

114TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session* }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
114-49

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION  
ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016**

**REPORT**

[TO ACCOMPANY S. 1376]

ON

TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 FOR  
MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND  
FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, TO PRESCRIBE MILITARY PER-  
SONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER  
PURPOSES

TOGETHER WITH

**ADDITIONAL VIEWS**

—————  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
UNITED STATES SENATE



MAY 19, 2015.—Ordered to be printed

—————  
U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN McCAIN, Arizona, *Chairman*

JAMES M. INHOFE, Oklahoma	JACK REED, Rhode Island
JEFF SESSIONS, Alabama	BILL NELSON, Florida
ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi	CLAIRE McCASKILL, Missouri
KELLY AYOTTE, New Hampshire	JOE MANCHIN III, West Virginia
DEB FISCHER, Nebraska	JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire
TOM COTTON, Arkansas	KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York
MIKE ROUNDS, South Dakota	RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, Connecticut
JONI ERNST, Iowa	JOE DONNELLY, Indiana
THOM TILLIS, North Carolina	MAZIE K. HIRONO, Hawaii
DAN SULLIVAN, Alaska	TIM Kaine, Virginia
MIKE LEE, Utah	ANGUS S. KING, Jr., Maine
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina	MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
TED CRUZ, Texas	

CHRISTIAN BROSE, *Staff Director*

ELIZABETH L. KING, *Minority Staff Director*

## CONTENTS

Purpose of the Bill .....	1
Committee Overview .....	2
Summary of Discretionary Authorizations and Budget Authority Im- plication .....	4
Budgetary Effects of This Act (Sec. 4) .....	5
DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS .....	7
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT .....	7
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....	7
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101) .....	7
Subtitle B—Navy Programs .....	7
Amendment to cost limitation baseline for CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program (sec. 111) .....	7
Limitation on availability of funds for USS <i>John F. Kennedy</i> (CVN- 79) (sec. 112) .....	8
Limitation on availability of funds for USS <i>Enterprise</i> (CVN-80) (sec. 113) .....	8
Modification of CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program (sec. 114) .....	9
Limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship (sec. 115) .....	10
Extension and modification of limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship (sec. 116) .....	11
Construction of additional <i>Arleigh Burke</i> destroyer (sec. 117) .....	11
Fleet replenishment oiler program (sec. 118) .....	11
Reporting requirement for <i>Ohio</i> -class replacement submarine pro- gram (sec. 119) .....	12
Subtitle C—Air Force Programs .....	12
Limitations on retirement of B-1, B-2, and B-52 bomber aircraft (sec. 131) .....	12
Limitation on retirement of Air Force fighter aircraft (sec. 132) .....	12
Limitation on availability of funds for F-35A aircraft procurement (sec. 133) .....	14
Prohibition on retirement of A-10 aircraft (sec. 134) .....	15
Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of EC-130H Com- pass Call aircraft (sec. 135) .....	16
Limitation on transfer of C-130 aircraft (sec. 136) .....	17
Limitation on use of funds for T-1A Jayhawk aircraft (sec. 137) .....	17
Restriction on retirement of the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), EC-130H Compass Call, and Airborne Early Warning and Control (AWACS) aircraft (sec. 138) .....	18
Sense of the Congress regarding the OCONUS basing of the F- 35A aircraft (sec. 139) .....	18
Sense of Congress on F-16 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar upgrade (sec. 140) .....	18
Subtitle D—Defense-Wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters .....	18
Report on Army and Marine Corps modernization plan for small arms (sec. 151) .....	18
Budget Items .....	18
Army .....	18
Common missile warning system .....	18
PAC-3 Missile Segment Enhancement .....	18
Army Tactical Missile System .....	19
Improved recovery vehicle .....	19
Precision sniper rifle .....	19
Compact semi-automatic sniper system .....	19
Common remotely operated weapons station .....	19

IV

	Page
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT—Continued	
Budget Items—Continued	
Army—Continued	
Handgun .....	19
Sniper rifle modifications .....	20
Items less than \$5.0 million .....	20
Army ammunition decrease .....	20
Transportable Tactical Command Communications .....	20
Prophet Ground System .....	20
Counterfire radars .....	20
Global Combat Support System—Army .....	21
Automated data processing equipment .....	21
Non-system training devices .....	21
Navy .....	21
F/A-18E/F aircraft procurement .....	21
F-35C .....	21
F-35B .....	21
AV-8 series aircraft .....	22
F-18 series kill chain enhancements .....	22
V-22 Osprey .....	22
Tomahawk .....	22
Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile .....	23
Ordnance support equipment .....	23
Virginia-class submarines .....	23
Arleigh Burke-class destroyers .....	24
Afloat Forward Staging Base .....	24
Amphibious Assault Ship (LHA) Replacement .....	24
LX(R) .....	25
Landing craft utility replacement .....	25
T-ATS(X) .....	25
Destroyer modernization .....	25
Littoral Combat Ship Mine Countermeasures Mission Module .....	25
Remote Minehunting System .....	26
Submarine towed arrays .....	26
Surface electronic warfare improvement program .....	26
Tube-launched, optically-tracked, wireless-guided missile .....	27
Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar .....	27
Air Force .....	27
F-35A .....	27
MQ-9 .....	27
F-15 capability upgrades .....	28
Budget request realignment .....	28
C-130H Propulsion System Enhancements .....	28
C-130H avionics modernization program .....	29
A-10 Munitions Buyback .....	29
Battlefield air operations kits .....	30
Air Force Network Procurements .....	30
Joint terminal attack controller training and rehearsal system simulators .....	30
Defense Wide .....	30
MC-12 .....	30
MQ-9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle .....	31
Items of Special Interest .....	31
Armored vehicle transmission industrial base .....	31
Army UH-60A to UH-60L conversions for the National Guard .....	32
Combat Logistics Fleet .....	32
Comptroller General of the United States review of the implementa- tion of recommendations from the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force .....	33
Comptroller General review of the CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program .....	34
Enhance cockpit displays to improve safety and mission effectiveness .....	35
Expeditionary Health Services Systems .....	35
F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program .....	35
Joint Standoff Weapon .....	37
Land mobile radio .....	37
Missile and munitions industrial base .....	37

	Page
TITLE I—PROCUREMENT—Continued	
Items of Special Interest—Continued	
Modernization for Light Armored Vehicles .....	37
Navy maritime security barriers .....	38
Navy training helicopters .....	38
Night Vision Reset .....	39
Patriot Product Improvement Future Lower Tier Sensor Alternatives	39
Route and area clearance mine protected vehicles .....	39
<i>San Antonio</i> -Class Amphibious Transport Dock program .....	40
Single-source providers of critical acquisition program components ....	40
Standoff precision guided weapons .....	40
Unmanned Undersea Vehicles .....	41
Vehicle occupant protection technology .....	42
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION .....	43
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....	43
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201) .....	43
Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations .....	43
Centers for science, technology, and engineering partnership (sec. 211) .....	43
Department of Defense technology offset program to build and maintain the military technological superiority of the United States (sec. 212) .....	44
Reauthorization of Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program (sec. 213) .....	46
Reauthorization of Global Research Watch Program (sec. 214) .....	46
Science and technology activities to support business systems information technology acquisition programs (sec. 215) .....	47
Expansion of eligibility for financial assistance under Department of Defense science, mathematics, and research for transformation program to include citizens of countries participating in the technical cooperation program (sec. 216) .....	48
Streamlining the Joint Federated Assurance Center (sec. 217) .....	49
Limitation on availability of funds for development of the Shallow Water Combat Submersible (sec. 218) .....	49
Limitation on availability of funds for distributed common ground system of the Army (sec. 219) .....	50
Limitation on availability of funds for Distributed Common Ground System of the United States Special Operations Command (sec. 220) .....	51
Subtitle C—Other Matters .....	51
Assessment of air-land mobile tactical communications and data network requirements and capabilities (sec. 231) .....	51
Study of field failures involving counterfeit electronic parts (sec. 232) .....	51
Demonstration of persistent close air support capabilities (sec. 233) ...	52
Airborne data link plan (sec. 234) .....	52
Report on the technology readiness levels of the technologies and capabilities critical to the Long Range Strike Bomber aircraft (sec. 235) .....	54
Budget Items .....	54
Army defense research sciences .....	54
High-performance computing modernization .....	55
Infantry support weapons .....	55
Integrated personnel and pay systems for Army and Air Force .....	55
Common infrared countermeasures .....	56
Aircraft survivability development .....	56
Joint Tactical Radio System .....	56
Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness and Safety .....	57
Stryker modification and improvement .....	57
Navy defense research sciences .....	57
Undersea warfare applied research .....	58
Capable manpower, enablers, and sea basing .....	58
Advanced submarine system development .....	58
USS <i>Gerald R. Ford</i> full ship shock trials .....	58
LX(R) .....	59
Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike System .....	59
Submarine tactical warfare systems development .....	59

	Page
TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION—Continued	
Budget Items—Continued	
F-35B/C engineering and manufacturing development .....	59
Submarine acoustic warfare development .....	59
Mk-48 ADCAP .....	60
Air Force defense research sciences .....	60
Nanostructured and biological materials .....	60
Long range strike—bomber .....	60
F-35A engineering and manufacturing development .....	60
KC-46 aerial refueling tanker aircraft program .....	61
F-15 capability upgrades .....	61
Budget request realignment .....	61
Logistics information technology .....	62
Applied research for the advancement of science and technology priorities .....	62
Multi-azimuth defense fast intercept round engagement system .....	62
Materials and biological technology .....	62
Science and technology analytic assessments .....	63
Joint capability technology demonstration .....	63
Network-centric warfare technology .....	63
Quick Reaction Special Projects .....	64
Advanced sensor application program .....	64
Corrosion control and prevention funding increase .....	64
Global Combat Support System—Joint Systems engineering .....	64
MQ-9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle .....	65
C-130 terrain following/terrain avoidance radar .....	65
Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance Payload Technology Improvements Program .....	66
Unmanned Combat Air System Demonstration and prototyping .....	66
Items of Special Interest .....	67
Advancement in radar technologies .....	67
Advancements in Antenna Research and Capabilities .....	67
Air Force seismic activity research .....	67
Conditions and Capabilities of the Undersea Warfare Test Capabilities .....	68
Cost estimate for a land-based electromagnetic railgun program .....	68
Database on Department of Defense research grants .....	69
Entrepreneurial sabbatical for Department of Defense laboratory scientists .....	69
Expedited approval for attendance at conferences in support of science and innovation activities of Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration .....	70
High Power Microwave Counter-electronics Capabilities .....	71
Improved turbine engine program .....	72
Improvised Explosive Device Detection Systems .....	72
Market survey of active protection systems .....	72
Medical evaluation of Anthropomorphic data on vehicle blast testing ..	73
National Defense Education Program .....	73
Training Range Upgrades .....	73
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	75
Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations .....	75
Authorization of appropriations (sec. 301) .....	75
Subtitle B—Energy and the Environment .....	75
Modification of energy management reporting requirements (sec. 311) .....	75
Report on efforts to reduce high energy costs at military installations (sec. 312) .....	75
Southern Sea Otter military readiness areas (sec. 313) .....	75
Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment .....	76
Repeal of limitation on authority to enter into a contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul of the F117 engine (sec. 321) .....	76
Subtitle D—Reports .....	76
Modification of annual report on prepositioned materiel and equipment (sec. 331) .....	76
Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority .....	76

VII

	Page
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued	
Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority—Continued	
Modification of requirements for transferring aircraft within the Air Force inventory (sec. 341) .....	76
Limitation on use of funds for Department of Defense sponsorships, advertising, or marketing associated with sports-related organizations or sporting events (sec. 342) .....	77
Temporary authority to extend contracts and leases under ARMS Initiative (sec. 343) .....	78
Subtitle F—Other Matters .....	78
Streamlining of Department of Defense management and operational headquarters (sec. 351) .....	78
Adoption of retired military working dogs (sec. 352) .....	80
Modification of required review of projects relating to potential obstructions to aviation (sec. 353) .....	80
Pilot program on intensive instruction in certain Asian languages (sec. 354) .....	81
Budget Items .....	81
Transfer to overseas contingency operations .....	81
Army and Army Reserve readiness unfunded priorities increases .....	82
Insider threat unfunded priorities increases .....	82
Streamlining Combatant Commands .....	83
Army outreach reduction .....	83
United States Southern Command unfunded priorities increase .....	83
Streamlining Management Headquarters .....	84
Foreign currency fluctuation deductions .....	84
Bulk fuel savings .....	85
Army and Air National Guard Operation Phalanx increase .....	85
Army National Guard portrait cuts .....	86
Army National Guard marketing program reduction .....	86
Army National Guard readiness funding increase .....	86
Marine Corps readiness unfunded priorities increases .....	87
Criminal Investigative Equipment .....	87
A-10 to F-15E training transition .....	87
Air Force readiness unfunded priorities increases .....	88
Joint Enabling Capabilities Command .....	88
Air Force Headquarters reductions .....	88
Remotely piloted aircraft .....	89
Air Force acquisition tools reduction .....	89
Air Force enterprise information technology systems .....	89
Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System reduction ..	89
EC-130H Buyback .....	90
A-10 Operation and Maintenance Buyback .....	90
Middle East Assurance Initiative .....	90
Department of Defense Rewards Program reduction .....	91
Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program .....	91
Funding for impact aid .....	91
Defense-wide funding decreases for Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) .....	92
Defense-wide funding decrease for base realignment and closure planning and support .....	92
Studies of fleet platform architectures for the Navy .....	92
A-10 retirement manpower transfer .....	92
Items of Special Interest .....	93
Army and Air Force full spectrum training requirements .....	93
Body armor modernization .....	94
Care of stock in storage .....	94
Category I ammunition items in OCONUS environments .....	95
Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) .....	96
Commercial innovation in energy technologies .....	96
Defense Logistics Agency and military services' integrated demand planning for spare parts .....	97
Department of Defense airfield reflective pavement markings .....	97
Department of Defense energy security and efficiency technologies ..	98
Department of Defense fuel consumption estimates .....	98
Department of Defense investment in community relations activities .	99
Depot maintenance core workload capability .....	99

VIII

	Page
TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued	
Items of Special Interest—Continued	
Effects of operation and maintenance funding levels .....	100
Encouraging the Use of the Innovative Readiness Training (IRT) Program .....	101
Enhanced Performance Round and Special Operations Science and Technology review .....	101
Fabric-based respiratory protective equipment .....	102
Foreign language training .....	102
Installation access programs and systems .....	103
Major test range and test facility bases reimbursement .....	103
Medical textile apparel for healthcare workers and patients .....	103
Mentor Protégé program .....	104
Obstructions on or near military installations .....	104
Operational Energy .....	104
Personal protection equipment .....	105
Red Hill underground fuel storage facility .....	105
Report on those at-risk of exposure to perfluorochemicals from the Haven Well in Portsmouth, New Hampshire .....	106
Resilience of Department of Defense-owned utility infrastructure .....	106
Tubular light-emitting diode technology .....	107
Utah Test and Training Range .....	107
TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS .....	109
Subtitle A—Active Forces .....	109
End strengths for active forces (sec. 401) .....	109
Enhancement of authority for management of end strengths for military personnel (sec. 402) .....	109
Subtitle B—Reserve Forces .....	109
End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411) .....	109
End strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserves (sec. 412) .....	110
End strengths for military technicians (dual status) (sec. 413) .....	110
Fiscal year 2016 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414) .....	110
Maximum number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support (sec. 415) .....	111
Chief of the National Guard Bureau authority in increase certain end strengths applicable to the Army National Guard (sec. 416) .....	111
Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations .....	111
Military personnel (sec. 421) .....	111
Budget Items .....	112
Military personnel funding changes .....	112
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY .....	113
Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy .....	113
Authority of promotion boards to recommend officers of particular merit be placed at the top of the promotion list (sec. 501) .....	113
Minimum grades for certain corps and related positions in the Army, Navy, and Air Force (sec. 502) .....	113
Enhancement of military personnel authorities in connection with the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 503) .....	114
Enhanced flexibility for determination of officers to continue on active duty and for selective early retirement and early discharge (sec. 504) .....	114
Authority to defer until age 68 mandatory retirement for age of a general or flag officer serving as Chief or Deputy Chief of Chaplains of the Army, Navy or Air Force (sec. 505) .....	115
Reinstatement of enhanced authority for selective early discharge of warrant officers (sec. 506) .....	115
Authority to conduct warrant officer retired grade determinations (sec. 507) .....	115
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management .....	115
Authority to designate certain Reserve officers as not to be considered for selection for promotion (sec. 511) .....	115
Clarification of purpose of reserve component special selection boards as limited to correction of error at a mandatory promotion board (sec. 512) .....	116



	Page
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY—Continued	
Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management—Continued	
Reconciliation of contradictory provisions relating to citizenship qualifications for enlistment in the reserve components of the Armed Forces (sec. 513) .....	116
Authority for certain Air Force reserve component personnel to provide training and instruction regarding pilot instructor training (sec. 514) .....	116
Subtitle C—General Service Authorities .....	116
Duty required for eligibility for preseparation counseling for members being discharged or released from active duty (sec. 521) .....	116
Expansion of pilot programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 522) .....	117
Sense of Senate on development of gender-neutral occupational standards for occupational assignments in the Armed Forces (sec. 523) .....	117
Subtitle D—Member Education and Training .....	117
PART I—Educational Assistance Reform .....	117
Limitation on tuition assistance for off-duty training or education (sec. 531) .....	117
Termination of program of educational assistance for reserve component members supporting contingency operations and other operations (sec. 532) .....	118
Reports on educational levels attained by certain members of the Armed Forces at time of separation from the Armed Forces (sec. 533) .....	118
Sense of Congress on transferability of unused education benefits to family members (sec. 534) .....	118
No entitlement to unemployment insurance while receiving Post-9/11 Education Assistance (sec. 535) .....	118
PART II—Other Matters .....	118
Repeal of statutory specification of minimum duration of in-resident instruction for courses of instruction offered as part of Phase II Joint Professional Military Education (sec. 536) .....	118
Quality assurance of certification programs and standards for professional credentials obtained by members of the Armed Forces (sec. 537) .....	119
Support for athletic programs of the United States Military Academy (sec. 538) .....	119
Online access to the higher education component of the transition assistance program (sec. 539) .....	119
Subtitle E—Military Justice .....	120
Modification of Rule 304 of the Military Rules of Evidence relating to the corroboration of a confession or admission (sec. 546) .....	120
Modification of Rule 104 of the Rules for Courts-Martial to establish certain prohibitions concerning evaluations of Special Victims' Counsel (sec. 547) .....	120
Right of victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to timely disclosure of certain materials and information in connection with prosecution of offenses (sec. 548) .....	120
Enforcement of certain crime victims' rights by the Court of Criminal Appeals (sec. 549) .....	121
Release to victims upon request of complete record of proceedings and testimony of courts-martial in cases in which sentences adjudged could include punitive discharge (sec. 550) .....	121
Representation and assistance of victims by Special Victims' Counsel in questioning by military criminal investigators (sec. 551) .....	121
Authority of Special Victims' Counsel to provide legal consultation and assistance in connection with various government proceedings (sec. 552) .....	121
Enhancement of confidentiality of restricted reporting of sexual assault in the military (sec. 553) .....	121
Establishment of Office of Complex Investigations within the National Guard Bureau (sec. 554) .....	122
Modification of deadline for establishment of Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces (sec. 555) .....	122

	Page
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY—Continued	
Subtitle E—Military Justice—Continued	
Comptroller General of the United States reports on prevention and response to sexual assault by the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve (sec. 556) .....	122
Sense of Congress on the service of military families and on sentencing retirement eligible members of the Armed Forces (sec. 557) .....	122
Subtitle F—Defense Dependents' Education and Military Family Readiness Matters .....	123
Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 561) .....	123
Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 562) .....	123
Authority to use appropriated funds to support Department of Defense student meal programs in domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools located outside the United States (sec. 563) ..	123
Biennial surveys of military dependents on military family readiness matters (sec. 564) .....	123
Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements .....	123
Extension of semiannual reports on the involuntary separation of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 571) .....	123
Remotely piloted aircraft career field manning shortfalls (sec. 572) ....	124
Subtitle H—Other Matters .....	125
PART I—Financial Literacy and Preparedness of Members of the Armed Forces .....	125
Improvement of financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 581) .....	125
Financial literacy training with respect to certain financial services for members of the uniformed services (sec. 582) .....	125
Sense of Congress on financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 583) .....	125
PART II—Other Matters .....	125
Authority for applications for correction of military records to be initiated by the Secretary concerned (sec. 586) .....	125
Recordation of obligations for installment payments of incentive pays, allowances, and similar benefits when payment is due (sec. 587) .....	125
Enhancements to Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program (sec. 588) .....	126
Priority processing of applications for Transportation Worker Identification Credentials for members undergoing discharge or release from the Armed Forces (sec. 589) .....	126
Issuance of Recognition of Service ID cards to certain members separating from the Armed Forces (sec. 590) .....	126
Revised policy on network services for military services (sec. 591) .....	126
Increase in number of days of Active Duty required to be performed by reserve component members for duty to be considered federal service for purposes of unemployment compensation for ex-servicemembers (sec. 592) .....	127
Items of Special Interest .....	127
Assessment on Servicemembers lacking post-transition housing .....	127
Availability of Special Victims' Counsel as Individual Military Counsel .....	128
Changes to the Joint Travel Regulation .....	128
Comptroller General of the United States assessment of Department of Defense personnel strategies for unmanned aerial systems .....	129
Comptroller General report on Department of Defense credentialing and licensing programs .....	129
Cyber security training, testing and certification .....	130
Disability pilot program feasibility report .....	130
Extending Special Victims' Counsel eligibility for civilian sexual assault survivors .....	131
Forensic Experiential Trauma Interview .....	132
Increase in number of persons from U.S. Pacific Command area of operations who receive instruction at military academies .....	133

	Page
TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY—Continued	
Items of Special Interest—Continued	
Increasing the transparency of the military justice system .....	133
Leadership reorganization of the United States Air Force Judge Advocate General's Corps .....	133
National Guard and Reserve headquarters .....	134
Public Schools on Department of Defense Installations .....	135
Punishment for collateral misconduct revealed by reports of sexual misconduct .....	135
Religious freedom and role of military chaplains .....	135
Report on review of petitions for review of discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces of veterans with mental health issues connected with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury .....	136
Report on Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff decisions on combat integration .....	137
Social Security Number Use Reduction Plan .....	138
Support for military families impacted by grief, behavioral health disorders, or substance abuse .....	138
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS .....	139
Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances .....	139
Fiscal year 2016 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601) .....	139
Modification of percentage of national average monthly cost of housing usable in computation of basic allowance for housing inside the United States (sec. 602) .....	139
Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing (sec. 603) .....	139
Basic allowance for housing for married members of the uniformed services assigned for duty within normal commuting distance and for other members living together (sec. 604) .....	139
Repeal of inapplicability of modification of basic allowance for housing to benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (sec. 605) .....	140
Limitation on eligibility for supplemental subsistence allowances to members serving outside the United States and associated territory (sec. 606) .....	140
Availability of information (sec. 607) .....	140
Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays .....	140
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611) .....	140
One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612) .....	140
One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613) .....	141
One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614) .....	141
One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615) .....	141
Increase in maximum annual amount of nuclear officer bonus pay (sec. 616) .....	141
Repeal of obsolete authority to pay bonus to encourage Army personnel to refer persons for enlistment in the Army (sec. 617) .....	141
Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances .....	142
Repeal of obsolete special travel and transportation allowance for survivors of deceased members from the Vietnam conflict (sec. 621) .....	142
Subtitle D—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits .....	142
Part I—Retired Pay Reform .....	142
Thrift Savings Plan participation for members of the uniformed services (sec. 631) .....	142
Modernized retirement system for members of the uniformed services (sec. 632) .....	142
Lump sum payments of certain retired pay (sec. 633) .....	143
Continuation pay after 12 years of service for members of the uniformed services participating in the modernized retirement systems (sec. 634) .....	143

	Page
TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS—Continued	
Subtitle D—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits—Continued	
Part I—Retired Pay Reform—Continued	
Authority for retirement flexibility for members of the uniformed services (sec. 635) .....	143
Treatment of Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund as a qualified trust (sec. 636) .....	144
Part II—Other Matters .....	144
Death of former spouse beneficiaries and subsequent remarriages under Survivor Benefit Plan (sec. 641) .....	144
Transitional compensation and other benefits for dependents of members of the Armed Forces ineligible to receive retired pay as a result of court-martial sentence (sec. 642) .....	144
Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations .....	144
Commissary system matters (sec. 651) .....	144
Plan on privatization of the Defense Commissary System (sec. 652) ...	145
Comptroller General of the United States report on the Commissary Surcharge, Non-appropriated Fund, and Privately-financed Major Construction Program (sec. 653) .....	145
Items of Special Interest .....	146
Comptroller General of the United States assessment of potential costs and benefits from privatizing Department of Defense commissaries .....	146
Comptroller General of the United States review of the Department of Defense special and incentive pay program .....	147
Comptroller General of the United States review of the Gold Star Advocate Program .....	147
Report on wait-times at child development centers .....	148
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS .....	151
Subtitle A—Tricare and Other Health Care Benefits .....	151
Urgent care authorization under the TRICARE program (sec. 701) ....	151
Modifications of cost-sharing requirements for the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program (sec. 702) .....	151
Expansion of continued health benefits coverage to include discharged and released members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 703) ...	152
Expansion of reimbursement for smoking cessation services for certain TRICARE beneficiaries (sec. 704) .....	152
Pilot program on treatment of members of the Armed Forces for post-traumatic stress disorder related to military sexual trauma (sec. 705) .....	152
Subtitle B—Health Care Administration .....	152
Access to health care under the TRICARE program (sec. 711) .....	152
Portability of health plans under the TRICARE program (sec. 712) ....	153
Improvement of mental health care provided by health care providers of the Department of Defense (sec. 713) .....	153
Comprehensive standards and access to contraception counseling for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 714) .....	153
Waiver of recoupment of erroneous payments due to administrative error under the TRICARE Program (sec. 715) .....	153
Designation of certain non-Department mental health care providers with knowledge relating to treatment of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 716) .....	154
Limitation on conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions (sec. 717) .....	154
Extension of authority for joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (sec. 718) .....	154
Extension of authority for DOD-VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund (sec. 719) .....	155
Pilot program on incentive programs to improve health care provided under the TRICARE program (sec. 720) .....	155
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters .....	155

