	0605213F	F–22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	70,290		70,290
075	0605214F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	937		937
076	0605221F	KC–46	261,724	–140,000	121,724
		Scope Reduction		[–140,000]	
077	0605223F	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING	12,377		12,377
078	0605229F	CSAR HH–60 RECAPITALIZATION	319,331		319,331
080	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	259,131		259,131
081	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	50,815		50,815
082	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	41,632		41,632
083	0605458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E	28,911		28,911
084	0605931F	B–2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	315,615	–26,658	288,957
		Scope Reduction		[–26,658]	
085	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	137,909		137,909
086	0207171F	F–15 EPAWSS	256,669		256,669
087	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	12,051		12,051
088	0305176F	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	29,253		29,253

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
089	0307581F	JSTARS RECAP	128,019		128,019
090	0401319F	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)	351,220		351,220
091	0701212F	AUTOMATED TEST SYSTEMS	19,062		19,062
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**4,075,804**	**–143,230**	**3,932,574**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
092	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	21,630		21,630
093	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	66,385		66,385
094	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	34,641		34,641
096	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	11,529		11,529
097	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	661,417		661,417
098	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	11,198		11,198
099	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	27,070		27,070
100	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	134,111		134,111
101	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	28,091		28,091
102	0606017F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	29,100		29,100
103	0606116F	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT	18,528		18,528
104	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE	176,666		176,666
105	0308602F	ENTEPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS)	4,410		4,410
106	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	14,613		14,613
107	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING	1,404		1,404
109	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	4,784		4,784
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**1,245,577**		**1,245,577**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
110	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT	393,268		393,268
111	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING	15,427		15,427

112	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE	46,695		46,695
115	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS)	10,368		10,368
116	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY	31,952		31,952
117	0605117F	FOREIGN MATERIEL ACQUISITION AND EXPLOITATION	42,960		42,960
118	0605278F	HC/MC–130 RECAP RDT&E	13,987		13,987
119	0101113F	B–52 SQUADRONS	78,267		78,267
120	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM)	453		453
121	0101126F	B–1B SQUADRONS	5,830		5,830
122	0101127F	B–2 SQUADRONS	152,458		152,458
123	0101213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS	182,958		182,958
124	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM	39,148		39,148
126	0101316F	WORLDWIDE JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS	6,042		6,042
128	0102110F	UH–1N REPLACEMENT PROGRAM	14,116		14,116
129	0102326F	REGION/SECTOR OPERATION CONTROL CENTER MODERNIZATION PROGRAM	10,868		10,868
130	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES	8,674		8,674
131	0205219F	MQ–9 UAV	151,373	49,000	200,373
		Auto take-off and landing capability		[35,000]	
		Tactical Datalink Integration		[14,000]	
133	0207131F	A–10 SQUADRONS	14,853		14,853
134	0207133F	F–16 SQUADRONS	132,795		132,795
135	0207134F	F–15E SQUADRONS	356,717		356,717
136	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION	14,773		14,773
137	0207138F	F–22A SQUADRONS	387,564		387,564
138	0207142F	F–35 SQUADRONS	153,045		153,045
139	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES	52,898		52,898
140	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM)	62,470		62,470
143	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE	362		362
144	0207247F	AF TENCAP	28,413	3,200	31,613
		Restore FY16 level		[3,200]	
145	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT	649		649
146	0207253F	COMPASS CALL	13,723	37,100	50,823
		Program Restructure		[37,100]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
147	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM	109,859		109,859
148	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM)	30,002		30,002
149	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC)	37,621		37,621
150	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC)	13,292		13,292
151	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWACS)	86,644		86,644
152	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS	2,442		2,442
154	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES	10,911	5,000	15,911
		Geospatial software development		[5,000]	
155	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD	11,843		11,843
156	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK	1,515		1,515
157	0207452F	DCAPES	14,979		14,979
158	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE	25,308		25,308
159	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION	16,666		16,666
160	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS	4,245		4,245
161	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES	3,886		3,886
162	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS	71,785		71,785
164	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	25,025		25,025
165	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS	29,439		29,439
168	0301017F	GLOBAL SENSOR INTEGRATED ON NETWORK (GSIN)	3,470		3,470
169	0301112F	NUCLEAR PLANNING AND EXECUTION SYSTEM (NPES)	4,060		4,060
175	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE	13,880		13,880
176	0302015F	E–4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	30,948		30,948
177	0303001F	FAMILY OF ADVANCED BLOS TERMINALS (FAB-T)	42,378		42,378
178	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	47,471		47,471
179	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	46,388		46,388
180	0303141F	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	52		52
181	0303142F	GLOBAL FORCE MANAGEMENT—DATA INITIATIVE	2,099		2,099

184	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	90,762		90,762
187	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,354		4,354
188	0305110F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	15,624		15,624
189	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	19,974	3,000	22,974
		Commercial Weather Pilot Program		[3,000]	
190	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCALS)	9,770		9,770
191	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	3,051		3,051
194	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	405		405
195	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	4,844		4,844
196	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	339		339
199	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,989		3,989
200	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	3,070		3,070
201	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	8,833		8,833
202	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	11,867		11,867
203	0305202F	DRAGON U–2	37,217		37,217
205	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	3,841	15,000	18,841
		Wide area motion imagery		[15,000]	
206	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	20,975		20,975
207	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	18,902		18,902
208	0305220F	RQ–4 UAV	256,307		256,307
209	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	22,610	–6,300	16,310
		Program reduction		[–6,300]	
211	0305238F	NATO AGS	38,904		38,904
212	0305240F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE	23,084		23,084
213	0305258F	ADVANCED EVALUATION PROGRAM	116,143		116,143
214	0305265F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT	141,888		141,888
215	0305600F	INTERNATIONAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURES	2,360		2,360
216	0305614F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM	72,889		72,889
217	0305881F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION	4,280		4,280
218	0305906F	NCMC—TW/AA SYSTEM	4,951		4,951
219	0305913F	NUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE)	21,093		21,093
220	0305940F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS	35,002		35,002

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
222	0308699F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW)	6,366		6,366
223	0401115F	C–130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON	15,599		15,599
224	0401119F	C–5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF)	66,146		66,146
225	0401130F	C–17 AIRCRAFT (IF)	12,430		12,430
226	0401132F	C–130J PROGRAM	16,776		16,776
227	0401134F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCM)	5,166		5,166
229	0401314F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT	13,817		13,817
230	0401318F	CV–22	16,702		16,702
231	0408011F	SPECIAL TACTICS / COMBAT CONTROL	7,164		7,164
232	0702207F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF)	1,518		1,518
233	0708610F	LOGISTICS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT)	61,676		61,676
234	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	9,128		9,128
235	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING	1,653		1,653
236	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES	57		57
237	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY	3,663		3,663
238	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM	3,735		3,735
239	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION	5,157		5,157
240	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY	1,523		1,523
242	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	10,581		10,581
242A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	13,091,557		13,091,557
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**17,457,056**	**106,000**	**17,563,056**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**28,112,251**	**–7,230**	**28,105,021**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		BASIC RESEARCH			
001	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	35,436		35,436

002	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	362,297	–10,000	352,297
		Program reduction		[–10,000]	
003	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	36,654		36,654
004	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	57,791		57,791
005	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	69,345	10,000	79,345
		K–12 STEM program increase		[10,000]	
006	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	23,572	10,000	33,572
		Program increase		[10,000]	
007	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	44,800		44,800
		SUBTOTAL BASIC RESEARCH	**629,895**	**10,000**	**639,895**
		APPLIED RESEARCH			
008	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	17,745		17,745
009	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	115,213	–10,000	105,213
		Program reduction		[–10,000]	
010	0602230D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION	30,000	–30,000	
		Program decrease		[–30,000]	
011	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	48,269		48,269
012	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	42,206		42,206
013	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	353,635	–5,000	348,635
		Program reduction		[–5,000]	
014	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	21,250		21,250
015	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	188,715		188,715
016	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	12,183		12,183
017	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	313,843		313,843
018	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	220,456	–10,000	210,456
		Program reduction		[–10,000]	
019	0602716E	ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY	221,911		221,911
020	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES	154,857		154,857
021	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH	8,420		8,420
022	1160401BB	SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	37,820		37,820
		SUBTOTAL APPLIED RESEARCH	**1,786,523**	**–55,000**	**1,731,523**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT			
023	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	23,902		23,902
025	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT	73,002	27,000	100,002
		Additional EOD equipment for Conventional Units		[12,000]	
		Program increase for DOD CT and C-UAS		[15,000]	
026	0603133D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING	19,343	10,000	29,343
		Anti-tunnel defense systems		[10,000]	
027	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT	266,444		266,444
028	0603176C	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	17,880		17,880
030	0603178C	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY	71,843		71,843
031	0603179C	ADVANCED C4ISR	3,626		3,626
032	0603180C	ADVANCED RESEARCH	23,433		23,433
033	0603225D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	17,256		17,256
035	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY	83,745	25,000	108,745
		Classified Annex		[25,000]	
036	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS	182,327	–5,000	177,327
		Program reduction		[–5,000]	
037	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY	175,240	–10,000	165,240
		Program reduction		[–10,000]	
038	0603288D8Z	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS	12,048		12,048
039	0603289D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS	57,020		57,020
041	0603375D8Z	TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION	39,923	–20,000	19,923
		Program decrease		[–20,000]	
042	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	127,941		127,941
043	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH	181,977		181,977
044	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY	22,030		22,030

045	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	148,184	10,000	158,184
		Social Medial Analysis Cell		[10,000]	
046	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES	9,331		9,331
047	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	158,398	–10,000	148,398
		Program decrease		[–10,000]	
048	0603680S	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM	31,259		31,259
049	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	49,895		49,895
050	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTICS R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS	11,011		11,011
052	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM	65,078		65,078
053	0603720S	MICROELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT	97,826		97,826
054	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM	7,848		7,848
055	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONICS TECHNOLOGIES	49,807		49,807
056	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS	155,081		155,081
057	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY	428,894		428,894
058	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY	241,288		241,288
060	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE	14,264		14,264
061	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS	74,943	–2,000	72,943
		QRSP		[–2,000]	
063	0603833D8Z	ENGINEERING SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	17,659		17,659
064	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY	87,135		87,135
065	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT	37,329		37,329
066	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS	44,836	–23,600	21,236
		Constellation program reduction		[–23,600]	
067	1160402BB	SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	61,620		61,620
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	**3,190,666**	**1,400**	**3,192,066**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES			
068	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P	28,498		28,498
069	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF	89,643		89,643
071	0603821D8Z	ACQUISITION ENTERPRISE DATA & INFORMATION SERVICES	2,136		2,136
072	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM	52,491		52,491

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
073	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT	206,834		206,834
074	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT	862,080		862,080
075	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL	138,187		138,187
076	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS	230,077		230,077
077	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS	401,594		401,594
078	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA	321,607		321,607
079	0603892C	AEGIS BMD	959,066		959,066
080	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM	32,129		32,129
081	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS	20,690		20,690
082	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI	439,617		439,617
083	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT	47,776		47,776
084	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC)	54,750		54,750
085	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH	8,785		8,785
086	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX)	68,787		68,787
087	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS	103,835	190,000	293,835
		Directed Energy Cooperation through MDA		[25,000]	
		Increase for Cooperative Development Programs subject to Title XVI		[165,000]	
088	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST	293,441		293,441
089	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS	563,576		563,576
090	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING	10,007		10,007
091	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE	10,126		10,126
092	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM	3,893		3,893
093	0604115C	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES	90,266	15,000	105,266
		Directed Energy Acceleration—Low Power Laser Demonstrator - to reclaim schdule slippage		[15,000]	
094	0604132D8Z	MISSILE DEFEAT PROJECT	45,000		45,000
095	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES	844,870	–40,000	804,870
		SCO		[–40,000]	

097	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED SYSTEM COMMON DEVELOPMENT	3,320		3,320
099	0604682D8Z	WARGAMING AND SUPPORT FOR STRATEGIC ANALYSIS (SSA)	4,000		4,000
102	0604826J	JOINT C5 CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT, INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY ASSESSMENTS	23,642		23,642
104	0604873C	LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR (LRDR)	162,012		162,012
105	0604874C	IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS	274,148		274,148
106	0604876C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT TEST	63,444		63,444
107	0604878C	AEGIS BMD TEST	95,012		95,012
108	0604879C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR TEST	83,250		83,250
109	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM–3 (LBSM3)	43,293		43,293
110	0604881C	AEGIS SM–3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT	106,038		106,038
111	0604887C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE SEGMENT TEST	56,481		56,481
112	0604894C	MULTI-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE	71,513		71,513
114	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM	2,636		2,636
115	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	969		969
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES	**6,919,519**	**170,000**	**7,089,519**
115A	0604XXXD	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON		5,000	5,000
		Transfer Cloud Characterization and Theater Weather Imagery from USAF		[5,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		**170,000**	**170,000**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION			
116	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E SDD	10,324		10,324
117	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	181,303	5,000	186,303
		Examination of Army land-attack and anti-ship capability		[5,000]	
118	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD	266,231		266,231
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO)		15,000	15,000
		Commercial IT Eval Program		[15,000]	
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS)	16,288		16,288
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES	4,568		4,568
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	11,505		11,505
123	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE	1,658		1,658
124	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM	2,920		2,920
126	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	12,631		12,631

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
128	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INTIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM	26,657		26,657
129	0605090S	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS)	4,949		4,949
130	0605140D8Z	TRUSTED FOUNDRY	69,000		69,000
131	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES	9,881		9,881
132	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM	7,600		7,600
133	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EEIM)	2,703		2,703
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION	**628,218**	**20,000**	**648,218**
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
134	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS)	4,678		4,678
135	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT	4,499		4,499
136	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP)	219,199		219,199
137	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS	28,706		28,706
138	0605001E	MISSION SUPPORT	69,244		69,244
139	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC)	87,080		87,080
140	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS	23,069		23,069
142	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO)	32,759		32,759
144	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING	32,429		32,429
145	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD	3,797		3,797
146	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY	5,302		5,302
147	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION	7,246		7,246
148	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE)	1,874		1,874
149	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	85,754		85,754
158	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER	2,187		2,187
159	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS	22,650		22,650
160	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	43,834		43,834
161	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION	22,240		22,240

162	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION	19,541	4,000	23,541
		DASD(DT&E)		[4,000]	
163	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D	4,759		4,759
164	0605998KA	MANAGEMENT HQ—DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC)	4,400		4,400
165	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS	4,014		4,014
166	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI)	2,072		2,072
167	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT	7,464		7,464
170	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES	857		857
171	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO)	916		916
172	0305172K	COMBINED ADVANCED APPLICATIONS	15,336		15,336
173	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE	18,523		18,523
175	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (CE2T2)—MHA	34,384		34,384
176	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA	31,160	25,000	56,160
		Cyber Improvements Acceleration		[25,000]	
179	0903235D8W	JOINT SERVICE PROVIDER (JSP)	827		827
180A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	56,799		56,799
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**897,599**	**29,000**	**926,599**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
181	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS)	4,241		4,241
182	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA	1,424		1,424
183	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS)	287		287
184	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT	16,195		16,195
185	0607310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS: OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	4,194		4,194
186	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS)	7,861		7,861
187	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT)	33,361		33,361
189	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS)	3,038		3,038
190	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY	57,501		57,501
192	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING	5,935		5,935
196	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT	575		575
197	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION	18,041		18,041
198	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DCS	13,994	5,000	18,994

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		Secure cellular communications for senior leaders		[5,000]	
199	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	12,206		12,206
200	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI)	34,314		34,314
201	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI)	36,602		36,602
202	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	8,876		8,876
203	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	159,068	2,000	161,068
		SHARKSEER Program Increase		[2,000]	
204	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM	24,438		24,438
205	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION	13,197		13,197
207	0303228K	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT (JIE)	2,789		2,789
209	0303430K	FEDERAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICES INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	75,000		75,000
210	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM	657		657
215	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE	1,553		1,553
220	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS	6,204	–2,000	4,204
		Program decrease		[–2,000]	
221	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY	17,971		17,971
223	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	5,415		5,415
226	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	3,030		3,030
229	0305327V	INSIDER THREAT	5,034		5,034
230	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM	2,037		2,037
236	0307577D8Z	INTELLIGENCE MISSION DATA (IMD)	13,800		13,800
238	0708012S	PACIFIC DISASTER CENTERS	1,754		1,754
239	0708047S	DEFENSE PROPERTY ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM	2,154		2,154
240	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJCS	826		826
241	1105219BB	MQ–9 UAV	17,804		17,804
244	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS	159,143	–12,100	147,043
		AC–130 Precision Strike		[–12,100]	

245	1160405BB	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	7,958		7,958
246	1160408BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS	64,895		64,895
247	1160431BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS	44,885		44,885
248	1160432BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS	1,949		1,949
249	1160434BB	UNMANNED ISR	22,117		22,117
250	1160480BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES	3,316		3,316
251	1160483BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS	54,577		54,577
252	1160489BB	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES	3,841		3,841
253	1160490BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE	11,834		11,834
253A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,270,515		3,270,515
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**4,256,406**	**–7,100**	**4,249,306**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**18,308,826**	**168,300**	**18,477,126**
		OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE			
		MANAGEMENT SUPPORT			
001	0605118OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION	78,047	10,000	88,047
		DOT&E Cybersecurity Exercises		[10,000]	
002	0605131OTE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION	48,316		48,316
003	0605814OTE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES	52,631		52,631
		SUBTOTAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT	**178,994**	**10,000**	**188,994**
		TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE	**178,994**	**10,000**	**188,994**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**71,391,771**	**238,070**	**71,629,841**

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY			
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
055	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION	9,375		9,375
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**9,375**		**9,375**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
117	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCM)	10,900		10,900
122	0605051A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT	73,110		73,110
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**84,010**		**84,010**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
208	0307665A	BIOMETRICS ENABLED INTELLIGENCE	7,104		7,104
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**7,104**		**7,104**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**100,489**		**100,489**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY			
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
038	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH	3,907		3,907
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**3,907**		**3,907**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
245A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	36,426		36,426
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**36,426**		**36,426**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**40,333**		**40,333**

		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF			
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
058	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	425		425
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**425**		**425**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
200	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	4,715		4,715
242A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	27,765		27,765
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT	**32,480**		**32,480**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF	**32,905**		**32,905**
		RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW			
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT			
253A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	162,419		162,419
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT	**162,419**		**162,419**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW	**162,419**		**162,419**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**336,146**		**336,146**

SEC. 4203. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4203. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
090	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV	33		33
122	0605051A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT		10,000	10,000
		Army unfunded requirement- modernized warning system		[10,000]	

SEC. 4203. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION	**33**	**10,000**	**10,033**
		OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT			
161	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM		16,000	16,000
		Army unfunded requirement- GMLRS M-code upgrade		[16,000]	
166	0607134A	LONG RANGE PRECISION FIRES (LRPF)		27,700	27,700
		Army unfunded requirement		[27,700]	
179	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS		10,000	10,000
		Army unfunded requirement- Vehicle APS		[10,000]	
		SUBTOTAL OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT		**53,700**	**53,700**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY	**33**	**63,700**	**63,733**
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
078	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM)	37,990		37,990
081	0604454N	LX (R)		19,000	19,000
		LX (R) Design		[19,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES	**37,990**	**19,000**	**56,990**
		SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION			
102	0604262N	V–22A		11,400	11,400
		Accelerate Readiness Improvement- Swashplate actuator re-design		[11,400]	
118	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS		20,000	20,000
		Aegis Radar Solid State Improvements		[20,000]	
		SUBTOTAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION		**31,400**	**31,400**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY	**37,990**	**50,400**	**88,390**