XIII

	Page
TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS—Continued	
Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters—Continued	
Publication of certain information on health care provided by the Department of Defense through the Hospital Compare web site of the Department of Health and Human Services (sec. 731) .....	155
Publication of data on patient safety, quality of care, satisfaction, and health outcome measures under the TRICARE program (sec. 732) .....	155
Annual report on patient safety, quality of care, and access to care at military medical treatment facilities (sec. 733) .....	156
Report on plans to improve experience with and eliminate performance variability of health care provided by the Department of Defense (sec. 734) .....	156
Report on plan to improve pediatric care and related services for children of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 735) .....	156
Report on preliminary mental health screenings for individuals becoming members of the Armed Forces (sec. 736) .....	157
Comptroller General report on use of quality of care metrics at military treatment facilities (sec. 737) .....	157
Items of Special Interest .....	157
Annual report on autism care demonstration program .....	157
Antimicrobial coatings .....	158
Continued support for diagnosis and treatment for traumatic brain injury .....	158
Intensive behavioral counseling .....	158
Mild traumatic brain injury research .....	159
Molecular diagnostics .....	159
Newborn infant screening evaluation and treatment .....	159
Preseparation counseling on opioid therapy for chronic pain management .....	160
Prosthetic socket manufacturing cells .....	160
Reform of the TRICARE program .....	161
Training for physician assistants specializing in psychiatric care .....	161
TRICARE Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration .....	162
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS .....	163
Acquisition policy reform overview .....	163
Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management .....	166
Role of service chiefs in the acquisition process (sec. 801) .....	166
Expansion of rapid acquisition authority (sec. 802) .....	167
Middle tier of acquisition for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding (sec. 803) .....	167
Amendments to other transaction authority (sec. 804) .....	167
Use of alternative acquisition paths to acquire critical national security capabilities (sec. 805) .....	168
Secretary of Defense waiver of acquisition laws to acquire vital national security capabilities (sec. 806) .....	169
Acquisition authority of the Commander of United States Cyber Command (sec. 807) .....	170
Advisory panel on streamlining and codifying acquisition regulations (sec. 808) .....	171
Review of time-based requirements process and budgeting and acquisition systems (sec. 809) .....	173
Improvement of program and project management by the Department of Defense (sec. 810) .....	173
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations .....	174
Preference for fixed-price contracts in determining contract type for development programs (sec. 821) .....	174
Applicability of cost and pricing data and certification requirements (sec. 822) .....	174
Risk-based contracting for smaller contract actions under the Truth In Negotiations Act (sec. 823) .....	174
Limitation of the use of reverse auctions and lowest priced technically acceptable contracting methods (sec. 824) .....	175
Rights in technical data (sec. 825) .....	175
Procurement of supplies for experimental purposes (sec. 826) .....	176

	Page
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS—Continued	
Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations—Continued	
Extension of authority to acquire products and services produced in countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan (sec. 827) .....	177
Reporting related to failure of contractors to meet goals under negotiated comprehensive small business subcontracting plans (sec. 828) .....	177
Competition for religious services contracts (sec. 829) .....	177
Treatment of interagency and state and local purchases when the Department of Defense acts as contract intermediary for the General Services Administration (sec. 830) .....	177
Pilot program for streamlining awards for innovative technology projects (sec. 831) .....	177
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs ...	178
Acquisition strategy required for each major defense acquisition program (sec. 841) .....	178
Risk reduction in major defense acquisition programs (sec. 842) .....	178
Designation of milestone decision authority (sec. 843) .....	179
Revision of Milestone A decision authority responsibilities for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 844) .....	179
Revision of Milestone B decision authority responsibilities for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 845) .....	180
Tenure and accountability of program managers for program development periods (sec. 846) .....	181
Tenure and accountability of program managers for program execution periods (sec. 847) .....	181
Repeal of requirement for stand-alone manpower estimates for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 848) .....	182
Penalty for cost overruns (sec. 849) .....	182
Streamlining of reporting requirements applicable to Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering regarding major defense acquisition programs (sec. 850) .....	183
Configuration steering boards for cost control under major defense acquisition programs (sec. 851) .....	183
Subtitle D—Provisions Related to Commercial Items .....	183
Inapplicability of certain laws and regulations to the acquisition of commercial items and commercially available off-the-shelf items (sec. 861) .....	183
Market research and preference for commercial items (sec. 862) .....	183
Continuing validity of commercial item determinations (sec. 863) .....	184
Treatment of commercial items purchased as major weapon systems (sec. 864) .....	184
Limitation on conversion of procurements from commercial acquisition procedures (sec. 865) .....	185
Treatment of goods and services provided by a non-traditional contractors as commercial items (sec. 866) .....	186
Subtitle E—Other Matters .....	187
Streamlining of requirements relating to defense business systems (sec. 871) .....	187
Acquisition workforce (sec. 872) .....	187
Unified information technology services (sec. 873) .....	187
Cloud strategy for Department of Defense (sec. 874) .....	188
Development period for Department of Defense information technology systems (sec. 875) .....	188
Revisions to pilot program on acquisition of military purpose non-developmental items (sec. 876) .....	189
Extension of the Department of Defense Mentor-Protégé pilot program (sec. 877) .....	189
Improved auditing of contracts (sec. 878) .....	189
Survey on the costs of regulatory compliance (sec. 879) .....	189
Government Accountability Office report on bid protests (sec. 880) .....	190
Steps to identify and address potential unfair competitive advantage of technical advisors to acquisition officials (sec. 881) .....	190
HUBZone qualified disaster areas (sec. 882) .....	191

	Page
TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS—Continued	
Subtitle E—Other Matters—Continued	
Base closure HUBZones (sec. 883) .....	191
Items of Special Interest .....	191
AbilityOne Program .....	191
Acquisition of Commercial Test, Research, and Measurement Capability .....	191
Barriers to innovation from non-traditional and commercial contractors .....	192
Competition in the procurement of collaboration services .....	193
Inspector General report on pricing of engine sustainment contract ...	193
Mitigation strategy to prevent fraud and abuse in the Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Program .....	194
Obtaining technical data for operations, maintenance, installation, and training purposes .....	195
Review of should-cost process Security and facility clearances .....	196
TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT	
Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management .....	197
Update of statutory specification of functions of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relating to advice on requirements, programs, and budget (sec. 901) .....	197
Reorganization and redesignation of Office of Family Policy and Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs (sec. 902) .....	197
Repeal of requirement for annual Department of Defense funding for Ocean Research Advisory Panel (sec. 903) .....	197
Items of Special Interest .....	198
Special Operations Policy and Oversight Council .....	198
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS .....	199
Subtitle A—Financial Matters .....	199
General transfer authority (sec. 1001) .....	199
Annual audit of financial statements of Department of Defense components by independent external auditors (sec. 1002) .....	199
Treatment as part of the base budget of certain amounts authorized for overseas contingency operations upon enactment of an act revising the Budget Control Act discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2016 (sec. 1003) .....	199
Sense of Senate on sequestration (sec. 1004) .....	200
Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities .....	200
Extension of authority to support unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1011) .....	200
Extension and expansion of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments (sec. 1012) .....	201
Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards .....	201
Studies of fleet platform architectures for the Navy (sec. 1021) .....	201
Amendment to National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund (sec. 1022) .....	202
Extension of authority for reimbursement of expenses for certain Navy mess operations afloat (sec. 1023) .....	203
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism .....	203
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 (sec. 1031) .....	203
Limitation on the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo (sec. 1032) .....	203
Reenactment and modification of certain prior requirements for certifications relating to transfer of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to foreign countries and other foreign entities (sec. 1033) .....	204
Authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment (sec. 1034) .....	204
Prohibition on use of funds for transfer or release to Yemen of individuals detained at United States Naval Facility, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1035) .....	205

	Page
TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS—Continued	
Subtitle D—Counterterrorism—Continued	
Report on current detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantana- mo Bay, Cuba, determined or assessed to be high risk or me- dium risk (sec. 1036) .....	205
Report to Congress on memoranda of understanding with foreign countries regarding transfer of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1037) .....	205
Semiannual Reports on use of United States Naval Station, Guanta- mo Bay, Cuba, and any other Department of Defense or Bureau of Prisons prison or other detention or disciplinary facility in re- cruitment and other propaganda of terrorist organizations (sec. 1038) .....	206
Extension and modification of authority to make rewards for com- bating terrorism (sec. 1039) .....	206
Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations .....	206
Assistance to secure the southern land border of the United States (sec. 1041) .....	206
Protection of Department of Defense installations (sec. 1042) .....	206
Strategy to protect United States national security interests in the Arctic region (sec. 1043) .....	207
Extension of limitations on the transfer to the regular Army of AH- 64 Apache helicopters assigned to the Army National Guard (sec. 1044) .....	207
Treatment of certain previously transferred Army National Guard helicopters as counting against number transferrable under excep- tion to limitation on transfer of Army National Guard helicopters (sec. 1045) .....	207
Management of military technicians (sec. 1046) .....	207
Sense of Congress on consideration of the full range of Department of Defense manpower worldwide in decisions on the proper mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to accomplish the national defense strategy (sec. 1047) .....	208
Sense of the Senate on the United States Marine Corps (sec. 1048) ....	208
Subtitle F—Studies and Reports .....	208
Repeal of reporting requirements (sec. 1061) .....	208
Termination of requirement for submittal to Congress of reports re- quired of the Department of Defense by statute (sec. 1062) .....	210
Annual submittal to Congress of munitions assessments (sec. 1063) ...	210
Potential role for United States ground forces in the Pacific theater (sec. 1064) .....	211
Subtitle G—Other Matters .....	211
Technical and clerical amendments (sec. 1081) .....	211
Authority to provide training and support to personnel of foreign ministries of defense (sec. 1082) .....	212
Expansion of outreach for veterans transitioning from serving on Active Duty (sec. 1083) .....	212
Modification of certain requirements applicable to major medical fa- cility lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Tulsa, Oklahoma (sec. 1084) .....	212
Items of Special Interest .....	212
Air and Missile Defense Radar backfit .....	212
Analysis of domestic Department of Defense installations' gas and oil reserves .....	213
Comptroller General of the United States study on options for the Department of Defense close air support mission .....	213
Congressional Defense Review to Prepare for Future Strategic Chal- lenges .....	214
Cruiser and dock landing ship phased modernization .....	215
Human industrial operations augmentation technology .....	215
National Guard Counterdrug Program .....	216
Shipbuilding industrial base and workload allocation .....	216
Unmanned Carrier-Launched Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) Pro- gram .....	216
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS .....	219
Legislative Provisions .....	219



	Page
TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS—Continued	
Legislative Provisions—Continued	
Required probationary period for new employees of the Department of Defense (sec. 1101) .....	219
Delay of periodic step increase for civilian employees of the Department of Defense based upon unacceptable performance (sec. 1102) .	219
Procedures for reduction in force of Department of Defense civilian personnel (sec. 1103) .....	219
United States Cyber Command workforce (sec. 1104) .....	219
One-year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on premium pay and aggregate limitation on pay for federal civilian employees working overseas (sec. 1105) .....	220
Five-year extension of expedited hiring authority for designated defense acquisition workforce positions (sec. 1106) .....	220
One-year extension of discretionary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to civilian personnel on official duty in a combat zone (sec. 1107) .....	220
Extension of rate of overtime pay for Department of the Navy employees performing work aboard or dockside in support of the nuclear aircraft carrier forward deployed in Japan (sec. 1108) .....	221
Expansion of temporary authority to make direct appointments of candidates possessing bachelor's degrees to scientific and engineering positions at science and technology reinvention laboratories (sec. 1109) .....	221
Extension of authority for the civilian acquisition workforce personnel demonstration project (sec. 1110) .....	221
Pilot program on dynamic shaping of the workforce to improve the technical skills and expertise at certain Department of Defense laboratories (sec. 1111) .....	221
Pilot program on temporary exchange of financial management and acquisition personnel (sec. 1112) .....	222
Pilot program on enhanced pay authorities for certain acquisition and technology positions in the Department of Defense (sec. 1113) .	223
Pilot program on direct hire authority for veteran technical experts into the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 1114) .....	223
Direct hire authority for technical experts into the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 1115) .....	223
Items of Special Interest .....	223
Report on comparison of cost performance of functions by Department of Defense civilian personnel with cost of performance of functions by Department contractors .....	223
Report on Department of Defense application of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act .....	224
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS .....	227
Subtitle A—Training and Assistance .....	227
One-year extension of funding limitations for authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces (sec. 1201) .....	227
Extension, expansion, and modification of authority for reimbursement to the Government of Jordan for border security operations (sec. 1202) .....	227
Extension of authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1203) .....	227
Redesignation, modification, and permanent extension of National Guard State Partnership Program (sec. 1204) .....	227
Authority to provide support to national military forces of allied countries for counterterrorism operations in Africa (sec. 1205) .....	228
Authority to build the capacity of foreign military intelligence forces (sec. 1206) .....	228
Prohibition on assistance to entities in Yemen controlled by the Houthi movement (sec. 1207) .....	228
Report on potential support for the vetted Syrian opposition (sec. 1208) .....	228
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq .....	228
Drawdown of United States forces in Afghanistan (sec. 1221) .....	228
Extension and modification of Commanders' Emergency Response Program (sec. 1222) .....	229

XVIII

	Page
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS—Continued	
Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq—Continued	
Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan (sec. 1223)	229
Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1224)	229
Prohibition on transfer to violent extremist organizations of equipment or supplies provided by the United States to the Government of Iraq (sec. 1225)	230
Report on lines of communication of Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and other foreign terrorist organizations (sec. 1226)	231
Modification of protection for Afghan allies (sec. 1227)	231
Extension of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1228)	231
Sense of Senate on support for the Kurdistan Regional Government (sec. 1229)	231
Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Iran	231
Modification and extension of the annual report on the military power of Iran (sec. 1241)	231
Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation	232
Ukraine security assistance initiative (sec. 1251)	232
Eastern European Training Initiative (sec. 1252)	232
Increased presence of United States ground forces in Eastern Europe to deter aggression on the border of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (sec. 1253)	233
Sense of Congress on European Defense and North Atlantic Treaty Organization spending (sec. 1254)	233
Additional matters in annual report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation (sec. 1255)	233
Report on alternative capabilities to procure and sustain nonstandard rotary wing aircraft historically procured through Rosoboronexport (sec. 1256)	233
Subtitle E—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region	234
South China Sea Initiative (Sec. 1261)	234
Sense of Congress reaffirming the importance of implementing the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region (Sec. 1262)	234
Sense of the Senate on Taiwan Asymmetric Military Capabilities and Bilateral Training Activities (Sec. 1263)	234
Subtitle F—Reports and Related Matters	235
Item in quarterly reports on assistance to counter the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant on forces ineligible to receive assistance due to a gross violation of human rights (sec. 1271)	235
Report on bilateral agreement with Israel on joint activities to establish an anti-tunneling defense system (sec. 1272)	235
Sense of Senate and report on Qatar fighter aircraft capability contribution to regional security (sec. 1273)	235
Subtitle G—Other Matters	235
NATO Special Operations Headquarters (sec. 1281)	235
Two-year extension and modification of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1282)	236
Items of Special Interest	236
Additional Analysis of People’s Liberation Army Cyber Capabilities	236
Annual report on the military power of Iran	236
Briefing on United States Unmanned Aerial System Export Requests	237
Countering Russian propaganda	238
Designation of lead Inspector General for Overseas Contingency Operations in Afghanistan	238
Organizational management of Department of Defense security assistance programs	239
Report on capability of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to respond to unconventional or hybrid warfare tactics such as used by the Russian Federation in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine	240

XIX

	Page
TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS—Continued	
Items of Special Interest—Continued	
Support of foreign forces participating in operations against the Lord's Resistance Army .....	240
United States-Indonesia military cooperation .....	241
TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION .....	243
Subtitle A—Funding Allocations .....	243
Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds (sec. 1301) .....	243
Funding allocations (sec. 1302) .....	243
TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS .....	245
Subtitle A—Military Programs .....	245
Working Capital Funds (sec. 1401) .....	245
National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1402) .....	245
Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1403) .....	245
Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1404) .....	245
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1405) .....	245
Defense Health Program (sec. 1406) .....	245
Subtitle B—Other Matters .....	245
Authority for transfer of funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois (sec. 1411) .....	245
Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1412) .....	246
Inspections of the Armed Forces Retirement Home by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (sec. 1413) .....	246
Budget Items .....	246
United States Southern Command unfunded priorities increase .....	246
Drug Demand Reduction Program .....	247
Department of Defense Inspector General Research, Development, Test & Evaluation reduction .....	247
Department of Defense Inspector General procurement reduction .....	247
Defense Health Program (sec. 1406) .....	247
Foreign currency fluctuation deduction .....	248
Items of Special Interest .....	248
Clarification of funding available for additional support for counterdrug activities and activities to counter transnational organized crime .....	248
Comptroller General review of electronic waste recycling .....	248
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS .....	251
Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations .....	251
Purpose (sec. 1501) .....	251
Overseas contingency operations (sec. 1502) .....	251
Procurement (sec. 1503) .....	251
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1504) .....	251
Operation and Maintenance (sec. 1505) .....	251
Military personnel (sec. 1506) .....	251
Working capital funds (sec. 1507) .....	251
Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide (sec. 1508) .....	251
Defense Inspector General (sec. 1509) .....	252
Defense Health Program (sec. 1510) .....	252
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (sec. 1511) .....	252
Subtitle B—Financial Matters .....	252
Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1521) .....	252
Special transfer authority (sec. 1522) .....	252
Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters .....	252
Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1531) .....	252
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1532) .....	252
Availability of Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund funds for training of foreign security forces to defeat improvised explosive devices (sec. 1533) .....	253
Budget Items .....	253
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund .....	253
Office of Security Cooperation—Iraq .....	253

	Page
TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS—Continued	
Budget Items—Continued	
Reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations .....	254
Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund .....	254
Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative .....	255
Items of Special Interest .....	255
Joint Improvised Explosive Device Analysis Tool .....	255
TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS .....	257
Subtitle A—Space Activities .....	257
Integrated policy to deter adversaries in space (sec. 1601) .....	257
Principal advisor on space control (sec. 1602) .....	258
Exception to the prohibition on contracting with Russian suppliers of rocket engines for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle pro- gram (sec. 1603) .....	258
Elimination of launch capabilities contracts under Evolved Expend- able Launch Vehicle program (sec. 1604) .....	259
Allocation of funding for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Pro- gram (sec. 1605) .....	260
Inclusion of plan for development and fielding of a full-up engine in rocket propulsion system development program (sec. 1606) .....	260
Limitations on availability of funds for the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (sec. 1607) .....	261
Quarterly reports on Global Positioning System III space segment, Global Positioning System operational control segment, and Military Global Positioning System User Equipment acquisitions pro- grams (sec. 1608) .....	262
Plan for consolidation of acquisition of commercial satellite commu- nications services (sec. 1609) .....	263
Council on oversight of the Department of Defense Positioning, Navi- gation, and Timing Enterprise (sec. 1610) .....	263
Analysis of Alternative for Wide-band Communications (sec. 1611) ....	263
Expansion of goals for pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite services (sec. 1612) .....	264
Streamline commercial space launch activities (sec. 1613) .....	264
Subtitle B—Cyber Warfare, Cyber Security, and Related Matters .....	264
Authorization of Military Cyber Operations (sec. 1621) .....	264
Designation of Department of Defense entity responsible for acquisi- tion of critical cyber capabilities (sec. 1622) .....	265
Incentive for submittal to Congress by President of integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyberspace (sec. 1623) .....	266
Authorization for procurement of relocatable Sensitive Compart- mented Information Facility (sec. 1624) .....	266
Evaluation of cyber vulnerabilities of major weapon systems of the Department of Defense (sec. 1625) .....	266
Assessment of capabilities of United States Cyber Command to def- end the United States from cyber attack (sec. 1626) .....	267
Biennial exercises on responding to cyber attacks against critical infrastructure (sec. 1627) .....	268
Subtitle C—Nuclear Forces .....	269
Designation of Air Force officials to be responsible for policy on and procurement of Nuclear Command and Control Communica- tions Systems (sec. 1631) .....	269
Comptroller General of the United States review of recommendations relating to the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 1632) .....	269
Assessment of global nuclear environment (sec. 1633) .....	270
Deadline for Milestone A decision on Long-Range Standoff Weapon (sec. 1634) .....	272
Availability of Air Force procurement funds for certain commercial off-the-shelf parts for intercontinental ballistic missiles fuzes (sec. 1635) .....	272
Sense of Congress on policy on the nuclear triad (sec. 1636) .....	272
Subtitle D—Missile Defense Programs .....	272
Plan for expediting deployment time of continental United States interceptor site (sec. 1641) .....	272

	Page
TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS—Continued	
Subtitle D—Missile Defense Programs—Continued	
Additional missile defense sensor coverage for the protection of the United States homeland (sec. 1642)	273
Air defense capability at North Atlantic Treaty Organization missile defense sites (sec. 1643)	274
Availability of funds for Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system (sec. 1644)	274
Israeli cooperative missile defense program codevelopment and potential coproduction (sec. 1645)	274
Development and deployment of multiple-object kill vehicle for missile defense of the United States homeland (sec. 1646)	275
Requirement to replace capability enhancement I exoatmospheric kill vehicles (sec. 1647)	275
Airborne boost phase defense system (sec. 1648)	276
Extension of limitation on providing certain sensitive missile defense information to the Russian Federation (sec. 1649)	277
Extension of requirement for Comptroller General of the United States review and assessment of missile defense acquisition programs (sec. 1650)	277
Subtitle E—Other Matters	277
Measures in response to violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty by the Russian Federation (sec. 1661)	277
Modification of notification and assessment of proposal to modify or introduce new aircraft or sensors for flight by the Russian Federation under the Open Skies Treaty (sec. 1662)	278
Milestone A decision for the conventional prompt global strike weapons system (sec. 1663)	279
Budget Items	279
Conventional prompt global strike	279
Divert attitude control system in support of multi-object kill vehicle	279
Fiber combining laser prototype	279
Funding for U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs	280
Multiple Object Kill Vehicle	280
Operationally Responsive Space program	280
Redesigned Kill Vehicle	281
Sharkseer zero day defense for enterprise email	281
Standard Missile-3 block IB	282
U.S. Cyber Command technology development	282
Items of Special Interest	282
Assessment of the information security threats of wireless-enabled capabilities at Department of Defense facilities	282
Comptroller General review of space system acquisition and acquisition oversight	283
Continuation of nuclear command, control and communications assessments by the Government Accountability Office	283
Missile Defense Agency assessment of capabilities to defend against current and projected missile threats	284
Organization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Deterrence Mission	284
Report on Advanced Extremely High Frequency Terminals for bomber aircraft	285
Report on Follow-On Commander's Evaluation Tests and Demonstration and Shake Out tests	285
Report on space-based missile defense interceptor	285
Reserve component Cyber Protection Teams	286
Solid Rocket Motor industrial base	287
Space control modeling and simulation range	287
The importance and use of U.S. FAA licensed spaceports	287
Upgrades to the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System	288
DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS	291
Summary and explanation of funding tables	291
Short title (sec. 2001)	291
Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002)	291
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	293

	Page
TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION—Continued	
Summary .....	293
Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101) .....	293
Family housing (sec. 2102) .....	294
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103) .....	294
Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104) .....	294
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2105) .....	294
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2106) ..	294
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2107) ..	294
Additional authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2016 project (sec. 2108) .....	294
Limitation on construction of new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 2109) .....	295
TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....	297
Summary .....	297
Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201) .....	298
Family housing (sec. 2202) .....	298
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203) .....	298
Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204) .....	298
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2205) .....	298
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2206) .....	298
TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....	299
Summary .....	299
Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301) .....	299
Family housing (sec. 2302) .....	299
Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303) .....	299
Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304) .....	300
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2010 project (sec. 2305) .....	300
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project (sec. 2306) .....	300
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 project (sec. 2307) .....	300
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2308) ...	300
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2309) ...	300
TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....	303
Summary .....	303
Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401) .....	303
Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402) .....	303
Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403) .....	303
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2404) .....	304
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2405) .....	304
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2406) .....	304
Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project (sec. 2407) .....	304
TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM .....	305
Summary .....	305
Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501) ...	305
Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502) .....	305
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES .....	307
Summary .....	307
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorizations of Appropriations ..	307
Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601) .....	307
Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602) .....	307

	Page
TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES—Continued	
Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorizations of Appropriations—Continued	
Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603) .....	308
Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604) .....	308
Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605) .....	308
Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606) .....	308
Subtitle B—Other Matters .....	308
Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2611) .....	308
Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 projects (sec. 2612) .....	308
Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2613) .....	309
Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2614) .....	309
TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES .....	311
Summary and explanation of tables .....	311
Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account (sec. 2701) .....	311
Prohibition on conducting additional base realignment and closure (BRAC) round (sec. 2702) .....	311
TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS .....	313
Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes .....	313
Authority for acceptance and use of contributions for certain mutually beneficial projects (sec. 2801) .....	313
Change in authorities relating to scope of work variations for military construction projects (sec. 2802) .....	313
Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2803) .....	313
Modification of reporting requirement on in-kind construction and renovation payments (sec. 2804) .....	313
Lab modernization pilot program (sec. 2805) .....	314
Conveyance to Indian tribes of certain housing units (sec. 2806) .....	314
Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration .....	314
Utility systems conveyance authority (sec. 2811) .....	314
Leasing of non-excess property of military departments and defense agencies; treatment of value provided by local education agencies and elementary and secondary schools (sec. 2812) .....	314
Modification of facility repair notification requirement (sec. 2813) .....	315
Increase of threshold of notice and wait requirement for certain facilities for reserve components and parity with authority for unspecified minor military construction and repair projects (sec. 2814) .....	315
Subtitle C—Land Conveyances .....	315
Release of reversionary interest retained as part of the conveyance to the economic development alliance of Jefferson County, Arkansas (sec. 2821) .....	315
Items of Special Interest .....	315
Kwajalein Atoll infrastructure .....	315
Military construction delay report .....	316
Military construction supporting major range and test facility bases ..	316
Military training ranges for Special Operations Forces .....	317
Redevelopment of the former Indiana Army Ammunition Plant .....	318
Repair by replacement .....	318
Safe and suitable housing for junior enlisted servicemembers .....	319
DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS .....	321
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS .....	321

	Page
TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS—Continued	
Overview .....	321
Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations .....	321
National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101) .....	321
Defense environmental clean-up (sec. 3102) .....	322
Other defense activities (sec. 3103) .....	322
Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations .....	322
Responsive capabilities program (sec. 3111) .....	322
Long-term plan for meeting national security requirements for unencumbered uranium (sec. 3112) .....	323
Defense nuclear nonproliferation management plan (sec. 3113) .....	323
Plan for deactivation and decommissioning of nonoperational defense nuclear facilities (sec. 3114) .....	323
Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant contract oversight (sec. 3115) .....	323
Assessment of emergency preparedness of defense nuclear facilities (sec. 3116) .....	324
Laboratory-and facility-directed research and development programs (sec. 3117) .....	324
Limitation on bonuses for employees of the National Nuclear Security Administration who engage in improper program management (sec. 3118) .....	324
Modification of authorized personnel levels of the Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security (sec. 3119) .....	325
Modification of submission of assessments of certain budget requests relating to the nuclear weapons stockpile (sec. 3120) .....	325
Repeal of phase three review of certain defense environmental clean-up projects (sec. 3121) .....	325
Modifications to cost-benefit analysis for competition of management and operating contracts (sec. 3122) .....	326
Review of implementation of recommendations of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 3123) .....	326
Budget Items .....	326
Defense Environmental Cleanup, Los Alamos National Laboratory .....	326
Deferred Maintenance .....	326
Enhanced surveillance .....	326
Plutonium disposition program .....	327
Responsive capabilities program .....	329
Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund .....	329
Items of Special Interest .....	329
Ability of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board to communicate with the Secretary of Energy .....	329
Interoperable Warhead—1 .....	330
Lithium supply and demand .....	331
Microlab Technology Transfer .....	331
Report on program management at the National Nuclear Security Administration .....	331
TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD .....	333
Authorization for Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201) .....	333
DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES .....	333
Authorization of amounts in funding tables (sec. 4001) .....	333
Clarification of applicability of undistributed reductions of certain operation and maintenance funding among all operation and maintenance funding (sec. 4002) .....	333
Funding tables (secs. 4101–4701) .....	333
TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT .....	343
Procurement (sec. 4101) .....	344
Procurement for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4102) .....	386
TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION .....	395
Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 4201) .....	396
Research, development, test, and evaluation for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4202) .....	429
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	431
Operation and maintenance (sec. 4301) .....	432



	Page
TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE—Continued	
Operation and maintenance for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4302) .....	452
TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL .....	463
Military personnel (sec. 4401) .....	464
Military personnel for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4402) .....	465
TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS .....	467
Other authorizations (sec. 4501) .....	468
Other authorizations for overseas contingency operations (sec. 4502) .....	472
TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....	475
Military construction (sec. 4601) .....	476
TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS .....	497
Department of Energy national security programs (sec. 4701) .....	511
LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS .....	511
Departmental Recommendations .....	511
Committee Action .....	511
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate .....	514
Regulatory Impact .....	514
Changes in Existing Law .....	515
ADDITIONAL VIEWS .....	516
Additional Views of Mr. Reed .....	516
Additional Views of Mr. Inhofe .....	518
Additional Views of Ms. Ayotte .....	520
Additional Views of Mr. Tillis .....	524



## Calendar No. 88

114TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session* }

SENATE

{ REPORT  
114-49

---

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 FOR MILITARY ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AND FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, TO PRESCRIBE MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTHS FOR SUCH FISCAL YEAR, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

---

MAY 19, 2015.—Ordered to be printed

---

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

### R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 1376]

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

#### PURPOSE OF THE BILL

This bill would:

- (1) authorize appropriations for (a) procurement, (b) research, development, test and evaluation, (c) operation and maintenance and the revolving and management funds of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016;
- (2) authorize the personnel end strengths for each military active duty component of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2016;
- (3) authorize the personnel end strengths for the Selected Reserve of each of the reserve components of the Armed Forces for fiscal year 2016;
- (4) impose certain reporting requirements;
- (5) impose certain limitations with regard to specific procurement and research, development, test and evaluation actions and manpower strengths; provide certain additional legislative authority, and make certain changes to existing law;
- (6) authorize appropriations for military construction programs of the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016; and

(7) authorize appropriations for national security programs of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016.