		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES			
		ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES			
074	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT		65,000	65,000
		Ground System Communications Modernization & Upgrades to Enable Full RKV Capabilities		[65,000]	
076	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS		45,000	45,000
		Electronic Protection Acceleration for Sensors		[25,000]	
		RFPs for Hawaii & East Coast Radars		[20,000]	
077	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS		10,000	10,000
		Modeling and Simulation Improvements		[10,000]	
079	0603892C	AEGIS BMD		10,000	10,000
		Aegis BMD Integration with AMDR		[10,000]	
082	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI		30,000	30,000
		C2BMC Acceleration		[20,000]	
		Post-Intercept Assessment Acceleration		[10,000]	
088	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST		10,000	10,000
		Test Infrastructure		[10,000]	
105	0604874C	IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS		75,000	75,000
		Modernized Booster Acceleration		[50,000]	
		RKV risk reduction		[25,000]	
112	0604894C	MULTI-OBJECT KILL VEHICLE		55,000	55,000
		MOKV Technology Maturation		[55,000]	
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES		**300,000**	**300,000**
		SUBTOTAL ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES		**300,000**	**300,000**
		TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW		**300,000**	**300,000**
		TOTAL RDT&E	**38,023**	**414,100**	**452,123**

TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	791,450		791,450
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	68,373		68,373
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	438,823		438,823
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	660,258		660,258
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	863,928	334,900	1,198,828
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[334,900]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	1,360,597		1,360,597
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	3,086,443	8,000	3,094,443
	Additional cyber protection teams		[3,000]	
	Public-private cyber training partnership		[5,000]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	439,488		439,488
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,013,452	12,600	1,026,052
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[12,600]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	7,816,343	15,000	7,831,343
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[15,000]	
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	2,234,546		2,234,546
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	452,105		452,105
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	155,658		155,658
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	441,143		441,143
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**19,822,607**	**370,500**	**20,193,107**
	MOBILIZATION			

180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY	336,329		336,329
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	390,848	184,000	574,848
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[184,000]	
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS	7,401		7,401
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**734,578**	**184,000**	**918,578**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION	131,942		131,942
220	RECRUIT TRAINING	47,846		47,846
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING	45,419		45,419
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	482,747		482,747
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	921,025	6,500	927,525
	Defense Foreign Language Program		[6,500]	
260	FLIGHT TRAINING	902,845		902,845
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	216,583		216,583
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	607,534		607,534
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	550,599		550,599
300	EXAMINING	187,263		187,263
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	189,556		189,556
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	182,835		182,835
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS	171,167		171,167
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**4,637,361**	**6,500**	**4,643,861**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	230,739	120,000	350,739
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements from OCO		[120,000]	
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES	850,060		850,060
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	778,757		778,757
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	370,010		370,010
390	ADMINISTRATION	451,556		451,556
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	1,888,123		1,888,123
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	276,403		276,403

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	369,443		369,443
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT	1,096,074		1,096,074
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES	207,800		207,800
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	240,641		240,641
460	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS	250,612		250,612
470	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS	416,587		416,587
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS	36,666		36,666
530	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,151,023		1,151,023
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**8,614,494**	**120,000**	**8,734,494**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
540	UNDISTRIBUTED		–654,600	–654,600
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–56,100]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–229,900]	
	Historical unobligated balances		[–376,300]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[7,700]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–654,600**	**–654,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**33,809,040**	**26,400**	**33,835,440**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	11,435		11,435
020	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	491,772		491,772
030	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	116,163		116,163
040	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	563,524		563,524
050	AVIATION ASSETS	91,162		91,162

060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	347,459	200	347,659
	Defense Language Program		[200]	
070	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	101,926		101,926
080	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	56,219		56,219
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	573,843		573,843
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	214,955		214,955
110	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	37,620		37,620
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,606,078**	**200**	**2,606,278**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
120	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	11,027		11,027
130	ADMINISTRATION	16,749		16,749
140	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	17,825		17,825
150	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	6,177		6,177
160	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	54,475		54,475
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**106,253**		**106,253**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
180	UNDISTRIBUTED		–6,800	–6,800
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–6,800]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–6,800**	**–6,800**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**2,712,331**	**–6,600**	**2,705,731**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	708,251		708,251
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	197,251		197,251
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	792,271		792,271
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	80,341		80,341
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	37,138		37,138
060	AVIATION ASSETS	887,625		887,625

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	696,267	200	696,467
	Defense Language Program		[200]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	61,240		61,240
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	219,948		219,948
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,040,012		1,040,012
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	676,715		676,715
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	1,021,144		1,021,144
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,418,203**	**200**	**6,418,403**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	6,396		6,396
140	ADMINISTRATION	68,528	2,524	71,052
	National Guard State Partnership Program		[2,524]	
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	76,524		76,524
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	7,712		7,712
170	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	245,046		245,046
180	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	2,961		2,961
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**407,167**	**2,524**	**409,691**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		–29,000	–29,000
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–29,000]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–29,000**	**–29,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**6,825,370**	**–26,276**	**6,799,094**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			

	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	4,094,765		4,094,765
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING	1,722,473		1,722,473
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES	52,670		52,670
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	97,584		97,584
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	446,733		446,733
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,007,681		1,007,681
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	38,248		38,248
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	564,720		564,720
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	3,513,083		3,513,083
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	743,765		743,765
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	5,168,273	9,500	5,177,773
	Ship Repair Capability in the Western Pacific		[9,500]	
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,575,578		1,575,578
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	558,727		558,727
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE	105,680		105,680
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE	180,406		180,406
160	WARFARE TACTICS	470,032		470,032
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	346,703		346,703
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	1,158,688		1,158,688
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	113,692		113,692
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,509		2,509
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	91,019		91,019
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	74,780		74,780
230	CRUISE MISSILE	106,030		106,030
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE	1,233,805	7,500	1,241,305
	Engineering and Technical Services, Project 934		[7,500]	
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	163,025		163,025
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	553,269	–1,800	551,469
	Heavy Weight Torpedo Program Execution		[–1,500]	
	Light Weight Torpedo Program Execution		[–300]	
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	350,010		350,010

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	790,685		790,685
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	1,642,742		1,642,742
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	4,206,136		4,206,136
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**31,173,511**	**15,200**	**31,188,711**
	MOBILIZATION			
310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE	893,517		893,517
320	READY RESERVE FORCE	274,524		274,524
330	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	6,727		6,727
340	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	288,154		288,154
350	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	95,720		95,720
360	INDUSTRIAL READINESS	2,109		2,109
370	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	21,114		21,114
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**1,581,865**		**1,581,865**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
380	OFFICER ACQUISITION	143,815		143,815
390	RECRUIT TRAINING	8,519		8,519
400	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS	143,445		143,445
410	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	699,214		699,214
420	FLIGHT TRAINING	5,310		5,310
430	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	172,852	1,200	174,052
	Naval Sea Cadets		[1,200]	
440	TRAINING SUPPORT	222,728		222,728
450	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	225,647		225,647
460	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	130,569		130,569
470	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	73,730		73,730

480	JUNIOR ROTC	50,400		50,400
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**1,876,229**	**1,200**	**1,877,429**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
490	ADMINISTRATION	917,453		917,453
500	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	14,570		14,570
510	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	124,070		124,070
520	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	369,767		369,767
530	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	285,927		285,927
540	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	319,908		319,908
570	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	171,659		171,659
590	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN	270,863		270,863
600	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	1,112,766		1,112,766
610	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT	49,078		49,078
620	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS	24,989		24,989
630	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS	72,966		72,966
640	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	595,711		595,711
700	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES	4,809		4,809
730	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	517,440		517,440
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**4,851,976**		**4,851,976**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
740	UNDISTRIBUTED		–585,600	–585,600
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–390,500]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–26,400]	
	Historical unobligated balances		[–174,100]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[5,400]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–585,600**	**–585,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**39,483,581**	**–569,200**	**38,914,381**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	674,613		674,613
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	947,424		947,424
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	206,783		206,783
040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING	85,276		85,276
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	632,673		632,673
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	2,136,626		2,136,626
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,683,395**		**4,683,395**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
070	RECRUIT TRAINING	15,946		15,946
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION	935		935
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	99,305		99,305
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	45,495	500	45,995
	MOS-to-Degree Program		[500]	
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	369,979		369,979
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	165,566		165,566
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	35,133		35,133
140	JUNIOR ROTC	23,622		23,622
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**755,981**	**500**	**756,481**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	34,534		34,534
160	ADMINISTRATION	355,932		355,932
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	76,896		76,896
200	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	47,520		47,520
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**514,882**		**514,882**

	UNDISTRIBUTED			
210	UNDISTRIBUTED		–37,700	–37,700
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–4,900]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–1,500]	
	Historical unobligated balances		[–33,100]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[1,800]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–37,700**	**–37,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**5,954,258**	**–37,200**	**5,917,058**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	526,190		526,190
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE	6,714		6,714
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	86,209		86,209
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	389		389
050	AVIATION LOGISTICS	10,189		10,189
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	560		560
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	13,173		13,173
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	109,053		109,053
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION	27,226		27,226
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	27,571		27,571
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	99,166		99,166
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**906,440**		**906,440**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	ADMINISTRATION	1,351		1,351
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	13,251		13,251
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	3,445		3,445
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	3,169		3,169
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**21,216**		**21,216**

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
200	UNDISTRIBUTED		–26,600	–26,600
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–26,600]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–26,600**	**–26,600**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**927,656**	**–26,600**	**901,056**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	94,154		94,154
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	18,594		18,594
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	25,470		25,470
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	111,550		111,550
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**249,768**		**249,768**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	902		902
060	ADMINISTRATION	11,130		11,130
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	8,833		8,833
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**20,865**		**20,865**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
090	UNDISTRIBUTED		–800	–800
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–800]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–800**	**–800**

	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**270,633**	**–800**	**269,833**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	3,294,124		3,294,124
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,682,045		1,682,045
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	1,730,757		1,730,757
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	7,042,988	–56,500	6,986,488
	Compass Call Program Restructure		[–56,500]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	1,657,019		1,657,019
060	BASE SUPPORT	2,787,216		2,787,216
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	887,831		887,831
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	1,070,178		1,070,178
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	208,582		208,582
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	362,250		362,250
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	907,245		907,245
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS	199,171		199,171
135	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	930,757		930,757
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**22,760,163**	**–56,500**	**22,703,663**
	MOBILIZATION			
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	1,703,059		1,703,059
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	138,899		138,899
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,553,439		1,553,439
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	258,328		258,328
180	BASE SUPPORT	722,756		722,756
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**4,376,481**		**4,376,481**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION	120,886		120,886
200	RECRUIT TRAINING	23,782		23,782
210	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC)	77,692		77,692

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	236,254		236,254
230	BASE SUPPORT	819,915		819,915
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	387,446		387,446
250	FLIGHT TRAINING	725,134		725,134
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	264,213		264,213
270	TRAINING SUPPORT	86,681		86,681
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	305,004		305,004
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	104,754		104,754
300	EXAMINING	3,944		3,944
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION	184,841		184,841
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	173,583		173,583
330	JUNIOR ROTC	58,877		58,877
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**3,573,006**		**3,573,006**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	1,107,846		1,107,846
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES	924,185		924,185
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	48,778		48,778
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	321,013		321,013
380	BASE SUPPORT	1,115,910		1,115,910
390	ADMINISTRATION	811,650		811,650
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	269,809		269,809
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	961,304		961,304
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL	25,735	4,765	30,500
	Civil Air Patrol O&M Support		[4,765]	
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	90,573		90,573
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,131,603		1,131,603

	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**6,808,406**	**4,765**	**6,813,171**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
470	UNDISTRIBUTED		–765,900	–765,900
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–368,000]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–116,700]	
	Historical unobligated balances		[–288,000]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[6,800]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–765,900**	**–765,900**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**37,518,056**	**–817,635**	**36,700,421**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,707,882		1,707,882
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	230,016		230,016
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	541,743		541,743
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	113,470		113,470
050	BASE SUPPORT	384,832		384,832
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,977,943**		**2,977,943**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	54,939		54,939
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	14,754		14,754
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC)	12,707		12,707
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP)	7,210		7,210
100	AUDIOVISUAL	376		376
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**89,986**		**89,986**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
110	UNDISTRIBUTED		–59,700	–59,700
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–59,700]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–59,700**	**–59,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**3,067,929**	**–59,700**	**3,008,229**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS	3,282,238		3,282,238
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	723,062		723,062
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,824,329		1,824,329
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	245,840		245,840
050	BASE SUPPORT	575,548		575,548
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**6,651,017**		**6,651,017**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES			
060	ADMINISTRATION	23,715	2,524	26,239
	National Guard State Partnership Program		[2,524]	
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	28,846		28,846
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES	**52,561**	**2,524**	**55,085**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
080	UNDISTRIBUTED		–117,700	–117,700
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–117,700]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–117,700**	**–117,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**6,703,578**	**–115,176**	**6,588,402**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			

	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	506,113		506,113
020	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	524,439	–5,000	519,439
	Program decrease		[–5,000]	
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	4,898,159		4,898,159
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,928,711**	**–5,000**	**5,923,711**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
040	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY	138,658		138,658
050	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF	85,701		85,701
070	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING	365,349		365,349
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**589,708**		**589,708**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
080	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS	160,480	20,000	180,480
	STARBASE		[20,000]	
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	630,925		630,925
110	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	1,356,380		1,356,380
120	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY	683,620		683,620
130	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	1,439,891		1,439,891
150	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	24,984		24,984
160	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY	357,964		357,964
170	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	223,422	–10,000	213,422
	Program decrease		[–10,000]	
180	DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACCOUNTING AGENCY	112,681		112,681
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	496,754		496,754
200	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE	538,711		538,711
230	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	35,417		35,417
240	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY	448,146		448,146
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	2,671,143	30,000	2,701,143
	Impact Aid		[30,000]	
270	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY	446,975		446,975

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
290	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT	155,399		155,399
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	1,481,643	–74,930	1,406,713
	Alcohol Abuse Prevention Program		[1,000]	
	BRAC 2017 Round Planning and Analyses		[–3,530]	
	CWMD Sustainment: Constellation program reduction		[–3,800]	
	Program decrease		[–84,428]	
	Readiness environmental protection initiative		[15,828]	
310	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES	89,429	–18,600	70,829
	SOCOM MH–60 Block Upgrades / MH–60M Replacement		[–18,600]	
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	629,874	–10,000	619,874
	Program decrease		[–10,000]	
330	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	14,069,333	2,000	14,071,333
	Classified adjustment		[2,000]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**26,053,171**	**–61,530**	**25,991,641**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
340	UNDISTRIBUTED		–293,900	–293,900
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–17,800]	
	Foreign Currency adjustments		[–34,300]	
	Historical unobligated balances		[–248,100]	
	Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[6,300]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–293,900**	**–293,900**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**32,571,590**	**–360,430**	**32,211,160**
	MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS			
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE	14,194		14,194

020	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID	105,125		105,125
030	COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION	325,604		325,604
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY	170,167		170,167
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY	281,762		281,762
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE	371,521		371,521
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE	9,009		9,009
090	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES	197,084		197,084
	SUBTOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,474,466**		**1,474,466**
	TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS	**1,474,466**		**1,474,466**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**171,318,488**	**–1,993,217**	**169,325,271**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	406,852	–10,800	396,052
	Army requested realignment (ERI)		[–10,800]	
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	1,643,456	70,100	1,713,556
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[70,100]	
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	556,066	–399,700	156,366
	Army requested realignment (ERI)		[–132,000]	
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[67,200]	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–334,900]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS	58,620	31,500	90,120
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[31,500]	

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,502,845	173,500	1,676,345
	Army requested realignment (ERI)		[–2,000]	
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[175,500]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	348,174	10,000	358,174
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[10,000]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	40,000	–15,000	25,000
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–15,000]	
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	5,979,678	1,080,600	7,060,278
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[1,093,200]	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–12,600]	
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM	5,000		5,000
160	RESET	1,092,542		1,092,542
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	79,568		79,568
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**11,712,801**	**940,200**	**12,653,001**
	MOBILIZATION			
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS	350,200	–220,200	130,000
	Army requested realignment (ERI)		[–220,200]	
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**350,200**	**–220,200**	**130,000**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	540,400	19,100	559,500
	Army requested realignment (ERI)		[120,000]	
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[203,100]	
	Realign APS Unit Set Requirements to Base		[–304,000]	
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT	13,974	35,100	49,074
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[35,100]	

420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	105,508		105,508
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT	165,678	97,500	263,178
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[97,500]	
530	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	835,551	14,300	849,851
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[14,300]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**1,661,111**	**166,000**	**1,827,111**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
540	UNDISTRIBUTED		–6,083,330	–6,083,330
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–138,600]	
	Historical unobligated balances		[–188,500]	
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–5,756,230]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–6,083,330**	**–6,083,330**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**13,724,112**	**–5,197,330**	**8,526,782**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	6,252	3,000	9,252
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[3,000]	
040	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,075	1,000	3,075
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[1,000]	
060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,140	300	1,440
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[300]	
090	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	14,653	500	15,153
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[500]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**24,120**	**4,800**	**28,920**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
180	UNDISTRIBUTED		–11,394	–11,394
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–11,394]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–11,394**	**–11,394**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**24,120**	**–6,594**	**17,526**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	10,564	6,000	16,564
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[6,000]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	748		748
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	5,751	1,700	7,451
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[1,700]	
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	200		200
060	AVIATION ASSETS	27,183	3,800	30,983
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[3,800]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	2,741		2,741
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	18,800		18,800
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	920		920
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**66,907**	**11,500**	**78,407**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		–30,892	–30,892
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–30,892]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–30,892**	**–30,892**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**66,907**	**–19,392**	**47,515**
	AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND			
	MINISTRY OF DEFENSE			

010	SUSTAINMENT	2,173,341		2,173,341
020	INFRASTRUCTURE	48,262		48,262
030	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	76,216	99,831	176,047
	Maintain security forces at fiscal year 2016 levels		[99,831]	
040	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	220,139	61,416	281,555
	Maintain security forces at fiscal year 2016 levels		[61,416]	
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF DEFENSE	**2,517,958**	**161,247**	**2,679,205**
	MINISTRY OF INTERIOR			
050	SUSTAINMENT	860,441	19,859	880,300
	Maintain security forces at fiscal year 2016 levels		[19,859]	
060	INFRASTRUCTURE	20,837		20,837
070	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION	8,153	108,420	116,573
	Maintain security forces at fiscal year 2016 levels		[108,420]	
080	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS	41,326	24,016	65,342
	Maintain security forces at fiscal year 2016 levels		[24,016]	
	SUBTOTAL MINISTRY OF INTERIOR	**930,757**	**152,295**	**1,083,052**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
110	UNDISTRIBUTED		–1,482,289	–1,482,289
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–1,482,289]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–1,482,289**	**–1,482,289**
	TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND	**3,448,715**	**–1,168,747**	**2,279,968**
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
010	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	630,000	50,000	680,000
	Support to Kurdish and Sunni tribal security forces for operations in Mosul, Iraq		[50,000]	
	SUBTOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**630,000**	**50,000**	**680,000**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
020	UNDISTRIBUTED		–267,913	–267,913
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–267,913]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–267,913**	**–267,913**
	TOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**630,000**	**–217,913**	**412,087**
	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND			
010	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	250,000		250,000
	SUBTOTAL SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**250,000**		**250,000**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
020	UNDISTRIBUTED		–98,497	–98,497
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–98,497]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–98,497**	**–98,497**
	TOTAL SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND	**250,000**	**–98,497**	**151,503**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	360,621		360,621
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT	4,603		4,603
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT	159,049		159,049
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	113,994		113,994
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,840		1,840
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS	35,529		35,529
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS	1,073,080		1,073,080

100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING	17,306	17,306
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	2,128,431	2,128,431
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS	21,257	21,257
160	WARFARE TACTICS	22,603	22,603
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY	22,934	22,934
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	568,511	568,511
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE	11,358	11,358
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT	61,000	61,000
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE	289,045	289,045
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT	8,000	8,000
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	7,819	7,819
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	61,493	61,493
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**4,968,473**	**4,968,473**
	MOBILIZATION		
330	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS	1,530	1,530
350	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	5,307	5,307
370	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	162,692	162,692
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**169,529**	**169,529**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING		
410	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	43,365	43,365
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**43,365**	**43,365**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		
490	ADMINISTRATION	3,764	3,764
500	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	515	515
520	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,409	5,409
530	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,578	1,578
570	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	126,700	126,700
600	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	9,261	9,261
640	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,501	1,501