### **Committee overview**

For seven decades, the U.S. military has been the most reliable guarantor of the foundations of international order that American statesmen of both parties helped to establish in the aftermath of World War II. The relative security and prosperity that our nation has enjoyed, and made possible for so many others across the world, has been painstakingly maintained through the deterrence of adversaries, the cooperation with allies and partners, the global leadership of the United States, and the credibility and capability of our Armed Forces.

The committee is concerned that growing threats abroad and continued limitations on defense spending at home are increasingly harming the ability of the United States, and its military, to play an effective leadership role in the world. Indeed, military readiness and capabilities have deteriorated to the point where senior military leaders have warned that we are putting at risk the lives of the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces. There is a growing consensus that we must reverse this damage so that we can respond adequately to a host of disturbing challenges to the international order that adversely impact our national security. These challenges include:

- In Ukraine, Russia has sought to redraw an international border and annex the territory of another sovereign country through the use of military force. It continues aggressively to destabilize Ukraine, with troubling implications for security in Europe.
- A terrorist army with tens of thousands of fighters, many holding Western passports, has taken over a vast swath of territory and declared an Islamic State in the heart of the Middle East. Nearly 3,000 U.S. troops have returned to Iraq to combat this threat, with U.S. aircraft flying hundreds of strike missions a month over Iraq and Syria.
- Amid negotiations over its nuclear program, Iran continues to pursue its ambitions to challenge regional order in the Middle East by increasing its development of ballistic missiles, support for terrorism, training and arming of pro-Iranian militant groups, and other malign activities in places such as Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Gaza, Bahrain, and Yemen.
- Yemen has collapsed, as a Shia insurgency with ties to the Iranian regime has toppled the U.S.-backed government in Sanaa, Al-Qaeda continues to use parts of the country to plan attacks against the West, the U.S. Embassy has been evacuated, and a U.S.-backed coalition of Arab nations has intervened militarily to reverse the gains of the Houthi insurgency and to restore the previous government to power.
- Libya has become a failed state, beset by civil war and a growing presence of transnational terrorist groups, such as al-Qaeda and ISIL, similar to Afghanistan in 2001.
- North Korea, while continuing to develop its nuclear arsenal and ever-more capable ballistic missiles, committed the most destructive cyberattack ever on U.S. territory.

- China is increasingly taking coercive actions to assert expansive territorial claims that unilaterally change the status quo in the South and East China Seas and raise tensions with U.S. allies and partners, all while continuing to expand and modernize its military in ways that challenge U.S. access and freedom of movement in the Western Pacific.

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

Despite the challenges we face and our commitment to the men and women of the Department of Defense (DOD), the President's budget for fiscal year 2016 proposes reductions in force structure and compensation that increase risk for our nation and for the men and women who protect us. These reductions are driven by fiscal limitations that Congress dictated when we enacted the Budget Control Act of 2011 and reaffirmed (with minor relief in fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for the DOD and other agencies) in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013. The impact of these budget limitations on our Armed Forces has been a major oversight priority for the committee.

To date, in this 1st Session of the 114th Congress, the Senate Committee on Armed Services has conducted 49 hearings and formal briefings on the President's budget request for fiscal year 2016. We have received testimony from many of America's most respected statesmen, thinkers, and former military commanders and these leaders have all conveyed a similar message: We are experiencing a nearly unprecedented period of global turmoil and at current sequestration levels will not be able effectively respond to these threats. In order to provide a framework for the consideration of these matters, the committee identified 10 guidelines for its consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. These guidelines are as follows:

(1) Ensure the long-term viability of the all-volunteer force by sustaining the quality of life of the men and women of the total force (active duty, National Guard and Reserves) and their families, as well as Department of Defense civilian personnel, through fair pay, policies and enhanced retirement benefits, and by addressing the needs of the wounded, ill and injured service members and their families.

(2) Ensure that our men and women in uniform have the advanced equipment they need to succeed in future combat against technologically sophisticated adversaries, in the most efficient and effective manner that provides best value to the taxpayers, by initiating a comprehensive overhaul of the acquisition system.

(3) Initiate a reorganization of the Department of Defense in order:

- a. to focus limited resources on operations rather than administration
- b. ensure military personnel can develop critical military skills
- c. stabilize organizations and programs

(4) Drive innovation by allocating funds for advanced technology development and next generation capabilities.

(5) Build capacity and capability by reducing the strike fighter shortfall, munitions deficit, and increasing fleet capabilities

(6) Advance our ability to protect our eastern European friends and allies

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

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

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

(7) Address the threats from nuclear weapons and materials by strengthening nonproliferation programs, modernizing our nuclear deterrent, and ensuring the safety, security and reliability of the stockpile, the delivery systems, and the nuclear infrastructure.

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

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

## **SUMMARY OF DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS AND BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION**

The administration's budget request for national defense discretionary programs within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services for fiscal year 2016 was \$604.1 billion. Of this amount, \$534.2 billion was requested for base Department of Defense (DOD) programs, \$19.0 billion was requested for national security programs in the Department of Energy (DOE) and the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB), and \$50.9 billion was requested for Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO).

The committee recommends an overall discretionary authorization of \$604.1 billion in fiscal year 2016, including \$496.5 billion for base DOD programs, \$18.7 billion for national security programs in the DOE and the DNFSB, and \$88.9 billion for OCO.

The two tables preceding the detailed program adjustments in Division D of this bill summarize the direct discretionary authorizations in the committee recommendation and the equivalent budget authority levels for fiscal year 2016 defense programs. The first table summarizes the committee's recommended discretionary authorizations by appropriation account for fiscal year 2016 and compares these amounts to the request. The second table summarizes the total budget authority implication for national defense by including national defense funding for items that are not in the jurisdiction of the defense committees or are already authorized.

**BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF THIS ACT (SEC. 4)**

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





## **DIVISION A—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS**

### **TITLE I—PROCUREMENT**

#### **Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations**

##### **Authorization of appropriations (sec. 101)**

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

#### **Subtitle B—Navy Programs**

##### **Amendment to cost limitation baseline for CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program (sec. 111)**

The committee recommends a provision that would further amend section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) as amended by section 121(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) by striking “\$11,498,000,000” and inserting “\$11,398,000,000”. While the lead ship (CVN-78) cost cap remains \$12.9 billion, this change would apply to CVN-79 and subsequent CVN-78 class nuclear aircraft carriers.

The initial CVN-78 class aircraft carrier cost cap was established by the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), which set the cost cap for the lead ship at \$10.5 billion, plus adjustments for inflation and other factors, and at \$8.1 billion for subsequent CVN-78 class carriers, plus adjustments for inflation and other factors. The cost cap was amended by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) to \$12.9 billion and \$11.5 billion, respectively.

While the estimated procurement cost of each of the first three CVN-78 class aircraft carriers increased more than \$2.0 billion since 2008, the Navy has held cost relatively constant over the past three years. The committee is encouraged by the fiscal year 2016 budget request, which indicates the lead ship is on track to deliver in March 2016 at its cost cap and the estimated procurement costs for CVN-79 and CVN-80 are decreasing. From the fiscal year 2015 budget request to the fiscal year 2016 budget request, the estimated procurement costs for CVN-79 and CVN-80 decreased by \$150.0 million and \$402.2 million, respectively.

In recognition of the gains made in controlling the cost of CVN-78 class aircraft carriers and to allow for \$50.0 million of unexpected growth in the CVN-79 procurement cost, the committee recommends reducing the cost cap by \$100.0 million from \$11.5 billion

to \$11.4 billion, plus adjustments for inflation and other factors, for CVN-79 and subsequent aircraft carriers.

**Limitation on availability of funds for USS John F. Kennedy (CVN-79) (sec. 112)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit \$100.0 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy procurement funds for USS *John F. Kennedy* (CVN-79) subject to the submission of a certification regarding full ship shock trials and two reports.

The committee is concerned by the Navy's decision to delay by up to 7 years full ship shock trials on CVN-78 class nuclear aircraft carriers from the lead ship, USS *Gerald R. Ford* (CVN-78), to CVN-79. While the committee understands the Navy is concerned with the cost of the test and potential deployment delay, it is the committee's view that the benefits outweigh these concerns. With the abundance of new technology, including the catapult, arresting gear, and radar, as well as the reliance on electricity rather than steam to power key systems, there continues to be a great deal of risk in this program. Testing CVN-78 will not only improve the design of future carriers, but also reduce the costs associated with retrofitting engineering changes. Even more importantly, the thought that CVN-78 could deploy and potentially fight without this testing would be imprudent and puts sailors at risk. As a result, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to certify that the Navy will conduct by not later than September 30, 2017, full ship shock trials on CVN-78.

The committee is also concerned by the cost growth in CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program and the potential for further growth in the future. The committee understands the \$2.4 billion in CVN-78 cost growth is attributable to government furnished equipment, design and engineering changes, and shipbuilder performance. The committee views cost reduction efforts in all three of these areas as essential. As a result, the committee directs the specified report.

The committee views CVN-78 class aircraft carriers as extraordinarily important instruments of U.S. national military power. However, with costs ranging from \$11.5 billion to more than \$13.0 billion, these ships are also extraordinarily expensive, and only one shipbuilder in the world is capable of building these ships. Since the first advance procurement funding for this program was appropriated in fiscal year 2001, each of the first three ships in the class have experienced more than \$2.0 billion in procurement cost growth. In view of the vital importance of aircraft carriers to national defense, the cost per ship, lack of competition, and history of cost overruns, the committee directs a report, which examines potential requirements, capabilities, and alternatives for future development of aircraft carriers that would replace or supplement CVN-78 class aircraft carriers.

**Limitation on availability of funds for USS Enterprise (CVN-80) (sec. 113)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit \$191.4 million in advance procurement funds for USS *Enterprise* (CVN-80), until the Secretary of the Navy submits a certification and report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the

House of Representatives. \$191.4 million is the sum of funding requested for plans (detailed) and basic construction for CVN-80.

The committee is concerned by the \$13.5 billion estimated procurement cost of CVN-80. This cost is \$2.1 billion, or 18 percent greater, than the estimated procurement cost of USS John F. Kennedy (CVN-79). While the committee understands inflation contributes to this cost increase, the committee believes greater savings should be achieved through a stable design and the benefits of industrial base learning curve efficiencies.

As a result, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit a certification that the design of CVN-80 will repeat that of CVN-79, with exceptions only as specified, and pursuant to section 114 of this Act. In addition, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit a report on the plans costs of CVN-80, including a detailed description and justification of the cost elements.

**Modification of CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program (sec. 114)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend subsection (f) of section 122 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364; 120 Stat. 2104), as added by section 121(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 127 Stat. 692), by adding a reporting requirement to the USS John F. Kennedy (CVN-79) quarterly report.

The committee is concerned by the continuing substantial plans costs, design changes, and engineering changes associated with the CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program. While non-recurring plans costs are expected for the lead ship in a class, the committee would expect these costs to drop substantially once the class design is complete and the follow-on ships enter construction. The plans cost for the lead ship, USS Gerald R. Ford (CVN-78), amounts to \$3.3 billion, which is 25 percent of the overall ship cost (\$12.9 billion). The plans cost for the next ship, CVN-79, is estimated at \$880.0 million. The committee understands these costs are attributable to detail design and lead yard services, which include: planning, material sourcing, engineering, and program management performed by the shipbuilder.

The committee is also acutely aware of past cost growth and schedule delays associated with design and engineering changes to this program. The committee believes design and engineering changes to this program should be limited to operational necessity, safety, or cost reduction initiatives that meet threshold requirements.

As a result, beginning January 1, 2016, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit, as part of the CVN-79 quarterly report, a description of new design and engineering changes to CVN-78 class aircraft carriers that exceed \$5.0 million and occurred during the reporting period. The report shall include program or ship cost increases for each design or engineering change and any cost reduction achieved. The Secretary of the Navy and Chief of Naval Operations shall each personally sign (not autopen) this additional reporting requirement. This certification may not be delegated. The certification shall include a determination that each

change serves the national security interests of the United States; cannot be deferred to a future ship due to operational necessity, safety, or substantial cost reduction; and was personally reviewed and endorsed by the Secretary of the Navy and Chief of Naval Operations.

**Limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship (sec. 115)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit 75 percent of fiscal year 2016 funds for research and development, design, construction, procurement or advance procurement of materials for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ships (LCS), designated as LCS-33 and subsequent, until the Secretary of the Navy submits to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives: a capabilities based assessment to assess capability gaps and associated capability requirements and risks for the upgraded LCS, an updated capabilities development document for the upgraded LCS, and a report describing the upgraded LCS modernization.

The committee understands that the Secretary of Defense directed the Navy to explore “alternative proposals to procure a capable and lethal small surface combatant, generally consistent with the capabilities of a frigate”. The outcome of this analysis, subsequently approved by the Secretary of Defense, was modifications to the two existing variants of the LCS. The committee recognizes the significant analysis the Navy did accomplish, which is similar to an analysis of alternatives in defense acquisition.

However, the committee is concerned by the absence of analysis to identify the specific capability gaps and mission needs that the Navy is seeking to address, which would have been appropriate prior the Secretary of Defense’s initial tasking. Without this analysis, it is unclear why the capabilities of the current LCS are inadequate and if the proposed modifications will be sufficient to address a defined warfighting gap. In addition, given the significant proposed changes to the LCS, the committee believes an updated capabilities development document is warranted and understands the Navy is pursuing this action.

Finally, the committee believes this modernization of the LCS class needs to be pursued in a comprehensive and analytically-derived manner, particularly because these ships are planned to be in service until 2050. Large surface combatants, submarines, and tactical aircraft follow documented, proven modernization processes to outpace the advances of potential adversaries. Most relevant for the LCS is the advanced capability build process for large surface combatants, which is based on a naval capabilities document. The 14 sections of this document are listed in the recommended provision.

Therefore, this provision would direct the Navy to deliver a capabilities based assessment, an updated capabilities development document certified by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, and a report on LCS modernization.

**Extension and modification of limitation on availability of funds for Littoral Combat Ship (sec. 116)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 123 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) by extending the limitation on funds for LCS–25 and LCS–26 until pre-existing requirements are met and would additionally require the Navy to provide to the congressional defense committees the following: an acquisition strategy for LCS–25 through LCS–32; a LCS mission module acquisition strategy; a plan to outfit Flight 0 and Flight 0+ Littoral Combat Ships with capabilities identified for the upgraded Littoral Combat Ship; and a current test and evaluation master plan for the Littoral Combat Ship mission modules.

The committee believes the additional requirements are in keeping with defense acquisition policies and best practices. The committee is concerned that the introduction of an upgraded LCS, beginning with LCS–33, will further complicate configuration management of the LCS seaframes and mission modules. Opportunistic modifications or “backfits” of existing LCS with some, but not all, of these upgraded capabilities are another source of concern. The committee needs clarity on the LCS seaframe acquisition strategy, requirement for mission modules in light of the upgraded LCS decision, cost and schedule of the Navy’s plan to modify or “backfit” existing LCS, and how the Navy will achieve developmental and operational testing for each component and mission module.

**Construction of additional *Arleigh Burke* destroyer (sec. 117)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract beginning with the fiscal year 2016 program year for the procurement of one *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyer in addition to the ten DDG–51s in the fiscal year 2013 through 2017 multiyear procurement contract or for one DDG–51 in fiscal year 2018. The Secretary may employ incremental funding for such procurement.

Additional funding and incremental funding authority would help relieve pressure on the shipbuilding budget as funding requirements grow for the *Ohio*-class replacement program over the next several years. As a result, the committee recommends incremental funding authority for 1 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyer in addition to the 10 DDG–51s in the fiscal year 2013–2017 multiyear procurement contract or for a DDG–51 in fiscal year 2018.

**Fleet replenishment oiler program (sec. 118)**

The committee recommends a provision that would grant the Secretary of the Navy contracting authority to procure up to six fleet replenishment oilers (T–AO(X)). This new ship class is a non-developmental recapitalization program based on existing commercial technology and standards. The ship design is considered to be low risk by the Navy, with the design scheduled to be complete prior to the start of construction on the lead ship. This provision would generate an estimated \$45.0 million in savings per ship compared to annual procurement cost estimates. In addition, the provi-

sion would provide a long-term commitment to the shipbuilder and vendors, which would enable workforce stability and planning efficiency.

**Reporting requirement for *Ohio*-class replacement submarine program (sec. 119)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit *Ohio*-class replacement submarine cost tracking information, together with annual budget justification materials. While the first *Ohio*-class replacement submarine is not planned to be authorized until fiscal year 2021, the national importance of this program and significant cost will continue to merit close oversight by the congressional defense committees. In response to a committee request, the Navy provided the committee an information paper dated February 3, 2015 with the following elements in fiscal year 2010 dollars and then-year dollars: lead ship end cost (with plans), lead ship end cost (less plans), lead ship non-recurring engineering cost, average follow-on ship (hulls 2–12) cost, operations and sustainment cost per hull per year, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (OSD AT&L) average follow-on ship (hulls 2–12) affordability target, and OSD AT&L operations & sustainment cost per hull per year affordability target (including disposal). The committee recommends this format continue to be used to enable cost visibility, direct comparison of cost elements, and year-on-year trend analysis.

**Subtitle C—Air Force Programs**

**Limitations on retirement of B-1, B-2, and B-52 bomber aircraft (sec. 131)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the retirement of B-1, B-2, or B-52 bomber aircraft to be retired during a fiscal year prior to initial operational capability (IOC) of the Long Range Strike Bomber (LRS-B) unless the Secretary of Defense certifies, in the materials submitted in support of the budget of the President for that fiscal year as submitted to Congress, that:

- (1) the retirement of the aircraft is required to reallocate funding and manpower resources to enable LRS-B to reach IOC and full operational capability (FOC); and
- (2) the Secretary has concluded that retirements of B-1, B-2, and B-52 bomber aircraft in the near-term will not detrimentally affect operational capability.

The committee acknowledges the need to recapitalize the Air Force's bomber fleet with the LRS-B and recognizes the need for a carefully phased retirement of legacy bomber aircraft to facilitate this transition as LRS-B approaches IOC.

**Limitation on retirement of Air Force fighter aircraft (sec. 132)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8062 of title 10, United States Code, by adding a new subsection requiring the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain a minimum total active inventory of 1,950 fighter aircraft, within which

the Secretary must also maintain a minimum of 1,116 fighter aircraft as primary mission aircraft inventory (combat-coded).

The provision would also provide additional limitations on fighter retirements by requiring the Secretary of the Air Force to certify to the defense committees that:

(1) the retirement of such fighter aircraft will not increase the operational risk of meeting the National Defense Strategy; and

(2) the retirement of such aircraft will not reduce the total fighter force structure below 1,950 fighter aircraft or primary mission aircraft inventory below 1,116 and would require a report setting forth the following:

(a) The rationale for the retirement of existing fighter aircraft and an operational analysis of replacement fighter aircraft that demonstrates performance of the designated mission at an equal or greater level of effectiveness as the retiring aircraft;

(b) An assessment of the implications for the Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve of the force mix ratio of fighter aircraft; and

(c) Such other matters relating to the retirement of fighter aircraft as the Secretary considers appropriate.

Lastly, the provision would also require a report at least 90 days prior to the date on which a fighter aircraft is retired that includes the following:

(1) A list of each aircraft in the inventory of fighter aircraft, including for each such aircraft:

(a) the mission design series type;

(b) the variant; and

(c) the assigned unit and military installation where such aircraft is based.

(2) A list of each fighter aircraft proposed for retirement, including for each such aircraft:

(a) the mission design series type;

(b) the variant; and

(c) the assigned unit and military installation where such aircraft is based.

(3) A list of each unit affected by a proposed retirement listed under (2) above and how such unit is affected.

(4) For each military installation and unit listed under (2)(c) above, changes, if any, to the designed operational capability (DOC) statement of the unit as a result of a proposed retirement.

(5) Any anticipated changes in manpower authorizations as a result of a proposed retirement listed under (2) above.

The committee understands the Air Force determined through extensive analysis that a force structure of 1,200 primary mission aircraft and 2,000 total aircraft is required to execute the National Defense Strategy with increased operational risk. Subsequently, based on the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance and fiscal constraints, analysis showed the Air Force could decrease fighter force structure by approximately 100 additional aircraft; however, at an even higher level of risk.

The committee acknowledges that the original F-35 procurement plan projected 516 F-35A variants to be delivered by fiscal year 2016, but schedule delays and subsequent re-baselining of the program now projects only 103 F-35A aircraft delivered by fiscal year 2016. This occurred simultaneously with the Air Force retiring over 400 fighter aircraft in the period since fiscal year 2010. These factors result in a fighter aircraft shortfall that will gradually improve as the F-35A procurement rate increases.

The Air Force currently fields 54 fighter squadrons in fiscal year 2015. The proposed fiscal year 2016 retirement of an additional five A-10 combat squadrons would reduce the total to 49 fighter squadrons. Of the 49 squadrons remaining in fiscal year 2016, the Air Force estimates less than half would be fully combat mission ready. Therefore, the committee has proposed a provision elsewhere in this act prohibiting the retirement of additional A-10 aircraft. The limitation on total aircraft numbers proposed by the committee in the provision would allow the Air Force to stand down one 24 primary assigned aircraft squadron at Hill Air Force Base in fiscal year 2016, in order to transition the people and resources of the squadron to the F-35A aircraft.

The committee believes further reductions in fighter force capacity, in light of ongoing and anticipated operations in Iraq and Syria against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, coupled with a potential delay of force withdrawals from Afghanistan, poses excessive risk to the Air Force's ability to execute the National Defense Strategy, causes remaining fighter squadrons to deploy more frequently, and drives even lower readiness rates across the combat air forces. The committee expects the Air Force to execute the fiscal year program in accordance with the spirit and intent of this provision.

#### **Limitation on availability of funds for F-35A aircraft procurement (sec. 133)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the availability of fiscal year 2016 funds for F-35A procurement to not more than \$4.3 billion until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that F-35A aircraft delivered in fiscal year 2018 will have full combat capability with currently planned Block 3F hardware, software, and weapons carriage.

The committee acknowledges that in light of increasing potential adversary capabilities and growing anti-access/area denial threat environments around the globe, the requirement for a robust fifth generation fighter capability is a necessary element for our combatant commanders' continued ability to execute their warfighting responsibilities. The committee also acknowledges the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program represents our only in-production fifth generation fighter aircraft and is a crucial capability that cannot be understated. The committee encourages the Secretary to exhibit increased management oversight of this critical program to ensure compliance with cost, schedule, and performance objectives.

The committee is concerned, however, that the 57 percent increase in F-35A production to 44 aircraft in the budget request, over the fiscal year 2015 level of 28 aircraft, presents an increased risk of cost growth and schedule delays. The ongoing System Devel-



opment and Demonstration (SDD) phase is now approximately 65 percent complete, and continues development, testing, and evaluation concurrently with production. Any further software development delays or test and evaluation deficiency discoveries and deferrals could incur increased retrofit costs for delivered aircraft, and delay required capabilities to the warfighter.

**Prohibition on retirement of A-10 aircraft (sec. 134)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of any funds during fiscal year 2016 to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any A-10 aircraft. The provision would also require the Secretary of the Air Force to maintain a minimum of 171 A-10 aircraft in primary mission aircraft inventory (combat-coded) status. The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to commission an independent entity outside the Department of Defense to conduct an assessment of the required capabilities and mission platform to replace the A-10 aircraft. The committee expects the Air Force to execute the fiscal year program in accordance with the spirit of this provision.

The committee believes that the Air Force is proposing the retirement of the A-10 fleet purely on the basis of the fiscal environment and not on grounds of the ability of the combat air forces to effectively meet the requirements of the combatant commanders and defense strategy. The committee also believes that with the A-10 fleet currently engaged in operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), providing a theater security package in Europe to assure our allies and partners, and continuing rotational deployment operations to Afghanistan, divesting this capability at this time incurs unacceptable risk in the capacity and readiness of the combat air forces without a suitable replacement available.

Additionally, in fiscal year 2015 the Air Force implemented the move of 18 A-10s to backup aircraft inventory status, reducing all but two of the A-10 fleet's combat squadrons to 18 primary assigned aircraft each.

Specifically, the Secretary of the Air Force should ensure that the Air Force does not close or consolidate A-10 units, make changes to standard sustainment processes, or reduce A-10 pilot training or A-10 flying hours disproportionately to reductions applied to pilots or flying hours for other Air Force aircraft. Additionally, the provision would require the Secretary of the Air Force to ensure that the Air Force maintains a minimum of 171 A-10 aircraft designated as primary mission aircraft inventory (PMAI) to retain viable combat squadron sizes through sufficient primary assigned aircraft.

The committee also recommends an increase of \$279.7 million for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force; \$16.2 million for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force; and \$38.5 million for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force.