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
730	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,780		15,780
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**164,508**		**164,508**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
740	UNDISTRIBUTED		–2,226,518	–2,226,518
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–120,300]	
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–2,106,218]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–2,226,518**	**–2,226,518**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**5,345,875**	**–2,226,518**	**3,119,357**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	403,489	66,300	469,789
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[66,300]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS	266,094		266,094
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	147,000		147,000
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	18,576		18,576
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**835,159**	**66,300**	**901,459**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
110	TRAINING SUPPORT	31,750		31,750
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**31,750**		**31,750**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	73,800	16,000	89,800
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[16,000]	

200	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	3,650		3,650
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**77,450**	**16,000**	**93,450**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
210	UNDISTRIBUTED		–413,593	–413,593
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–9,100]	
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–404,493]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–413,593**	**–413,593**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**944,359**	**–331,293**	**613,066**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE	16,500		16,500
050	AVIATION LOGISTICS	2,522		2,522
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES	7,243		7,243
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**26,265**		**26,265**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
200	UNDISTRIBUTED		–10,448	–10,448
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–100]	
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–10,348]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–10,448**	**–10,448**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES	**26,265**	**–10,448**	**15,817**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATING FORCES	2,500		2,500
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	804		804
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**3,304**		**3,304**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
090	UNDISTRIBUTED		–1,302	–1,302
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–1,302]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–1,302**	**–1,302**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE	**3,304**	**–1,302**	**2,002**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,339,461	30,900	1,370,361
	Enahncing readiness levels of DCA aircraft		[10,000]	
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[20,900]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	1,096,021	20,900	1,116,921
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[20,900]	
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	152,278		152,278
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,061,506	25,600	1,087,106
	Compass Call Program Restructure		[25,600]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	56,700		56,700
060	BASE SUPPORT	941,714		941,714
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	30,219		30,219
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	207,696	10,000	217,696
	Promoting additional DCA burden sharing		[5,000]	
	Supporting DCA dispersal CONOP development		[5,000]	
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	869		869
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,008		5,008
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	100,081		100,081
135	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	79,893		79,893

	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**5,071,446**	**87,400**	**5,158,846**
	MOBILIZATION			
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS	2,774,729	97,700	2,872,429
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[97,700]	
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS	108,163		108,163
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	891,102		891,102
180	BASE SUPPORT	3,686		3,686
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**3,777,680**	**97,700**	**3,875,380**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
230	BASE SUPPORT	52,740		52,740
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	4,500		4,500
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**57,240**		**57,240**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS	86,716		86,716
380	BASE SUPPORT	59,133		59,133
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	165,348		165,348
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	141,883		141,883
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT	61		61
460	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	15,323		15,323
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**468,464**		**468,464**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
470	UNDISTRIBUTED		–3,868,111	–3,868,111
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–101,600]	
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–3,766,511]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–3,868,111**	**–3,868,111**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**9,374,830**	**–3,683,011**	**5,691,819**

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	51,086		51,086
050	BASE SUPPORT	6,500		6,500
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**57,586**		**57,586**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
110	UNDISTRIBUTED		–22,788	–22,788
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–100]	
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–22,688]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–22,788**	**–22,788**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE	**57,586**	**–22,788**	**34,798**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS	3,400		3,400
050	BASE SUPPORT	16,600		16,600
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**20,000**		**20,000**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
080	UNDISTRIBUTED		–7,880	–7,880
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–7,880]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–7,880**	**–7,880**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG	**20,000**	**–7,880**	**12,120**

	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF		10,000	10,000
	Enhancing exercise of DCA aircraft		[10,000]	
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	2,636,307	169,600	2,805,907
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[169,600]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**2,636,307**	**179,600**	**2,815,907**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY	13,436		13,436
110	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY	13,564		13,564
130	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	32,879		32,879
150	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY	111,986		111,986
170	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY	13,317		13,317
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY	1,412,000		1,412,000
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY	67,000		67,000
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE	31,106		31,106
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES	3,137		3,137
330	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	1,609,397	1,000	1,610,397
	Operational support for deployed end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[1,000]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**3,307,822**	**1,000**	**3,308,822**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
340	UNDISTRIBUTED		–2,419,878	–2,419,878
	Excessive standard price for fuel		[–6,800]	
	Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–2,413,078]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–2,419,878**	**–2,419,878**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**5,944,129**	**–2,239,278**	**3,704,851**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**39,860,202**	**–15,230,991**	**24,629,211**

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	317,093	50,000	367,093
	Army unfunded requirement—Improve training from BN+ to BCT-		[50,000]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	5,904		5,904
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	38,614		38,614
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	8,361		8,361
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	279,072		279,072
060	AVIATION ASSETS	106,424	100,500	206,924
	Army unfunded requirement—Meet air readiness targets		[68,000]	
	Increase to support ARI—Eleventh CAB		[32,500]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	253,533		253,533
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	350,000		350,000
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT		22,100	22,100
	Increase to support ARI—Eleventh CAB		[22,100]	
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		922,000	922,000
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[494,900]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[427,100]	
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES	11,200		11,200
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,370,201**	**1,094,600**	**2,464,801**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	3,565		3,565
260	FLIGHT TRAINING		42,934	42,934

	Army unfunded requirement—Ensure AVN restructure initiative execution		[5,405]	
	Army unfunded requirement—Increase student workload for additional warrant officers		[31,125]	
	Army unfunded requirement—Train full ARPINT load of 990		[6,404]	
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION	9,021	31,600	40,621
	Military Training and PME		[31,600]	
280	TRAINING SUPPORT	2,434		2,434
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING		356,500	356,500
	Recruiting and Advertising Add		[356,500]	
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING	1,254		1,254
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING	**16,274**	**431,034**	**447,308**
	ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	200,000	65,000	265,000
	Army unfunded requirement—Restore cricital shortfalls		[65,000]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES	**200,000**	**65,000**	**265,000**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
540	UNDISTRIBUTED		704,300	704,300
	Additional funding to support increase in Army end strength		[704,300]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**704,300**	**704,300**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY	**1,586,475**	**2,294,934**	**3,881,409**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	708		708
020	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	8,570	20,000	28,570
	Army unfunded requirement—Improve training from PLT to CO proficiency		[20,000]	
030	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	375		375
040	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	13		13
050	AVIATION ASSETS	608		608
060	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	4,285		4,285

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
100	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		97,500	97,500
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[57,100]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[40,400]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**14,559**	**117,500**	**132,059**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
180	UNDISTRIBUTED		103,400	103,400
	Additional funding to support increase in Army Reserve end strength		[103,400]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**103,400**	**103,400**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES	**14,559**	**220,900**	**235,459**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	5,585		5,585
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	28,956		28,956
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	10,272		10,272
060	AVIATION ASSETS	5,621	46,000	51,621
	Increase to support ARI		[46,000]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	9,694		9,694
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		121,000	121,000
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[16,800]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[104,200]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**60,128**	**167,000**	**227,128**
	UNDISTRIBUTED			
190	UNDISTRIBUTED		159,100	159,100

	Additional funding to support increase in Army National Guard end strength		[159,100]	
	SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**159,100**	**159,100**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG	**60,128**	**326,100**	**386,228**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS	500,000	56,520	556,520
	Carrier Air Wing Restoration		[56,520]	
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING		23,020	23,020
	Carrier Air Wing Restoration		[23,020]	
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT		6,500	6,500
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement—accelerate readiness - H–1		[5,300]	
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement—accelerate readiness - MV–22B		[1,200]	
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE		36,000	36,000
	Carrier Air Wing Restoration		[6,000]	
	Navy unfunded requirement—Improve Afloat Readiness		[30,000]	
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS		33,500	33,500
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement—accelerate readiness - KC–130J		[6,800]	
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement—accelerate readiness - MV–22B		[10,700]	
	Navy unfunded requirement—Improve Afloat Readiness		[16,000]	
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS		348,200	348,200
	Cruiser Modernization		[90,200]	
	Navy unfunded requirement—Improve Afloat Readiness		[158,000]	
	Navy unfunded requirement—Restore 3 CG Deployments		[41,000]	
	Navy unfunded requirement—Reverse PONCE (LPD–15) Inactivation		[59,000]	
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING		19,700	19,700
	Navy unfunded requirement—Restore Fleet Training		[19,700]	
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE	775,000	309,100	1,084,100
	Cruiser Modernization		[71,100]	
	Navy unfunded requirement—Ship Depot Wholeness		[238,000]	
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT		79,000	79,000

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	Navy unfunded requirement—Increase Alfoat Readiness		[79,000]	
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION	19,270	389,200	408,470
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[113,600]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[275,600]	
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT	158,032		158,032
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**1,452,302**	**1,300,740**	**2,753,042**
	MOBILIZATION			
350	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	3,597		3,597
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION	**3,597**		**3,597**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
540	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	25,617		25,617
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES	**25,617**		**25,617**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY	**1,481,516**	**1,300,740**	**2,782,256**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS			
	OPERATING FORCES			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	300,000	22,000	322,000
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- enhanced combat helmets		[22,000]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS		21,450	21,450
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- rifle combat optic modernization		[13,200]	
	Marine Corps unfunded requirement- SPMAGTF—C4 UUNS		[8,250]	
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		145,600	145,600
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[31,400]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[114,200]	

	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**300,000**	**189,050**	**489,050**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS	**300,000**	**189,050**	**489,050**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE		4,000	4,000
	Navy unfunded requirement—Improve Afloat Readiness		[4,000]	
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING		300	300
	Navy unfunded requirement—Restore Fleet Training		[300]	
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION		7,800	7,800
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[2,100]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[5,700]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES		**12,100**	**12,100**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES		**12,100**	**12,100**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION		7,700	7,700
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[4,300]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[3,400]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES		**7,700**	**7,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE		**7,700**	**7,700**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	124,000	323,576	447,576
	Air Force unfunded requirement—Weapons System Sustainment		[323,576]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		407,900	407,900
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[142,900]	

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[265,000]	
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING		40,000	40,000
	Air Force unfunded requirement—Ground Based Radars		[40,000]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**124,000**	**771,476**	**895,476**
	MOBILIZATION			
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE		66,424	66,424
	Air Force unfunded requirement—Weapons System Sustainment		[66,424]	
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		63,600	63,600
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[22,300]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[41,300]	
	SUBTOTAL MOBILIZATION		**130,024**	**130,024**
	TRAINING AND RECRUITING			
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		58,200	58,200
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[20,400]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[37,800]	
	SUBTOTAL TRAINING AND RECRUITING		**58,200**	**58,200**
	ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES			
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		79,000	79,000
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[27,700]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[51,300]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMIN & SRVWD ACTIVITIES		**79,000**	**79,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE	**124,000**	**1,038,700**	**1,162,700**

	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		20,500	20,500
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[7,100]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[13,400]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES		**20,500**	**20,500**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE		**20,500**	**20,500**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE		40,000	40,000
	Air Force unfunded requirement—Weapons System Sustainment		[40,000]	
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION		64,500	64,500
	Increase Restoration & Modernization funding		[18,900]	
	Restore Sustainment shortfalls		[45,600]	
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES		**104,500**	**104,500**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES			
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING		67,000	67,000
	Air Force unfunded requirement		[67,000]	
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES		**67,000**	**67,000**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG		**171,500**	**171,500**
	OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE			
	OPERATING FORCES			
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES	14,344		14,344
	SUBTOTAL OPERATING FORCES	**14,344**		**14,344**
	ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES			
130	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY	14,700		14,700

SEC. 4303. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
330	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	9,000		9,000
	SUBTOTAL ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES	**23,700**		**23,700**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE	**38,044**		**38,044**
	TOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**3,604,722**	**5,582,224**	**9,186,946**

TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	**128,902,332**	**–419,418**	**128,482,914**
Foreign Currency adjustments		[–200,400]	
Historical unobligated balances		[–248,700]	
National Guard State Partnership Program, Air Force, Special Training		[841]	
National Guard State Partnership Program, Army, Special Training		[841]	
Prohibition on Per Diem Allowance Reduction		[28,000]	
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions	**6,366,908**		**6,366,908**

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	**3,499,293**	**–1,299,721**	**2,199,572**
Maintain end strength of 9,800 in Afghanistan		[130,300]	
Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–1,430,021]	

SEC. 4403. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4403. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Military Personnel Appropriations	62,965	2,509,750	2,572,715
Fund active Air Force end strength to 321k		[145,000]	
Fund active Army end strength to 480k		[1,123,500]	
Fund active Marine Corps end strengthto 185k		[300,000]	
Fund active Navy end strength		[65,300]	
Fund Army National Guard end strength to 350k		[303,700]	
Fund Army Reserves end strength to 205k		[166,650]	
Marine Corps—Bonus Pay/PCS Resotral/Foreign Language Bonus		[75,600]	
Military Personnel Pay Raise		[330,000]	
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions		49,900	49,900
Increase associated with additional end strength		[49,900]	

TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
INDUSTRIAL OPERATIONS			
SUPPLY MANAGEMENT—ARMY	56,469		56,469
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**56,469**		**56,469**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE			
FUEL COSTS			
SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS	63,967		63,967
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE	**63,967**		**63,967**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
ENERGY MANAGEMENT—DEF			
SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT—DEF	37,132		37,132
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**37,132**		**37,132**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA			
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	1,214,045		1,214,045
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA	**1,214,045**		**1,214,045**
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND			
POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING			

NATIONAL DEF SEALIFT VESSEL		85,000	85,000
National Security Multi-Mission Vehicle		[85,000]	
TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND		**85,000**	**85,000**
NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND			
DEVELOPMENT		773,138	773,138
Realignment of funds to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund		[773,138]	
TOTAL NATIONAL SEA-BASED DETERRENCE FUND		**773,138**	**773,138**
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	147,282		147,282
RDT&E	388,609		388,609
PROCUREMENT	15,132		15,132
TOTAL CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION	**551,023**		**551,023**
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	730,087	30,000	760,087
SOUTHCOM Operational Support		[30,000]	
DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	114,713		114,713
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**844,800**	**30,000**	**874,800**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	318,882		318,882
RDT&E	3,153		3,153
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**322,035**		**322,035**
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
IN-HOUSE CARE	9,240,160		9,240,160
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	15,738,759		15,738,759
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	2,367,759		2,367,759
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	1,743,749		1,743,749

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES	311,380		311,380
EDUCATION AND TRAINING	743,231		743,231
BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS	2,086,352		2,086,352
SUBTOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**32,231,390**		**32,231,390**
RDT&E			
RESEARCH	9,097		9,097
EXPLORATRY DEVELOPMENT	58,517		58,517
ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT	221,226		221,226
DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION	96,602		96,602
ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT	364,057		364,057
MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT	58,410		58,410
CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT	14,998		14,998
SUBTOTAL RDT&E	**822,907**		**822,907**
PROCUREMENT			
INITIAL OUTFITTING	20,611		20,611
REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION	360,727		360,727
JOINT OPERATIONAL MEDICINE INFORMATION SYSTEM	2,413		2,413
DOD HEALTHCARE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM MODERNIZATION	29,468		29,468
SUBTOTAL PROCUREMENT	**413,219**		**413,219**
UNDISTRIBUTED		–419,500	–419,500
Foreign Currency adjustments		[–20,400]	
Historical unobligated balances		[–399,100]	
SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–419,500**	**–419,500**

TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**33,467,516**	**–419,500**	**33,048,016**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**36,556,987**	**468,638**	**37,025,625**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY			
INDUSTRIAL OPERATIONS			
SUPPLY MANAGEMENT—ARMY	46,833		46,833
UNDISTRIBUTED		–18,452	–18,452
Reduction to sustain minimal readiness levels		[–18,452]	
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY	**46,833**	**–18,452**	**28,381**
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE			
SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGEMENT—DEF			
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA)	93,800		93,800
UNDISTRIBUTED		–36,956	–36,956
Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–36,956]	
TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE	**93,800**	**–36,956**	**56,844**
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	191,533		191,533
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**191,533**		**191,533**
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE	22,062		22,062
TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	**22,062**		**22,062**

SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE			
IN-HOUSE CARE	95,366		95,366
PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	233,073		233,073
CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT	3,325		3,325
SUBTOTAL OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	**331,764**		**331,764**
UNDISTRIBUTED			
UNDISTRIBUTED		–130,711	–130,711
Prorated OCO allocation in support of base readiness requirements		[–130,711]	
SUBTOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED		**–130,711**	**–130,711**
TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM	**331,764**	**–130,711**	**201,053**
UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE			
UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE		150,000	150,000
Program increase		[150,000]	
TOTAL UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE		**150,000**	**150,000**
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND			
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	1,000,000	–250,000	750,000
Program decrease		[–250,000]	
TOTAL COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND	**1,000,000**	**–250,000**	**750,000**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**1,685,992**	**–286,119**	**1,399,873**

SEC. 4503. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4503. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF			
DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE	23,800		23,800
TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF	**23,800**		**23,800**
TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS	**23,800**		**23,800**

TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	ALASKA	Fort Wainwright	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	47,000		47,000
Army	CALIFORNIA	Concord	Access Control Point	12,600		12,600
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Automated Infantry Platoon Battle Course	8,100		8,100
Army	COLORADO	Fort Carson	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	5,000		5,000
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	Access Control Point	0	29,000	29,000
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	Company Operations Facility	0	10,600	10,600
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	Cyber Protection Team Ops Facility	90,000		90,000
Army	GEORGIA	Fort Stewart	Automated Qualification/Training Range	14,800		14,800
Army	GERMANY	East Camp Grafenwoehr	Training Support Center	22,000		22,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	GERMANY	Garmisch	Dining Facility	9,600		9,600
Army	GERMANY	Wiesbaden Army Airfield	Controlled Humidity Warehouse	16,500		16,500
Army	GERMANY	Wiesbaden Army Airfield	Hazardous Material Storage Building	2,700		2,700
Army	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	Guantanamo Bay	Guantanamo Bay Naval Station Migration Complex	33,000		33,000
Army	HAWAII	Fort Shafter	Command and Control Facility, Incr 2	40,000		40,000
Army	MISSOURI	Fort Leonard Wood	Fire Station	0	6,900	6,900
Army	TEXAS	Fort Hood	Automated Infantry Platoon Battle Course	7,600		7,600
Army	UTAH	Camp Williams	Live Fire Exercise Shoothouse	7,400		7,400
Army	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	Secure Admin/Operations Facility, Incr 2	64,000		64,000
Army	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	0	23,000	23,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Host Nation Support FY17	18,000		18,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction FY17	25,000		25,000
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design FY17	80,159		80,159
Military Construction, Army Total				**503,459**	**69,500**	**572,959**
Navy	ARIZONA	Yuma	VMX–22 Maintenance Hangar	48,355		48,355
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	Coastal Campus Entry Control Point	13,044		13,044
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	Coastal Campus Utilities Infrastructure	81,104		81,104
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	Grace Hopper Data Center Power Upgrades	10,353		10,353
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	F–35C Engine Repair Facility	26,723		26,723
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Miramar	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar, Incr 1	0	79,399	79,399
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Miramar	Communications Complex & Infrastructure Upgrade	0	34,700	34,700
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Miramar	F–35 Aircraft Parking Apron	0	40,000	40,000
Navy	CALIFORNIA	San Diego	Energy Security Hospital Microgrid	6,183	–6,183	0
Navy	CALIFORNIA	Seal Beach	Missile Magazines	21,007		21,007
Navy	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	WMD Field Training Facilities	20,489		20,489
Navy	FLORIDA	Mayport	Advanced Wastewater Treatment Plant	0	66,000	66,000