The committee recommends no increase in Air Force military personnel accounts. The Air Force is encouraged to find the billets necessary to fill A-10 and F-35 manpower authorizations from within the 2,200 billets reduced from its management headquarters and its 6,000 billet increase request authorized in title IV of this Act. The committee expects that the Secretary and Chief of Staff

of the Air Force will use some of the thousands of military positions freed up in the 4-year, 30 percent reduction of headquarter and defense agency staffs to recruit the necessary maintenance personnel for these aircraft. The committee believes that combat capability, not headquarter staffs, should be the priority of the service leaders.

**Prohibition on availability of funds for retirement of EC-130H Compass Call aircraft (sec. 135)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of any funds during fiscal year 2016 to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage any EC-130H Compass Call aircraft. The committee believes that the Air Force is proposing the retirement of EC-130H Compass Call aircraft purely on the basis of the fiscal environment and not on grounds of the ability of the Air Force to meet effectively the requirements of the combatant commanders and the national defense strategy.

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

The committee was concerned with the Air Force's fiscal year 2015 budget proposal to retire half the EC-130H fleet beginning in fiscal year 2016. The Senate report accompanying S. 2410 (S. Rept. 113-176) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) directed the Air Force to develop a plan, including milestones and resource requirements, to replace, modernize, or re-host the current Compass Call capabilities.

In the Air Force's report transmitted to the committee by the Under Secretary of the Air Force in September 2014, the Air Force stated, ". . . budget realities have forced the Air Force to extreme measures to cut costs and yet attempt to maintain capabilities. The decision to reduce the Compass Call fleet by nearly half after [fiscal year 2015] is one of those extreme measures . . ."

Additionally, the Air Force stated, "This decision is not without risk, in that the Air Force will NOT be able to meet combatant commander operations plan capacity requirements, however, it is made fully informed of those risks. Because of this, alternatives to ensure capabilities will not be lost to combatant commanders will be analyzed, assessed, and selected in a disciplined, rigorous fashion, with answers expected no later than [fiscal year 2017]."

The committee believes the Air Force response in the report indicates it has not yet sufficiently identified, through studies and analysis, how it will continue to provide the required capability and capacity to meet combatant commander requirements for this segment of the airborne electronic attack mission at acceptable risk, and will not gain insight through observations and conclusions until at least fiscal year 2017. Additionally, the Air Force has placed the restoration of the EC-130H Compass Call fleet on its

fiscal year 2016 unfunded priority list received by the committee in March 2015.

The committee also notes that while the primary mission electronic warfare capabilities are critical, the EC-130H is not the ideal platform for anti-access/area denial (A2/AD) combat environments, and gaps may continue to exist even with planned platform upgrades.

The committee understands there may be options available to transition Compass Call capabilities to a new platform that can address capability requirements in combatant commander operations plans. The committee is interested in ways the Air Force could potentially use existing and future EC-130H modernization and sustainment funds to begin procurement of a new platform to meet an initial operations capability in 2019, provide full-spectrum electronic attack capabilities against an advanced threat in highly contested environments, and thereby obviate mission capability gaps.

The committee recommends an increase of \$27.3 million for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force and \$28.7 million for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force. The committee recommends no increase for Air Force military personnel accounts and directs the Air Force to examine its existing force structure and reduction of management headquarters military personnel billets to adequately staff the EC-130H fleet at its current operational capability.

**Limitation on transfer of C-130 aircraft (sec. 136)**

The committee recommends a provision that would place a limitation on all of the funds authorized or appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2016 for the Air Force that may be obligated or expended to transfer from one facility of the Department of Defense to another any C-130H aircraft, initiate any C-130 manpower authorization adjustments, retire or prepare to retire any C-130H aircraft, or close any C-130H unit until 90 days after the date on which the Secretary of the Air Force, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army, and after certification by the commanders of the XVIII Airborne Corps, 82nd Airborne Division, and United States Army Special Operations Command, certifies to the committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representatives that:

(1) the United States Air Force will maintain dedicated C-130 wings to support the daily training and contingency requirements of the XVIII Airborne Corps, 82nd Airborne Division, and United States Army Special Operations Command at manning levels required to support and operate the number of aircraft that existed as part of the regular and reserve Air Force operations in support of such units as of September 30, 2014; and

(2) failure to maintain such Air Force operations will not adversely impact the daily training requirement of those airborne and special operations units.

**Limitation on use of funds for T-1A Jayhawk aircraft (sec. 137)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit all the funds authorized or appropriated by this Act or that otherwise may

be obligated or expended for fiscal year 2016 for avionics modifications to the T-1A Jayhawk aircraft until 30 days after the Secretary of the Air Force submits to the congressional defense committees the report required under section 142 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

**Restriction on retirement of the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), EC-130H Compass Call, and Airborne Early Warning and Control (AWACS) aircraft (sec. 138)**

The committee recommends a provision that would restrict the Secretary of the Air Force from retiring any Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), EC-130H Compass Call, and Airborne Early Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft until the follow-on replacement aircraft program enters low-rate initial production.

**Sense of the Congress regarding the OCONUS basing of the F-35A aircraft (sec. 139)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress regarding basing of the F-35A aircraft outside of the continental United States.

**Sense of Congress on F-16 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar upgrade (sec. 140)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Congress on F-16 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar upgrades.

**Subtitle D—Defense-Wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters**

**Report on Army and Marine Corps modernization plan for small arms (sec. 151)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretaries of the Army and Navy to jointly submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report on the plan of the Army and Marine Corps to modernize small arms.

**Budget Items**

**Army**

**Common missile warning system**

The budget request included \$78.3 million in Aircraft Procurement, Army (APA) for common missile warning system. The committee recommends an increase of \$26.0 million in APA for procurement of common missile warning systems. Additional funding for common missile warning systems was included on the Chief of Staff of the Army’s unfunded priorities list.

**PAC-3 Missile Segment Enhancement**

The budget included \$414.9 million in Missile Procurement, Army (MPA) for PAC-3 Missile Segment Enhancement (MSE) mis-

siles for use in the Medium Extended Air Defense System and Patriot missile defense systems. The PAC-3 MSE provides substantial improvement in interceptor altitude, range, propulsion, lethality and agility while furthering insensitive munitions compliance. The committee recommends an increase of \$200.0 million in MPA for procurement of MSE missiles. Additional funding was included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priority list.

#### **Army Tactical Missile System**

The budget request included \$30.1 million in Missile Procurement, Army (MPA) for Army Tactical Missile Systems (ATACMS) modifications. The committee is concerned about the Army's plan to enter into a production contract prior to the completion of testing. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$10.0 million in MPA for ATACMS.

#### **Improved recovery vehicle**

The budget request included \$123.6 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV) for improved recovery vehicles (M88A2 Hercules). The committee recommends an increase of \$72.0 million in WTCV for the procurement of 16 additional M88A2s. Additional funding for the improved recovery vehicle was included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list.

#### **Precision sniper rifle**

The budget request included \$2.0 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV) for the precision sniper rifle. Given this requirement is early to need, the committee recommends a decrease of \$2.0 million in WTCV for the precision sniper rifle due to program delay.

#### **Compact semi-automatic sniper system**

The budget request included \$1.5 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV) for the compact semi-automatic sniper system. Given this requirement is early to need, the committee recommends a decrease of \$1.5 million in WTCV for the compact semi-automatic sniper system due to program delay.

#### **Common remotely operated weapons station**

The budget request included \$8.4 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV) for common remotely operated weapons station (CROWS). At the Army's request, the committee recommends an increase of \$6.4 million in WTCV for the CROWS. The Army will use the additional funds to synchronize the conversion and fielding of systems in a sustainable configuration.

#### **Handgun**

The budget request included \$5.4 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV) for handguns. The committee recommends a decrease of \$5.4 million in WTCV for handguns due to program delay.

**Sniper rifle modifications**

The budget request included \$2.4 million in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV) for sniper rifle modifications. Given this requirement is early to need, the committee recommends a decrease of \$1.4 million in WTCV for sniper rifle modifications due to program delay.

**Items less than \$5.0 million**

The budget request included \$391,000 in Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles, Army (WTCV) for items less than \$5.0 million. The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in WTCV for the items less than \$5.0 million. The Army would use the additional funds to procure nonstandard weapons for Regionally Aligned Forces training.

**Army ammunition decrease**

The budget request included \$1.2 billion in Procurement of Ammunition, Army (PAA), of which \$7.7 million was for LI 1450EA3000 CTG, Handgun, All Types and \$79.9 million was for LI 3222ER8001 CTG, 40mm, All Types.

The committee believes that funding related to both line items are requested ahead of need.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$952,000 in LI 1450EA3000 PAA for CTG, Handgun, All Types and \$10.0 million in LI 3222ER8001 CTG, 40mm, All Types.

**Transportable Tactical Command Communications**

The budget request included \$45.0 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for the Transportable Tactical Command Communications (T2C2) system. The committee notes that the program's Milestone C decision has been delayed to late fiscal year 2015. Therefore, a portion of the funds requested for fiscal year 2016 are early to need. The committee recommends a decrease of \$15.0 million in OPA for T2C2.

**Prophet Ground System**

The budget request included \$63.6 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for Prophet ground systems. The committee recommends a decrease of \$15.0 million in OPA for the Prophet due to unjustified growth in production.

**Counterfire radars**

The budget request included \$217.4 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA), for counterfire radars (AN/TPQ-53). The committee notes that this program is delayed due to problems discovered during initial operational test and evaluation resulting in unobligated funds available from prior year appropriations. Procurement funds requested for fiscal year 2016 are not operationally urgent and appear early to need. The committee recommends a decrease of \$75.0 million in OPA for counterfire radars to allow the program test and production schedules to synchronize in fiscal year 2017.

The committee directs that not later than 180 days after the dates of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall

submit to the congressional defense committees a report on counterfire radars explaining the under execution of fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015 funds as well as repair problems. The report should also include actions planned and taken to correct the deficiencies. Specifically, the report should address problems discovered during initial operation testing and evaluation. The committee directs that not later than 60 days after the report of the Secretary, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the report and submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the matter contained in the report.

#### **Global Combat Support System—Army**

The budget request included \$162.7 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Global Combat Support System—Army (GCSS–A). The committee recommends a decrease of \$16.0 million in OPA for GCSS–A due to unjustified program growth.

#### **Automated data processing equipment**

The budget request included \$106.4 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for automated data processing equipment. The committee recommends a decrease of \$12.0 million to this program. The committee recommends that the Army should ensure that information technology procurements are not redundant with capabilities available under joint, other Service, or other agency programs.

#### **Non-system training devices**

The budget request included \$303.2 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for non-system training devices. The committee recommends a decrease of \$25.0 million in OPA for non-system training devices due to unjustified cost growth.

### **Navy**

#### **F/A–18E/F aircraft procurement**

The budget request included no funds in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for F/A–18E/F aircraft. Procuring additional F/A–18E/F aircraft will reduce near-term strike fighter inventory gaps and risk. This item was included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.2 billion in APN for 12 F/A–18E/F aircraft and initial spares.

#### **F–35C**

The budget request included \$897.5 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for four F–35C aircraft. The committee recommends a decrease of \$24.5 million in APN due to anticipated efficiencies savings and excess support equipment cost growth.

#### **F–35B**

The budget request included \$1.5 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for nine F–35B aircraft. The committee recommends a decrease of \$25.1 million in APN due to anticipated efficiencies savings and excess support equipment cost growth. Additionally,

the committee recommends an increase in F-35B procurement to a total quantity of 15 F-35B aircraft to mitigate the strike fighter shortfall. This request was on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priority list.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.1 billion in APN for the procurement of six additional F-35B aircraft.

#### **AV-8 series aircraft**

The budget request included \$83.2 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for AV-8 series aircraft. Link 16 upgrades are necessary for the fleet of AV-8 aircraft to improve pilot situational awareness, joint communications, and force protection. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$3.3 million in APN. This item was included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priorities list.

#### **F-18 series kill chain enhancements**

The budget request included \$986.8 million in Aircraft Procurement, Navy (APN), for F-18 series aircraft modifications. The committee recommends an increase of \$170.0 million in APN for F-18 aircraft series radio frequency kill chain enhancements to counter sophisticated digital weapons and combat systems currently proliferated around the world. This item was included on the Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priorities list.

#### **V-22 Osprey**

The base budget request included \$121.2 million for procurement of V-22 Osprey. The committee notes the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded requirement for MV-22 integrated aircraft survivability (\$15.0 million) and MV-22 ballistic protection (\$8.0 million). As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$23.0 million to this program.

#### **Tomahawk**

The budget request included \$184.8 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy to procure 100 Tomahawk missiles. The future years defense program envisions shutting down the Tomahawk production line after the fiscal year 2016 procurement.

The committee is concerned about the Navy's decision to truncate production. The Tomahawk is a combat-proven missile, having been used well over 2,000 times in the last two decades, most recently against targets in Syria during Operation Inherent Resolve in September 2014 and remains the country's first-strike weapon of choice. The Navy has stated that the current Tomahawk inventory is sufficient for munitions requirements and will meet the Navy's needs until its replacement is operational in the mid-2020s. The Next Generation Land Attack Weapon, however, is only in initial planning stages and is not due to enter service until 2024. The committee believes the assumption of this much risk in a capability as important as long-range strike is not prudent in the current and projected security environment.

Additionally, the Navy plans to begin recertification of its existing Block IV missiles beginning in 2019. By its own analysis, the Navy recognizes that the existence of a production gap between the



end of new missile builds and the start of recertification will put tremendous strain on the Tomahawk supplier base and involve millions of dollars to requalify suppliers for recertification. The committee is concerned by the Navy's plan as it moves toward recertification.

The committee believes that it would be imprudent to ramp down and close production of the Tomahawk missile at this time. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$30.0 million to keep Tomahawk production at the minimum sustaining rate of 196 missiles per year.

#### **Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile**

The budget request included \$192.9 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy funding to procure 192 Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM). The AMRAAM remains the preeminent all-weather, radar-guided missile fielded by the U.S. Navy and Air Force. The most up-to-date version, the AIM-120D, provides enhanced lethality to the warfighter and is essential to success in any potential conflict involving air combat. Chief of Naval Operations Jonathan Greenert testified to the Navy's shortfall in AMRAAM before the committee. The committee believes the Navy needs to address the shortfall and therefore recommends an increase of \$15.0 million to procure additional missiles.

#### **Ordnance support equipment**

The budget request included \$57.6 million in Weapons Procurement, Navy for Ordnance Support Equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$3.7 million.

#### **Virginia-class submarines**

The budget request included \$2.0 billion in advance procurement and \$3.3 billion in procurement in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for *Virginia*-class submarines.

The committee notes that the *Virginia*-class submarine program has continued to perform well, delivering submarines early and within budget to combatant commanders. As Assistant Secretary of Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition Sean Stackley testified on March 18, 2015, "Submarines' stealth and ability to conduct sustained forward-deployed operations in anti-access/area-denial environments serve as force multipliers by providing high-quality intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance as well as indication and warning of potential hostile action. In addition, attack submarines are effective in anti-surface warfare and undersea warfare in almost every environment, thus eliminating any safe-haven that an adversary might pursue with access-denial systems. As such, they represent a significant conventional deterrent."

Despite these important capabilities and the success of the *Virginia*-class submarine program, the committee notes that on March 18, 2015, Vice Admiral Joseph P. Mulloy testified that the Navy is only meeting approximately 54 percent of combatant commander requests for attack submarines.

The Navy has a validated requirement for 48 attack submarines, and currently has a fleet of 53 attack submarines. However, the committee notes that the Navy's attack submarine fleet will drop

to 41 submarines in fiscal year 2029. This smaller attack submarine fleet, combined with an increasing demand for the unique capabilities they provide, could result in the Navy meeting an even smaller percentage of combatant commander requests for attack submarines. The committee believes it is important that the Navy procure two *Virginia*-class submarines per year in fiscal years 2016 to 2020.

The committee understands that the Virginia Payload Module (VPM) will help mitigate the nearly 60 percent decrease in under-sea strike capacity associated with the declining number of attack submarines and retirement of the Navy's guided missile submarines (SSGNs) in the 2020s. The VPM will increase the capacity of *Virginia*-class submarines from 12 to 40 cruise missiles. The committee believes it is essential to accelerate as soon as practicable the inclusion of the VPM on *Virginia*-class submarines. Furthermore, once inclusion of the VPM is determined to be feasible, the committee supports inclusion of the VPM on every new construction *Virginia*-class submarine.

Therefore, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to submit a report to the committee no later than December 1, 2015 on the feasibility of accelerating the VPM introduction to *Virginia*-class submarines, as well as an assessment of the industrial base impact of building *Ohio*-class replacement submarines, *Virginia*-class submarines with the VPM, and *Virginia*-class submarines without the VPM, simultaneously.

Furthermore, in light of the importance of *Virginia*-class submarines and the VPM, the committee recommends an increase of \$800.0 million in advance procurement and the full requested amount in procurement for *Virginia*-class submarines.

#### ***Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers**

The budget request included \$3.1 billion in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for procurement of *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyers (DDG-51). Additional funding and incremental funding authority would help relieve pressure on the shipbuilding budget as funding requirements grow for the *Ohio*-class replacement program over the next several years. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$400.0 million and incremental funding authority for 1 *Arleigh Burke*-class destroyer in addition to the 10 DDG-51s in the fiscal year 2013-2017 multiyear procurement contract or for a DDG-51 in fiscal year 2018.

#### **Afloat Forward Staging Base**

The budget request included no funding in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for advance procurement of afloat forward staging base (AFSB). The committee notes the Navy has procured two AFSBs and has a new requirement to provide support to the Crisis Response Security Force that justifies an increase in AFSBs from two to three. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$97.0 million to this program for advance procurement.

#### **Amphibious Assault Ship (LHA) Replacement**

The budget request included \$277.5 million in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for advance procurement of amphibious assault

ship (LHA) replacement. The committee notes additional advance procurement funding would expedite delivery of this ship enabling the Navy to reach the force structure assessment objective of 11 large deck amphibious ships as early as fiscal year 2023. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$199.0 million to this program.

#### **LX(R)**

The budget request included no funding in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for advance procurement of LX(R), which is expected to functionally replace LSD-41 and LSD-49 class ships. The committee notes accelerating the delivery of LX(R) class ships to the fleet will enable the Navy to meet a greater amount of combatant commander demand for amphibious warships. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$51.0 million in advance procurement for this program.

#### **Landing craft utility replacement**

The budget request included no funding in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for procurement of landing craft utility replacement. The committee understands accelerating this program from fiscal year 2018 to 2016 has acceptable technical risk and will alleviate some pressure on the shipbuilding budget in future years. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$34.0 million to this program to procure one landing craft utility replacement.

#### **T-ATS(X)**

The budget request included no funding in Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy for procurement of T-ATS(X). The committee notes T-ATS(X) will replace two ship classes—*Safeguard*-class salvage and rescue ships (T-ARS) and *Powhatan*-class fleet ocean tugs (T-ATF). The committee understands accelerating this program by one year from fiscal year 2017 to 2016 has acceptable technical risk and will alleviate some pressure on the shipbuilding budget in future years. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$75.0 million to this program to procure one T-ATS(X).

#### **Destroyer modernization**

The budget request included \$364.2 million in Other Procurement, Navy for DDG modernization. The committee notes the Navy's DDG modernization program increases the Fleet's Navy Integrated Fire Control—Counter Air and Ballistic Missile Defense capacity, which improves the U.S. ability to pace high-end adversary weapons systems. Procuring one additional combat system ship set in fiscal year 2016 will allow the Navy to modernize an additional DDG in fiscal year 2018 with these capabilities. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$60.0 million to this program. This was a Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priority.

#### **Littoral Combat Ship Mine Countermeasures Mission Module**

The budget request included \$85.1 million in Other Procurement, Navy to procure Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Mine Countermeasures (MCM) mission modules. The committee notes the Navy

has two MCM mission modules delivered and four MCM mission modules procured through fiscal year 2015. The Director of Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E) has stated that only one MCM module of each increment is required to complete operational testing. During developmental testing, as noted by DOT&E, “attempts to demonstrate the sequence of events necessary for an LCS to complete end-to-end mine clearance operations have been limited by low operator proficiency, software immaturity, system integration problems, and poor reliability of MCM components including RMS/RMMV.” As a result, the committee recommends a decrease of \$55.8 million for this program due to procurement in excess of need ahead of satisfactory operational testing.

This reduction would reduce the hardware components to the manufacturer minimum sustaining rate—a reduction from two to one Airborne Mine Neutralization Systems (AMNS), two to one Airborne Laser Mine Detection Systems (ALMDS), six to one AN/AQS-20A Minehunting Sonars, and two to zero COBRA systems (two other COBRA systems are requested in LI 2624, which satisfies the manufacturer minimum sustaining rate).

#### **Remote Minehunting System**

The budget request included \$87.6 million in Other Procurement, Navy for the Remote Minehunting System (RMS). In January 2015, the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation noted in his annual report, “RMS had not demonstrated sufficient performance or successful integration with interfacing LCS systems to demonstrate the Navy’s minimum Increment 1 warfighting capability, and developmental testing completed in the first quarter of fiscal year 2015 demonstrated continued performance issues and RMS mission package integration challenges.” The committee believes that upgrading two previously procured systems may provide further assets for testing to demonstrate whether upgrades improve performance and reliability. As a result, the committee recommends a decrease of \$65.6 million for this program due to procurement in excess of need, ahead of satisfactory developmental and operational testing.

#### **Submarine towed arrays**

The budget request included \$214.8 million in Other Procurement, Navy for fast attack submarine (SSN) acoustics. The committee notes TB-29X and TB-34X submarine towed arrays improve detection, classification, and tracking capabilities for deployed *Virginia*-class SSNs. Accelerating procurement by four additional TB-29X and four additional TB-34X arrays will improve operational availability of advanced towed sensors and flexibility of operational, forward-deployed submarines. This was a Chief of Naval Operations’ unfunded priority. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to this program.

#### **Surface electronic warfare improvement program**

The budget request included \$324.7 million in Other Procurement, Navy for AN/SLQ-32. The committee notes the Surface Electronic Warfare Improvement Program (SEWIP) provides for upgraded electromagnetic sensing capabilities for surface ships.

SEWIP Block II provides an upgraded receiver/antenna group and improved electromagnetic interference mitigation and combat system interface. Procuring two additional units in fiscal year 2016 would outfit two additional ships in fiscal year 2018. This was a Chief of Naval Operations' unfunded priority. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$28.0 million to this program.

**Tube-launched, optically-tracked, wireless-guided missile**

The budget request included \$12.5 million in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC) for tube-launched, optically-tracked, wireless-guided (TOW) missiles. The committee recommends an increase of \$140.0 million in PMC for TOW missiles to replenish a depleted inventory. The additional funding was included on the Commandant of the Marine Corps' unfunded priority list.

**Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar**

The budget request included \$130.7 million in Procurement, Marine Corps (PMC) for the Ground/Air Task Oriented Radar (G/ATOR). The committee notes that excessive concurrency makes the G/ATOR program a relatively high risk development effort. This has been demonstrated in poor developmental test results to date and a major system design change introducing a less mature technology not tested in previous radars. G/ATOR continues to struggle with software performance and reliability problems resulting in significant schedule delays. The committee recommends a decrease of \$32.1 million in PMC for G/ATOR procurement.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to Congress a report on G/ATOR regarding the procurement in excess of need and ahead of satisfactory testing. The report should explain the poor development test results and why there has been major system changes. Furthermore, the report should address the software performance and reliability problems that have resulted in significant schedule delays. Not later than 60 days after the report of the Secretary is submitted, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review the report and submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the matters contained in the report.

**Air Force**

**F-35A**

The budget request included \$5.3 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for 44 F-35A aircraft. The committee recommends a decrease of \$99.1 million in APAF due to anticipated efficiencies savings and excess support equipment cost growth.

**MQ-9**

The budget request included \$553.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for 29 MQ-9 aircraft. The committee recommends an increase of \$480.0 million in APAF for 24 additional MQ-9 aircraft and initial spares to support increased combatant commander requirements for medium altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support. Additional funding was in-

cluded on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force’s unfunded priorities list.

The committee also recommends under title V in this Act a provision that would direct the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report on actions the Air Force will take to rectify persistent remotely piloted aircraft career field manning shortfalls. The committee expects the Air Force to take required actions to correct these shortfalls to facilitate these additional aircraft to fulfill combatant commander requirements.

**F-15 capability upgrades**

The budget request included \$464.4 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for F-15 fighter aircraft modifications. The F-15 series of fighter aircraft will be operated through the 2030 decade, and must have capability upgrades to increase its operational effectiveness against advanced threats and operate in increasingly contested environments, and training aircraft modified to mirror combat configurations for the most effective aircrew training. Additional funding was included in the Chief of Staff of the Air Force’s unfunded priorities list.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$11.6 million for the Eagle Passive/Active Warning Survivability System (EPAWSS), an increase of \$48.0 million for six F-15C advanced electronically scanned array (AESA) radar upgrades, an increase of \$192.5 million for 24 F-15D AESA radar upgrades, and an increase of \$10.0 million for Advanced Display/Core Processor II (ADCP II) upgrades to support AESA upgrades. The total recommended increase for APAF is \$262.1 million.

**Budget request realignment**

At the Air Force’s request, the committee recommends realignments in the following table to correct various errors in the budget request for Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), and Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF).

AIR FORCE REQUESTED REALIGNMENTS  
(in millions)

Item	Quantity	Account	Line Item	Amount
QF-16	.....	APAF	12	- 25
F-15	.....	APAF	22	-\$12.8
F-15	.....	RDTEAF	136	+\$12.8
C2ISR TDL	.....	APAF	59	-\$2.2
COMSEC Equip	.....	OPAF	11	+\$2.2

**C-130H Propulsion System Enhancements**

The budget request included \$7.0 million in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for C-130 modifications. The Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve will operate C-130H aircraft for the next two decades. Enhancements to the C-130H propulsion system will provide increased performance, improved fuel efficiency, and greater reliability. Therefore, the committee recommends increases

of \$33.2 million for T-56 3.5 Engine Modifications, \$1.5 million for In-flight Propeller Balancing System certification, and \$13.5 million for Electronic Propeller Control System for a total increase in APAF of \$48.2 million.

### **C-130H avionics modernization program**

The budget request included no funding in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF), for the C-130H Avionics Modernization Program (AMP). The committee believes the term “avionics modernization program of record for C-130 aircraft” in section 134 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) includes C-130H safety modifications and airspace compliance modifications that will be required to operate in both Federal Aviation Administration-controlled airspace and International Civil Aviation Organization-controlled airspace after January 1, 2020.

The current Air Force plan includes making those airspace compliance modifications within the C-130H Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) effort. However, as the Air Force plan for making airspace compliance modifications (AMP Increment 1) would not achieve airspace compliance for the entire C-130H aircraft fleet until well after that deadline, the committee expects the Air Force to accelerate the AMP Increment I schedule as rapidly as possible. Additionally, the committee also expects the Air Force to accelerate the effort for AMP increment 2 modifications, using previously purchased components and leveraging research and development efforts to the maximum extent practical. The committee expects the Air Force to comply with the spirit and intent of section 134 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ‘Buck’ McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) for executing the C-130H AMP program of record.