Navy	FLORIDA	Pensacola	A-School Dormitory	0	53,000	53,000
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Hardening of Guam POL Infrastructure	26,975		26,975
Navy	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Power Upgrade—Harmon	62,210		62,210
Navy	HAWAII	Barking Sands	Upgrade Power Plant & Electrical Distrib Sys	43,384		43,384
Navy	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Regimental Consolidated Comm/Elec Facility	72,565		72,565
Navy	JAPAN	Kadena AB	Aircraft Maintenance Complex	26,489		26,489
Navy	JAPAN	Sasebo	Shore Power (Juliet Pier)	16,420		16,420
Navy	MAINE	Kittery	Unaccompanied Housing	17,773		17,773
Navy	MAINE	Kittery	Utility Improvements for Nuclear Platforms	30,119		30,119
Navy	MARYLAND	Patuxent River	UCLASS RDT&E Hangar	40,576		40,576
Navy	NEVADA	Fallon	Air Wing Simulator Facility	13,523		13,523
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Range Facilities Safety Improvements	18,482		18,482
Navy	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point	Central Heating Plant Conversion	12,515		12,515
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	Beaufort	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	83,490		83,490
Navy	SOUTH CAROLINA	Parris Island	Recruit Reconditioning Center & Barracks	29,882		29,882
Navy	SPAIN	Rota	Communication Station	23,607		23,607
Navy	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	Chambers Field Magazine Recap PH I	0	27,000	27,000
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bangor	SEAWOLF Class Service Pier	0	73,000	73,000
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bangor	Service Pier Electrical Upgrades	18,939		18,939
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bangor	Submarine Refit Maint Support Facility	21,476		21,476
Navy	WASHINGTON	Bremerton	Nuclear Repair Facility	6,704		6,704
Navy	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	EA–18G Maintenance Hangar	45,501		45,501
Navy	WASHINGTON	Whidbey Island	Triton Mission Control Facility	30,475		30,475
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	88,230		88,230
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	29,790		29,790
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Triton Forward Operating Base Hangar	41,380		41,380
Military Construction, Navy Total				**1,027,763**	**366,916**	**1,394,679**
AF	ALASKA	Clear AFS	Fire Station	20,000		20,000
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F–35A ADAL Field Training Detachment Fac	22,100		22,100
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F–35A Aircraft Weather Shelter (Sqd 2)	82,300	–82,300	0
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F–35A Aircraft Weather Shelters (Sqd 1)	79,500		79,500

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F–35A Earth Covered Magazines	11,300		11,300
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F–35A Hangar/Propulsion MX/Dispatch	44,900		44,900
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F–35A Hangar/Squad Ops/AMU Sq #2	42,700		42,700
AF	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F–35A Missile Maintenance Facility	12,800		12,800
AF	ALASKA	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	Add/Alter AWACS Alert Hangar	29,000		29,000
AF	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F–35A Squad Ops/Aircraft Maint Unit #5	20,000		20,000
AF	AUSTRALIA	Darwin	APR—Aircraft MX Support Facility	1,800		1,800
AF	AUSTRALIA	Darwin	APR—Expand Parking Apron	28,600		28,600
AF	CALIFORNIA	Edwards AFB	Flightline Fire Station	24,000		24,000
AF	COLORADO	Buckley AFB	Small Arms Range Complex	13,500		13,500
AF	DELAWARE	Dover AFB	Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	39,000		39,000
AF	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	Advanced Munitions Technology Complex	75,000		75,000
AF	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	Flightline Fire Station	13,600		13,600
AF	FLORIDA	Patrick AFB	Fire/Crash Rescue Station	13,500		13,500
AF	GEORGIA	Moody AFB	Personnel Recovery 4-Bay Hangar/Helo Mx Unit	30,900		30,900
AF	GERMANY	Ramstein AB	37 AS Squadron Operations/Aircraft Maint Unit	13,437		13,437
AF	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	EIC—Site Development and Infrastructure	43,465		43,465
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	APR—Munitions Storage Igloos, Ph 2	35,300		35,300
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	APR—SATCOM C4I Facility	14,200		14,200
AF	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Block 40 Maintenance Hangar	31,158		31,158
AF	JAPAN	Kadena AB	APR—Replace Munitions Structures	19,815		19,815
AF	JAPAN	Yokota AB	C–130J Corrosion Control Hangar	23,777		23,777
AF	JAPAN	Yokota AB	Construct Combat Arms Training & Maint Fac	8,243		8,243
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower	11,200		11,200
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A ADAL Taxiway Delta	5,600		5,600
AF	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC–46A Alter Flight Simulator Bldgs	3,000		3,000

AF	LOUISIANA	Barksdale AFB	Consolidated Communication Facility	21,000		21,000
AF	MARIANA ISLANDS	Unspecified Location	APR—Land Acquisition	9,000		9,000
AF	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	21 Points Enclosed Firing Range	13,000		13,000
AF	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	Consolidated Communications Center	0	50,000	50,000
AF	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	PAR Relocate JADOC Satellite Site	3,500		3,500
AF	MASSACHUSETTS	Hanscom AFB	Construct Vandenberg Gate Complex	0	10,965	10,965
AF	MASSACHUSETTS	Hanscom AFB	System Management Engineering Facility	20,000		20,000
AF	MONTANA	Malmstrom AFB	Missile Maintenance Facility	14,600		14,600
AF	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F–35A POL Fill Stand Addition	10,600		10,600
AF	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	North Fitness Center	21,000		21,000
AF	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	Hazardous Cargo Pad and Taxiway	10,600		10,600
AF	NEW MEXICO	Kirtland AFB	Combat Rescue Helicopter (CRH) Simulator	7,300		7,300
AF	OHIO	Wright-Patterson AFB	Relocated Entry Control Facility 26A	12,600		12,600
AF	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	KC–46A FTU/FTC Simulator Facility Ph 2	11,600		11,600
AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	E–3G Mission and Flight Simulator Training Facility	0	26,000	26,000
AF	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	KC–46A Depot System Integration Laboratory	17,000		17,000
AF	SOUTH CAROLINA	Joint Base Charleston	Fire & Rescue Station	0	17,000	17,000
AF	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT Recruit Dormitory 6	67,300		67,300
AF	TURKEY	Incirlik AB	Airfield Fire/Crash Rescue Station	13,449		13,449
AF	UNITED ARAB EMIRATES	Al Dhafra	Large Aircraft Maintenance Hangar	35,400		35,400
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF Croughton	JIAC Consolidation—Ph 3	53,082	–53,082	0
AF	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF Croughton	Main Gate Complex	16,500		16,500
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	649 MUNS Munitions Storage Magazines	6,600		6,600
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	649 MUNS Precision Guided Missile MX Facility	8,700		8,700
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	649 MUNS STAMP/Maint & Inspection Facility	12,000		12,000
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	Composite Aircraft Antenna Calibration Fac	7,100		7,100
AF	UTAH	Hill AFB	F–35A Munitions Maintenance Complex	10,100		10,100
AF	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Air Force Targeting Center	45,000		45,000
AF	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Fuel System Maintenance Dock	14,200		14,200
AF	WASHINGTON	Fairchild AFB	Pipeline Dorm, USAF SERE School (150 RM)	27,000		27,000
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	143,582	20,000	163,582
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Military Construction	30,000	33,082	63,082

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
AF	WYOMING	F. E. Warren AFB	Missile Transfer Facility Bldg 4331	5,550		5,550
Military Construction, Air Force Total				**1,481,058**	**21,665**	**1,502,723**
Def-Wide	ALASKA	Clear AFS	Long Range Discrim Radar Sys Complex Ph1, Incr 1	155,000	–55,000	100,000
Def-Wide	ALASKA	Fort Greely	Missile Defense Complex Switchgear Facility	9,560		9,560
Def-Wide	ALASKA	Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson	Construct Truck Offload Facility	4,900		4,900
Def-Wide	ARIZONA	Fort Huachuca	JITC Building 52110 Renovation	4,493		4,493
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Human Performance Training Center	15,578		15,578
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Seal Team Ops Facility	47,290		47,290
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Seal Team Ops Facility	47,290		47,290
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Special RECON Team ONE Operations Fac	20,949		20,949
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Training Detachment ONE Ops Facility	44,305		44,305
Def-Wide	CALIFORNIA	Travis AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System	26,500		26,500
Def-Wide	DELAWARE	Dover AFB	Welch ES/Dover MS Replacement	44,115		44,115
Def-Wide	DIEGO GARCIA	Diego Garcia	Improve Wharf Refueling Capability	30,000		30,000
Def-Wide	FLORIDA	Patrick AFB	Replace Fuel Tanks	10,100		10,100
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Fort Benning	SOF Tactical Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Hangar	4,820		4,820
Def-Wide	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	Medical Clinic Replacement	25,000		25,000
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Kaiserlautern AB	Sembach Elementary/Middle School Replacement	45,221		45,221
Def-Wide	GERMANY	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Medical Center Replacement Incr 6	58,063		58,063
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Iwakuni	Construct Truck Offload & Loading Facilities	6,664		6,664
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Kadena AB	Kadena Elementary School Replacement	84,918		84,918
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Kadena AB	Medical Materiel Warehouse	20,881		20,881
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Kadena AB	SOF Maintenance Hangar	42,823		42,823
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Kadena AB	SOF Simulator Facility (MC–130)	12,602		12,602
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Yokota AB	Airfield Apron	41,294		41,294

Def-Wide	JAPAN	Yokota AB	Hangar/AMU	39,466		39,466
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Yokota AB	Operations and Warehouse Facilities	26,710		26,710
Def-Wide	JAPAN	Yokota AB	Simulator Facility	6,261		6,261
Def-Wide	KWAJALEIN	Kwajalein Atoll	Replace Fuel Storage Tanks	85,500		85,500
Def-Wide	MAINE	Kittery	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	27,100		27,100
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Bethesda Naval Hospital	MEDCEN Addition/Alteration Incr 1	50,000		50,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	Access Control Facility	21,000		21,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW Campus Feeders Phase 3	17,000		17,000
Def-Wide	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW Recapitalize Building #2 Incr 2	195,000	–50,000	145,000
Def-Wide	MISSOURI	St. Louis	Land Acquisition-Next NGA West (N2W) Campus	801	–801	0
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Dental Clinic Replacement	31,000		31,000
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Combat Medic Training Facility	10,905		10,905
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Parachute Rigging Facility	21,420		21,420
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Special Tactics Facility (PH3)	30,670		30,670
Def-Wide	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Tactical Equipment Maintenance Facility	23,598		23,598
Def-Wide	SOUTH CAROLINA	Joint Base Charleston	Construct Hydrant Fuel System	17,000		17,000
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Red River Army Depot	Construct Warehouse & Open Storage	44,700		44,700
Def-Wide	TEXAS	Sheppard AFB	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement	91,910		91,910
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF Croughton	Croughton Elem/Middle/High School Replacement	71,424		71,424
Def-Wide	UNITED KINGDOM	RAF Lakenheath	Construct Hydrant Fuel System	13,500		13,500
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Pentagon Metro Entrance Facility	12,111		12,111
Def-Wide	VIRGINIA	Pentagon	Upgrade IT Facilities Infrastructure—RRMC	8,105		8,105
Def-Wide	WAKE ISLAND	Wake Island	Test Support Facility	11,670		11,670
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Contingency Construction	10,000		10,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ECIP Design	10,000	–10,000	0
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Energy Conservation Investment Program	150,000		150,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Exercise Related Minor Construction	8,631		8,631
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design, Defense Wide	13,450	10,000	23,450
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design, DODEA	23,585		23,585
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design, NGA	71,647	–35,647	36,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design, NSA	24,000		24,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design, WHS	3,427		3,427

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction, DHA	8,500		8,500
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction, DODEA	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction, Defense Wide	3,000		3,000
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction, SOCOM	5,994		5,994
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor MILCON, NSA	3,913		3,913
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Worldwide Unspecified Minor Construction, MDA	2,414		2,414
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design, DLA	27,660		27,660
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design, SOCOM	27,653		27,653
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED LOCATIONS	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design, MDA	0	15,000	15,000
Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total				**2,056,091**	**–126,448**	**1,929,643**
NATO	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NATO Security Investment Program	NATO Security Investment Program	177,932		177,932
NATO Security Investment Program Total				**177,932**	**0**	**177,932**
Army NG	COLORADO	Fort Carson	National Guard Readiness Center	0	16,500	16,500
Army NG	HAWAII	Hilo	Combined Support Maintenance Shop	31,000		31,000
Army NG	IOWA	Davenport	National Guard Readiness Center	23,000		23,000
Army NG	KANSAS	Fort Leavenworth	National Guard Readiness Center	29,000		29,000
Army NG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Hooksett	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	11,000		11,000
Army NG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Rochester	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop	8,900		8,900
Army NG	OKLAHOMA	Ardmore	National Guard Readiness Center	22,000		22,000
Army NG	PENNSYLVANIA	Fort Indiantown Gap	Access Control Buildings	0	20,000	20,000
Army NG	PENNSYLVANIA	York	National Guard Readiness Center	9,300		9,300
Army NG	RHODE ISLAND	East Greenwich	National Guard/Reserve Center Building (JFHQ)	20,000		20,000
Army NG	UTAH	Camp Williams	National Guard Readiness Center	37,000		37,000

Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	8,729		8,729
Army NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	12,001		12,001
Army NG	WYOMING	Camp Guernsey	General Instruction Building	0	31,000	31,000
Army NG	WYOMING	Laramie	National Guard Readiness Center	21,000		21,000
Military Construction, Army National Guard Total				**232,930**	**67,500**	**300,430**
Army Res	ARIZONA	Phoenix	Army Reserve Center	0	30,000	30,000
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Camp Parks	Transient Training Barracks	19,000		19,000
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Fort Hunter Liggett	Emergency Services Center	21,500		21,500
Army Res	CALIFORNIA	Barstow	Equipment Concentration Site	0	29,000	29,000
Army Res	VIRGINIA	Dublin	Organizational Maintenance Shop/AMSA	6,000		6,000
Army Res	WASHINGTON	Joint Base Lewis–McChord	Army Reserve Center	0	27,500	27,500
Army Res	WISCONSIN	Fort McCoy	AT/MOB Dining Facility	11,400		11,400
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	7,500		7,500
Army Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	2,830		2,830
Military Construction, Army Reserve Total				**68,230**	**86,500**	**154,730**
N/MC Res	LOUISIANA	New Orleans	Joint Reserve Intelligence Center	11,207		11,207
N/MC Res	NEW YORK	Brooklyn	Electric Feeder Ductbank	1,964		1,964
N/MC Res	NEW YORK	Syracuse	Marine Corps Reserve Center	13,229		13,229
N/MC Res	TEXAS	Galveston	Reserve Center Annex	8,414		8,414
N/MC Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCNR Planning & Design	3,783		3,783
Military Construction, Naval Reserve Total				**38,597**	**0**	**38,597**
Air NG	CONNECTICUT	Bradley IAP	Construct Small Air Terminal	6,300		6,300
Air NG	FLORIDA	Jacksonville IAP	Replace Fire Crash/Rescue Station	9,000		9,000
Air NG	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	F–22 Composite Repair Facility	11,000		11,000
Air NG	IOWA	Sioux Gateway Airport	Construct Consolidated Support Functions	12,600		12,600
Air NG	MARYLAND	Joint Base Andrews	Munitions Load Crew Trng/Corrosion Cnrtl Facility	0	5,000	5,000
Air NG	MINNESOTA	Duluth IAP	Load Crew Training/Weapon Shops	7,600		7,600
Air NG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC–46A Install Fuselage Trainer Bldg 251	1,500		1,500
Air NG	NORTH CAROLINA	Charlotte/Douglas IAP	C–17 Corrosion Control/Fuel Cell Hangar	29,600		29,600

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Air NG	NORTH CAROLINA	Charlotte/Douglas IAP	C–17 Type III Hydrant Refueling System	21,000		21,000
Air NG	OHIO	Toledo Express Airport	Indoor Small Arms Range	0	6,000	6,000
Air NG	SOUTH CAROLINA	McEntire ANGS	Replace Operations and Training Facility	8,400		8,400
Air NG	TEXAS	Ellington Field	Consolidate Crew Readiness Facility	4,500		4,500
Air NG	VERMONT	Burlington IAP	F–35 Beddown 4-Bay Flight Simulator	4,500		4,500
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	17,495	12,000	29,495
Air NG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	10,462		10,462
Military Construction, Air National Guard Total				**143,957**	**23,000**	**166,957**
AF Res	GUAM	Andersen AFB	Reserve Medical Training Facility	0	5,200	5,200
AF Res	MASSACHUSETTS	Westover ARB	Indoor Small Arms Range	0	9,200	9,200
AF Res	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	KC–46A ADAL Bldg for AGE/Fuselage Training	5,700		5,700
AF Res	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	KC–46A ADAL Squadron Operations Facilities	2,250		2,250
AF Res	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	KC–46A Two-Bay Corrosion/Fuel Cell Hangar	90,000		90,000
AF Res	PENNSYLVANIA	Pittsburgh IAP	C–17 ADAL Fuel Hydrant System	22,800		22,800
AF Res	PENNSYLVANIA	Pittsburgh IAP	C–17 Const/OverlayTaxiway and Apron	8,200		8,200
AF Res	PENNSYLVANIA	Pittsburgh IAP	C–17 Construct Two-Bay Corrosion/Fuel Hangar	54,000		54,000
AF Res	UTAH	Hill AFB	ADAL Life Support Facility	0	3,050	3,050
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	4,500		4,500
AF Res	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction	1,500		1,500
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve Total				**188,950**	**17,450**	**206,400**
FH Con Army	KOREA	Camp Humphreys	Family Housing New Construction, Incr 1	143,563	–43,563	100,000
FH Con Army	KOREA	Camp Walker	Family Housing New Construction	54,554		54,554
FH Con Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	2,618		2,618
Family Housing Construction, Army Total				**200,735**	**–43,563**	**157,172**

FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings	10,178		10,178
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Housing Privitization Support	19,146		19,146
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	131,761		131,761
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance	60,745		60,745
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management	40,344		40,344
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous	400		400
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services	7,993		7,993
FH Ops Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities	55,428		55,428
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Army Total				**325,995**	**0**	**325,995**
FH Con Navy	MARIANA ISLANDS	Guam	Replace Andersen Housing PH I	78,815		78,815
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements	11,047		11,047
FH Con Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	4,149		4,149
Family Housing Construction, Navy And Marine Corps Total				**94,011**	**0**	**94,011**
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings	17,457		17,457
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Housing Privatization Support	26,320		26,320
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	54,689		54,689
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance	81,254		81,254
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management	51,291		51,291
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous	364		364
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services	12,855		12,855
FH Ops Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities	56,685		56,685
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Navy And Marine Corps Total				**300,915**	**0**	**300,915**
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Construction Improvements	56,984		56,984
FH Con AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design	4,368		4,368
Family Housing Construction, Air Force Total				**61,352**	**0**	**61,352**
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings	31,690		31,690
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Housing Privatization Support	41,809		41,809
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	20,530		20,530

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance	85,469		85,469
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management	42,919		42,919
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous	1,745		1,745
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services	13,026		13,026
FH Ops AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities	37,241		37,241
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Air Force Total				**274,429**	**0**	**274,429**
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings	399		399
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings	20		20
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings	500		500
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	11,044		11,044
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	40,984		40,984
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance	800		800
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance	349		349
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management	388		388
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services	32		32
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities	174		174
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities	367		367
FH Ops DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities	4,100		4,100
Family Housing Operation And Maintenance, Defense-Wide Total				**59,157**	**0**	**59,157**
FHIF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Program Expenses	3,258		3,258
DoD Family Housing Improvement Fund Total				**3,258**	**0**	**3,258**
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Closure, Army	Base Realignment and Closure	14,499	10,000	24,499
Base Realignment and Closure—Army Total				**14,499**	**10,000**	**24,499**

BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Closure, Navy	Base Realignment & Closure	110,606	15,000	125,606
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–100: Planning, Design and Management	4,604		4,604
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–101: Various Locations	10,461		10,461
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–138: NAS Brunswick, ME	557		557
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–157: MCSA Kansas City, MO	100		100
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA	4,648		4,648
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DON–84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg AP	3,397		3,397
	Base Realignment and Closure—Navy Total			**134,373**	**15,000**	**149,373**
BRAC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	DoD BRAC Activities—Air Force	56,365		56,365
	Base Realignment and Closure—Air Force Total			**56,365**	**0**	**56,365**
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Worldwide	Air Force	0	–29,300	–29,300
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Worldwide	Army	0	–25,000	–25,000
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Worldwide	Defense-Wide	0	–60,577	–60,577
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Worldwide	Navy	0	–87,699	–87,699
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Worldwide	HAP	0	–25,000	–25,000
PYS	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Worldwide	NSIP	0	–30,000	–30,000
	Prior Year Savings Total			**0**	**–257,576**	**–257,576**
	Total, Military Construction			**7,444,056**	**249,944**	**7,694,000**

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Army	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ERI: Planning and Design	18,900		18,900

SEC. 4602. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Military Construction, Army Total				**18,900**	**0**	**18,900**
Navy	ICELAND	Keflavik	ERI: P–8A Aircraft Rinse Rack	5,000		5,000
Navy	ICELAND	Keflavik	ERI: P–8A Hangar Upgrade	14,600		14,600
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ERI: Planning and Design	1,800		1,800
Military Construction, Navy Total				**21,400**	**0**	**21,400**
AF	BULGARIA	Graf Ignatievo	ERI: Construct Sq Ops/Operational Alert Fac	3,800		3,800
AF	BULGARIA	Graf Ignatievo	ERI: Fighter Ramp Extension	7,000		7,000
AF	BULGARIA	Graf Ignatievo	ERI: Upgrade Munitions Storage Area	2,600		2,600
AF	DJIBOUTI	Chabelley Airfield	OCO: Construct Chabelley Access Road	3,600		3,600
AF	DJIBOUTI	Chabelley Airfield	OCO: Construct Parking Apron and Taxiway	6,900		6,900
AF	ESTONIA	Amari AB	ERI: Construct Bulk Fuel Storage	6,500		6,500
AF	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	ERI: Construct High Cap Trim Pad & Hush House	1,000		1,000
AF	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	ERI: F/A–22 Low Observable/Comp Repair Fac	12,000		12,000
AF	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	ERI: F/A–22 Upgrade Infrastructure/Comm/Util	1,600		1,600
AF	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	ERI: Upgrade Hardened Aircraft Shelters	2,700		2,700
AF	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	ERI: Upgrade Munitions Storage Doors	1,400		1,400
AF	LITHUANIA	Siauliai	ERI: Munitions Storage	3,000		3,000
AF	POLAND	Lask AB	ERI: Construct Squadron Operations Facility	4,100		4,100
AF	POLAND	Powidz AB	ERI: Construct Squadron Operations Facility	4,100		4,100
AF	ROMANIA	Campia Turzii	ERI: Construct Munitions Storage Area	3,000		3,000
AF	ROMANIA	Campia Turzii	ERI: Construct Squadron Operations Facility	3,400		3,400
AF	ROMANIA	Campia Turzii	ERI: Construct Two-Bay Hangar	6,100		6,100
AF	ROMANIA	Campia Turzii	ERI: Extend Parking Aprons	6,000		6,000

AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	CTP: Planning and Design	9,000	–449	8,551
AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	OCO: Planning and Design	940		940
	Military Construction, Air Force Total			**88,740**	**–449**	**88,291**
Def-Wide	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ERI: Unspecified Minor Construction	5,000		5,000
	Military Construction, Defense-Wide Total			**5,000**	**0**	**5,000**
	Total, Military Construction			**134,040**	**–449**	**133,591**

SEC. 4603. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS.

SEC. 4603. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FOR BASE REQUIREMENTS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Agreement
Navy	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier	OCO: Medical/Dental Facility	37,409		37,409
Navy	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	1,000		1,000
	Military Construction, Navy Total			**38,409**	**0**	**38,409**
	Total, Military Construction			**38,409**	**0**	**38,409**

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 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Discretionary Summary By Appropriation			
Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies			
Appropriation Summary:			
Energy Programs			
Nuclear Energy	151,876	–15,260	136,616
Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
National nuclear security administration:			
Weapons activities	9,243,147	316,000	9,559,147
Defense nuclear nonproliferation	1,807,916	94,000	1,901,916
Naval reactors	1,420,120	0	1,420,120
Federal salaries and expenses	412,817	–40,000	372,817
Total, National nuclear security administration	**12,884,000**	**370,000**	**13,254,000**
Environmental and other defense activities:			
Defense environmental cleanup	5,382,050	–92,100	5,289,950
Other defense activities	791,552	9,000	800,552
Total, Environmental & other defense activities	**6,173,602**	**–83,100**	**6,090,502**
Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities	**19,057,602**	**286,900**	**19,344,502**
Total, Discretionary Funding	**19,209,478**	**271,640**	**19,481,118**
Nuclear Energy			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security	129,303		129,303
Idaho operations and maintenance	7,313		7,313

Consent Based Siting	15,260	–15,260	0
Denial of funds for defense-only repository		[–15,260]	
Total, Nuclear Energy	**151,876**	**–15,260**	**136,616**
Weapons Activities			
Directed stockpile work			
Life extension programs			
B61 Life extension program	616,079		616,079
W76 Life extension program	222,880		222,880
W88 Alt 370	281,129		281,129
W80–4 Life extension program	220,253	21,000	241,253
Mitigation of schedule risk		[21,000]	
Total, Life extension programs	**1,340,341**	**21,000**	**1,361,341**
Stockpile systems			
B61 Stockpile systems	57,313		57,313
W76 Stockpile systems	38,604		38,604
W78 Stockpile systems	56,413		56,413
W80 Stockpile systems	64,631		64,631
B83 Stockpile systems	41,659		41,659
W87 Stockpile systems	81,982		81,982
W88 Stockpile systems	103,074		103,074
Total, Stockpile systems	**443,676**	**0**	**443,676**
Weapons dismantlement and disposition			
Operations and maintenance	68,984	–14,000	54,984
Denial of dismantlement acceleration		[–14,000]	
Stockpile services			
Production support	457,043		457,043
Research and development support	34,187		34,187
R&D certification and safety	156,481	46,000	202,481

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Stockpile Responsiveness Program and technology maturation efforts		[46,000]	
Management, technology, and production	251,978		251,978
Total, Stockpile services	**899,689**	**46,000**	**945,689**
Nuclear material commodities			
Uranium sustainment	20,988		20,988
Plutonium sustainment	184,970	6,000	190,970
Mitigation of schedule risk for meeting statutory pit production requirements		[6,000]	
Tritium sustainment	109,787		109,787
Domestic uranium enrichment	50,000		50,000
Strategic materials sustainment	212,092		212,092
Total, Nuclear material commodities	**577,837**	**6,000**	**583,837**
Total, Directed stockpile work	**3,330,527**	**59,000**	**3,389,527**
Research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E)			
Science			
Advanced certification	58,000		58,000
Primary assessment technologies	99,000	12,000	111,000
Support to Prototype Nuclear Weapons for Intelligence Estimates program		[12,000]	
Dynamic materials properties	106,000		106,000
Advanced radiography	50,500		50,500
Secondary assessment technologies	76,000		76,000
Academic alliances and partnerships	52,484		52,484
Total, Science	**441,984**	**12,000**	**453,984**
Engineering			
Enhanced surety	37,196	16,000	53,196

Stockpile Responsiveness Program and technology maturation efforts		[16,000]	
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology	16,958		16,958
Nuclear survivability	43,105	4,000	47,105
Improve planning and coordination on strategic radiation-hardened microsystems		[4,000]	
Enhanced surveillance	42,228		42,228
Total, Engineering	**139,487**	**20,000**	**159,487**
Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield			
Ignition	75,432	–5,000	70,432
Program decrease		[–5,000]	
Support of other stockpile programs	23,363		23,363
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support	68,696		68,696
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion	5,616		5,616
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas	9,492		9,492
Facility operations and target production	340,360	–4,000	336,360
Program decrease		[–4,000]	
Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield	**522,959**	**–9,000**	**513,959**
Advanced simulation and computing	663,184	–7,000	656,184
Program decrease		[–7,000]	
Advanced manufacturing			
Additive manufacturing	12,000		12,000
Component manufacturing development	46,583	31,000	77,583
Stockpile Responsiveness Program and technology maturation efforts		[31,000]	
Processing technology development	28,522		28,522
Total, Advanced manufacturing	**87,105**	**31,000**	**118,105**
Total, RDT&E	**1,854,719**	**47,000**	**1,901,719**
Infrastructure and operations (formerly RTBF)			
Operating			
Operations of facilities			

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Kansas City Plant	101,000		101,000
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	70,500		70,500
Los Alamos National Laboratory	196,500		196,500
Nevada Test Site	92,500		92,500
Pantex	55,000		55,000
Sandia National Laboratory	118,000		118,000
Savannah River Site	83,500		83,500
Y–12 National security complex	107,000		107,000
Total, Operations of facilities	**824,000**	**0**	**824,000**
Safety and environmental operations	110,000		110,000
Maintenance and repair of facilities	294,000	30,000	324,000
Address high-priority preventative maintenance		[30,000]	
Recapitalization:			
Infrastructure and safety	554,643	120,000	674,643
Address high-priority deferred maintenance		[120,000]	
Capability based investment	112,639		112,639
Total, Recapitalization	**667,282**	**120,000**	**787,282**
Construction:			
17–D–640, U1a Complex Enhancements Project, NNSS	11,500		11,500
17–D–630 Electrical Infrastructure Upgrades, LLNL	25,000		25,000
16–D–515 Albuquerque complex upgrades project	15,047		15,047
15–D–613 Emergency Operations Center, Y–12	2,000		2,000
15–D–302, TA–55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL	21,455		21,455

07–D–220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL	17,053		17,053
06–D–141 PED/Construction, UPF Y–12, Oak Ridge, TN	575,000		575,000
04–D–125—04 RLUOB equipment installation	159,615		159,615
Total, Construction	**826,670**	**0**	**826,670**
Total, Infrastructure and operations	**2,721,952**	**150,000**	**2,871,952**
Secure transportation asset			
Operations and equipment	179,132		179,132
Program direction	103,600		103,600
Total, Secure transportation asset	**282,732**	**0**	**282,732**
Defense nuclear security			
Operations and maintenance	657,133	60,000	717,133
Support to physical security infrastructure recapitalization and CSTART		[60,000]	
Construction:			
14–D–710 Device assembly facility argus installation project, NV	13,000		13,000
Total, Defense nuclear security	**670,133**	**60,000**	**730,133**
Information technology and cybersecurity	176,592		176,592
Legacy contractor pensions	248,492		248,492
Rescission of prior year balances	–42,000		–42,000
Total, Weapons Activities	**9,243,147**	**316,000**	**9,559,147**
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation			
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs			
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D			
Global material security	337,108	–5,000	332,108
Program decrease		[–5,000]	
Material management and minimization	341,094		341,094
Nonproliferation and arms control	124,703		124,703
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D	393,922	24,000	417,922

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Acceleration of low-yield detection experiments		[4,000]	
Nuclear detection technology and new challenges such as 3D printing		[20,000]	
Low Enriched Uranium R&D for Naval Reactors	0	5,000	5,000
Low Enriched Uranium R&D for Naval Reactors		[5,000]	
Nonproliferation Construction:			
99–D–143 Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, SRS	270,000	70,000	340,000
Increase to support construction		[70,000]	
Total, Nonproliferation construction	**270,000**	**70,000**	**340,000**
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs	**1,466,827**	**94,000**	**1,560,827**
Legacy contractor pensions	83,208		83,208
Nuclear counterterrorism and incident response program	271,881		271,881
Rescission of prior year balances	–14,000		–14,000
Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation	**1,807,916**	**94,000**	**1,901,916**
Naval Reactors			
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure	449,682		449,682
Naval reactors development	437,338		437,338
Ohio replacement reactor systems development	213,700		213,700
S8G Prototype refueling	124,000		124,000
Program direction	47,100		47,100
Construction:			
17–D–911, BL Fire System Upgrade	1,400		1,400
15–D–904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3	700		700
15–D–902 KS Engineroom team trainer facility	33,300		33,300

14–D–901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF	100,000		100,000
10-D–903, Security upgrades, KAPL	12,900		12,900
Total, Construction	**148,300**	**0**	**148,300**
Total, Naval Reactors	**1,420,120**	**0**	**1,420,120**
Federal Salaries And Expenses			
Program direction	412,817	–40,000	372,817
Program decrease		[–40,000]	
Total, Office Of The Administrator	**412,817**	**–40,000**	**372,817**
Defense Environmental Cleanup			
Closure sites:			
Closure sites administration	9,389		9,389
Hanford site:			
River corridor and other cleanup operations	69,755	45,000	114,755
Acceleration of priority programs		[45,000]	
Central plateau remediation	620,869	8,000	628,869
Acceleration of priority programs		[8,000]	
Richland community and regulatory support	14,701		14,701
Construction:			
15–D–401 Containerized sludge removal annex, RL	11,486		11,486
Total, Hanford site	**716,811**	**53,000**	**769,811**
Idaho National Laboratory:			
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition	359,088		359,088
Idaho community and regulatory support	3,000		3,000
Total, Idaho National Laboratory	**362,088**	**0**	**362,088**
Los Alamos National Laboratory			

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
EMLA cleanup activities	185,606		185,606
EMLA community and regulatory support	3,394		3,394
Total, Los Alamos National Laboratory	**189,000**	**0**	**189,000**
NNSA sites			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory	1,396		1,396
Separations Process Research Unit	3,685		3,685
Nevada	62,176		62,176
Sandia National Laboratories	4,130		4,130
Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites	**71,387**	**0**	**71,387**
Oak Ridge Reservation:			
OR Nuclear facility D & D			
OR Nuclear facility D & D	93,851		93,851
Construction:			
14–D–403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility	5,100		5,100
Total, OR Nuclear facility D & D	**98,951**	**0**	**98,951**
U233 Disposition Program	37,311		37,311
OR cleanup and disposition	54,557		54,557
OR reservation community and regulatory support	4,400		4,400
Oak Ridge technology development	3,000		3,000
Total, Oak Ridge Reservation	**198,219**	**0**	**198,219**
Office of River Protection:			
Waste treatment and immobilization plant			
WTP operations	3,000		3,000

15–D–409 Low activity waste pretreatment system, ORP	73,000		73,000
01–D–416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction	690,000		690,000
Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant	**766,000**	**0**	**766,000**
Tank farm activities			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	721,456		721,456
Total, Tank farm activities	**721,456**	**0**	**721,456**
Total, Office of River protection	**1,487,456**	**0**	**1,487,456**
Savannah River sites:			
Nuclear Material Management	311,062		311,062
Environmental Cleanup	152,504		152,504
SR community and regulatory support	11,249		11,249
Radioactive liquid tank waste:			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition	645,332		645,332
Construction:			
15–D–402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6, SRS	7,577		7,577
17–D–401—Saltstone Disposal Unit #7	9,729		9,729
05–D–405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River Site	160,000		160,000
Total, Construction	**177,306**	**0**	**177,306**
Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste	**822,638**	**0**	**822,638**
Total, Savannah River site	**1,297,453**	**0**	**1,297,453**
Waste Isolation Pilot Plant			
Operations and maintenance	257,188		257,188
Construction:			
15–D–411 Safety significant confinement ventilation system, WIPP	2,532		2,532
15–D–412 Exhaust shaft, WIPP	2,533		2,533
Total, Construction	**5,065**	**0**	**5,065**
Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant	**262,253**	**0**	**262,253**

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2017 Request	House Change	House Authorized
Program direction	290,050		290,050
Program support	14,979		14,979
Safeguards and Security	255,973		255,973
Technology development	30,000	10,000	40,000
NAS study on technology development, acceleration of priority efforts		[10,000]	
Infrastructure recapitalization	41,892		41,892
Defense Uranium enrichment D&D	155,100	–155,100	0
Ahead of need		[–155,100]	
Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup	**5,382,050**	**–92,100**	**5,289,950**
Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup	**5,382,050**	**–92,100**	**5,289,950**
Other Defense Activities			
Environment, health, safety and security			
Environment, health, safety and security	130,693		130,693
Program direction	66,519		66,519
Total, Environment, Health, safety and security	**197,212**	**0**	**197,212**
Independent enterprise assessments			
Independent enterprise assessments	24,580		24,580
Program direction	51,893		51,893
Total, Independent enterprise assessments	**76,473**	**0**	**76,473**
Specialized security activities	237,912	9,000	246,912
IT infrastructure and red teaming		[9,000]	

Office of Legacy Management			
Legacy management	140,306		140,306
Program direction	14,014		14,014
Total, Office of Legacy Management	**154,320**	**0**	**154,320**
Defense-related activities			
Defense related administrative support			
Chief financial officer	23,642		23,642
Chief information officer	93,074		93,074
Project management oversight and assessments	3,000		3,000
Total, Defense related administrative support	**119,716**	**0**	**119,716**
Office of hearings and appeals	5,919		5,919
Subtotal, Other defense activities	**791,552**	**9,000**	**800,552**
Total, Other Defense Activities	**791,552**	**9,000**	**800,552**

DIVISION E—MILITARY JUSTICE

OVERVIEW

The committee remains dedicated to ensuring the military justice system is a just, efficient and effective system that helps maintain good order and discipline in the Armed Forces. The committee recognizes the significant changes that have been made to individual segments of the military justice system over the past 5 years. However, the provisions contained in this Act, informed by the valuable work of the Military Justice Working Group, represent the first comprehensive revision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice in decades. The committee believes these revisions would promote fairness, improve efficiency, and increase the functionality of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The committee recognizes the importance of maintaining a military justice system that is fair to both service members and victims. To that end, provisions are included that would clarify the procedures for appointment of individuals to assume the rights of certain victims; create the opportunity for all parties, including victims, to provide additional input on disposition decisions at the preliminary hearing stage; and allow all victims access to records of trial. In addition, provisions are included that would promote fairness by standardizing court-martial panel sizes and the number required to convict or sentence an accused; requiring defense counsel in capital cases to be learned in the law applicable to capital cases; and expanding the types of cases eligible for automatic appeal. Transparency would be enhanced by providing for public access to court documents. Finally, unitary sentencing in favor of offense-based sentencing would be eliminated, a change which will improve visibility over sentencing data.

The committee is also committed to improving the efficiency of the military justice system. Therefore, provisions are included that would establish a military judge-alone special court-martial, an additional disposition option with confinement limited to 6 months and no punitive discharge. In addition, the military departments would be authorized to establish a military magistrates program, with magistrates authorized to preside over certain pre-referral matters and, with the consent of the parties, at the proposed judge-alone special court-martials. Finally, the post-trial process would be streamlined by provisions that would eliminate redundant post-trial paperwork and require an entry of judgment by the military judge to mark the end of a general or special court-martial.

Finally, the committee recognizes the need to improve the functionality of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. Several of the provisions would help enhance functionality by consolidating several forms of misconduct currently addressed by Executive Order into specific punitive articles; authorizing the President to designate lesser included offenses within certain statutory criteria; and amending the statute of limitations for child-abuse offenses, fraudulent enlistment, and cases in which DNA testing implicates an individual. Finally, new enumerated offenses would be established, including offenses concerning retaliation; fraudulent use of credit and debit cards; prohibited activities with a military recruit

or trainee by a person in a position of special trust; and an offense concerning Government computers.

TITLE LX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Section 6001—Definitions

This section would make technical amendments to article 1 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice concerning the definitions of "military judge" and "judge advocate".

Section 6002—Clarification of Persons Subject to UCMJ While on Inactive-Duty Training

This section would amend section 802 of title 10, United States Code (article 2 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to clarify jurisdiction over Reserve Component members performing periods of inactive-duty training. The amendment would provide commanders clearer authority to address misconduct that takes place during periods incident to inactive-duty training, and during intervals between inactive-duty training on consecutive days.

Section 6003—Staff Judge Advocate Disqualification Due to Prior Involvement in Case

This section would amend section 806 of title 10, United States Code (article 6 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), which concerns the assignment for duty of judge advocates and the role of staff judge advocates and legal officers in military justice matters. Article 6(c) currently disqualifies military judges, trial and defense counsel, investigating officers, and panel members from later acting as a staff judge advocate or legal officer to any reviewing authority in a case in which they previously participated. The proposed amendments would expressly cover military magistrates when presiding, with the parties' consent, over cases referred to judge-alone special courts-martial, under article 19. The amendment also would revise the disqualification provision under article 6(c) to include appellate judges and counsel (including victims' counsel) who have participated previously in the same case or in any proceeding before a military judge (to include a military magistrate designated under article 19), preliminary hearing officer, or appellate court in the same case.

Section 6004—Conforming Amendment Relating to Military Magistrates

This section would amend section 806a of title 10, United States Code (article 6a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to align the statute with the changes proposed in article 19 and the proposed new article 26a, concerning military magistrates. The amendment would add "military magistrate" to the list of officials whose fitness to perform duties shall be subject to investigation and disposition under regulations prescribed by the President, consistent with Federal law concerning the investigation and disposition of matters relating to the fitness of Federal magistrate judges in the performance of their judicial duties.

Section 6005—Rights of Victim

This section would make amendments to the rights of victims under section 806b of title 10, United States Code (article 6b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)), that: clarify the procedure for appointment of individuals to assume the rights of a victim who is under 18 years of age, incompetent, incapacitated, or deceased; clarify the relationship between the rights provided to victims under the UCMJ and the exercise of disposition discretion under articles 30 and 34; and move the recently enacted provisions concerning defense counsel interviews of victims of sex-related offenses from article 46(b) into article 6b and would extend those provisions to victims of all offenses.