The committee understands that the Air Force is restructuring the AMP program of record, but also recognizes that it has no completed design, cost estimates, or schedule plan on how it will execute AMP Increment 2. The committee expects the Air Force to continue to execute AMP and field C-130H aircraft previously upgraded by the AMP program until the Air Force provides a concrete plan that describes the final modification configuration for AMP Increment 2, a service cost position, and a procurement and installation schedule that would realistically support a fleet viability requirement.

Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$75.0 million in APAF for C-130H AMP aircraft modifications.

### **A-10 Munitions Buyback**

The budget request included \$1.7 billion for Procurement of Ammunition, Air Force (PAAF) of which \$131.1 million was for LI 352010 Cartridges.

The committee believes that the Air Force is proposing the retirement of the A-10 fleet purely on the basis of the fiscal environment and not on grounds of the ability of the combat air forces to effectively meet the requirements of the combatant commanders and defense strategy. The committee also believes that with the A-10 fleet currently engaged in operations against the Islamic State of

Iraq and the Levant, providing a theater security package in Europe to assure our allies and partners, and continuing rotational deployments operations to Afghanistan, divesting this capability at this time incurs unacceptable risk in the capacity and readiness of the combat air forces without a suitable replacement available.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$38.5 million for LI 352010 Cartridges for munitions for the A-10 buyback.

#### **Battlefield air operations kits**

The budget request included \$13.1 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for mobility command and control equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$19.9 million in OPAF for additional battlefield air operations kits which decrease the risk of fratricide and lowers by 30 percent the weight of equipment carried by battlefield airmen. Additional funding was included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list.

#### **Air Force Network Procurements**

The budget request included \$103.8 million in Other Procurement, Air Force for Air Force network (AFNet) procurements. The committee recommends a decrease of \$17.0 million for this program. The committee notes that many network and maintenance functions can be outsourced to reduce costs and leverage commercial technologies. The committee also notes that some of the systems being procured will be better delivered through the Department-wide Joint Information Environment.

#### **Joint terminal attack controller training and rehearsal system simulators**

The budget request included \$81.6 million in Other Procurement, Air Force (OPAF), for tactical communications-electronics equipment. The committee recommends an increase of \$36.0 million in OPAF for additional Joint Terminal Attack Controller Training and Rehearsal System Simulators to increase availability of Joint Terminal Attack Control personnel and increase unit readiness for combat deployments. Additional funding was included on the Chief of Staff of the Air Force's unfunded priorities list.

### **Defense Wide**

#### **MC-12**

The budget request included \$63.2 million in Procurement, Defense-Wide (PDW), to modify MC-12 aircraft that were to be transferred from the Air Force to U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) to replace the existing U-28 fleet and support the tactical airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) requirements of deployed special operations forces. The committee notes that the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) prohibited the transfer of MC-12 aircraft from the Air Force to SOCOM until an analysis and justification for the transfer of such aircraft was submitted to the congressional defense committees. According to the resulting analysis of alternatives, SOCOM identified the U-28 as the most cost-effective ISR platform to meet



special operations requirements through 2020. Therefore, at the request of SOCOM, the committee recommends a transfer of \$63.2 million from PDW for MC-12 modifications (P-1 Line # 41) to PDW for U-28 modifications (P-1 Line #45).

### **MQ-9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle**

The budget request included \$11.7 million in Procurement, Defense-Wide (PDW), for the acquisition and support of special operations-unique mission kits for the MQ-9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV). U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is responsible for the rapid development and acquisition of special operations capabilities to, among other things, effectively carry out operations against terrorist networks while avoiding collateral damage.

The committee understands that the budget request only partially addresses technology gaps identified by SOCOM on its fleet of MQ-9 UAVs. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PDW for the MQ-9 UAV.

The committee strongly supports SOCOM's efforts to accelerate fielding of advanced weapons, sensors, and emerging technologies on its fleet of MQ-9 UAVs. The committee has authorized additional funds above the budget request in each of the last 3 years to enhance these efforts and understands that SOCOM has successfully developed and acquired a number of new capabilities, including improved weapon effectiveness, target location and tracking, image resolution, and video transmission during that time.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Armored vehicle transmission industrial base**

The committee remains interested in the Army's management of strategic risk in the armored vehicle industrial base, including its related transmission industrial base.

Accordingly, last year's Senate report accompanying S. 2410 (S. Rept. 113-176) the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 required the Secretary of the Army to conduct a business case analysis of the armored vehicle transmission industrial base. The required analysis would assess the costs, benefits, risks, feasibility, and advisability of strategies to manage risks in the armored vehicle transmission industrial base including, but not limited to, increased competition, consolidation, or other industrial approaches across public depot, private commercial, and public-private partnership entities and facilities.

The committee was recently notified by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology (ASA-ALT) that the analysis required by last year's committee report has been delayed until June 2015. Included with this notification the ASA-ALT indicated that the Army is working with its current transmission suppliers to carefully manage increasingly constrained resources, maintain combat vehicle fleet readiness, foster future competition, reset production facilities, invest as necessary in selected critical and fragile suppliers to sustain capabilities, and use investments in science and technology to retain important engineering capabilities.

The committee agrees that successful management of risk in this important sector of the industrial base will require the Army to develop plans and programs, sufficiently funded, to address each of these areas. Although the current fiscal environment is challenging, it could be an opportunity to develop new technologies, implement creative partnerships, and take advantage of opportunities for competition that may achieve improved technical performance, cost savings, and greater value for the warfighter and taxpayers. The committee expects the Army's final report no later than June 30, 2015.

### **Army UH-60A to UH-60L conversions for the National Guard**

The committee is aware that the UH-60 Black Hawk helicopter is one of the most versatile and heavily used aviation capabilities in the Army National Guard, as well as by all the states in which they serve. The UH-60A is the oldest model Black Hawk in service and currently flown almost exclusively by the Army National Guard. Although old, these A-model Black Hawks continue to provide a reliable and critically important medium-lift capability to the National Guard in support of its state role in homeland defense and support for civil authorities in response to emergencies. While the Army National Guard currently uses UH-60A Black Hawk helicopters for the range of state and domestic requirements for medium-lift, the lack of modern on-board capabilities means these helicopters are not ordinarily available for deployment overseas into hostile environments without significant upgrades to their current configuration.

The committee notes that based on the Army's current budget projections Army National Guard units will not replace their aging UH-60A Black Hawk helicopters until the end of fiscal year 2025. This naturally results in higher operational tempo and increased flight hours for the rest of the Army's rotary wing aviation in support of overseas contingency operations. To sustain the readiness and increase the availability of the Army National Guard's UH-60 fleet, and close the A-model capability gap, the committee encourages the Army to review the feasibility of accelerating the replacement of all UH-60A aircraft through the production of new UH-60M helicopters, the UH-60V upgrade program, and the conversion of A-model Black Hawks to UH-60L model aircraft.

### **Combat logistics fleet**

The ability of U.S. naval forces to deter aggression and rapidly respond to crisis around the world is sustained by Military Sealift Command ships. U.S. global logistics capability provides a significant advantage over the regionally focused fleets of potential adversaries. With challenges to U.S. allies and interests growing, the committee believes U.S. naval forces must be able to remain deployed and at sea, even in the face of enemy anti-access/area-denial (A<sup>2</sup>/AD) threats.

The size and structure of today's logistics force appears to be based on a longstanding operating concept in which naval forces operate almost exclusively in strike groups or ready groups with accompanying logistics ships. While such a model applied in the

years following the end of the Cold War, today a smaller fleet, new missions, such as ballistic missile defense and counter-piracy, and improving adversary A2/AD capabilities cause strike groups and ready groups to disperse over more expansive areas. Additionally, global shipping systems place fuel and supplies at depots closer to naval forces, enabling logistics ships to shuttle them out to the fleet as opposed to having to carry them for the whole deployment.

As the Navy finalizes the requirements for the new oiler, T-AO(X), the changes in naval operations and threats since its predecessor, the Henry J. Kaiser-class, was designed should be a foremost consideration. Therefore, the Secretary of the Navy, in coordination with U.S. Pacific Command, is directed to provide the committee a report no later than February 1, 2016, describing the requirements for T-AO(X) that addresses the following elements:

- (1) Ship's capacity for fuel, dry stores, and chilled or frozen stores;
- (2) Operational concept for fleet resupply that forms the basis for the T-AO(X) requirement, including how T-AO(X) will complement existing T-AKE class logistics ships and how the concept will evolve over the life of the T-AO(X) class;
- (3) Number of T-AO(X) hulls required, how this requirement addresses a more dispersed fleet and combat losses likely in a modern conflict, and how the requirement may evolve over the next 30 years;
- (4) How the T-AO(X) will be protected from missile and submarine attack as it supports a more widely distributed fleet; and
- (5) An analysis of various fleet resupply force structures to meet projected mission needs in the 2025 timeframe, including: the current program of record, an alternative consisting a larger number of smaller ships with the same overall resupply capacity, and a mixture of the program of record and smaller ships.

**Comptroller General of the United States review of the implementation of recommendations from the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force**

Section 1055 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) requires that, not later than 30 days after the date of the submittal to Congress pursuant to section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, of the budget of the President for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the response of the Air Force to the 42 specific recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force in the report of the Commission pursuant to section 363(b) of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force Act of 2012 (subtitle G of title III of Public Law 112-19 239; 126 Stat. 1704). The committee received the initial report from the Secretary of the Air Force in March 2015.

The committee is concerned that although the Air Force was required by the statute to provide discernible milestones for review of the recommendations or preliminary implementation plans, none

were included in the initial report. Additionally, several of the Commission's recommendations concerned the force mix ratio between the active and reserve components, which the Air Force elected to review through its High Velocity Analysis process. None of the analysis from this process was included in the report.

Additionally, section 138 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 submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the costs and benefits of the proposed transfer from one facility of the Department of Defense to another of C-130H or C-130J aircraft. The committee received this report in April 2015.

The committee is concerned that while the Air Force stated it would provide a review of the force mix balance between the active and reserve components through its High Velocity Analysis process, and in response to specific recommendations of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force, no reference to observations, conclusions, or recommendations are found in the C-130 force structure report that refers to this High Velocity Analysis review process on the C-130 mission area.

In addition, the report also contains no range or weighting of criteria, similar to the Air Force's strategic basing process, that would determine the operational effectiveness of stationing C-130 units at one location over another.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Air Force's methodology and effectiveness in its effort to plan for and implement the National Commission recommendations. The review should include, at a minimum, assessments of:

- (1) the Air Force's plans for review and implementation of the Commission's recommendations;
- (2) the sufficiency of the Air Force's High Velocity Analysis process to provide decision level information to senior Air Force leaders on appropriate force mix balance between the components;
- (3) the applicability and appropriateness of the models used in the High Velocity Analysis process;
- (4) the decision process used following data collection and analysis; and
- (5) any other matters the Comptroller General determines are appropriate during the review.

The Comptroller General shall submit a preliminary review to the congressional defense committees not later than August 31, 2015, and a final report to follow on February 1, 2016.

#### **Comptroller General review of the CVN-78 class aircraft carrier program**

The committee notes the estimated procurement costs for the first three CVN-78 class aircraft carriers are \$12.9 billion, \$11.3 billion, and \$13.5 billion, respectively. In fiscal year 2008, the procurement costs for these ships were estimated to be \$10.5 billion, \$9.2 billion, and \$10.7 billion, respectively. The committee remains concerned with the current and potential future cost growth in this program. In light of the significant cost growth since the original

estimates and substantial costs that continue to be requested for the CVN-78 aircraft carrier program, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report, not later than February 1, 2016, that includes analysis and recommendations for the following:

- (1) Cost estimates and cost estimating practices for the development and acquisition of the first three CVN-78 class aircraft carriers, including the factors that contributed to the quality of these estimates and the extent to which the cost estimates are reliable;
- (2) Effectiveness of current cost accounting and cost surveillance practices in providing reliable information for budget and program planning and execution, in light of the cost caps; and
- (3) Reporting format for CVN-78 aircraft carrier program costs, including annual budget requests and selected acquisition reports.

#### **Enhance cockpit displays to improve safety and mission effectiveness**

The committee notes that advancements in cockpit display technologies have the potential to improve safety and mission effectiveness for military aircrews operating a wide range of fixed wing and rotary aircraft. These technologies include but are not limited to enhanced vision and video overlays, integration of aircraft data with real world and stored imagery, ability to display three dimensional information, and ability to share information both on and off the aircraft. The committee also understands these technologies may be available as commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) equipment.

The committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics to investigate recently developed cockpit display technologies to improve flight safety and enhance mission effectiveness through improved situational awareness. The committee believes that Department of Defense may be able to improve flight safety, reduce aircrew workload and increase combat effectiveness by incorporating new cockpits display technologies into aircraft cockpits, to include the use of existing COTS systems.

#### **Expeditionary Health Services Systems**

The committee supports the Department of the Navy's Expeditionary Health Services Systems (EHSS) and notes with interest the goal of transitioning dated legacy systems to rapidly erectable Expeditionary Medical Facilities (EMF). Improving and/or correcting performance and safety issues in the EMF legacy systems should be a high priority in the Navy's EHSS Equipment Purchases. Therefore, the committee urges the Department of the Navy to make the modernization and upgrading of the EMFs a priority focused on improving the safety of legacy systems while upgrading their performance. This would include fast-tracking improved material technology insertion for immediate impact on legacy equipment.

#### **F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program**

The committee supports, and is committed to, the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program. The committee notes the progress made in

the System Development and Demonstration phase since the program was re-baselined following the Nunn-McCurdy breach in 2011, generally achieving program schedule goals and driving aircraft flyaway costs downward despite ongoing technological challenges and deficiencies revealed in both hardware and software testing. The committee desires to increase the annual procurement quantities for all three variants insofar as program performance and available funding allow.

The committee is concerned with the growing fighter force structure capacity shortfalls in the Departments of the Air Force and Navy due to delays in the F-35 program, noting the original program delivery plan expected to have 1,013 aircraft of all three variants delivered by fiscal year 2016, with actual and currently planned deliveries now only totaling 179. These program delivery delays occurred while legacy fighter aircraft continue to reach the end of their designed service lives, become increasingly less capable due to adversaries' technological advances, or are being divested in significant numbers due to shrinking defense budgets.

The committee is also concerned that the Department of Defense established the requirement for the F-35 program of record total buy quantity under very different strategic circumstances nearly 20 years ago. In addition, prospective adversary technological advances and increased capabilities with regard to establishing contested combat environments, combined with updated threat assessments and an evolving national defense strategy, have significantly changed the calculus for force sizing constructs.

The committee notes that the rapid pace of new technological developments in such areas as unmanned systems, robotics, cyber, directed energy, propulsion, hypersonics, nanotechnology, and composites, among many others, is pointing the way to the future. Moreover, with many significant defense modernization programs scheduled to peak simultaneously in the middle of the next decade, informed strategic choices must be made on how the nation's resources will be applied to meet 21st century challenges.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, within 180 days following the enactment of this Act, to either revalidate the current requirement for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter total program of record quantity, or identify a new requirement for the total number of F-35 aircraft the Department would ultimately procure. The report should include the relevant portions of the defense strategy, critical assumptions, priorities, and force sizing construct used to revalidate the current requirement. If a new requirement is identified, the report should include the overarching plan for fielding complementary weapons systems to meet combatant commander objectives and fulfilling warfighting capability and capacity requirements in the areas of an optimized force mix of long-range versus medium/short-range ISR/strike platforms; manned versus unmanned platforms; observability characteristics; land-based versus sea-based; advanced fourth-generation platforms of proven design; next generation air superiority capabilities; and promising, game-changing, advanced technology innovations.

The required report may be classified, but must include an unclassified executive summary.

**Joint Standoff Weapon**

The committee is concerned with the lack of clarity in the Navy's proposal to terminate the Joint Standoff Weapon (JSOW). The Secretary of the Navy is directed to provide to the congressional defense committees, within 60 days of the enactment of this act, a detailed analysis of Navy JSOW inventory, wartime requirements and the impact of termination on U.S. war plans and JSOW Foreign Military Sales. Should the Navy's analysis determine the need for more JSOWs, the committee would be supportive of additional procurement.

**Land mobile radio**

The committee is aware that some U.S. Army Europe (USAREUR) installations may be operating with outdated installation security and public safety communications systems that do not support multiple-party conversations in the event of an emergency. A land mobile radio (LMR) study conducted by the Naval Surface Warfare Center—Crane found that insufficient radio coverage could occur between installations over large distances within the Army's Installation Management Command—Europe (IMCOM-E). In order to improve radio coverage, the study recommended that the Army join an initiative with the U.S. Air Force—Europe (USAFE) on its Enterprise Land Mobile Radio program. The committee also notes that cost savings may be realized if IMCOM-E and USAFE pursue a joint LMR system rather than if IMCOM-E upgrades its LMR independently. Additionally, migrating to a joint USAREUR—USAFE installation security network could allow for the reuse of system frequencies throughout the area, resulting in reduced spectrum use. Accordingly, the committee encourages IMCOM-E and USAFE to coordinate efforts to find and implement an effective and affordable system that meets requirements.

**Missile and munitions industrial base**

The committee is concerned by the fragility of the missile and munitions industrial base. Unstable and declining budgets and a lack of new start programs continue to pressure tier two and tier three suppliers, particularly in the solid rocket motor, fuse and energetic materials segments. The committee notes the importance of sustaining design engineering and systems integration skills and the critical sub-tier supply chain and is encouraged by Department of Defense efforts to mitigate some of the most acute risks. The committee looks forward to working with the Department to ensure a healthy missile and munitions industrial base.

**Modernization for Light Armored Vehicles**

The committee finds that the Light Armored Vehicle (LAV) Family of Vehicles (FoV) has been plagued by inadequate and unreliable power due to technological increases in communications, command and control, situational awareness, modern weapon systems, and an aging electrical infrastructure. The committee encourages the Secretary of the Navy to continue to seek ways to modernize the LAV FoV to meet the existing and future vehicle power requirements.

### **Navy maritime security barriers**

Given the continued terrorist threat to U.S. military personnel and installations, the committee believes the department must seek to continually improve force protection measures. Security at Navy shipyards and bases depends not only on land-based security measures, but also on effective maritime barriers. As we tragically observed in the 2000 attack on the USS *Cole*, an attack against a U.S. vessel in port can result in a significant loss of American life.

The committee understands that the maritime barriers on many Naval bases and shipyards may utilize dated technology that may not provide the best available protection.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than March 31, 2016. That report should: (1) assess the force protection capability of maritime barriers used by the Navy; (2) assess the force protection capability of maritime barriers that are currently available on the commercial market; (3) describe whether additional force protection capability could be achieved by employing new maritime barriers; (4) estimate acquisition costs for the alternative maritime barriers currently available on the commercial market; (5) compare the operating and support costs of current barriers with the projected operating and support costs of maritime barriers available on the commercial market; and (6) evaluate whether any potential increase in force protection capability, as well as potential reduced operating and support costs, would be worth the costs of deploying that capability. In assessing potential differences in force protection capability, the Secretary should examine such factors as the estimated stopping power and stopping distance of the respective maritime barriers.

### **Navy training helicopters**

The committee is aware that the Navy and Army have used the TH-57 Sea Ranger and TH-67 Creek helicopters respectively for initial pilot training for more than 30 years. The TH-57 Sea Ranger has been a reliable and affordable training aircraft, however, this fleet of aircraft is becoming increasingly expensive to maintain and may require significant upgrades to extend the fleet's service life. The committee also notes that the Army has started to divest itself of the TH-67 Creek trainers and is procuring a modern, dual-engine training helicopter to improve initial pilot training and make pilot transitions to operational aircraft more effective and efficient.

Given the challenges associated with the sustainment and cost to extend the life of the Navy's aging TH-57 fleet, the committee is interested to know the Navy's near and long-term plans for training helicopter modernization. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a report on the TH-57 fleet to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate no later than September 30, 2015. That report should provide: (1) an assessment of the current and a 5-year projection of TH-57 fleet reliability, including related maintenance and sustainment costs; and (2) the Navy's 10-year plan for training helicopter modernization, including funding profile and schedule assumed in the future years defense program, as provided in the fiscal year 2016 budget request.



**Night Vision Reset**

Night vision systems are an essential capability for successful conventional military and counterterrorism operations.

As night vision technologies continue to proliferate around the world, the committee believes it is crucial that the Department of Defense maintains and where possible extends its technological advantage in night vision systems. The committee notes that the Army has plans and programs in place to address the technological opportunities, operational requirements, and industrial base challenges associated with current and future night vision systems. In this regard, the committee encourages the Secretary of the Army to develop and implement a comprehensive night vision systems research, development, acquisition, reset maintenance, and sustainment strategy that improves readiness, identifies and delivers promising new or emerging technologies, and ensures the affordability of night vision systems by managing cost throughout their life cycle.

**Patriot Product Improvement Future Lower Tier Sensor Alternatives**

The Congress supports retention of the Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD) technical superiority in balance with affordability to protect our forces and our coalition partners. To that end, the Army is conducting an analysis of alternatives (AoA) to determine the future path for IAMD Lower Tier investment and modernization within the overarching IAMD Strategy.

To achieve this end state, the Army should thoroughly assess and consider all alternatives for modernizing the Lower Tier Patriot radar, including system solutions incorporating Active Electronic Scan Array (AESA) and Gallium Nitride (GaN) technology insertion into the existing Lower Tier Patriot radar. The committee believes the Army analysis should also consider relative risks, affordability and lead times of alternatives to maintain this capability.

The committee directs the Army to report within 90 days of completion of the AoA on the overall results of the AoA and on the relative merits of various technology options to sustain and modernize the existing Patriot radar.

**Route and area clearance mine protected vehicles**

The budget request included \$131.0 million in Other Procurement, Army for the modification of in service equipment that would upgrade a mix of route and area clearance mine protected vehicles. Route and area clearance mine protected vehicles, such as the Panther, Husky, Buffalo, and RG31, are special purpose vehicles with a combination of on board mine detection and clearing capabilities. All of these vehicles have been proven effective by U.S. forces and those of other nations in detecting and countering improvised explosive devices in combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The committee notes that the Army plans to retain 1,840 of these route and area clearance mine protected vehicles for distribution to units, pre-positioned stocks, training, and for repair cycle spares. Of these, 650 would be Husky and 324 would be Buffalo vehicles.

The committee understands that the budget request would complete the Army's acquisition objective for the Buffalo and Husky, however, the committee is concerned that to date neither of them has a sustainment or modernization plan. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, no later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, a report detailing plans to sustain and modernize the route and area clearance mine protected vehicle fleet. The report required shall include details regarding the plan's schedule as well as funding profiles in relevant research and development and procurement accounts from fiscal year 2017 to fiscal year 2020.

#### ***San Antonio*-Class Amphibious Transport Dock program**

The committee recognizes final requirements are still under development for the *San Antonio*-class amphibious transport dock ship designated LPD-28 and expects the fiscal year 2017 budget request to fully fund LPD-28 in the future years defense program.

#### **Single-source providers of critical acquisition program components**

The committee notes with concern the February 2015 fire in the United Kingdom that destroyed the factory of the single-source provider of propellers for C-130J aircraft.

While the committee received assurances from the Air Force that actions have been taken to avoid C-130J manufacturing delays, the committee is concerned there are other single-source or single-location providers of critical components of major defense acquisition programs where the loss of which, for any reason, could undermine the national security interests of the United States.

Therefore, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to provide a classified report to the congressional defense committees, not later than February 1, 2016, that identifies major defense acquisition programs with operational implications, a list of critical components of such major defense acquisition programs provided by single-source and/or single-provider suppliers, the severity of the operational impact of the loss of such suppliers, and risk management actions with associated implementation plans and timelines the Department will take to prevent negative operational impact in the event of such loss.

#### **Standoff precision guided weapons**

As the air and missile defense capabilities of potential adversaries rapidly advance, the ability of the U.S. Armed Forces to employ short-range precision guided weapons such as Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAMs) will be increasingly challenged. The capability to employ precision guided weapons at standoff ranges in large numbers will be necessary to ensure operational success in any high-end engagement. Advanced weapons such as the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile—Extended Range (JASSM-ER), the Long Range Anti-Ship Missile (LRASM), the Tomahawk missile and others will be key elements in attack execution, but are cost

prohibitive to use in the numbers that future strike scenarios may require.

The committee is concerned the Navy is not adequately planning for a future environment in which large scale use of standoff precision guided munitions is a prerequisite for victory. The committee directs the Secretary of the Navy to provide, prior to submission of the fiscal year 2017 budget request, a report on the Navy's plan for standoff precision guided munitions in the 2025–2030 timeframe to include ship-, submarine- and air-launched weapons. The report should include what actions are being taken to ensure that cost-effective solutions are part of the planning. The Navy should provide this information in an unclassified report with an accompanying classified annex.

### **Unmanned Undersea Vehicles**

The sophistication and endurance of autonomous undersea vehicles (AUVs) are dramatically improving as they incorporate new civilian and military technologies. Vehicles in development will likely be able to take over some missions performed today by submarines, reducing stress on the force and enabling greater capacity for undersea warfare. The decision-making limitations of AUVs, however, will constrain the degree to which they can replace or augment submarines for the foreseeable future.

A large number of AUVs are in development. However, the committee is concerned that the size and capabilities of these AUVs are not necessarily well suited for the missions they can perform. For example, AUVs that are small enough to be carried on submarines are not likely to have space for the redundant power and control systems needed to support independent long-endurance operations. They may be best suited for missions where the AUV is expended or acts as an extension of the host submarine's sensors or weapons. Conversely, large AUVs that can carry redundant power and control systems are likely to be launched from shore or large surface ships, and may be best suited for long-endurance surveillance or transport missions. Vehicles in the middle, such as the Large Displacement Unmanned Undersea Vehicle (LDUUV), are too large and expensive to deploy in quantity but are likely too small to host the systems needed for long-endurance independent operations.

As AUVs transition from science and technology projects to acquisition programs, the Navy should assess the number and type of AUVs needed so it can most effectively use the resources allocated to these systems. Therefore, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to provide the committee a report no later than February 1, 2016, describing its projected AUV force structure requirement for 2025 that addresses the following:

- (1) The missions expected to be conducted by different AUV classes and how this mission set relates to current and future submarine mission sets;
- (2) The different AUV classes, as well as other deployable undersea sensor and communications systems, anticipated in this timeframe and their host platform(s), as appropriate; and
- (3) The required number of AUVs in each class and the impact, if any, on submarine force structure requirements.

In the report on the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Report 113–176), the committee expressed its belief that the Navy should, where feasible, take full advantage of existing expertise and infrastructure at the public shipyards for unmanned undersea vehicle development and maintenance.

The committee continues to expect the Navy to capitalize, where feasible, on existing expertise and infrastructure at the public shipyards for research, development, engineering, configuration management, acquisition support, technical problem solving, and operations and logistics support, including life-cycle maintenance and mission package support.

#### **Vehicle occupant protection technology**

The committee has followed with interest the development of unique technology to detect and autonomously respond to underbody explosive incidents with an active response to counter vehicle flight and reduce the physical effects on occupants. The committee is interested in the testing conducted under a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement between industry and the Army. The committee directs the Secretary of the Army to submit a report within 90 days of enactment of this Act which evaluates the results of the testing on this technology.