TITLE LXI—APPREHENSION AND RESTRAINT

Section 6101—Restraint of Persons Charged

This section would amend section 810 of title 10, United States Code (article 10 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)), concerning restraint of persons charged with offenses and the actions that must be taken by military commanders and convening authorities when persons subject to the UCMJ are held for trial by court-martial. This section would clarify the general provisions concerning restraint under article 10, and would incorporate into article 10, the requirement under article 33, for prompt forwarding of charges in cases involving pretrial confinement. This section would also expand the requirement for prompt forwarding to cover special courts-martial as well as general courts-martial, and would require the establishment of prompt processing time-frames in the Manual for Courts-Martial.

Section 6102—Modification of Prohibition of Confinement of Armed Forces Members With Enemy Prisoners and Certain Others

This section would amend section 812 of title 10, United States Code (article 12 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) to clarify that no member of the Armed Forces may be placed in confinement in immediate association with: (1) enemy prisoners of war; or (2) other individuals who are detained under the law of war, are foreign nationals, and are not members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

TITLE LXII—NON-JUDICIAL PUNISHMENT

Section 6201—Modification of Confinement as Non-Judicial Punishment

This section would amend non-judicial punishment under section 815 of title 10, United States Code (article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to eliminate punishment in the form of a diet consisting only of bread and water as an option, while retaining the remaining range of disciplinary measures.

TITLE LXIII—COURT-MARTIAL JURISDICTION

Section 6301—Courts-Martial Classified

This section would amend courts-martial classifications under section 816 of title 10, United States Code (article 16 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice). This section would establish standard panel sizes: 12 members in capital general courts-martial, 8 members in non-capital general courts-martial, and 4 members in special courts-martial. As amended, article 16 would include references to article 25a (addressing panel size in capital cases), article 25(d) (addressing the initial detailing of members by the convening authority), and article 29 (addressing the impaneling of members and the impact of excusals on panel composition). Article 16(c) would be amended to require a military judge to be detailed to all special courts-martial, in accordance with current practice. This section also would add the option of referral to a non-jury (judge-alone) special court-martial.

Section 6302—Jurisdiction of General Courts-Martial

This section would make conforming changes to section 818 of title 10, United States Code (article 18 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to align the statute with the revised descriptions of types of courts-martial under article 16. The amendments would also modify article 18 to specify the sexual offenses over which general courts-martial have exclusive jurisdiction.

Section 6303—Jurisdiction of Special Courts-Martial

This section would amend section 819 of title 10, United States Code (article 19 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to align the statute with proposed changes in article 16 regarding the composition of special courts-martial.

Section 6304—Summary Court-Martial as Non-Criminal Forum

This section would amend section 820 of title 10, United States Code (article 20 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to clarify the status of the summary court-martial as a non-criminal forum. This section would clarify that, because of its non-judicial nature, a summary court-martial is not a "criminal prosecution," within the traditional due process understanding of a criminal prosecution (i.e., presided over by a judicial officer, and where the accused has a right to counsel) and that a finding of guilty at a summary court-martial does not constitute a "criminal conviction."

TITLE LXIV—COMPOSITION OF COURTS-MARTIAL

Section 6401—Technical Amendment Relating to Persons Authorized To Convene General Courts-Martial

This section would make a technical amendment to section 822 of title 10, United States Code (article 22 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to reflect the current terminology for the title of an officer commanding a naval fleet.

Section 6402—Who May Serve on Courts-Martial; Detail of Members

This section would amend section 825 of title 10, United States Code (article 25 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to expand the opportunity for service on a court-martial panel by permitting the detail of enlisted personnel as panel members without requiring a specific request from the accused. This section would also require that the convening authority detail a sufficient number of members for impanelment.

Section 6403—Number of Court-Martial Members in Capital Cases

This section would amend section 825a of title 10, United States Code (article 25a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to establish a standard panel size of 12 members in capital cases.

Section 6404—Detailing, Qualifications, etc. of Military Judges

This section would amend section 826 of title 10, United States Code (article 26 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to conform to the proposed amendments to article 16 to ensure a military judge is detailed to every general and special court-martial; require the Judge Advocates General select military judges based on statutory criteria and an evaluation of their individual education, training, experience, and judicial temperament; provide for minimum tour length for military judges; expressly authorize cross-service detailing of military judges; codify the position of chief trial judge; and remove the phrase "or his designee" from article 26.

Section 6405—Qualifications of Trial Counsel and Defense Counsel

This section would modify section 827 of title 10, United States Code (article 27 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to broaden the disqualification provision to include appellate judges who have participated previously in the same case; extend the qualification requirement to any assistant defense counsel detailed to a general court-martial; require any defense counsel or assistant defense counsel detailed to a special court-martial to be qualified under article 27(b); and require at least one defense counsel detailed to a capital case to be learned in such cases.

Section 6406—Assembly and Impaneling of Members; Detail of New Members and Military Judges

This section would modify section 829 of title 10, United States Code (article 29 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to clarify the function of assembly in general and special courts-martial and describe the limited situations in which a member may be absent or excused after assembly; require the military judge to impanel the number of members required; provide for the detail on new members if the membership on the panel is reduced below stated thresholds; address the detailing of a new military judge when the military judge is unable to proceed as a result of disability; and establish the procedure for presenting the prior trial proceedings to the newly detailed members or judge.

Section 6407—Military Magistrates

This section would create a new section, section 826a of title 10, United States Code (article 26a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that would set forth minimum qualifications under which the Judge Advocates General could, if so authorized under regulations of the Secretary concerned, certify military magistrates who could preside over proceedings when designated by a military judge.

TITLE LXV—PRE-TRIAL PROCEDURE

Section 6501—Charges and Specifications

This section would amend section 830 of title 10, United States Code (article 30 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to improve the functionality of the statute by restructuring it into three subsections and removing the requirement to take "immediate steps" to dispose of charges and specifications, instead requiring the proper authority to, as soon as practicable, determine what disposition should be made.

Section 6502—Preliminary Hearing Required Before Referral to General Court-Martial

This section would amend section 832 of title 10, United States Code (article 32 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice). This section would be restructured to clarify the current law concerning the requirement for and the conduct of preliminary hearings before referral of charges and specifications to general courts-martial for trial.

Section 6503—Disposition Guidance

This section would amend section 833 of title 10, United States Code (article 33 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)) to require the establishment and maintenance of non-binding guidance regarding factors that commanders, convening authorities, staff judge advocates, and judge advocates should take into account when exercising their duties with respect to disposition of charges and specifications in the interest of justice and discipline under articles 30 and 34 of the UCMJ.

Section 6504—Advice to Convening Authority Before Referral for Trial

This section would amend section 834 of title 10, United States Code, (article 34 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to clarify ambiguities in the existing language, to require judge advocate consultation before referral of charges to special courts-martial, and to expressly tie the staff judge advocate's pre-referral disposition recommendation in general courts-martial to the "in the interest of justice and discipline" standard for disposition of charges and specifications under article 30.

Section 6505—Service of Charges and Commencement of Trial

This section would amend section 835 of title 10, United States Code (article 35 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to clarify the accused's right to object, in peacetime, to the commencement of trial before the completion of a statutory period following service of charges; 3 days for special courts-martial and 5 days for general courts-martial.

TITLE LXVI—TRIAL PROCEDURE

Section 6601—Duties of Assistant Defense Counsel

This section would amend section 838 of title 10, United States Code (article 38 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to conform it to the amendments to article 27 concerning the requirement for all defense counsel in general and special courts-martial to be qualified under article 27(b).

Section 6602—Sessions

This section would amend section 839 of title 10, United States Code (article 39 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to clarify that military judges preside at arraignments.

Section 6603—Technical Amendments Relating to Continuances

This section would amend section 840 of title 10, United States Code (article 40 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to clarify that a summary court-martial is the only exception to the general rule that the authority to grant continuances is vested solely in the military judge.

Section 6604—Conforming Amendments Relating to Challenges

This section would amend section 841 of title 10, United States Code, (article 41 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to conform the section to the amendments made to article 16 regarding standard panel sizes in general and special courts-martial.

Section 6605—Statute of Limitations

This section would amend section 843 of title 10, United States Code (article 43 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to extend the statute of limitations applicable to child abuse offenses from the current 5 years or the life of the child, whichever is longer, to 10 years or the life of the child, whichever is longer; extend the statute of limitations on fraudulent enlistment under article 83 from the current 5 years to length of enlistment/appointment, or 5 years, whichever is longer; and extend the statute of limitations if DNA testing implicates an identified person in the commission of an offense punishable by confinement for more than 1 year.

Section 6606—Former Jeopardy

This section would amend section 844 of title 10, United States Code (article 44 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), by clarifying the circumstances under which jeopardy attaches, and to align it with Federal civilian standards concerning double jeopardy.

Section 6607—Pleas of the Accused

This section would amend section 845 of title 10, United States Code (article 45 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to permit an accused to plead guilty in a capital case when the death penalty is not a mandatorily prescribed punishment and establish a harmless error rule if the variance does not materially prejudice the substantial rights of the accused.

Section 6608—Contempt

This section would amend section 848 of title 10, United States Code (article 48 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to clarify those who may exercise contempt authority; transfer the review function for contempt punishment from the convening authority to the appropriate appellate court; and clarify the appeal process.

Section 6609—Depositions

This section would amend section 849 of title 10, United States Code (article 49 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to better align deposition practice with the authority to issue and enforce subpoenas for witnesses; ensure parties at a deposition are represented by detailed counsel; and clarify the prohibition on the use of depositions in capital cases by the Government.

Section 6610—Admissibility of Sworn Testimony by Audiotape or Videotape from Records of Courts of Inquiry

This section would amend section 850 of title 10, United States Code (article 50 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to permit sworn testimony from a court of inquiry to be played from audiovisual recording if the deposed witness is unavailable at trial and the evidence is otherwise admissible under the rules of evidence.

Section 6611—Conforming Amendment Relating to Defense of Lack of Mental Responsibility

This section would amend section 850a of title 10, United States Code (article 50a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to conform to the proposed changes in article 16 to eliminate special courts-martial without a military judge.

Section 6612—Voting and Rulings

This section would amend section 851 of title 10, United States Code (article 51 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to remove reference to courts-martial without a military judge to conform with the amended language in article 16.

Section 6613—Votes Required for Conviction, Sentencing, and Other Matters

This section would amend section 852 of title 10, United States Code (article 52 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)), to standardize the percentage of votes required by a court-martial panel for conviction and for a specific sentence at 75 percent for non-capital cases. In conjunction with standard panel sizes under article 16 of the UCMJ, this would standardize the percentage of

votes required in all non-capital cases, and continue to require a unanimous vote on both findings and sentence in capital cases.

Section 6614—Plea Agreements

This section would create section 853a of title 10, United States Code (article 53a of the Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)). The new section would contain the statutory authority for plea agreements, which was previously contained in article 60 of the UCMJ. The section would provide rules for the construction and negotiation of plea agreements, allowing the convening authority and the accused to enter into binding agreements regarding the sentence that may be adjudged at a court-martial.

Section 6615—Record of Trial

This section would amend section 854 of title 10, United States Code (article 54 of the Uniformed Code of Military Justice), to require the court reporter, instead of the military judge or prosecutor, to certify the record of trial; require a complete record of trial in any general or special court-martial if the sentence includes death, dismissal, discharge, or confinement or forfeitures for more than 6 months; and provide all victims who testify at a court-martial with access to records of trial, eliminating the distinction in the statute that currently provides such access only to victims of sex-related offenses under article 120.

TITLE LXVII—SENTENCES

Section 6701—Sentencing

This section would amend section 856 of title 10, United States Code (article 56 of the Uniformed Code of Military Justice), to: clarify the factors that must be taken into consideration by a court-martial when fashioning an appropriate sentence; require offense-based sentencing for confinement and fines, rather than unitary sentencing, in all general and special courts-martial; incorporate article 56a (Sentence of confinement for life without eligibility for parole) into article 56 without substantive change; and allow the U.S. Government to appeal a sentence if it violates the law or the sentence is plainly unreasonable.

Section 6701A—Minimum Confinement Period Required for Conviction of Certain Sex-Related Offenses Committed by Members of the Armed Forces

This section would further amend subsection (b)(1) of section 856 of title 10, United States Code (article 56 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), as amended by section 6701, to establish a minimum period of confinement for those convicted of certain sex-related offenses.

Section 6702—Effective Date of Sentences

This section would amend section 857 of title 10, United States Code (article 57 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to consolidate portions of articles 57, 57a, and 71, so that the effective date for all punishments that could be adjudged at a court-martial are

addressed in a single article. In addition, this section would remove the distinction between when a sentence becomes effective and when it is ordered executed. With the exception of death and punitive discharges, sentences would be effective by operation of law, without any additional approval, upon entry of judgment.

Section 6703—Sentence of Reduction in Enlisted Grade

This section would amend section 858a of title 10, United States Code (article 58a of the Uniformed Code of Military Justice), to conform the section to the proposed changes to post-trial procedure under article 60 and the entry of judgment under the proposed article 60c.

TITLE LXVIII—POST-TRIAL PROCEDURE AND REVIEW OF COURTS-MARTIAL

Section 6801—Post-Trial Processing in General and Special Courts-Martial

This section would amend section 860 of title 10, United States Code (article 60 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to provide for the distribution of the trial results and to authorize the filing of post-trial motions with the military judge in general and special courts-martial. The convening authority's role in post-trial processing would be moved to new article 60a and 60b.

Section 6802—Limited Authority To Act on Sentence in Specified Post-Trial Circumstances

This section would create a new section 860a of title 10, United States Code (article 60a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), which would retain current limitations on the convening authority's post-trial actions in most general and special courts-martial, subject to a limited suspension authority that would be permissible only if specifically recommended by the military judge. In addition, this section would contain a revised authority related to accused who provide substantial assistance to the Government; would allow the accused and a victim of the offense to submit matters to the convening authority for consideration; and would require the decision of the convening authority to be forwarded to the military judge so that the entry of judgment can be updated to reflect any changes to the sentence.

Section 6803—Post-Trial Actions in Summary Courts-Martial and Certain General and Special Courts-Martial

This section would create a new section 860b of title 10, United States Code (article 60b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that would retain and clarify the convening authority's post-trial authorities and responsibilities with respect to the findings and sentence of those courts-martial not covered by the new article 60a, namely summary courts-martial and certain general and special courts-martial which, because of the offenses charged and the sentence adjudged, would not be covered under article 60a.

Section 6804—Entry of Judgment

This section would create a new section 860c of title 10, United States Code (article 60c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that would establish the entry of judgment, which would require the military judge to enter the judgment of the court-martial into the record in all general and special courts-martial, and would mark the conclusion of trial proceedings.

Section 6805—Waiver of Right To Appeal and Withdrawal of Appeal

This section would amend section 861 of title 10, United States Code (article 61 of the Uniformed Code of Military Justice), to conform the section to the changes proposed in articles 60, 65, and 69 concerning post-trial processing.

Section 6806—Appeal by the United States

This section would amend section 862 of title 10, United States Code (article 62 of the Uniformed Code of Military Justice), to authorize an appeal by the Government when, upon defense motion, the military judge sets aside a panel's finding of guilty because of legally insufficient evidence. In addition, this section would extend interlocutory appeals to all general and special courts-martial.

Section 6807—Rehearings

This section would amend section 863 of title 10, United States Code (article 63 of the Uniformed Code of Military Justice), to remove the sentence limitation at a rehearing in cases in which an accused changes the plea from guilty to not guilty, or otherwise fails to comply with the terms of a pre-trial agreement; or a sentence is set aside based on a Government appeal.

Section 6808—Judge Advocate Review of Finding of Guilty in Summary Court-Martial

This section would amend section 864 of title 10, United States Code (article 64 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to make the provision apply only to the initial review of summary courts-martial.

Section 6809—Transmittal and Review of Records

This section would amend section 865 of title 10, United States Code (article 65 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to: require the record of trial in all general and special courts-martial in which there is a finding of guilty to be transmitted to the Office of the Judge Advocate General; outline the processing of reviews conducted by the Office of the Judge Advocate General, including those cases not eligible for appellate review by the Court of Criminal Appeals; and outline review procedures if the accused waives the right to appellate review or withdraws an appeal.

Section 6810—Courts of Criminal Appeals

This section would amend section 866 of title 10, United States Code (article 66 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to: re-

quire the President to establish minimum tour lengths for appellate military judges; establish discretionary review by the Court of Criminal Appeals in cases that are not eligible for an appeal as of right; provide standards of review for appeals; and codify the authority of Courts of criminal Appeals to remand cases and order rehearings.

Section 6811—Review by Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces

This section would amend section 867 of title 10, United States Code (article 67 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to conform the section to proposed changes in article 60 and article 66. In addition, the amendment would provide for notification by a Judge Advocate General to the other Judge Advocates General prior to certifying a case for review by the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

Section 6812—Supreme Court Review

This section would make a technical amendment to section 867 of title 10, United States Code (article 67 of the Uniformed Code of Military Justice) to add "United States'" before "Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces'".

Section 6813—Review by Judge Advocate General

This section would amend section 869 of title 10, United States Code (article 69 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to allow the accused a 1-year period in which to file for review under article 69 in the Office of the Judge Advocate General, extendable to 3 years for good cause. A review under this provision could consider issues of newly discovered evidence, fraud on the court, lack of jurisdiction over the accused or the offense, error prejudicial to the substantial rights of the accused, or the appropriateness of the sentence.

Section 6814—Appellate Defense Counsel in Death Penalty Cases

This section would amend section 870 of title 10, United States Code (article 70 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to require, to the greatest extent practicable, at least one appellate defense counsel to be learned in the law applicable to capital cases in which the death penalty was adjudged at trial.

Section 6815—Authority for Hearing on Vacation of Suspension of Sentence to be Conducted by Qualified Judge Advocate

This section would amend section 872 of title 10, United States Code (article 72 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to authorize a special court-martial convening authority to detail a judge advocate qualified under article 27(b) to preside at the vacation hearing, which must be held before a suspended sentence can be vacated.

Section 6816—Extension of Time for Petition for New Trial

This section would amend section 873 of title 10, United States Code (article 73 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to in-

crease the time period for an accused to petition for a new trial from 2 years to 3 years.

Section 6817—Restoration

This section would amend section 875 of title 10, United States Code (article 75 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to require the President to establish regulations governing when an accused may receive pay and allowances while pending a rehearing.

Section 6818—Leave Requirements Pending Review of Certain Court-Martial Convictions

This section would amend section 876a of title 10, United States Code (article 76a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to conform to the proposed changes to article 60 (actions by the convening authority) and article 60c (entry of judgment).

TITLE LXIX—PUNITIVE ARTICLES

Section 6901—Reorganization of Punitive Articles

This section would reorganize the punitive articles by transferring and re-designating 14 articles within subchapter X of the Uniform Code of Military Justice to more closely group related offenses.

Section 6902—Conviction of Offense Charged, Lesser Included Offenses, and Attempts

This section would amend section 879 of title 10, United States Code (article 79 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)), to authorize the President to designate an authoritative, but non-exhaustive, list of lesser included offenses for each punitive article of the UCMJ in addition to judicially determined lesser included offenses.

Section 6903—Soliciting Commission of Offenses

This section would amend title 882 of section 10, United States Code (article 82 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to consolidate the general solicitation offense under article 134 into article 82.

Section 6904—Malingering

This section would amend section 883 of title 10, United States Code (article 83 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to relocate article 115 (malingering) to this section, and make a technical correction.

Section 6905—Breach of Medical Quarantine

This section would amend section 884 of title 10, United States Code (article 84 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the offense of "Quarantine: medical, breaking" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6906—Missing Movement; Jumping From Vessel

This section will amend section 887 of title 10, United States Code (article 87 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to incorporate the current article 134 offense of "Jumping from vessel into the water" into the existing article 87 offense of "Missing movement".

Section 6907—Offenses Against Correctional Custody and Restriction

This section would create a new section 887b of title 10, United States Code (article 87b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move and consolidate the offenses of "Restriction, breaking" and "Correctional custody-offenses against" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6908—Disrespect Toward Superior Commissioned Officer; Assault of Superior Commissioned Officer

This section would amend section 889 of title 10, United States Code (article 89 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move and consolidate the closely related offense of "Assaulting a superior commissioned officer" under article 90 to the existing article 89 "Disrespect toward a superior commissioned officer".