## **TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION**

### **Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations**

#### **Authorization of appropriations (sec. 201)**

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

### **Subtitle B—Program Requirements, Restrictions, and Limitations**

#### **Centers for science, technology, and engineering partner- ship (sec. 211)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Chapter 139 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a program that would enhance the Department of Defense laboratories with innovative academic and industry partners in research and development activities. The provision would enable more effective transfer of laboratory-generated innovations to small businesses and other industry partners to promote their transition into military systems or for development into commercial technologies. The provision would also improve the overall quality of research efforts, while reducing the costs of ownership and maintenance of world-class research infrastructure, and enhance the return on taxpayer investment in facilities and personnel at the laboratories. The provision is modeled on similar authority that has been provided to Department of Defense agencies by Congress under the Center of Industrial and Technical Excellence program. The provision is also supportive of the Department's "Better Buying Power" efforts to "improve the return on investment in Department of Defense laboratories."

The labs have a tradition of partnerships with industry and academia that has led to significant advances in mission areas and technologies ranging from robotics to cyber security to aeronautics. A recent example is the development of the Army Research Laboratory's (ARL's) "Open Campus" initiative, the goal of which is to develop processes and engagements through which the academic community, industry, small business, and other government laboratories can efficiently engage with ARL's specialized research staff and unique technical facilities in a broad range of Army technology mission areas. Another is the Air Force Research Laboratory partnership with the Wright Brothers Institute on the Tec-Edge Innovation and Collaboration Center, which promotes public-private research partnerships in unmanned air systems, advanced sensors, and rapid prototyping of advanced materials. The committee be-

lieves that more can be done to encourage and strengthen these types of activities.

A recent report by the Institute for Defense Analyses indicates that mutually beneficial partnerships between Department of Defense laboratories and academia “are not as abundant as those in the intramural research programs at the Department of Energy.” The committee believes that this provision would support the enhancement of beneficial activities with both academia and the private sector.

**Department of Defense technology offset program to build and maintain the military technological superiority of the United States (sec. 212)**

The committee notes with concern that the United States has not faced a more diverse and complex array of crises since the end of World War II, and that taken together, they constitute the greatest challenge in a generation to the integrity of the liberal world order, which has consistently been underwritten by U.S. military technological superiority. At the same time, the committee is alarmed by the apparent erosion in recent years of this technological advantage, which is in danger of disappearing altogether. To prevent such a scenario and to maintain the country’s global military technological edge, the committee recommends a provision that would establish a new \$400.0 million initiative.

In doing so, the committee notes that the Defense Department is facing an emerging innovation gap. Commercial research and development in the United States now represents 80 percent of the national total, and the top four U.S. defense contractors combined spend only one-quarter of what the single biggest internet company does on research and development. Furthermore, global research and development is now more than twice that of the United States. The committee also notes that defense innovation is moving too slowly—in cycles that can last up to 18 years, whereas commercial innovation can be measured in cycles of 18 months or less.

The committee understands that accessing sources of innovation beyond the Defense Department is critical for national security, particularly in the areas of directed energy, low-cost high-speed munitions, cyber capabilities, autonomous systems, undersea warfare, and intelligence data analytics. However, there are currently too many barriers that limit cooperation with U.S. allies and global commercial firms, posing a threat to the country’s future military technological dominance.

For the past several years, U.S. adversaries have been rapidly improving their own military capabilities to counter our unique advantages. Structural trends, such as the diffusion of certain advanced military technologies, pose new operational challenges to U.S. armed forces. As a result, the dominance of the United States military can no longer be taken for granted. Consequently, the Department of Defense must remain focused on the myriad potential threats of the future and thus maintain technological superiority against potential adversaries.

The committee notes that since 1960, the department has invested more than \$6.0 billion in directed energy science and technology initiatives. The committee is concerned that, despite this

significant investment, the department's directed energy initiatives are not resourced at levels necessary to transition them to full-scale acquisition programs. The committee is encouraged by the Navy's demonstration a 100–150 kilowatt prototype laser and by the Air Force's demonstration of high-powered electromagnetic weapons capabilities. However, the committee is concerned about the future of directed energy technologies as a whole. The committee notes that there is no inter-service entity dedicated to advancing promising directed energy platforms beyond the development point towards acquisition.

The committee is encouraged that the department established a department-wide Defense Innovation Initiative in November 2014 to pursue innovative ways to sustain and advance our military superiority and to improve business operations throughout the department. However, the committee is concerned by the possibility that this initiative is not being implemented in an appropriate and expeditious manner.

In response to these factors, the committee recommends a provision that would establish an initiative within the Department of Defense to maintain and enhance the military technological superiority of the United States. The provision would establish a program to accelerate the fielding of offset technologies, including, but not limited to, directed energy, low-cost high-speed munitions, autonomous systems, undersea warfare, cyber technology, and intelligence data analytics, developed by the department and to accelerate the commercialization of such technologies. As part of this program, the committee expects that the Secretary of Defense would also establish updated policies and new acquisition and management practices that would speed the delivery of offset technologies into operational use.

The provision would authorize \$400.0 million for fiscal year 2016 for the initiative, of which \$200.0 million would be authorized specifically for directed energy technology. Accordingly, the provision would mandate the Secretary to develop a directed energy strategy to ensure that appropriate technologies are developed and deployed at an accelerated pace, and update it every 2 years. The committee expects that this strategy would include a recommendation on rationalizing the roles and authorities of the Joint Technology Office for High Energy Lasers. The provision would further direct the Secretary to submit this strategy to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee no later than 90 days after completing the strategy, and biennially thereafter.

To speed up the development of these vitally needed national security capabilities, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense shall consider all appropriate flexible acquisition authorities granted in law and in this Act. These should include the management structure and streamlined procedures for rapid prototyping outlined in section 803 of this Act on the middle tier of acquisition for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding, and the procedures and authorities to be considered under section 805 of this Act on use of alternative acquisition paths to acquire critical national security capabilities to include other transactions, rapid acquisition, and commercial item authorities.

The committee expects that the Secretary of Defense would keep the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services regularly updated on progress of activities under this technology offsets initiative.

#### **Reauthorization of Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program (sec. 213)**

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has established a Rapid Innovation Program to accelerate the fielding of innovative technologies, as authorized in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383). The committee further notes that the DOD has established a competitive, merit-based process to solicit proposals from interested contractors, review and select projects based on military needs and standardized evaluation criteria, and award contracts to execute program projects. The committee is encouraged that the military services and the congressional defense components participating in the program have practices and tools in place to manage and monitor the execution of projects.

According to the Government Accountability Office, some completed projects have already successfully transitioned technology to acquisition programs and other military users through the Rapid Innovation Program. In addition, the DOD estimates that 50 percent of all fiscal year 2011 funding projects have out-year funding commitments from military users indicating the likelihood that they will transition technologies. The Government Accountability Office assessed projects scheduled to be completed through July 2014 and found that 50 percent successfully transitioned to acquisition programs or other users. Although it is too soon to accurately assess the overall success of the Rapid Innovation Program, the committee is encouraged by the results achieved thus far. The committee notes that the Rapid Innovation Program has been highlighted as a part of the department’s Better Buying Power Acquisition Initiative.

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize the Rapid Innovation Program for an additional 5 years. At the same time, the committee recommends that the DOD takes steps to ensure that the selection of projects through the Program is not subject to improper influence outside of the established selection process.

#### **Reauthorization of Global Research Watch Program (sec. 214)**

The committee notes that since its inception in 2003, the Global Research Watch Program has made significant progress toward its program goals, as outlined in the original authorizing legislation. The committee also notes that the current authorization in section 2365 of title 10, United States Code, will expire on September 30, 2015.

Consequently, the committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize the program for an additional 10 years. The committee further recommends that the program be expanded to include private sector persons as part of its global focus. The definition of “person” is in section 1 of title 1, United States Code, and it in-



cludes corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies.

**Science and technology activities to support business systems information technology acquisition programs (sec. 215)**

The committee recommends a provision that would mandate the establishment of science and technology activities that would help reduce the technical risk and life cycle costs of major information technology acquisition programs. The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office and the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation have repeatedly reported to Congress failures in the acquisition of major information technology business systems programs. Among these are the Expeditionary Combat Support System and the Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System, which spent billions of dollars and delivered no useful capability.

The committee notes that current information technology programs, including those intended to support efforts at achieving audit ability, track pay and personnel records, and manage health care information, are also not performing in a manner that inspires confidence in the delivery of useful technologies within current cost and schedule estimates.

The committee believes that failures of these acquisition programs are the result of myriad causes, one of which is the weakness of the Department of Defense's acquisition workforce in developing and deploying these systems. The Department does not internally employ or have external access to expertise that can develop and technically manage these programs. The Department also does not maintain sufficient expertise to support the modification of antiquated business processes, thereby precluding department-wide organizational support by commercially-available modern information technology products and services. Furthermore, the Department does not have the testing infrastructure or workforce expertise to adequately ensure that systems will perform when deployed.

The committee believes another cause of failure is the expensive and technically complex modification of commercially available software to support perceived departmental needs. The business systems covered in this provision support business functions that are similar to those found in the private sector, such as accounting, contract management, health records, and pay systems. The Department lacks the expertise to modify their antiquated and labor-intensive business processes so that lower-cost, commercially-available solutions can be applied to support departmental operations. Instead, the Department employs contractors to customize commercial software programs with the expectation that they can support existing processes, thereby expending minimal effort or rigor to modify the processes themselves.

Finally, the committee believes these programs are suffering from the same cybersecurity challenges that all private and public sector information technology programs are facing. Given the importance of these systems in supporting departmental operations and deployed forces, they can be inviting targets for cyberattack.

The committee's recommended provision is based on the precepts built into the Weapons System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 and in the strong tradition of developing technical expertise to improve acquisition outcomes of conventional weapons systems. The provision would require the Department to fund appropriate research, development, and capability-building activities to make it a "smarter buyer" of these programs. Activities under the program would include using industry, academic, and government expertise to: develop technologies and processes that manage the customization of commercial software in a cost-effective manner; control problems when attempting to scale commercial solutions to the scope of the defense enterprise; and secure the networks, computers, and information associated with these programs. The provision would also support the development of smaller-scale information technology prototypes with limited deployments that can then be scaled to full operational capability.

The provision, if implemented, would also spur the Department to engage with industry and academia to address the business process and management issues that currently haunt these programs. The committee notes that there is significant business management expertise resident in academia and the private sector, yet it is rarely engaged to address management challenges facing department and costing taxpayers billions of dollars.

The committee believes that successful implementation of this provision would help build the expertise and tools necessary to develop information technology business systems in the future. The committee also believes that these efforts, when applied to the management of business information technology systems, would improve cost, schedule, and performance outcomes.

**Expansion of eligibility for financial assistance under Department of Defense science, mathematics, and research for transformation program to include citizens of countries participating in the technical cooperation program (sec. 216)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2192a of title 10, United States Code, to expand the Department of Defense's Science, Mathematics, and Research for Transformation (SMART) program, which awards service-based scholarships to students studying in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, to include students from the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. The selection of these countries is based on those which are currently parties to the Technical Cooperation Program Memorandum of Understanding of October 24, 1995.

Current authority for the program limits scholarship awards to only U.S. citizens. However, National Science Foundation data indicate that over 50 percent of engineering doctorates are granted to foreign graduate students, with the percentage growing annually. By removing this restriction, the Department can recruit foreign nationals from these four countries to participate in the program, with the goal of bringing on the best and brightest students to defense laboratories. The limited easing of this restriction would

serve as a pilot project for assessing potential future expansion of this authority to other friendly countries.

**Streamlining the Joint Federated Assurance Center (sec. 217)**

The committee recommends a provision that would streamline the structure of the Joint Federated Assurance Center (JFAC).

Section 937 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) established JFAC to serve as a joint, department-wide federation of existing capabilities to ensure security in the software and hardware developed, acquired, maintained, and used by the Department of Defense. Section 937 directed the Center for Assured Software of the National Security Agency to coordinate research and development to improve software assurance and the Defense Microelectronics Activity to coordinate research and development to improve hardware assurance. These designations resulted in an unnecessary layer of bureaucracy in the JFAC structure and should be eliminated.

**Limitation on availability of funds for development of the Shallow Water Combat Submersible (sec. 218)**

The committee remains concerned about cost and schedule overruns associated with U.S. Special Operations Command's (SOCOM) undersea mobility acquisition programs generally and, specifically, the Shallow Water Combat Submersible (SWCS) program.

According to the Government Accountability Office, approximately \$677.5 million was expended to develop and procure the Advanced SEAL Delivery System (ASDS) to fill SOCOM's requirement for a dry combat submersible for special operations personnel, more than \$600.0 million over original budget projections. The ASDS program suffered from ineffective contract oversight, technical challenges, and reliability and performance issues. Unfortunately, the SWCS program has experienced many of the same deficiencies as its predecessor.

In June 2014, the SWCS program was re-baselined as a result of significant cost and schedule overruns. Less than a year after this re-baselining, the SWCS program is again 19 percent over budget and 21 percent behind schedule (as of January 2015). Overall, the committee understands the engineering and management development phase of the program is approximately 126 percent over budget and more than a year behind schedule.

The committee has sought to encourage better acquisition oversight of the SWCS program through various legislative provisions and report language in past National Defense Authorization Acts. For example, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) directed the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-intensity Conflict (ASD SOLIC) to provide a report to the congressional defense committees on cost and schedule overruns associated with the SWCS program and efforts to correct such deficiencies. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) also clarified that the SOCOM Acquisition Executive is subordinate to the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD AT&L) for acquisition matters and directed the USD

AT&L and ASD SOLIC to improve oversight of SOCOM acquisition programs—particularly those special operations-peculiar platforms, like SWCS, that are at greatest risk of incurring delays and additional costs. Lastly, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) directed increased oversight of SOCOM undersea acquisition programs by the USD AT&L, but exempted the SWCS program from such requirements at the request of SOCOM due to perceived program stability and low technological risk at the time.

Given the concerns outlined above, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the expenditure of more than 25 percent of the funds available for the SWCS program for fiscal year 2016 until the USD (AT&L) designates a civilian official within his office responsible for providing oversight and assistance to SOCOM for all undersea mobility programs and, in coordination with the ASD SOLIC, provides the congressional defense committees a report on the SWCS program outlining:

- (1) An analysis of the reasons for cost and schedule overruns associated with the SWCS program;
- (2) The revised timeline for SWCS initial and full operational capability;
- (3) The projected cost to meet the basis of issue requirement;
- (4) A plan to prevent, identify, and mitigate any additional cost and schedule overruns;
- (5) Any opportunities to recover cost or schedule;
- (6) Any lessons learned from the SWCS program that could be applied to future undersea mobility acquisition programs; and
- (7) Any other matters the Under Secretary deems relevant.

**Limitation on availability of funds for distributed common ground system of the Army (sec. 219)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Department of Defense by section 201 and available for research, development, test, and evaluation, Army, for the distributed common ground system of the Army (DCGS–A), not more than 75 percent may be obligated or expended until the Secretary of the Army reviews program planning and submits to congressional defense committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report. The report is to address segmentation of software components; identification of commercial software capable of fulfilling DCGS–A system requirements; cost analysis; determination of commercial software compliance relative to guidance in Intelligence Community Technology Enterprise, the Defense Intelligence Information Enterprise, and the Joint Information Environment; identification of software which may be acquired through competitive means; an acquisition plan; and a review of the timetable for the DCGS–A program.

**Limitation on availability of funds for Distributed Common Ground System of the United States Special Operations Command (sec. 220)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the availability of research, development, test, and evaluation funds for the distributed common ground system of the U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) until the Commander of SOCOM submits a report to the committee.

**Subtitle C—Other Matters**

**Assessment of air-land mobile tactical communications and data network requirements and capabilities (sec. 231)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) to contract with an independent entity to conduct a comprehensive assessment of current and future requirements and capabilities to determine the technological feasibility, achievability, suitability, and survivability of a tactical communications and data network. Subject to the submission of the independent entity's report, the provision would prohibit the Secretary of the Army from obligating more than 50 percent of funds available in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T), Increment 2.

WIN-T, in its current or previous forms, has been in development for over 10 years with numerous changes in requirements, technology, architecture, and acquisition strategy. Most recently, the committee has received notice from the Secretary of the Army of a Nunn-McCurdy significant breach for WIN-T.

WIN-T is designed to ensure effective and efficient mission command both "at-the-halt" and while "on-the-move." WIN-T's currently fielded configuration, called "Increment 1", was assessed as providing suitable and effective enterprise tactical communications and data networking "at the halt" or while stationary or in fixed sites. Technology improvements planned for WIN-T's next configuration, called "Increment 2", are intended to achieve communications and data networking for forces "on the move." Increment 2, however, faces many challenges.

Given these technical challenges, the committee is concerned about the feasibility of an effective and affordable mobile tactical communications and data network. The budget request included \$783.1 million in Other Procurement, Army (OPA) for WIN-T. The committee recommends a decrease of \$200.0 million in OPA only for WIN-T, Increment 2.

**Study of field failures involving counterfeit electronic parts (sec. 232)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to task the Joint Federated Assurance Center (JFAC) to conduct a hardware assurance study to assess the presence, scope, and effect on Department of Defense operations of counterfeit electronic parts that have passed through the Department of Defense supply chain and into fielded systems.

In recent years, the committee has expressed concern about counterfeit electronic parts in the Department of Defense supply chain. To address this threat, the committee established JFAC to support the trusted defense system needs of the Department of Defense. At the direction of the committee, both Department of Defense and the Comptroller General of the United States have reviewed and analyzed reports relating to counterfeit or suspect counterfeit electronic parts submitted to the Government Industry Data Exchange Program (GIDEP). While past reports based on GIDEP data have provided insight into counterfeit parts detected in the supply chain, they have not addressed those counterfeit parts that have made it through the supply chain and into fielded systems.

**Demonstration of persistent close air support capabilities (sec. 233)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Army, and the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) to jointly conduct a demonstration of the Persistent Close Air Support (PCAS) capability in fiscal year 2016. The provision would require that the Air Force use in the demonstration at least two platforms with which the Air Force intends to employ future CAS missions.

The demonstration would require operations featuring multiple tactical radio networks representing diverse ground force user communities; two-way digital exchanges of situational awareness data, video, and calls for fire between aircraft and ground users without modification to aircraft operational flight programs (OFP); real-time sharing of friendly forces, aircraft, and target location data to reduce fratricide risks; and lightweight digital tools, such as tablets and smart phones, based on commercial-off-the-shelf technology for pilots and joint terminal air controllers (JTACs). The provision would require operations in both simple and complex operating environments—the latter to stress the process of synchronization between pilots and JTACs.

The provision would also require the Secretary of the Air Force, the Secretary of the Army, and the Director of DARPA to jointly assess the impact of the demonstrated capabilities on the time required to conduct CAS operations, on friendly force effectiveness in achieving tactical objectives, and on the risk of fratricide and collateral damage; and to estimate the costs that would be incurred in transitioning this technology to the Army and the Air Force.

The committee notes that despite advances in networking, computer processing, and digital displays, close air support has not materially changed in the decades since the introduction of precision-guided munitions. In many cases, pilots and ground controllers still rely on voice communications and paper maps to try to achieve a common understanding to exactly identify and locate desired targets. In complex urban environments, this synchronization process can take up to an hour and still not adequately reduce the risk of fratricide or collateral damage.

This situation has persisted because there are dozens of aircraft that perform close air support (CAS), even more numbers of dif-

ferent types of sensors employed, and a large array of different radios, target designation methods, peripheral equipment, and displays. Additionally, OFPs to update software embedded in aircraft avionics systems are all on different and lengthy upgrade cycles.

In response to this problem, the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, in 2009, in its Close Air Support Capabilities-Based Assessment, recommended that “Platforms should field flexible systems that utilize an improved architecture which migrates the processing of digital messages to a Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS) based processor and away from the [aircraft] operational flight programs.”

DARPA has achieved some level of success in implementing that recommendation through its PCAS program, shrinking synchronization time by a factor of five in simple environments and a factor of 10 in more complex situations. DARPA achieved this with off-the-shelf commodity products and radios in lightweight and easily installable form factors, without affecting individual aircraft OFPs.

The Marine Corps and U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) are currently transitioning PCAS into fielded capabilities with over 5,000 and 2,000 users, respectively. The committee is persuaded that DARPA’s approach holds sufficient promise of rapid and affordable improvements in close air support—with the potential to save lives and win on the battlefield—to warrant serious consideration by the Army and the Air Force, the largest consumer and provider of close air support in the Department of Defense.

#### **Airborne data link plan (sec. 234)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to jointly develop a plan, in consultation with the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of the Navy, to enable secure and survivable communications between and among fifth- and fourth-generation fighter aircraft, and the aircraft that support them, in anti-access/area denial environments. The capabilities to be covered by the plan include gateways and direct data links for the reception and dissemination of intelligence from and to low-observable aircraft and fifth-generation fighters of the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps.

The provision would require the plan to achieve these communication capabilities with minimal changes to the outer surfaces of the aircraft and to the operational flight programs of these aircraft. The provision would also require that the plan include non-proprietary and open systems approaches that are compatible with the Open Missions Systems initiative of the Air Force Rapid Capabilities Office (AFRCO) and the Future Airborne Capability Environment of the Navy.

Finally, the provision would prohibit the obligation and expenditure of funds on the Talon Hate and Multi-domain Adaptable Processing System interim or bridge solutions to these interoperability problems until the congressional defense committees are briefed on the plan.

The committee is concerned by the Department’s failure to address a critical shortfall with regard to secure and survivable com-

munications among and between advanced and legacy platforms. There is widespread agreement that next-generation air dominance hinges on highly networked “systems of systems,” and yet the Department lacks an integrated plan to securely share national-level intelligence information with combat aircraft, or to receive data from the sophisticated sensors on board those aircraft. The Nation’s premier fifth-generation fighters, built by the same prime contractor, utilize unique proprietary data links that cannot securely communicate with one another, nor with fourth-generation fighters and other supporting aircraft.

The Air Force is expending substantial funds on interim solutions in the form of pods or other gateway solutions on a small fraction of the F-15 fleet, but these are neither robust nor survivable. The Air Force sponsored a promising demonstration called Project Missouri, to link the F-22 and the F-35 via an L-band low-probability of intercept data link using existing common apertures in conformance with the AFRCO Open Mission Systems initiative, but is no longer pursuing the effort. The Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) mandated the use of the F-35 Multi-function Advanced Data Link (MADL) on the F-22 and B-2, but the Air Force has refused to comply due to cost and complexity barriers. OSD will not rescind its mandate, thus discouraging innovation and competition.

**Report on the technology readiness levels of the technologies and capabilities critical to the Long Range Strike Bomber aircraft (sec. 235)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to Congress, not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, on the technology readiness levels of the technologies and capabilities critical to the Long Range Strike Bomber aircraft. The provision would also direct the Comptroller General of the United States to review the report and provide an assessment to the congressional defense committees of the matters contained in the report.

**Budget Items**

**Army defense research sciences**

The budget request included \$239.1 million in PE 61102A for defense research sciences. The committee notes that the budget request for Army basic research has been reduced across the board by almost 8 percent relative to the amount enacted in fiscal year 2015. Such reductions would likely have a significant negative impact on the Department of Defense’s ability to advance technology development.

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



To help address the significant reduction in basic research funding, the committee recommends an increase of \$40.0 million in PE 61102A. The committee directs that these funds be awarded through well-established and competitive processes that already exist for defense research sciences.

### **High-performance computing modernization**

The budget request included \$177.2 million in PE 63461A for the high-performance computing modernization program. The committee notes that the budget request in this program has been reduced by over \$40.0 million relative to the amount enacted in fiscal year 2015. The committee believes, however, that greater efforts could be made to take advantage of commercially-available technology, which is often as sophisticated, if not more sophisticated, than technology developed by the Department of Defense. The committee believes that additional savings could be found by engaging more comprehensively with the private sector and the Department of Energy national labs. Therefore, the committee recommends a program decrease of \$10.0 million in PE 63461A.

### **Infantry support weapons**

The budget request included \$74.1 million in PE 64601A for infantry support weapons of which \$20.3 million would be for small arms improvement and \$3.1 million would be for the common remotely operated weapons station (CROWS). The committee recommends an increase of \$2.5 million in PE 64601A of which \$1.5 million would be for small arms improvement and \$1.0 million would be for CROWS.

### **Integrated personnel and pay systems for Army and Air Force**

The budget request included \$136.0 million in PE 65018A for Integrated Personnel and Pay System—Army (IPPS–A) and \$69.7 million in PE 65018F for AF Integrated Personnel and Pay System (AFIPPS). These two integrated personnel and pay systems are Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) business system intended to replace legacy human resource systems used by the Army and Air Force.

The committee is concerned that the current life-cycle costs for IPPS–A and AFIPPS are now \$2.0 billion and \$1.8 billion respectively.

The committee believes the Army and Air Force should each restructure their versions of integrated pay and personnel systems to achieve a low-risk, low-cost improvement to human resource challenges. Doing so would allow the Army and Air Force greater resources to address its combat readiness and modernization needs.

The committee directs the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force, in coordination with the Deputy Chief Management Officer, to develop alternatives to the current integrated personnel and pay system strategy of ERP implementation. These alternative strategies should:

- (1) Reduce errors for pay and benefits for servicemembers, including reserve component servicemembers;

(2) Provide accurate, timely, and reliable information about pay and benefits accessible by servicemembers and auditors (as appropriate);

(3) Reduce costs for the Department in administering pay and benefits with a significant return on investment (ROI) of less than 2 years;

(4) Provide accurate financial information with strong internal controls that is retrievable, traceable, and reproducible for financial statement audits; and

(5) Leverage the existing investment and capabilities of the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS) for military and civilian pay.

The committee notes that these strategies will not be limited to the implementation or improvement of a business system solution only but must also address the business processes of the Army and the Air Force for their respective human resource activity.

As a result of this restructuring, the committee recommends a decrease of \$50.0 million for research and development of IPPS-A and a decrease of \$45.4 million for AFIPPS.

Further, the committee directs the Army and Air Force to provide an interim report on its restructure alternatives by March 30, 2016 and a final report by September 30, 2016.

#### **Common infrared countermeasures**

The budget request included \$77.6 million in PE 65035A for common infrared countermeasures (CIRCM). The committee recommends an increase of \$24.0 million in PE 65035A for CIRCM. Additional funding for CIRCM system development was included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list.

#### **Aircraft survivability development**

The budget request included \$18.1 million in PE 65051A for aircraft survivability development. The committee recommends an increase of \$60.0 million in PE 65051A for common missile warning system. Additional funding for common missile warning system development was included on the Chief of Staff of the Army's unfunded priorities list.

#### **Joint Tactical Radio System**

The budget request included \$13.0 million in PE 65380A for the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) of which \$6.8 million would be for the Small Airborne Link 16 Terminal (SALT) radio. The committee notes that the Army is installing an already available Link 16 capability onto its attack helicopter fleet and may reevaluate whether SALT will be the objective capability for Army aviation. The committee recommends a decrease of \$6.8 million in PE 65380A only for the SALT radio.

The committee directs that not later than 180 days after the dates of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the Link 16 Terminals, which are currently being installed onto its attack helicopter fleet and the Army's plan for communication and data interoperability with ground forces. The committee directs that not later than 60 days after the report of the Secretary, the

Comptroller General of the United States shall review the report and submit to the congressional defense committees an assessment of the matter contained in the report.