Section 6909—Willfully Disobeying Superior Commissioned Officer

This section would amend section 890 of title 10, United States Code (article 90 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to transfer the offense of "Assaulting a superior commissioned officer" to article 89 and focus the article as amended on the willful disobedience of a lawful command of a superior commissioned officer.

Section 6910—Prohibited Activities With Military Recruit or Trainee by Person in Position of Special Trust

This section would create a new section 893a of title 10, United States Code (article 93a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), that would specifically address accountability for sexual misconduct committed by recruiters and trainers during the various phases within the recruiting and basic military training environments.

Section 6911—Offenses by Sentinel or Lookout

This section would amend section 895 of title 10 of the United States Code (article 95 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the loitering portion of the offense of "Sentinel or lookout: offenses against or by" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6912—Disrespect Toward Sentinel or Lookout

This section would create a new section 895a of title 10, United States Code (article 95a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the disrespect portion of the offense of "Sentinel or lookout: offenses against or by" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6913—Release of Prisoner Without Authority; Drinking With Prisoner

This section would amend section 896 of title 10, United States Code (article 96 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the separate offense of "Drinking liquor with prisoner" currently under article 134 to this section.

Section 6914—Penalty for Acting as a Spy

This section would amend section 903 of title 10, United States Code (article 103 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)), as transferred and re-designated elsewhere in this Act, by replacing the mandatory death penalty currently required with a discretionary death penalty similar to that authorized under existing article 106a "Espionage" and for all other capital offenses under the UCMJ.

Section 6915—Public Records Offenses

This section would amend section 904 of title 10, United States Code (article 104 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the offense of "Public record: altering, concealing, removing, mutilating, obliterating, or destroying" from article 134 to this section and re-designating it "Public records offenses".

Section 6916—False or Unauthorized Pass Offenses

This section would create a new section 905a of title 10, United States Code (article 105a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the offense of "False or unauthorized pass offenses" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6917—Impersonation Offenses

This section would amend section 906 of title 10, United States Code (article 106 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the offense of "Impersonating a commissioned, warrant, noncommissioned, petty officer or agent or official" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6918—Insignia Offenses

This section would create a new section 906a of title 10, United States Code (article 106a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the offense of "Wearing unauthorized insignia, decoration, badge, ribbon, device, or lapel button" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6919—False Official Statements; False Swearing

This section would amend section 907 of title 10, United States Code (article 107 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move the offense of "False swearing" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6920—Parole Violation

This section would create a new section 907a of title 10, United States Code (article 107a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice),

and would move the offense of "Parole, violation of" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6921—Wrongful Taking, Opening, Etc. of Mail Matter

This section would create a new section 909a of title 10, United States Code (article 109a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Mail: taking, opening, secreting, destroying, or stealing" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6922—Improper Hazarding of Vessel or Aircraft

This section would amend section 910 of title 10, United States Code (article 110 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to prohibit improper hazarding of an aircraft in addition to the existing "Improper hazarding of vessel".

Section 6923—Leaving Scene of Vehicle Accident

This section would amend section 911 of title 10, United States Code (article 111 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice) and retitle the section "Leaving scene of accident". The amended section would move the offense of "Fleeing the scene of an accident" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6924—Drunkenness and Other Incapacitation Offenses

This section would amend section 912 of title 10, United States Code (article 112 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and retitle the section as "Drunkenness and other incapacitation offenses". This section would move the offenses of "Drunkenness-incapacitation for performance of duties through prior wrongful indulgence in intoxicating liquor or any drug" and "Drunk prisoner" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6925—Lower Blood Alcohol Content Limits for Conviction of Drunken or Reckless Operation of Vehicle, Aircraft, or Vessel

This section would amend section 913 of title 10, United States Code (article 113 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to align the blood alcohol limits in the offense to the prevailing legal standard in the United States.

Section 6926—Endangerment Offenses

This section would amend section 914 of title 10, United States Code (article 114 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to move three related offenses from article 134 to this section and re-designating the section "Endangerment offenses".

Section 6927—Communicating Threats

This section would amend section 915 of title 10, United States Code (article 115 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offenses of "threat, communicating," and "Threat or hoax designed or intended to cause panic or public fear" from article 134 to this re-designated section.

Section 6928—Technical Amendment Relating to Murder

This section would make a technical amendment to section 918 of title 10, United States Code (article 118 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), removing the term "forcible sodomy" because the crime of forcible sodomy is already contained in article 120 "Rape and sexual assault generally."

Section 6929—Child Endangerment

This section would create a new section 919b of title 10, United States Code (article 119b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Child endangerment" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6930—Deposit of Obscene Matter in the Mail

This section would amend section 920a of title 10, United States Code (article 120a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Mails: depositing or causing to be deposited obscene materials in" from article 134 to this re-designated section.

Section 6931—Fraudulent Use of Credit Cards, Debit Cards, and Other Access Devices

This section would create a new section 921a of title 10, United States Code (article 121a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to specifically address the misuse of credit cards, debit cards, and other electronic payment technology, also known as "access devices."

Section 6932—False Pretenses To Obtain Services

This section would create a new section 921b of title 10, United States Code (article 121b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "False pretenses, obtaining services under" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6933—Robbery

This section would amend section 922 of title 10, United States Code (article 122 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to remove the words "with the intent to steal" from the section, thereby eliminating the requirement to show that the accused intended to permanently deprive the victim of his property.

Section 6934—Receiving Stolen Property

This section would amend section 922a of title 10, United States Code (article 122a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Stolen property: knowingly receiving, buying, concealing" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6935—Offenses Concerning Government Computers

This section would amend section 923 of title 10, United States Code (article 123 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and redesignate it "Offenses concerning government computers." This section would create a new punitive article to address computer-re-

lated offenses where the gravity of the offense may make punishment under other offenses inappropriately low.

Section 6936—Bribery

This section would create a new section 924a of title 10, United States Code (article 124a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Bribery" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6937—Graft

This section would create a new section 924b of title 10, United States Code (article 124b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Graft" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6938—Kidnapping

This section would amend section 925 of title 10, United States Code (article 125 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Kidnapping" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6939—Arson; Burning Property with Intent to Defraud

This section would amend section 926 of title 10, United States Code (article 126 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Burning with intent to defraud" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6940—Assault

This section would amend section 928 of title 10, United States Code (article 128 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to establish a standard focused on the intent of the accused to commit bodily harm. This amended section would also move the offense of "Assault-with intent to commit murder, voluntary manslaughter, rape, robbery, sodomy, arson, burglary, or housebreaking" from article 134 to this section.

Section 6941—Burglary and Unlawful Entry

This section would amend section 929 of title 10, United States Code (article 129 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and retitle the section "Burglary; unlawful entry". The amended section would remove the common-law "personal dwelling" and "nighttime" elements; the offense of "Housebreaking" would be incorporated into article 129; and the offense of "Unlawful entry" would move from article 134 to this section.

Section 6942—Stalking

This section would amend section 930 of title 10, United States Code (article 130 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and redesignate the section as "Stalking". The amended section would update current law to address cyberstalking and threats to intimate partners.

Section 6943—Subornation of Perjury

This section would create a new section 931a of title 10, United States Code (article 131a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Perjury: subornation of" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6944—Obstructing Justice

This section would create a new section 931b of title 10, United States Code (article 131b of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Obstructing justice" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6945—Misprision of Serious Offense

This section would create a new section 931c of title 10, United States Code (article 131c of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Misprision of serious offense" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6946—Wrongful Refusal To Testify

This section would create a new section 931d of title 10, United States Code (article 131d of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Testify: wrongful refusal" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6947—Prevention of Authorized Seizure of Property

This section would create a new section 931e of title 10, United States Code (article 131e of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Seizure: destruction, removal, or disposal of property to prevent" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6948—Wrongful Interference With Adverse Administrative Proceeding

This section would create a new section 931g of title 10, United States Code (article 131g of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), and move the offense of "Wrongful interference with an adverse administrative proceeding" from article 134 to this new section.

Section 6949—Retaliation

This section would amend section 932 of title 10, United States Code (article 132 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to establish a new offense that prohibits retaliation.

Section 6950—Extraterritorial Application of Certain Offenses

This section would amend section 934 of title 10, United States Code (article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (the general article)), to cover all non-capital Federal crimes of general applicability under clause 3, regardless of where the Federal crime is committed.

Section 6951—Table of Sections

This section would amend the table of sections for the beginning of subchapter X of title 10, United States Code, to reflect all proposed new sections and proposed amendments to section headings.

TITLE LXX—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Section 7001—Technical Amendment Relating to Courts of Inquiry

This section would amend section 935 of title 10, United States Code (article 135 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to provide individuals employed by the Department of Homeland Security, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, the right to be designated as parties in interest when they have a direct interest in the subject of a court of inquiry convened under article 135, aligning their rights with those of Department of Defense employees.

Section 7002—Technical Amendment to Article 136

This section would make a technical amendment to section 936 of title 10, United States Code (article 136 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to remove from the section heading the authority to act as a notary, which is not provided for in the text of the statute.

Section 7003—Articles of Uniform Code of Military Justice To Be Explained to Officers Upon Commissioning

This section would amend section 937 of title 10, United States Code (article 137 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)), to require that officers, in addition to enlisted personnel, receive training on the UCMJ upon entry to service, and periodically thereafter. The amendment would also require specific military justice training for military commanders and convening authorities; require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe regulations for additional specialized training on the UCMJ for combatant commanders and commanders of combined commands; and require the Secretary of Defense to maintain an electronic version of the UCMJ and Manual for Court-Martial that would be updated periodically and made available on the Internet for review by service members and the public.

Section 7004—Military Justice Case Management; Data Collection and Accessibility

This section would create a new section 940a of title 10, United States Code (article 140a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), which would require the Secretary of Defense to prescribe uniform standards and criteria for case processing and management, military justice data collection, production and distribution of records of trial, and access to case information.

TITLE LXXI—MILITARY JUSTICE REVIEW PANEL AND ANNUAL REPORTS

Section 7101—Military Justice Review Panel

This section would amend section 946 of title 10, United States Code (article 146 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)), and re-title the section as "Military Justice Review Panel". The amended section would establish an independent panel of experts tasked to conduct a periodic evaluation of military justice practices and procedures on a regular basis that would replace the current UCMJ Panel.

Section 7102—Annual Reports

This section would create a new section 946a of title 10, United States Code (article 146a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), to compile the annual reports issued individually by the Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces, the Judge Advocates General, and the Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the Marine Corps into a single volume.

TITLE LXXII—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS AND EFFECTIVE DATES

Section 7201—Amendments to UCMJ Subchapter Tables of Sections

This section would make conforming amendments to the tables of sections for several subchapters of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).

Section 7202—Effective Dates

This section would establish the effective date of amendments contained in this division as 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

The Department of Defense requested legislation, in accordance with the program of the President, as illustrated by the correspondence set out below:

MARCH 10, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find a draft of proposed legislation, titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017", which the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress.

The purpose of each provision in the proposed bill is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. Included is a new Base Realignment and Closure legislative proposal, which responds to Congressional concerns regarding cost. The changes include requiring the Secretary to certify that BRAC will have the primary objec-

tive of eliminating excess capacity and reducing costs; emphasizing recommendations that yield net savings within five years; and limiting recommendations that take longer than 20 years to pay back. These and other revisions reflect discussions with Members and amendments to the legislation introduced in previous sessions of Congress.

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. HEDGER.

Enclosure: As Stated

MARCH 21, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017."

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. HEDGER.

Enclosure: As Stated

MARCH 29, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals relating to acquisition matters that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress. An executive summary outlines the overarching purposes of these proposals; the purpose of each proposal is also stated in the accompanying section-by section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. HEDGER.

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 1, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017".

Two of the proposals would allow the Secretary of the Army to enter into a multiyear contract for AH–64E Apache helicopters and a multiyear contract for UH–60M/HH–60M Black Hawk helicopters, respectively, for fiscal years 2017 through 2021. As required by section 2306b of title 10, United States Code, we have attached (1) reports containing preliminary findings of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)), together with the basis for such findings, and (2) confirmation by the USD(AT&L) that the preliminary findings were made after the completion of a cost analysis performed by the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, and that the analysis supports those preliminary findings.

The Department estimates one of the proposals (Authority for Use of Amounts Recovered for Damage to Government Property) would generate annual savings of up to $2 million across the Department. It al so would generate an annual PA YGO cost of $2 million because recoveries are no longer deposited into the Treasury, but are made available for obligation by the Department, increasing net outlays.

$millions

	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	5-year	10-year
Discretionary	.....	.....	−$2m	−$2m	−$2m	−$2m	−$2m	−$10m	−$20m
Mandatory	.....	.....	$2m	$2m	$2m	$2m	$2m	$10m	$20m

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to

the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

TRESSA GUENOV.

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 12, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of each proposal is stated in the accompanying section-by-section analysis. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017."

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. HEDGER.

Enclosure: As Stated

APRIL 14, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress. The purpose of these proposals is to effectuate the Administration's plan to close the detention facilities at the U.S. Naval Base in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. These proposals are submitted by the Department as a follow-on to the earlier transmittal of our request for enactment of proposed legislation titled the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017".

The Department is currently working with the Administration on additional legislative initiatives, which the Department hopes to transmit to Congress for its consideration in the coming weeks.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, to the presenting of these legislative proposals for your consideration and the consideration of Congress.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. HEDGER.

Enclosure: As Stated

COMMUNICATIONS FROM OTHER COMMITTEES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I am writing concerning H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

This legislation contains provisions within the Committee on Agriculture's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Agriculture has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Agriculture is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4909, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017." While the legislation does contain provisions within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee will not request a sequential referral so that it can proceed expeditiously to the House floor for consideration.

The Committee takes this action with the understanding that its jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered, and that the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as such legislation moves forward. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on such legislation and requests your support when such a request is made.

Finally, I would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding and ask that a copy of our exchange of letters be included in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4909 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

FRED UPTON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. FRED UPTON,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Energy and Commerce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Energy and Commerce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding with respect to H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. Thank you for consulting with the Committee on Education and the Workforce with regard to H.R. 4909 on those matters within the Committee's jurisdiction.

In the interest of expediting the House's consideration of H.R. 4909, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will forgo further consideration of this bill. However, I do so only with the understanding this procedural route will not be construed to prejudice my Committee's jurisdictional interest and prerogatives on this bill or any other similar legislation and will not be considered as precedent for consideration of matters of jurisdictional interest to my Committee in the future.

I respectfully request your support for the appointment of outside conferees from the Committee on Education and the Workforce should this bill or a similar bill be considered in a conference with the Senate. I also request you include our exchange of letters on this matter in the Committee Report on H.R. 4909 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JOHN KLINE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. JOHN KLINE,
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Education and the Workforce has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Education and the Workforce is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, which contains substantial matter that falls within the Rule X legislative jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I appreciate the cooperation that allowed us to work out mutually agreeable text on numerous matters prior to your markup.

Based on that cooperation and our associated understandings, the Foreign Affairs Committee will not seek a sequential referral or object to floor consideration of the bill text approved at your Committee markup. This decision in no way diminishes or alters the jurisdictional interests of the Foreign Affairs Committee in this bill, any subsequent amendments, or similar legislation. I request your support for the appointment of House Foreign Affairs conferees during any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

Finally, I respectfully request that you include this letter and your response in your committee report on the bill and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4909 on the House floor.

Sincerely,

EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. EDWARD R. ROYCE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write to you concerning H.R. 4909, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, which contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence ("the Committee"). The Committee recognizes the need for proceeding expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill. Therefore, I do not intend to request a sequential referral.

This waiver is conditional on our mutual understanding that my decision to forego Committee consideration of this legislation does not diminish or otherwise affect any future claim over the matters in the bill which fall within the Committee's jurisdiction, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging the Committee's jurisdictional interest will be placed into the committee report on H.R. 4909 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of this measure on the House floor.

I also intend to seek appointment of Committee members to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and request your support if such a request is made. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this and other matters between our respective committees.

Sincerely,

DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. DEVIN NUNES,
Chairman, Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Homeland Security in matters being considered in H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

I recognize the importance of H.R. 4909 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Homeland Security, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Homeland Security also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference on this or any related bill.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Homeland Security has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Homeland Security is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the Committee waives consideration of the bill.

The Committee on the Judiciary takes this action only with the understanding that the Committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made.

Finally, I would appreciate your placing this letter in the committee report on H.R. 4909 and in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4909 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. BOB GOODLATTE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on the Judiciary has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on the Judiciary is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write concerning H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. That bill, as ordered reported, contains provisions within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Natural Resources Committee, including those affecting public lands, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Corps, the Endangered Species Act, and historic preservation.

In the interest of permitting you to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this very important bill, I waive this committee's right to a sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that the Natural Resources Committee does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matter contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I also request that you urge the Speaker to name members of the Natural Resources committee to any conference committee to consider such provisions.

Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 4909 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you and your staff have worked regarding this matter and others between our respective committees, and congratulations on this significant achievement.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Natural Resources has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Natural Resources is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to you concerning the jurisdictional interest of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in matters being considered in H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017.

Our committee recognizes the importance of H.R. 4909 and the need for the legislation to move expeditiously. Therefore, while we have a valid claim to jurisdiction over the bill, I do not intend to request a sequential referral. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that nothing in this legislation or my decision to forego a sequential referral waives, reduces, or otherwise affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and that a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest will be included in the Committee Report and as part of the Congressional Record during consideration of this bill by the House.

The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform also asks that you support our request to be conferees on the provisions over which we have jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. JASON CHAFFETZ,
Chairman, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I am writing to you concerning the bill H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. There are certain provisions in the legislation which fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Small Business pursuant to Rule X(q) of the House of Representatives.

In the interest of permitting the Committee on Armed Services to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive the right of the Committee on Small Business to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving consideration of the bill, the Committee on Small Business does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X(q) jurisdiction, including future bills that the Committee on Armed Services will consider.

I request that you urge the Speaker to appoint members of this Committee to any conference committee which is named to consider such provisions. Please place this letter into the committee report on H.R. 4909 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this issue and others between our respective committees. If you have any questions, please contact Jan Oliver, Chief Counsel to the Committee, at 202–225–3924.

Sincerely,

STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. STEVE CHABOT,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Small Business has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Small Business is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I am writing concerning H.R. 4909, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017," which your Committee ordered reported on April 28, 2016.

H.R. 4909 contains provisions within the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, April 28, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THORNBERRY: I write concerning H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as amended. There are certain provisions in the legislation that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This, of course, is conditional on our mutual understanding that forgoing consideration of the bill does not prejudice the Committee with respect to the appointment of conferees or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation that fall within the Committee's Rule X jurisdiction. I request you urge the Speaker to name members of the Committee to any conference committee named to consider such provisions.

Please place a copy of this letter and your response acknowledging our jurisdictional interest into the committee report on H.R. 4909 and into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. BILL SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, May 2, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I write to confirm our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. This legislation contains subject matter within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. However, in order to expedite floor consideration of this important legislation, the committee waives consideration of the bill.

The House Committee on Veterans Affairs takes this action only with the understanding that the committee's jurisdictional interests over this and similar legislation are in no way diminished or altered.

The committee also reserves the right to seek appointment to any House-Senate conference on this legislation and requests your support if such a request is made. Finally, I would appreciate your including this letter in the Congressional Record during consideration of H.R. 4909 on the House Floor. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

JEFF MILLER,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. JEFF MILLER,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has valid jurisdictional claims to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, April 29, 2016.

Hon. WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. THORNBERRY: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 4909, the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017." This legislation contains provisions that fall within the Rule X jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

In the interest of permitting your committee to proceed expeditiously to floor consideration of this important bill, I am willing to waive my committee's right to sequential referral. I do so with the understanding that by waiving formal consideration of the bill, the Committee on Ways and Means does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill which fall within its Rule X jurisdiction. I request that you urge the Speaker to name members of my committee to any conference committee that is convened to consider such provisions.