#### **Munitions Standardization, Effectiveness and Safety**

The budget request included \$32.6 million in PE 65805A for munitions standardization, effectiveness, and safety. Due to unexecuted prior years' funds, the committee recommends a decrease of \$8.0 million in PE 65805A for munitions standardization.

#### **Stryker modification and improvement**

The budget request included \$257.6 million in PE 23735A for the combat vehicle improvement program of which \$105.8 million would be for Stryker improvement.

The committee notes that Army deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan placed a strain on its combat vehicle fleets prompting a significant investment in the force protection and survivability of the Stryker family of wheeled combat vehicles in order to protect soldiers against rocket propelled grenades, anti-armor grenades, and improvised explosive devices (IED). In this regard, the committee commends the Army for the success of the double-V hull modification to the Stryker providing improved protection from under belly IED blasts.

The committee understands that these high priority often operationally urgent vehicle modifications for force protection and survivability resulted in the deferral of lower priority investments for improved vehicle lethality.

The committee has also learned that the Army has recently approved an operational needs statement requesting a significant lethality upgrade for some, but not all Stryker infantry carrier and reconnaissance vehicles. The committee is aware that the Army is considering the delivery of such a Stryker lethality upgrade, when identified and proven feasible and suitable, to its forward stationed Stryker brigade.

The committee supports the Army's efforts to improve Stryker lethality and recommends an increase of \$40.0 million in PE 23735A only for development and testing of Stryker lethality upgrades.

#### **Navy defense research sciences**

The budget request included \$451.6 million in PE 61153N for defense research sciences. The committee notes that the budget request for Navy basic research has been reduced across the board by almost 10 percent relative to the amount enacted in fiscal year 2015. Such reductions would likely have a significant negative impact on the department's ability to advance technology development.

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

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

To help address the significant reduction in basic research funding, the committee recommends an increase of \$55.0 million in PE 61153N. The committee directs that these funds be awarded through well-established and competitive processes that already exist for defense research sciences.

#### **Undersea warfare applied research**

The budget request included \$123.8 million in PE 62747N for research, development, test, and evaluation of undersea warfare applied research. The committee notes the promise of developing systems in the following areas: remote detection of ocean acoustic fields using light detection and ranging (LIDAR), upper ocean acoustic structure, high strain materials for sonar applications, surface decluttering, and novel anti-submarine warfare detection methods. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$18.6 million to this program.

#### **Capable manpower, enablers, and sea basing**

The budget request included \$258.9 million in PE 63673N for future naval capabilities advanced technology developments. The activities listed under this program element include capable manpower, enterprise and platform enablers, and sea basing. The committee believes that the work plans for fiscal year 2016 on these activities do not warrant the level of funding included in the budget request, and is concerned about the ability of the activities to absorb the requested funds. In addition, the committee notes that many of the technologies being developed under these programs are also in development by the private sector and savings could be extracted through increased external collaboration. Consequently, the committee recommends an aggregate decrease of \$10.0 million in PE 63673N to be distributed appropriately from capable manpower, enterprise and platform enablers, and sea basing.

#### **Advanced submarine system development**

The budget request included \$87.2 million in PE 63561N for research, development, test, and evaluation of advanced submarine system development. The committee notes the promise of the fleet modular autonomous unmanned vehicle (FMAUV) and submarine launched unmanned aerial system (UAS). The committee understands additional funding could be used to accelerate getting both capabilities to the fleet. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$11.0 million to this program.

#### **USS *Gerald R. Ford* full ship shock trials**

The budget request included \$48.1 million in PE 64112N for research, development, test, and evaluation of the USS *Gerald R. Ford*-class nuclear aircraft carrier. The committee notes the Department of Defense is reviewing the Navy decision to delay full ship shock trials from CVN-78 to CVN-79. The committee urges the Department of Defense to restore full ship shock trials to CVN-78. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$79.1 million to this program.

**LX(R)**

The budget request included \$46.5 million in PE 64454N for research, development, test, and evaluation of LX(R), which is expected to functionally replace LSD-41 and LSD-49 class ships. The committee notes accelerating the delivery of LX(R) class ships to the fleet will enable the Navy to meet a greater amount of combatant commander demand for amphibious warships. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$29.0 million for this program.

**Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike System**

The budget request included \$134.7 million in PE 64501N for the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Airborne Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) system. The committee notes the directed pause in the program during the Department of Defense's Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Strategic Portfolio Review, which will inform the Department's fiscal year 2017 budget submission. Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$134.7 million due to excess fiscal year 2015 funds that may be used to wholly offset fiscal year 2016 budget requirements.

The committee looks forward to reviewing the results of the Department of Defense ISR Strategic Portfolio Review and also the report directed in section 217 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

**Submarine tactical warfare systems development**

The budget request included \$48.2 million in PE 64562N for research, development, test, and evaluation of submarine tactical warfare systems development. The committee notes that additional funding would enable acceleration of the Fleet requested "Attack In a Minute" capability, support Torpedo Advanced Processor Build (APB) 5+ upgrade, and cybersecurity and information assurance capability improvements. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$12.0 million to this program.

**F-35B/C engineering and manufacturing development**

The budget request included \$537.9 million in PE 64800M for F-35B engineering and manufacturing development, and \$504.7 million in PE 64800N for F-35C engineering and manufacturing development. The committee recommends a decrease of \$12.5 million in each PE, \$25.0 million total, due to funding early to need for Block 4 software development.

**Submarine acoustic warfare development**

The budget request included \$3.9 million in PE 11226N for research, development, test, and evaluation of submarine acoustic warfare development. The committee notes the Compact Rapid Attack Weapon is a rapid development project to address emerging Fleet capability needs. Additional funding would provide the Navy with an advanced countermeasure for submarines. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$0.8 million to this program.

**Mk-48 ADCAP**

The budget request included \$42.2 million in PE 25632N for research, development, test, and evaluation of Mk-48 ADCAP torpedo. The committee notes that additional funding would enable hardware and software upgrades to the weapon system and accelerate implementation, validation, and verification of advanced weapon performance models. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$5.5 million to this program.

**Air Force defense research sciences**

The budget request included \$329.7 million in PE 61102F for defense research sciences. The committee notes that the budget request for Air Force basic research has been reduced across the board by almost 12 percent relative to the amount enacted in fiscal year 2015. Such reductions would likely have a significant negative impact on the department's ability to advance technology development.

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

To help address the significant reduction in basic research funding, the committee recommends an increase of \$45.0 million in PE 61102F. The committee directs that these funds be awarded through well-established and competitive processes that already exist in defense research sciences.

**Nanostructured and biological materials**

The budget request included \$125.2 million in PE 62102F for materials, of which \$8.7 million was requested for nanostructured and biological materials, and \$16.5 million for sensing technologies. The committee believes that while such work is of scientific importance, these are areas in which significant savings could be gained through closer collaboration and interaction with the private sector and other government agencies. Particularly during a time of constrained budgets and vigilance for overlapping efforts, the committee believes that such work can be coordinated more fully to reduce costs. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$10.0 million in PE 62102F for nanostructured and biological materials and for sensing technologies.

**Long range strike—bomber**

The budget request included \$1.2 billion in PE 64015F for the Long Range Strike Bomber. The committee recommends a decrease of \$460.0 million in PE 64015F due to availability of unobligated prior year funds.

**F-35A engineering and manufacturing development**

The budget request included \$589.5 million in PE 64800F for F-35A engineering and manufacturing development. The committee

recommends a decrease of \$25.0 million in PE 64800F due to funding early to need for Block 4 software development.

#### **KC-46 aerial refueling tanker aircraft program**

The budget request included \$602.4 million in PE 65221F for KC-46A tanker development and \$2.4 billion in Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF) for 12 KC-46A tanker aircraft. The KC-46 tanker aircraft is being developed and procured to replace the aging Department of the Air Force KC-135 aerial refueling tanker fleets.

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

The committee understands that the reduction of funds in fiscal year 2016 will not impact the program delivery schedule of the KC-46A tanker aircraft.

Therefore, the committee recommends a decrease of \$200.0 million in PE 65221F and \$24.0 million in APAF due to availability of unobligated prior year funds.

#### **F-15 capability upgrades**

The budget request included \$186.5 million in PE 27171F for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force. The committee recommends an increase of \$28.0 million for nonrecurring engineering in support of Advanced Display/Core Processor II (ADCP II) upgrades, and an increase of \$1.5 million for flight test support. The total recommended increase in PE 27171F is \$29.5 million.

#### **Budget request realignment**

At the Air Force's request, the committee recommends the realignment in the following table to correct an error in the budget request for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Air Force (RDTEAF), and Aircraft Procurement, Air Force (APAF).

#### **AIR FORCE REQUESTED REALIGNMENT**

(In millions)

Item	Account	Line Item	Amount
NATO AGS .....	RDTEAF	216	-\$59.1
NATO AWAC .....	SAPAF	79	+\$59.1

**Logistics information technology**

The budget request included \$112.3 million in PE 78610F for Logistics Information Technology to develop a software system as a follow-on to the Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS). The committee recommends a decrease of \$31.0 million to this program. The committee notes that the significant growth in this program has not been justified given that the program schedule has been delayed and that the Department has requested funding be transferred out of this program in a recent reprogramming action. The committee also notes that the independent assessment of the program required by the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015, Senate Report 113–176, has not yet been delivered to the Congress.

**Applied research for the advancement of science and technology priorities**

The budget request included \$48.2 million in PE 62251D8Z for applied research for the advancement of science and technology priorities. The committee appreciates the need for this program and the importance of creating communities of interest to identify gaps in collaborative funding. However, the committee notes that only 24 percent of the enacted funds for fiscal year 2014 have thus far been expended, and none of the enacted funds for fiscal year 2015, calling into question the efficiency of the activities under this program. Accordingly, the committee is concerned that the program will be unable to incorporate the large increase in funds requested for fiscal year 2016. Consequently, the committee recommends a general program decrease of \$15.0 million for PE 62251D8Z. Furthermore, the committee recommends that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering continue to focus on existing activities to demonstrate the effectiveness of this program.

**Multi-azimuth defense fast intercept round engagement system**

The budget request included \$314.6 million in PE 62702E for tactical technology, of which \$17.7 million was requested for the multi-azimuth defense fast intercept round engagement system. The committee notes that this request for the engagement system represents an almost 50 percent increase in funding above the amount enacted in fiscal year 2015, and is concerned about the ability of this activity to grow at such a fast rate. In addition, the committee is concerned about transition potential for this technology, particularly two years into the program. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$5.0 million in PE 62702E for multi-azimuth defense fast intercept round engagement system.

**Materials and biological technology**

The budget request included \$220.1 million in PE 62715E for materials and biological technology. The committee notes that this request represents an almost 50 percent increase in funding relative to the amount enacted in fiscal year 2015, and includes several programs which do not show much promise for transition. While the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency is well-positioned to focus on these activities and drive technological develop-



ments, the committee is concerned about the Agency's ability to use fully such a large increase in funds within 1 year, and about transition opportunities. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$10.0 million in PE 62715E to decrease program growth.

#### **Science and technology analytic assessments**

The budget request included \$14.6 million in PE 63288D8Z for science and technology analytic assessments. The committee supported the establishment of this program in fiscal year 2015, believing that the need to develop innovative capabilities to counter emerging threats should be a top priority for the Department of Defense. At the same time, the committee believes it is too early to make an assessment on the impact and success of the activities in this program, and that providing an increase in funds is thus premature. The committee is particularly concerned about the slow progress in the area of anti-access/area denial environments. Consequently, the committee recommends a general decrease of \$5.0 million in PE 63288D8Z. The committee expects the Department to focus on demonstrating the utility and effectiveness of this program.

#### **Joint capability technology demonstration**

The budget request included \$141.5 million in PE 63648D8Z for joint capability technology demonstration. The committee notes that the request represents an increase of over \$20.0 million relative to the amount enacted in fiscal year 2015, and also notes that the program is supporting several activities that appear to have limited potential for transitioning into service programs of records. As a result, the committee recommends a general decrease of \$10.0 million in PE 63648D8Z. The committee further recommends that the Department use this program to emphasize and prioritize prototypes that have greater potential for transition.

#### **Network-centric warfare technology**

The budget request included \$452.9 million in PE 63766E for network-centric warfare technology. The committee is encouraged by the focus that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency is placing on advanced technology development, the umbrella budget activity for this program element. Addressing high-payoff opportunities to develop and rapidly mature advanced technologies, as well as transition them to appropriate services or the private sector, is of prime importance in developing and maintaining the technological advantage of the United States.

At the same time, the committee is concerned that the Agency appears to be developing this technology independently. Given the vast expertise on network-centric technology in the United States and abroad, the committee would expect that development of network-centric technologies would take advantage of the significant commercial technologies that may already be available. The committee is further concerned that efforts to work with traditional defense industry contractors to develop system of systems architecture are not likely to transfer successfully to the military services. The committee believes that costs in this program can be reduced through more aggressive interaction and engagement with the pri-

vate sector. Consequently, the committee recommends a general decrease of \$20.0 million in PE 63766E.

### **Quick Reaction Special Projects**

The budget request included \$90.5 million in PE 63826D8Z for Quick Reaction Special Projects (QRSP). The committee notes that QRSP is intended to invest in technology opportunities that might arise during the execution of the fiscal year 2016 budget. The committee further notes that this program has not fully executed its appropriated funds for fiscal year 2014 or 2015 to date, and that many other programs in the Department of Defense are similarly intended to accelerate research program advances into deployable systems. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$20.0 million for this program. The committee recommends the Department fully fund research efforts to assure the trust of hardware and software systems used in defense systems, which are supported within this program.

### **Advanced sensor application program**

The budget request included \$18.3 billion for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-wide, of which \$15.9 million was for PE 0603714D8Z for the Advanced Sensor Application Program (ASAP).

This represents a reduction from the level funded in fiscal year 2015 of \$19.5 million.

The committee believes that this reduction will cause the program to postpone important testing and experiments. The committee additionally believes that these efforts are too important to postpone or cancel.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.0 million for PE 0603714D8Z for the Advanced Sensor Application Program (ASAP).

### **Corrosion control and prevention funding increase**

The budget request included \$6.8 billion in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) for Advanced Component Development & Prototypes, of which \$1.5 million was for the PE 604016D8Z Department of Defense Corrosion Program.

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

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in RDT&E, PE 604016D8Z, for the Department of Defense Corrosion Program.

### **Global Combat Support System—Joint**

The budget request included \$15.2 million in PE 65018A for the Global Combat Support System—Joint (GCSS–J). The committee believes this funding should be realigned to support high priority readiness requirements. According, the committee recommends a decrease of \$10.0 million to this program.

**Systems engineering**

The budget request included \$37.7 million in PE 65142D8Z for Systems Engineering. In the interest of increasing efficiencies within the Department of Defense, the committee elsewhere in this Act is recommending the repeal of several reporting requirements regarding systems engineering. In addition, the committee believes that further efficiencies can be found within these activities. Taken together, the committee recommends a general decrease of \$5.0 million in PE 65142D8Z.

**MQ-9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle**

The budget request included \$18.2 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide (RDTEDW), for the development, integration, and testing of special operations-unique mission kits for the MQ-9 Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV). U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is responsible for the rapid development and acquisition of special operations capabilities to, among other things, effectively carry out operations against terrorist networks while avoiding collateral damage.

The committee understands that the budget request only partially addresses technology gaps identified by SOCOM on its fleet of MQ-9 UAVs. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$5.0 million in RDTEDW for the MQ-9 UAV.

The committee strongly supports SOCOM's efforts to accelerate fielding of advanced weapons, sensors, and emerging technologies on its fleet of MQ-9 UAVs. The committee has authorized additional funds above the budget request in each of the last 3 years to enhance these efforts and understands that SOCOM has successfully developed and acquired a number of new capabilities, including improved weapon effectiveness, target location and tracking, image resolution, and video transmission during that time.

**C-130 terrain following/terrain avoidance radar**

The budget request included \$35.5 million in Procurement, Defense-wide (PDW), to field terrain following/terrain avoidance (TF/TA) radar with associated controls and displays to fulfill special operations-peculiar requirements for MC-130J aircraft. During the development phase of the existing program of record, U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) identified significant concerns with the TF/TA radar performance and ability meet defined user requirements. After conducting a comprehensive programmatic assessment, SOCOM recently decided to revise its acquisition strategy and adapt an alternative TF/TA capability to meet operational needs. Therefore, at the request of SOCOM, the committee recommends a transfer of \$15.2 million to Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide (PE 1160403BB) for the development of a TF/TA radar for its MC-130J fleet. The remaining funds requested for TF/TA radar procurement have been identified by SOCOM as excess to requirements and, elsewhere in this bill, the committee recommends re-purposing such funds for high priority airborne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities.

### **Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance Payload Technology Improvements Program**

The budget request included \$1.3 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide (RDTEDW), for the development, integration, and testing of special operations-unique intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) sensor technologies on tactical unmanned aerial vehicles. U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) is responsible for the rapid development and acquisition of special operations capabilities to, among other things, effectively carry out operations against terrorist networks while avoiding collateral damage.

The committee understands that the budget request only partially addresses ISR sensor technology gaps identified by SOCOM on its fleet of tactical UAVs. Therefore, the committee recommends an additional \$2.0 million in RDTEDW for the ISR Payload Technology Improvements Program.

### **Unmanned Combat Air System Demonstration and prototyping**

The budget request included no funding in PE 64402N for research, development, test, and evaluation of unmanned combat air vehicle advanced concept/prototype development. The committee notes the Navy Unmanned Combat Air System Demonstration (UCAS-D) successfully demonstrated the first unmanned aircraft operation in conjunction with manned aircraft aboard an aircraft carrier in 2014 and the first unmanned aerial refueling in 2015. The committee believes the two UCAS-D aircraft, Salty Dog 501 and Salty Dog 502, should continue development and risk reduction that will benefit the Unmanned Carrier-Launched Strike and Surveillance (UCLASS) program, including: carrier launch and recovery operations, carrier airspace operations, carrier flight deck handling, automated aerial refueling, and UCLASS mission architecture and common control station integration. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$350.0 million to the Defense-wide Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation account and directs the Secretary of Defense to accomplish this testing in fiscal year 2016 to the fullest extent possible. In addition, any contractual arrangements executed with this funding shall ensure that the Department has sufficient technical data rights to support competitive prototyping follow-on development efforts.

Moreover, using the lessons learned from the UCAS-D program, including the fiscal year 2016 extension, the Department of Defense shall conduct such a competitive prototyping of at least two follow-on air systems that move the Department toward a UCLASS program capable of long-range strike in a contested environment. As a result, the committee recommends an increase of \$375.0 million to the Defense-wide Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, account and directs the Secretary of Defense accomplish this competitive prototyping in fiscal year 2017 to the fullest extent possible.

To speed up the development of this vitally needed national security capability, the committee directs that the Secretary of Defense shall consider all appropriate flexible acquisition authorities granted in law and in this Act. These should include the management

structure and streamlined procedures for rapid prototyping outlined in section 803 of this Act on the middle tier of acquisition for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding, and the procedures and authorities to be considered under section 805 of this Act on use of alternative acquisition paths to acquire critical national security capabilities. In addition, any contractual arrangements executed with this funding shall ensure that the Department has sufficient technical data rights to support a subsequent level of competitive prototyping follow-on development or future multiple sourced production efforts.

Overall, the committee recommends an increase of \$725.0 million to this program.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Advancement in radar technologies**

The committee notes that substantial advances have been made in the field of radar technologies, allowing for the design of multi-function phased array radars that will be able to track both weather patterns and aircraft simultaneously. The committee considers the development of these new radars a critical enabler for the Department of Defense. The committee supports the ongoing efforts by the Air Force and expects to be kept updated on current radar research and capabilities. This includes efforts by the Air Force Research Laboratories to create radar technologies for multi-mission capability.

#### **Advancements in Antenna Research and Capabilities**

The committee notes that, over the past several years, there have been substantive advances in antenna research to include conformal phased array, which have resulted in dramatic leaps forward in the aerodynamic capability of aircraft and the potential for reducing the size and weight of both manned and unmanned aircraft. The committee also notes that these antenna advances can provide higher performance for communications and electronic warfare missions. The committee believes these capabilities are critical to future air operations in congested, contested, and aerial denial environments.

The committee expects the Air Force to keep the committee updated on current antenna research and capabilities to include advance antenna technologies on manned and unmanned aircraft. Accordingly, the committee urges the Secretary of the Air Force to incorporate advancements developed through this research into legacy and future aircraft, and expects the Secretary to keep the committee updated on these efforts.

#### **Air Force seismic activity research**

The committee notes with concern the continuing threat of nuclear proliferation. The committee also notes and authorizes the Air Force's request for \$7.5 million for the Air Force Research Laboratory's seismic technologies program. The committee supports the laboratory's efforts to develop seismic technology to improve the capability of the United States to monitor nuclear tests. The com-

mittee expects the Air Force to continue to keep the committee updated on the efforts of the seismic technologies program.

### **Conditions and Capabilities of the Undersea Warfare Test Capabilities**

The committee is concerned about the state of readiness and modernization of test ranges that support undersea warfare missions. The committee notes that in September of 2012, the Commander of the Submarine Force for the U.S. Pacific Fleet noted that capabilities at one range had deteriorated, stating, "Materiel conditions at Pacific Missile Range Facility Barking Sands Tactical Underwater Range have been deteriorating over several years and risk loss of a critical capability here in the Pacific." The committee notes that the Navy is attempting to refurbish these facilities as resources permit, but is concerned that test capabilities in this critical mission area are still not on a path to meet Navy requirements in the future.

The committee expects the Secretary of the Navy, in conjunction with the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, to keep the committee updated on the current condition of the undersea warfare test range capabilities. Updates should include data and analyses on the current use and future needs for underwater test range capabilities, and plans for updating and maintaining range equipment and capabilities.

### **Cost estimate for a land-based electromagnetic railgun program**

The committee is aware that the efforts within the Navy to develop an electromagnetic railgun have been successful in demonstrating early capabilities for naval applications. Further, the committee recognizes that the Navy's initial success has spawned investments within the Strategic Capabilities Office of the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to pursue development of a land-based electromagnetic railgun to support missile defense.

Recognizing that such investments are still in the demonstration phase, the committee believes it is important to do as much as possible to plan concurrently for how to proceed with railgun technology to improve the possibility of transition into a program of record. Therefore, the committee directs the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) to conduct a cost estimate for a land-based electromagnetic railgun program, and provide the results to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee by January 1, 2016. As part of the cost estimate briefing, CAPE should examine the potential costs for the projected life cycle of the railgun system, as well as comparison of those costs against current systems and other systems supporting missile defense missions projected to be fielded in the next 10 years.

### **Database on Department of Defense research grants**

The committee recognizes the value of transparency and the ability of publicly available information to drive effective and accountable government. Further, the committee believes that increased

transparency regarding the Department of Defense's external grants will improve the coordination of efforts department-wide. Consistent with the Administration's Open Government Initiative, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to establish a publicly-available, searchable database of the Department's active grants. The committee also directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that currently active grants remain in the database after the completion of the grant, and that all future grants are added. The database shall be searchable by a variety of codes, such as type of research grant, the research entity managing the grant, the Department of Defense program, and the area of interest. The committee notes that the National Science Foundation has already established an award search database (the "NSF Funding Opportunities search page"), and directs the Department to use that database as a model for its own, including maintaining accurate data in the same categories of information, at a minimum. The committee expects that this database would only be used to aggregate information on grants whose publication would not violate any procedures for handling sensitive information.

#### **Entrepreneurial sabbatical for Department of Defense laboratory scientists**

The Committee directs the Department of Defense to expand an authorized program for government scientists, specifically scientists at defense laboratories, to take an "entrepreneurial sabbatical" to work for a private sector firm. The committee notes that the department's Developmental Opportunities Program (DOP) currently allows scientists to pursue further education by attending business school or a war college, for example, but does not explicitly allow for pursuing opportunities in the private sector. The committee also notes that the Air Force Research Laboratory is implementing guidance for its entrepreneurial leave program, which may be a good model for an expanded program across the defense research enterprise.

The committee notes that the guidance by the Air Force Research Laboratory explicitly defines an approval process for entrepreneurial sabbatical at the directorate level, and establishes a multi-phase program for a sabbatical of between six months and two years. The committee notes that the Air Force guidance allows for a scientist to be paid by the directorate for up to one year, with further funding provided at the discretion of the directorate. The committee expects that in carrying out this mandate, all conflict-of-interest and other administrative issues would be addressed by the defense laboratories in a manner consistent with department guidelines.

In mandating this expansion, the committee notes the success of entrepreneurial leave programs established by the Department of Energy. For example, 145 employees have taken advantage of the Department of Energy's Sandia National Lab Entrepreneurial Separation to Technology Transfer program since its enactment in 1994. The committee is encouraged that forty percent of these participants have started new businesses, and sixty percent have expanded existing businesses. Overall, the scientists in the program created 49 new companies and positively impacted 99 others.

The committee notes that the benefits from an entrepreneurial sabbatical program to the country, the Department of Defense, and defense research laboratories could be significant, and could energize technology transfer from within the department to the regional and national economy and ultimately to the warfighter. This committee believes this would increase the department's ability to competitively recruit top talent, and both create and grow high-tech startups and small businesses. The committee also believes that the resulting direct interaction between Department of Defense scientists and the private sector would increase the amount of valuable technologies that are placed into operational systems, thereby benefiting both national security and economic prosperity.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to report on the department's progress and success in implementing an entrepreneurial sabbatical program, including levels of employee participation, and contributions of Department of Defense technologies to the formation or growth of private sector companies. The committee further directs that this report be submitted to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services no later than 1 year after the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter.

**Expedited approval for attendance at conferences in support of science and innovation activities of Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration**

The committee directs the Secretaries of Defense and Energy to establish respective expedited approval processes for scientists and engineers to attend science and technology conferences. The committee notes with concern that since the two departments implemented updated conference policies, in response to requirements from the Office of Management and Budget, attendance at such conferences by department personnel has reduced dramatically. According to a report from the Government Accountability Office in March 2015, conference attendance from the Army Research Laboratory declined from about 1300 attendees in 2011 to about 100 attendees in 2013. A similar drop in attendance was reported from Sandia National Laboratories. The report highlights that such a drop in attendance risks a decline in the quality of scientific research, difficulty in recruiting and retaining qualified scientists and engineers, and a diminished leadership role for the two departments within the global science and technology community. The report also notes that the new departmental policies are not meeting the needs of personnel requesting approval to travel to conferences.

Given the importance of conference attendance for an active exchange of scientific information and for recruiting and retaining high-quality technical talent, the committee is concerned that the conference attendance approval policies are undermining the science and technology missions of both departments and undermining the ability of personnel to engage in cutting-edge research, development, testing, and evaluation. The committee believes that technical conference participation is especially important to keep program managers aware of new trends in technology, so that they may make better informed decisions on behalf of taxpayers.



To maintain global technology awareness and to support retention of technical staff, the committee believes that the Departments should strive to follow the best practices of innovative private and academic institutions in developing management and oversight practices for conference participation. The committee is concerned that in specific technical fields of interest to defense, such as hypersonics and cybersecurity, the lack of participation in conferences is ceding U.S. leadership to competitor nations.