Please include this letter and your response confirming our understanding in the committee report on H.R. 4909, and in the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 3, 2016.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. I agree that the Committee on Ways and Means has a valid jurisdictional claim to certain provisions in this important legislation, and I am most appreciative of your decision not to request a referral in the interest of expediting consideration of the bill. I agree that by foregoing a sequential referral, the Committee on Ways and Means is not waiving its jurisdiction. Further, this exchange of letters will be included in the committee report on the bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. "MAC" THORNBERRY,
Chairman.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office and submitted pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE

MAY 4, 2016.

Hon. MAC THORNBERRY,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has completed a preliminary estimate of the direct spending and revenue effects of H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as ordered reported by the House Committee on Armed Services on April 28, 2016. This preliminary estimate is based on legislative language for H.R. 4909 that was provided to CBO on May 2, 2016. CBO's complete cost estimate for H.R. 4909, including discretionary costs, will be provided shortly.

H.R. 4909 would make several changes to military retirement and health care benefits. The bill also would make changes to the national defense stockpile, reduce unobligated balances in the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, and require women to register with the Selective Service. Several other provisions would change direct spending by an insignificant amount over the 2017–2026 period. On a preliminary basis, CBO estimates that in total enacting H.R. 4909 would reduce net direct spending by $206 million over the 2017–2026 period (see attached table).

The bill also would make numerous changes to the military justice system that CBO expects would increase the amount of fines and forfeitures of pay that are assessed at military courts-martial by less than $500,000 over the next 10 years. Those fines are classified as revenues. Because enacting the bill would affect direct spending and revenues, pay-as-you-go procedures apply.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is David Newman.

Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Attachment.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE OF THE IMPACT OF H.R. 4909 ON DIRECT SPENDING

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—											
	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2017–2021	2017–2026
Acquisition Workforce Fund												
Budget Authority	−475	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	−475	−475
Estimated Outlays	−113	−120	14	36	20	5	0	0	0	0	−163	−158
Special Survivor Indemnity Allowance												
Estimated Budget Authority	0	240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	240
Estimated Outlays	0	220	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	240
Stockpile Disposal/Purchases												
Estimated Budget Authority	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−75	−150
Estimated Outlays	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−15	−75	−150
Combat Related Special Compensation												
Estimated Budget Authority	0	−1	−3	−6	−8	−11	−14	−17	−20	−23	−18	−103
Estimated Outlays	0	−1	−3	−5	−8	−12	−14	−16	−20	−23	−17	−102
Selective Service Registration												
Estimated Budget Authority	0	−2	−3	−4	−5	−7	−7	−9	−9	−10	−15	−56
Estimated Outlays	0	−1	−2	−3	−4	−5	−7	−8	−9	−9	−11	−50
Survivor Benefit Plan												
Estimated Budget Authority	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	5	13
Estimated Outlays	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	5	13
Tricare Reform												
Estimated Budget Authority	0	*	*	*	−2	−2	−2	−2	−2	−2	−2	−12
Estimated Outlays	0	*	*	*	−2	−2	−2	−2	−2	−2	−2	−12
Stockpile Recycling/Qualifying												
Estimated Budget Authority	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	10
Estimated Outlays	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	10
Medals of Honor												
Estimated Budget Authority	1	1	*	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	3	3
Estimated Outlays	1	1	*	*	1	*	*	*	*	*	3	3
Total Changes in Direct Spending												
Estimated Budget Authority	−487	225	−19	−23	−27	−33	−36	−40	−43	−47	−332	−530
Estimated Outlays	−125	86	16	15	−6	−27	−36	−38	−43	−46	−15	−206

Notes: Several other provisions of H.R. 4909 would affect direct spending by an insignificant amount. Provisions to modify the military justice system would increase revenues by an insignificant amount.
Details may not sum to totals because of rounding; * = less than $500,000.

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

Pursuant to clause (3)(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–344):

(1) This legislation does not provide budget authority subject to an allocation made pursuant to section 302(b) of Public Law 93–344;

(2) The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) Estimate included in this report pursuant to clause (3)(c) (3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives contains CBO's projection of how this legislation will affect the levels of budget authority, budget outlays, revenues, and tax expenditures for fiscal year 2017 and for the ensuing 5 fiscal years; and

(3) The CBO Estimate does not identify any new budget authority for assistance to state and local governments by this measure at the time that this report was filed.

COMMITTEE COST ESTIMATE

Pursuant to clause (3)(d)(2)(B) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Congressional Budget Office Estimate included in this report satisfies the requirement for the committee to include an estimate by the committee of the costs incurred in carrying out this bill.

ADVISORY OF EARMARKS

The committee finds that H.R. 4909, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, as reported, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS

With respect to clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, this legislation results from hearings and other oversight activities conducted by the committee pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X and are reflected in the body of this report.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

With respect to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the general goal and objective of H.R. 4909 is to meet the national security needs of a nation at war, while preparing our warfighters for the threats of tomorrow, wherever and whenever they might emerge. This legislation would meet that goal while taking steps to reform the Department of Defense and balance the responsibilities of fiscal stewardship incumbent upon Congress in a time of economic stress. Only by providing for the common defense in an efficient, fiscally responsible manner can the Nation address our national security challenges.

The committee notes with concern that the disparity between declining resources and proliferating threats has forced military commanders to make difficult decisions that have weakened the force.

Often commanders have been forced to defer maintenance, reduce training, and delay procurement of replacement systems in order to provide those deployed with the training and capabilities they need. The committee recognizes and concurs that the military is obligated to support forward deployed forces; however, doing so at the expense of training and equipping forces that are preparing to deploy is a dangerous and ultimately unsustainable strategy. The committee believes that our service men and women should not be sent out on missions for which they are not fully prepared. Cuts in personnel, training, maintenance, and procurement are leading to that result.

In an attempt to reverse this trend, the bill would provide $566.50 billion to support core Department of Defense requirements, an increase of $18.00 billion over the budget request. The bill further provides Overseas Contingency Operations funding for ongoing operations of nearly $35.70 billion, which will support contingency operations at the current operational tempo until April 2017. The total funding authorized for national defense in the bill is the same as the level proposed by the budget request. The Chairman's expectation is that a new President will assess the national security landscape and submit a supplemental budget request for Overseas Contingency Operations for the remainder of fiscal year 2017.

While readiness shortfalls will take many years to correct, the bill halts and begins to reverse the drawdown of military end strength. The bill also fully funds over $2.50 billion in unfunded training and maintenance. The committee recognizes that military readiness cannot be improved solely through personnel and maintenance. Platforms deployed well beyond their intended useful life, inadequate supplies of high-demand assets, outdated technology, and equipment that is too expensive to maintain all exacerbate the readiness crisis. The bill makes key investments to accelerate the transition to new, more effective, and more reliable platforms, and provides additional high-demand assets to reduce the stress on the force. The fourth area of investment to improve readiness is facilities. The bill supports 90 percent of requirements for facilities sustainment and 88 percent of requirements for facilities restoration and modernization. This is an increase of 19 percent above the budget request in each category. This funding will be used to restore and maintain real property, ranging from barracks to hangars, and runways to hospitals. Each of these investments was identified as a critical requirement by the military services for which the services have been accepting risk.

Where possible, the bill also cuts excessive or wasteful expenditures and rededicates those resources to urgent needs. Even with a vigorous re-prioritization of programs, the committee was unable to address the readiness crisis and simultaneously provide a full year of contingency funding. The committee intends other reforms contained in this bill to incrementally restore strength to the force and agility over the long term, while providing a solid foundation for future administrations to address national security needs. Indeed, the committee took steps to reform the acquisition system, military healthcare system, the commissary system, the Uniform Code of Military Justice, defense strategic planning, joint duty assignments, and the structure of the military leadership of the De-

partment of Defense. The committee's intent is not only to procure services and equipment more cost-effectively, but also to increase the flexibility of the institution to address emerging threats and to put the military on a sustainable fiscal footing while ensuring the military services can recruit and retain a highly qualified, all-volunteer force.

STATEMENT OF FEDERAL MANDATES

Pursuant to section 423 of Public Law 104–4, this legislation contains no Federal mandates with respect to state, local, and tribal governments, nor with respect to the private sector. Similarly, the bill provides no Federal intergovernmental mandates.

FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE STATEMENT

Consistent with the requirements of section 5(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the committee finds that the functions of the proposed advisory committee authorized in the bill are not currently being nor could they be performed by one or more agencies, an advisory committee already in existence or by enlarging the mandate of an existing advisory committee.

APPLICABILITY TO THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The committee finds that this legislation does not relate to the terms and conditions of employment or access to public services or accommodations within the meaning of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act (Public Law 104–1).

DUPLICATION OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS

No provision of H.R. 4909 establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program, a program that was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111–139, or a program related to a program identified in the most recent Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance.

DISCLOSURE OF DIRECTED RULE MAKINGS

The committee estimates that H.R. 4909 requires seven instances of directed rule makings.

COMMITTEE VOTES

In accordance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, record votes were taken with respect to the committee's consideration of H.R. 4909. The record of these votes is contained in the following pages.

The committee ordered H.R. 4909 to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60–2, a quorum being present.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 1

H.R. 4909

On Duckworth Log 057
Description: Treat F-35 Block 4 modernization as an MDAP.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster				Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**20**	**41**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 2

H.R. 4909

On Fleming Log 181

Description: Prohibits funds for executive order mandates from 2013 and 2015 related to green energy benchmarks, climate change boards, councils, and working groups and inclusion of climate change review throughout DOD operations, acquisition, logistics, and planning.

April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney			
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster				Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally							
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	**29**	**30**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 3

H.R. 4909

On Conaway Log 279
Description: Prohibits DOD from using FY17 funding for the construction or refurbishment of a biofuels facility, subject to a national security waiver.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney			
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**29**	**32**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 4

H.R. 4909

On Rogers Log 188
Description: Requires the Army to transfer excess .45 caliber M1911A1 pistols to the Civilian Marksmanship Program (CMP).
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney			
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**40**	**21**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 5

H.R. 4909

On Bridenstine Log 25r1
Description: Prohibits housing unaccompanied alien children on US military installations located inside the US.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney			
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**35**	**26**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 6

H.R. 4909

On Bishop Log 248

Description: Strikes section 2841 that standardizes expirations dates for military land withdrawals and adds new section that makes withdrawals of public lands for military ranges in several states permanent.

April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney			
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**28**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 7

H.R. 4909

On Bishop Log 184

Description: Provides limited authority for Air Force to control public access to certain parcels of public lands on Utah Test and Training Range for next generation weapons testing; provides for federal-state land exchange and clarifies rights of way on certain roads.

April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney			
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Roll Call Vote Total:	**35**	**26**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 8

H.R. 4909

On Bridenstine Log 028
Description: Delists the Lesser Prairie Chicken from the Endangered Species Act for a period of 5 years to allow states to implement range-wide conservation plan. Delists the American Burying Beetle from the ESA.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**29**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 9

H.R. 4909

On Coffman Log 194
Description: Amendment to include the Military LAND Act.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner				Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**28**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 10

H.R. 4909

On Hunter Log 224

Description: Expands the military selective service requirements to female citizens and residents of the U.S. between the ages of 18 and 26.

April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**32**	**30**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 11

H.R. 4909

On Speier Log 99
Description: Enables service members to receive abortion services at defense medical facilities if they personally provide funding.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**25**	**37**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 12

H.R. 4909

On Larsen Log 158.
Description: Strikes section 1656, which relates to the development of a space-based missile defense layer.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 13

H.R. 4909

On Langevin Log 249
Description: Requires MDA to successfully test the redesigned kill vehicle before a final production decision is made (except for limited long-lead items).
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 14

H.R. 4909

On Aguilar Log 006
Description: Modification of CBO review of cost estimates for nuclear weapons.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**26**	**36**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 15

H.R. 4909

On Garamendi Log 204r1
Description: Amends the report required in section 1612.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**37**	**25**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 16

H.R. 4909

On Conaway Log 221r2
Description: Substitute to Walz Log 262 to strike section 311. This amendment says no USDA CCC funds shall be spent on biofuels.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**31**	**31**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 17

H.R. 4909

On Thornberry Log 337
Description: Perfecting amendment to Smith Log 301.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**34**	**28**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 18

H.R. 4909

On Russell Log 232r2
Description: Addresses protection of civil rights and disabilities. April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**29**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 19

H.R. 4909

On Kline Log 013
Description: Exempt DOD and NNSA from EO 13673, "Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces" Rule.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez		x	
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas		x	
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke		x	
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai		x	
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**34**	**28**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 20

H.R. 4909

On Gabbard Log 282r2
Description: This amendment strikes the language in section 1221, which modifies and extends the authority to provide assistance to vetted Syrian opposition.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith		x	
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez			
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady		x	
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis		x	
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin		x	
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen		x	
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper		x	
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo		x	
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney		x	
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi		x	
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson		x	
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro		x	
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth		x	
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters		x	
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey		x	
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz		x	
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross		x	
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego		x	
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham		x	
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford		x	
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton		x	
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar		x	
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**9**	**52**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 21

H.R. 4909

On Tsongas Log 069
Description: Strikes section 2864 in the underlying bill related to the Greater Sage Grouse.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson		x		Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook		x		Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves		x					
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik		x					
Ms. McSally		x					
Mr. Knight		x					
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**27**	**35**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 22

H.R. 4909

On Walz Log 262
Description: Strikes section 311, to prohibit DOD from using Department of Agriculture funds for alternative fuel procurement.
April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry		x		Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones		x		Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes		x		Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller		x		Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson		x		Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo		x		Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop		x		Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner		x		Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline		x		Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers		x		Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks		x		Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster		x		Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway		x		Ms. Speier	x		
Mr. Lamborn		x		Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman		x		Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter		x		Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming		x		Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman		x		Ms. Gabbard	x		
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler		x		Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck		x		Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott		x		Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks		x		Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent		x		Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine		x		Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup		x		Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski		x					
Mr. Byrne		x					
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke		x					
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell		x					
Roll Call Vote Total:	**33**	**29**	**0**				

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

114th Congress

ROLL CALL VOTE NO. 23

H.R. 4909

On Final Passage

Description: On motion by Mr. Forbes to report the bill H.R. 4909 as amended, favorably to the House, with a recommendation that it do pass.

April 27, 2016.

Member	Aye	No	Present	Member	Aye	No	Present
Mr. Thornberry	x			Mr. Smith	x		
Mr. Jones	x			Ms. Sanchez	x		
Mr. Forbes	x			Mr. Brady	x		
Mr. Miller	x			Mrs. Davis	x		
Mr. Wilson	x			Mr. Langevin	x		
Mr. LoBiondo	x			Mr. Larsen	x		
Mr. Bishop	x			Mr. Cooper	x		
Mr. Turner	x			Ms. Bordallo	x		
Mr. Kline	x			Mr. Courtney	x		
Mr. Rogers	x			Ms. Tsongas	x		
Mr. Franks	x			Mr. Garamendi	x		
Mr. Shuster	x			Mr. Johnson	x		
Mr. Conaway	x			Ms. Speier		x	
Mr. Lamborn	x			Mr. Castro	x		
Mr. Wittman	x			Ms. Duckworth	x		
Mr. Hunter	x			Mr. Peters	x		
Dr. Fleming	x			Mr. Veasey	x		
Mr. Coffman	x			Ms. Gabbard		x	
Mr. Gibson	x			Mr. Walz	x		
Mrs. Hartzler	x			Mr. O'Rourke	x		
Dr. Heck	x			Mr. Norcross	x		
Mr. Scott	x			Mr. Gallego	x		
Mr. Brooks	x			Mr. Takai	x		
Mr. Nugent	x			Ms. Graham	x		
Mr. Cook	x			Mr. Ashford	x		
Mr. Bridenstine	x			Mr. Moulton	x		
Dr. Wenstrup	x			Mr. Aguilar	x		
Mrs. Walorski	x						
Mr. Byrne	x						
Mr. Graves	x						
Mr. Zinke	x						
Ms. Stefanik	x						
Ms. McSally	x						
Mr. Knight	x						
Mr. MacArthur							
Mr. Russell	x						
Roll Call Vote Total:	**60**	**2**	**0**				

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY THE BILL, AS REPORTED

The committee has taken steps to make available the analysis of changes in existing law made by the bill, as required by clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and will make the analysis available as soon as possible.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN GARAMENDI'S ADDITIONAL VIEWS FOR H.R. 4909, THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

I congratulate Chairman Thornberry and Ranking Member Smith on the passage of the committee mark for the 55th National Defense Authorization Act. I deeply appreciate the effort my colleagues on the House Armed Services Committee put into preparing a committee mark that aims to ensure that the United States has a smart and strong national defense, and I believe it helps advance our ability to defend this nation. However, there are several areas of concern that I have with this bill, and I look forward to our continued work to improve this critically important legislation.

Despite some significant reservations, I supported the overall bill because of the bipartisan effort of this committee to address a number of issues vital to national security. I commend the committee's decision to fully fund the maintenance and modernization programs that sustain our nation's essential Air Mobility and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance missions, as well as the robust investment in Department of Defense's cyber operations and programs. In addition, I am pleased that the committee acknowledged the need for specific justifications and estimated costs for a number of upcoming nuclear weapons programs, including the Long Range Standoff Weapon (LRSO), Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD), and the modification of various aircraft to carry the B61–12 gravity bomb. I also applaud the committee for adopting my amendment that provides DOD with the authority to quickly acquire innovative commercial items from non-traditional sources and stay ahead of cybersecurity threats. Finally, I am pleased that the committee voted in favor of my amendment to advance efforts to establish a nationwide backup to GPS. GPS represents a single point of failure for both military and civilian users, putting our telecommunication, financial, energy, and navigation systems at risk. We must address this vulnerability as quickly as possible.

However, I have deep concerns about the way this bill's funding is structured. By transferring $18 billion of Overseas Contingency Operations to base budget requirements, it circumvents the Bipartisan Budget Act that was negotiated in good faith last year. As currently structured, funding for our overseas operations will run out of money halfway through the fiscal year, forcing the next president and the next Congress to produce a high-stakes supplemental funding bill next spring to keep our troops funded. This is not a responsible approach.

I am also deeply troubled by the nearly $10 billion this bill spends on nuclear weapons activities—$317 million above the President's request. By doing so, we are setting ourselves on a path to spend a trillion dollars over the next 25 to 30 years to upgrade

our nuclear arsenal and accelerate a new nuclear arms race. The new weapons systems we are developing, including the LRSO and GBSD, are incredibly expensive and destabilizing. While I am pleased that this bill requires DOD to fully justify why it believes these weapons are needed and explain to the public how they enhance, rather than jeopardize, our national security, I also believe that this $317 million is better spent on improving our troops' readiness with equipment and training.

Beyond the excessive spending on nuclear weapons, I remain concerned by the bill's reauthorization of the Iraq and Syria Train & Equip programs without proper oversight. Despite the billions of dollars we've spent on these two programs, they have proven to have limited effectiveness and their legality is questionable without an updated Authorization for Use of Military Force. We've been conducting nearly two years of fighting against ISIL, and it's time we do our Constitutional duty to vote on an appropriate new AUMF that authorizes extended military action in Syria and Iraq.

Our job is about choices. As members of the House Armed Services Committee, these choices determine whether or not our men and women in uniform have the support and resources they need to defend this nation. Are we willing to sacrifice our troops' readiness for programs that are wasteful at best and dangerously destabilizing at worst? These are the questions we must ask ourselves as we move the NDAA to the floor and through the conference process. As the representative for servicemembers at Travis Air Force Base, in Fairfield, California, which carries out a critical Air Mobility mission, and Beale Air Force Base near Marysville, which conducts a vital Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance mission, I look forward to working with my colleagues to shape an NDAA that provides for a smart and strong defense.

JOHN GARAMENDI.

CONGRESSMEN STEVE RUSSELL'S ADDITIONAL VIEWS FOR H.R. 4909, THE FISCAL YEAR 2017 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

As a combat veteran, I am concerned regarding the adoption of an amendment in the committee markup that would require females to register for the Selective Service. There have been no studies on this issue, or any research into possible implications to the welfare of our American warfighters, American families, and our nation. As such, I am against such a policy and also have serious moral reservations about such a policy.

It is my view that prior to adoption of such a major policy change with enormous impact to our readiness and the defense of our republic, we must have at least the most basic of research into this matter conducted. This is a major shift in policy, and it must be done in a measured, standards-based process. As a combat veteran, I understand the sacrifices of service, and I hope that this, along with a broader discussion on Selective Service and mobilization in general, will get the close study they deserve prior to becoming law.

STEVE RUSSELL.