In response to these findings and concerns, the committee directs the Secretaries of Defense and Energy to establish processes within the Department of Defense and National Nuclear Security Administration, respectively, whereby requests for scientific conference attendance are adjudicated within 1 month, and approvals are granted as appropriate within 1 month. Further, the committee directs the Secretaries of Defense and Energy to ensure that any decisions to disapprove conference attendance through these processes are made if and only if the appropriate officials determine that the disapproval would have a net positive impact on research and development and on program management quality, and not simply default disapprovals necessitated by a bureaucratic inability to make a timely decision. In addition, the committee directs that these approval processes be implemented no later than 90 days after the enactment of this act.

The committee recommends that, as part of these new approval processes, laboratory and test center directors be given the authority to approve conference attendance, provided that the attendance would meet the mission of the laboratory or test center and that sufficient laboratory or test center funds are available.

The committee directs the Secretaries of Defense and Energy each to report to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee with an assessment of the expedited process and its benefits and drawbacks, along with a recommendation on continuing their use. The committee further directs that this report be submitted no later than 1 year after the establishment of the approval process.

### **High Power Microwave Counter-electronics Capabilities**

The committee notes the development of promising new high-powered microwave technologies that can be used to disable and destroy the electronics of threat systems. The committee notes that the Air Force is currently investing in a research program to develop a counter-electronics, high-power microwave advanced missile, following from a successful joint capabilities technology demonstration in October 2012. The committee supports efforts to develop an operational prototype of a high-power microwave weapons system, and expects the Air Force to keep the committee updated on progress towards this goal.

### **Improved turbine engine program**

The budget request included \$51.2 million in PE 67139A for the improved turbine engine program (ITEP). The committee supports the Army and its plans to competitively develop, test, qualify, and integrate a next generation turboshaft engine for the Blackhawk and Apache combat helicopters. The committee notes that funding

continues to support at least two engine developers over the next few years and through completion of the technology-development phase. The committee further notes recent public statements by Army civilian and military leadership expressing their commitment to reduce risk, achieve appropriate technology maturity, and set the conditions for ultimate program success. The committee recommends full funding as requested for ITEP and encourages the Army to maintain stability and therefore momentum in the program as resources and technical progress allow.

### **Improvised Explosive Device Detection Systems**

The committee understands that improved stand-off hyperspectral imaging (HSI) technologies may offer improved detection of Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs) and the explosive constituent chemicals and other materials used in the manufacture of IEDs, such as nitrates, nitrites, phosphates, and ammonia.

The committee notes that the goal of these efforts is to develop technologies that provide the fastest possible detection, with the longest ranges and sensitivities, as well as lowest false alarm rate. To achieve this goal, the committee notes the importance of spectral imaging technologies and real time detection hardware and software.

The committee expects the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to keep the committee updated on current HSI technologies employed by the Department of Defense to counter IEDs, including HSI technologies that are commercially-available, and DOD's plan for ensuring DOD is employing the best technologies available.

### **Market survey of active protection systems**

The committee notes that technologies related to active protection systems for armored combat and tactical vehicles may have matured since the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation conducted live fire demonstrations at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland in 2010. Accordingly, the committee directs that the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, supported by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology, conduct a comprehensive market survey to assess, to the extent practical, the current state of the art with respect to active protection systems for armored and tactical vehicles. The survey should include those U.S. and international active protection systems that are fielded, in development with prototypes having completed or undergoing operational tests, or otherwise demonstrating or showing evidence of technology readiness levels that the Director deems relevant or appropriate. The Director shall report the findings of this market survey to the congressional defense committees not later than May 1, 2016. The Director's report shall include an assessment and recommendation as to whether or not there has been sufficient technological progress in active protection systems since and related to the live fire demonstration in 2010 to justify another live fire demonstration in the near future.

### **Medical evaluation of Anthropomorphic data on vehicle blast testing**

The committee remains concerned with serious injuries and deaths that often result from improvised explosive device (IED) attacks and the subsequent vehicle flight and rollover events. The committee supports the Army's future ground vehicle development and testing initiatives designed to mitigate these often fatal injuries. As the Army continues evaluating emerging technologies, the committee recommends that medical research using anthropomorphic testing be included in ongoing Cooperative Research and Development Agreement testing between the commercial sector and the Army on new sensors and active protective technologies.

### **National Defense Education Program**

The budget request included \$49.5 million in PE 61120D8Z for the National Defense Education Program, of which \$3.0 million for the P-12 military child STEM educational pilot program consistent with section 233 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) and the Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015. The committee notes that this program supports competitive awards to programs that improve the effectiveness of educational activities in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics focused primarily on military children. The committee further notes that military children face additional challenges relative to their peers due to frequent relocations, the stress of parental deployments, and sometimes underperforming schools in the vicinity of military installations. The committee continues to believe that the Department of Defense has a distinct obligation for the education of military children. Moreover, the committee recognizes the importance of STEM education and its contribution to the technical workforce on which the defense industrial base, in particular, depends. As such, the committee believes the Department has a unique interest in fostering a robust pipeline of qualified individuals and its promotion of STEM education programs will provide both short and long term advantages to military children and the nation.

### **Training Range Upgrades**

Training operational forces is one of the most important missions for which the military services are directly responsible. The committee also notes that the military services have traditionally allocated limited resources to research and development initiatives, including modeling and simulation, or to modernizing training range capabilities to support this mission area. The committee believes that modernization of training capabilities will both increase operational effectiveness of military forces and potentially reduce costs by displacing legacy training techniques and systems with more advanced approaches enabled by new technology.

The committee believes that the Central Test and Evaluation Investment Program, administered by the Director of the Department of Defense Test Resource Management Center, has proven to be an effective approach to prioritize and fund the development and de-

ployment of advanced test capabilities at the test ranges. Similarly, the Test and Evaluation Science and Technology program has provided funds to support next generation test capabilities. The committee believes that these approaches may also benefit the modernization of training range capabilities.

The committee directs the Undersecretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to develop jointly a strategic plan to assess and modernize overall training costs, with the goal of improving overall training range and training systems effectiveness and efficiency. The plan should also address policy options that can: enable enhanced leveraging of science and technology programs, including those of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the services; increase access to experts and new technologies from industry and academia, including through the use of Small Business Innovation Research programs and technology prizes; and revise management, resourcing, range charge practices, personnel practices, and acquisition practices.

## **TITLE III—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**

### **Subtitle A—Authorization of Appropriations**

#### **Authorization of appropriations (sec. 301)**

This provision would authorize the appropriations for operation and maintenance activities at the levels identified in section 4301 of division D of this Act.

### **Subtitle B—Energy and the Environment**

#### **Modification of energy management reporting requirements (sec. 311)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2925(a) of title 10, United States Code, by striking a subsection listing renewable energy credits (RECs) and clarifying and strengthening the reporting requirements on commercial and non-commercial utility outages. The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) no longer purchases RECs. The provision would also clarify electricity outage reporting requirements to include non-commercial utility outages and DOD-owned infrastructure.

#### **Report on efforts to reduce high energy costs at military installations (sec. 312)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, in consultation with the assistant secretaries responsible for energy installations and environment for the military services and the Defense Logistics Agency, to conduct an assessment of the efforts to achieve cost savings at military installations with high energy costs.

#### **Southern Sea Otter military readiness areas (sec. 313)**

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

to be listed as an endangered species or threatened species under section 4 of that Act.

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

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

### **Subtitle C—Logistics and Sustainment**

#### **Repeal of limitation on authority to enter into a contract for the sustainment, maintenance, repair, or overhaul of the F117 engine (sec. 321)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal Section 341 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3345).

### **Subtitle D—Reports**

#### **Modification of annual report on prepositioned materiel and equipment (sec. 331)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2229a(a) of title 10, United States Code, to update the list of named contingency operations slated for retrograde and subsequent inclusion in the prepositioned stocks.

### **Subtitle E—Limitations and Extensions of Authority**

#### **Modification of requirements for transferring aircraft within the Air Force inventory (sec. 341)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 345 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) to ease administrative burdens and facilitate non-contentious transfers of aircraft from the Air Reserve Components (ARC) to the regular component of the Air Force (RegAF).

The provision would remove uncontentious, routine transfers, and short-term transfers from Section 345 reporting requirements. The provision also would exempt transfers that terminate the reserve component’s interest in the aircraft (due to aircraft retirement or mission transfer) when that transfer has been the subject of prior notification to the defense committees.

Additionally, the provision would direct administrative changes, such as requiring a signature from the Chief of the Air Force Reserve (a staff position) rather than the Commander, Air Force Reserve Command (a command position) and removing references to “ownership” of the aircraft. Because title vests in the United States government, aircraft ownership does not transfer; the components are merely assigned possessory rights.

The provision would clarify that when a written agreement is required, only leaders of the affected components need sign the agreement. For example, an agreement documenting a 180-day transfer of aircraft from the Air National Guard to the Regular Air Force would not require signature by the Chief of the Air Force Reserve.

The provision would not create an oversight vacuum or allow aircraft transfers to occur without coordination and agreement. The Air Force would still be required to comply with Department of Defense Instruction 1225.06, Equipping the Reserve Forces, May 16, 2012, Enclosure 3, which requires coordination, approval, and a written agreement signed by a general officer or civilian equivalent for equipment transfers, including aircraft.

**Limitation on use of funds for Department of Defense sponsorships, advertising, or marketing associated with sports-related organizations or sporting events (sec. 342)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Department of Defense (DOD) from using appropriated funds to procure sponsorships, advertising, or marketing associated with sports-related organizations or sporting events until the Director, Accessions Policy within the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness conducts a review of current departmental activities in this area, including those by the active duty, reserve, and guard components to ensure that such activities enable the DOD to achieve recruiting goals and provide an appropriate return on investment. The committee is aware that for fiscal year 2016, DOD has requested \$507.5 million to fund its advertising activities.

While the committee recognizes that sports marketing and advertising activities can help DOD achieve its recruiting and retention goals, the committee is also concerned that in a period of declining budgets, the Department may not be ensuring that it is maximizing its return on investment of sports marketing and advertising funds. In particular, the committee is concerned with the Department's continued use of funds for sports-related sponsorships, advertising and marketing. The committee notes that DOD components do not appear to be utilizing specific metrics, such as leads generated that lead to recruit accessions, in a uniform and consistent way to measure the return on investment associated with these activities. The committee further notes that the approach to managing contracts used to procure these activities differs across DOD components, and in the case of the Army National Guard, is highly decentralized and managed at the individual state level. The committee is concerned that such differences and decentralization hinder the ability to apply best practices, minimize potential duplication, and ensure that appropriate oversight into these activities occurs.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to assess DOD sponsorship, sports marketing and advertising activities, including the active duty, and reserve, and guard components. The assessment shall include, but not be limited to: (1) Whether DOD marketing and advertising activities are achieving their stated goals; (2) How DOD determines whether

its marketing and advertising activities are effective and providing an appropriate return on investment; (3) The extent to which the effectiveness of DOD marketing and advertising activities are consistent with best commercial practices; (4) DOD actions to reduce unnecessary redundancies in its marketing and advertising activities; and (5) an assessment of the activities required under section (a)(1) and (a)(2) in this provision.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to deliver a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 1, 2016.

**Temporary authority to extend contracts and leases under ARMS Initiative (sec. 343)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4554(a)(3)(A) of title 10, United States Code, to temporarily extend the authority to extend contracts and leases under the Armament Retooling and Manufacturing Support (ARMS) Initiative.

**Subtitle F—Other Matters**

**Streamlining of Department of Defense management and operational headquarters (sec. 351)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the management, headquarters, and organization of the Department of Defense (DOD) for purposes of consolidating and streamlining headquarters functions. The provision would require the Secretary, to the extent practicable, to consult with subject matter experts outside of DOD and to submit the required report no later than March 1, 2016. To implement this comprehensive plan, the Secretary of Defense shall make required personnel and budget reductions. Section 904 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) required the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for streamlining DOD management headquarters, including the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Joint Staff, the military services, and others that was to be provided to the congressional defense committees not later than 180 days after passage. The Secretary has yet to provide the required plan. Therefore, the committee initiates the streamlining with a 7.5 percent reduction to these organizations (except Special Operations Command, classified programs, Department of Defense Educational Activities, and programs related to sexual assault prevention and response) in fiscal year 2016 and increasing the reductions 7.5 percent each year for 4 years. Furthermore, the funding reductions should be matched by personnel reductions (military, civilian, and contractor) across the defense agencies, OSD, Service Secretariats, service military staffs, combatant commands, and service subordinate commands with military personnel transferred to operating forces. In executing the plan to reduce the overhead costs, the Secretary is directed to provide details of any personnel or functions that are transferred to any other organization in DOD. Elsewhere in this bill the committee recommends four provisions that would provide the Secretary with the force shaping tools necessary to retain the highest performing workforce when determining which em-



employees should be retained. These provisions will: (1) make performance the key factor when the DOD conducts reductions in force to its civilian and contractor workforce; (2) require employees receiving a less than satisfactory performance evaluation to be held at their current step-level for within-grade increases until they achieve satisfactory job performance; (3) extend the probationary period for new employees of DOD to 2 years; and (4) direct DOD to conduct a study, to be reviewed by the Comptroller General of the United States for sufficiency, of the fully-burdened costs to DOD for civilian and contractor employees at clerical, mid-level manager, and senior management levels. In executing this plan, the committee directs that operating forces and organizations such as depots, shipyards and similar functions not be cut in order to retain headquarter staffing levels.

To monitor the implementation of this plan, the provision would require the Comptroller General, through the end of fiscal year 2019, to conduct an annual review of DOD's implementation efforts. Finally, to ensure compliance, the provision would limit the availability of funds for contract personnel in OSD should the Secretary fail to achieve the underlying reductions of the provision. In addition, the committee would defer two military construction projects for headquarters-related functions pending the outcome of this review and plan.

The committee remains concerned with the growth in headquarters, administration, and overhead costs of DOD at a time of fiscal austerity and reductions in force structure. According to the Comptroller General, the Army Staff has increased by 60 percent, from 2,272 in 2001 to 3,639 in 2013. This increase in Army staff largely remains intact despite a reduction of the Army's Active-Duty, Reserve, and National Guard end strengths. The Air Force appears to have avoided OSD requirements to reduce unnecessary and duplicative headquarters functions and overhead activity. Instead, the Air Force grew subordinate units by shifting individuals from higher headquarters to two newly created subordinate headquarters (e.g., the Twenty-Fifth Air Force and the Installation and Mission Support Center). The Air Force appears to have made no significant reductions to its overall civilian personnel or obtained any savings to the Air Force wide budget. The budget for DOD Washington Headquarters Service (WHS), whose job it is to support all the growing headquarters and bureaucracy in the National Capital Region, has grown over 40 percent in the last 8 years from \$443.0 million to \$621.0 million. Budget growth in WHS is a clear sign the headquarters and overhead at DOD are getting larger, not smaller. The Joint Staff has also nearly doubled in size in the last five years to over 2,500 military and civilian employees. This growth is primarily attributable to the transfer of personnel from the supposed closure of United States Joint Forces Command. The committee is also concerned that significant duplicative activities may exist between OSD, the Joint Staff, the military services, defense agencies, and other temporary organizations within DOD.

The Defense Business Board estimates DOD could save \$25.0 billion per year if it better managed its civilian and contractor workforce through targeted reductions and contract elimination and other efficiency initiatives. The National Defense Panel (NDP)

noted that “additional changes are required to right size the civilian Defense Department and federal contracting workforces. Pentagon civilians have continued to grow even after the active duty forces have been shrinking for some time. From 2001 to 2012, the active duty military grew by 3.4 percent while at the same time the size of the USG civilian workforce in the Department has grown by 15% to over 800,000. CBO calculates that the rising costs of civilian pay accounts for two-thirds of projected growth in operations and maintenance spending in the next decade. Clearly, controlling or reducing civilian pay costs is essential to ensuring that the operations and maintenance accounts can be effectively leveraged to provide for the readiness of the Joint Force.” The NDP further stated: “The defense contracting workforce is also in need of review. By 2012, the number of civilian contractors working inside the Department of Defense had grown to approximately 670,000. While some of these contractors are performing critical functions in support of the U.S. military, others are a legacy of the tremendous growth in the use of civilian contractors that attended the Iraq and Afghanistan wars. We urge the Department to undertake a detailed examination of both the size of its civilian workforce and its reliance on civilian contractors in an effort to identify and eliminate excess overhead and right-size the civilian workforce.”

**Adoption of retired military working dogs (sec. 352)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2583 of title 10, United States Code, to give preference in the adoption of retired military working dogs (MWDs) to their former handlers, consistent with the best interests of the MWDs.

The committee recognizes the value MWDs in support of the various training missions and combat operations of the U.S. Armed Forces. The committee also recognizes the efforts of the 341st Training Squadron at Lackland Air Force Base in their role of training and handling MWDs across the Department of Defense.

**Modification of required review of projects relating to potential obstructions to aviation (sec. 353)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 358 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 to expand the coverage of the Department of Defense (DOD) Siting Clearinghouse to requests for informal reviews from Indian tribes and landowners. The Siting Clearinghouse is an office in the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Energy Installations and Environment) that serves as the DOD’s point of contact under which the DOD evaluates projects for military mission compatibility and attempts to develop mitigations with developers.

This provision would clarify that information received from private entities, which is frequently confidential business information, is not required to be publicly released, as this reduces the willingness of private developers to seek early consultation with the DOD.

Further, the provision would eliminate an arbitrary and undesirable manner of distinguishing categories of adverse risk impact.

**Pilot program on intensive instruction in certain Asian languages (sec. 354)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the National Security Education Board, to carry out a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing scholarships in accordance with the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) to individuals for intensive language instruction in a covered Asian language where deficiencies exist.

**Budget Items**

**Transfer to overseas contingency operations**

The budget request included \$210.0 billion in service, component, and defense-wide operation and maintenance accounts. The committee recommends a decrease of \$39.0 billion in operation and maintenance in this title and as specified in the table in section 4301 and a corresponding increase in operation and maintenance accounts in title XV (Overseas Contingency Operations) and as specified in the table in section 4302. Recommended decreases and increases are summarized in the below table.

The Budget Control Act limits national defense discretionary spending to \$523.0 billion for fiscal year 2016. In order to meet the defense funding levels requested by the President and avoid triggering automatic cuts, known as sequestration, the committee recommends transferring funding authority from base budget operation and maintenance in this title to Overseas Contingency Operations in title XV.

The committee believes that the transfer of these funds to title XV should seek to limit any complications for the Department of Defense in the obligations of these funds. The committee notes the Armed Forces has been for the past 13 years, and continues to be today, engaged in overseas operations. Currently, the Armed Forces is expanding their presence abroad. As such, the budget request included significant overseas contingency operation funding in the operation and maintenance account, specifically for the operating forces activities. Therefore, the committee recommends the transfer of title III to title XV funds for the activities itemized below. The Department of Defense has executed both base and overseas contingency operations funding for the activities listed below in the past. In addition, in previous years the President has deemed the operation and maintenance account eligible for overseas contingency operation funding.

TRANSFER OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (OM) FUNDS FROM SECTION 4301 TO SECTION 4302  
(\$ millions)

Activity (\$M)	Decrease Sec.4301	Increase Sec. 4302
OM, Army, Maneuver Units, 10 .....	1,094.4	.....
OM, Army, Theater Level Assets, 40 .....	.....	763.3
OM, Army, Land Forces Operations Support, 50 .....	1,054.3	.....
OM, Army, Aviation Assets, 60 .....	1,546.1	.....
OM, Army, Force Readiness Operations Support, 70 .....	3,158.6	.....
OM, Navy, Mission and Other Flight Operations, 10 .....	4,940.4	.....
OM, Navy, Aircraft Depot Maintenance, 60 .....	.....	897.5

TRANSFER OF OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (OM) FUNDS FROM SECTION 4301 TO SECTION  
4302—Continued  
(\$ millions)

Activity (\$M)	Decrease Sec.4301	Increase Sec. 4302
OM, Navy, Mission and Other Ship Operations, 90 .....	4,287.7 .....	
OM, Navy, Ship Depot Maintenance, 110 .....	5,961.0 .....	
OM, Marine Corps, Operational Forces, 10 .....		931.1
OM, Marine Corps, Field Logistics, 20 .....		931.8
OM, Air Force, Primary Combat Forces, 10 .....	3,336.9 .....	
OM, Air Force, Combat Enhancement Forces, 20 .....	1,897.3 .....	
OM, Air Force, Depot Maintenance, 40 .....	6,537.1 .....	
OM, Air Force, Depot Maintenance, 160 .....	1,617.6 .....	1,617.6
Total Transfer .....	38,955.0	38,955.0

**Army and Army Reserve readiness unfunded priorities increases**

The budget request included \$31.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance (OMA), of which \$1.2 billion was for SAG 123 Land Forces Depot Maintenance, \$2.6 billion was for SAG 132 Facilities Sustainment, Restoration & Modernization (FSRM) and \$981.0 million was for SAG 321 Specialized Skill Training. The budget request also included \$2.6 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR), of which \$59.5 million was for SAG 123 Land Forces Depot Maintenance.

The Army has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could help accelerate readiness recovery. The committee notes that these recommended increases will restore critical depot maintenance as well as increase both cyber and unmanned aircraft systems training capabilities. Additionally, the committee understands these funds will maintain the operations of strategic missile defense test sites.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following increases in OMA: \$77.2 million for SAG 123 Land Forces Depot Maintenance, \$34.0 million for SAG 132 FSRM, and \$33.2 million for SAG 321 Specialized Skill Training. The committee also recommends an increase of \$32.4 million in OMAR for SAG 123 Land Forces Depot Maintenance.

**Insider threat unfunded priorities increases**

The budget request included \$31.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance (OMA), of which \$7.6 billion was for SAG 131 Base Operations Support and \$1.1 billion was for SAG 411 Security Programs.

The Army has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could help reduce the risk of insider threat attacks. The committee notes that these recommended increases will improve physical security and information management.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of OMA in SAG 131 Base Operations Support for \$10.5 million and \$5.5 million in SAG 411 Security Programs to help reduce the risk of insider threat attacks.

### **Streamlining Combatant Commands**

The budget request included \$35.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), of which \$448.6 million was for SAG 138 Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support, \$42.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), of which \$73.1 million was for SAG 1CCM Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support, \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$900.6 million was for SAG 015A Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support.

The committee is concerned that duplicative activities may exist between the staff of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the military services, and many defense agencies. In addition, new regulations and procedures have been implemented over the years that drive many of these costs. The committee recommends a reduction of 7.5 percent to operation and maintenance accounts for Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support.

Accordingly, the committee recommends undistributed decreases to the following: \$12.3 million in OMA to SAG 138 Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support, \$5.4 million in OMN to SAG 1CCM Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support, and \$15.3 million in OMAF to SAG 015A Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support.

### **Army outreach reduction**

The budget request included \$31.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance (OMA), of which \$1.1 billion was for SAG 435 Other Service Support.

The committee understands that within the Other Service Support request was an increase of \$4.5 million to fund two additional cities for the Army's Spirit of America outreach program. The committee believes these funds should be realigned to support higher priority readiness requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$4.5 million in OMA to SAG 435 Other Service Support.

### **United States Southern Command unfunded priorities increase**

The budget request included \$35.1 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), of which \$1.1 billion was for Security Programs.

United States Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) has identified specific amounts in this readiness account that could help offset the negative impacts from sequestration and resource critical mission shortfalls. The committee notes that in written testimony submitted to the committee on March 12, 2015, General John Kelly, Commander of SOUTHCOM, stated that in his area of responsibility the "limited tactical ISR allocation and national technical focus is impairing virtually every one of our assigned missions and exposing the southern approaches to the United States to significant risk." General John Kelly further stated that "we could be talking not high risk anymore, or severe risk, to our plans, but really we could be talking defeat if sequestration happens."

Accordingly, the committee recommends increases in OMA of \$20.0 million for Security Programs for SOUTHCOM, including air-

borne intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, and other intelligence and counter-intelligence support.

### **Streamlining Management Headquarters**

The budget request included \$35.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), of which \$7.4 billion was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$2.6 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR), of which \$105.8 million was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$6.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), of which \$430.1 million was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$42.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), of which \$4.3 billion was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$6.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), of which \$471.8 million was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$1.0 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (OMNR), of which \$1.0 billion was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$277.0 million for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (OMMCR), of which \$20.5 million was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$5.6 billion was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$3.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (OMAFR), of which \$88.5 million was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, \$6.9 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG), of which \$54.2 million was for Administration and Servicewide Activities, and \$32.4 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), of which \$7.1 billion was for Administration and Servicewide Activities.

The committee is concerned that duplicative activities may exist between the staff of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the military services, and many defense agencies. In addition, new regulations and procedures have been implemented over the years that drive many of these costs. The committee recommends a reduction of 7.5 percent to the Defense-wide and military service operations and maintenance accounts for Administration and Servicewide Activities.

Accordingly, the committee recommends undistributed decreases to the following Administration and Servicewide Activities accounts: \$238.4 million to OMA, \$6.0 million to OMAR, \$26.6 million to OMARNG, \$209.8 million to OMN, \$32.5 million to OMMC, \$1.3 million to OMNR, \$1.4 to OMMCR, \$276.2 million to OMAF, \$4.6 million to OMAFR, \$3.0 million to OMANG, and \$897.5 million to OMDW for streamlining of headquarters management.

### **Foreign currency fluctuation deductions**

The budget request included \$35.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), \$42.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), \$6.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), and \$32.4 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW).

The committee believes that when foreign currency fluctuation (FCF) rates are determined by the Department of Defense, the bal-

ance of the FCF funds should be considered, particularly if the balance is close to the cap of \$970.0 million. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has informed the committee that as of March 2015, the Department has not transferred in any prior year unobligated balances to replenish the account for fiscal year 2015 from a beginning balance of \$970.0 million. GAO analysis projects that the Department will experience a net gain of \$739.8 million in fiscal year 2015 due to favorable foreign exchange rates, of which \$456.1 million is attributed to Operation and Maintenance (O&M). Additionally, GAO analysis projects the Department will experience a net gain of \$891.4 million in fiscal year 2016 in FCF, of which \$587.4 million is attributed to O&M.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of: \$281.5 million to OMA, \$59.9 million to OMN, \$19.8 million to OMMC, \$137.8 million to OMAF, and \$51.9 million to OMDW for FCF.

### **Bulk fuel savings**

The budget request included \$35.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Army (OMA), \$2.6 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army Reserve (OMAR), \$6.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), \$42.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN), \$6.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), \$1.0 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (OMNR), \$277 million for Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve (OMMCR), \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), \$3.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (OMAFR), \$6.9 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG), and \$32.4 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW).

The committee understands that as of March 2015, the Department has overstated its projected bulk fuel costs for fiscal year 2016 by \$1.7 billion.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following decreases: \$260.1 million to OMA, \$7.6 million to OMAR, \$25.3 to OMARNG, \$482.3 million to OMN, \$17.0 million to OMMC, \$39.7 to OMNR, \$1.0 million to OMMCR, \$618.3 million to OMAF, \$101.1 to OMAFR, \$162.6 million to OMANG, and \$36.0 million to OMDW for bulk fuel savings.

### **Army and Air National Guard Operation Phalanx increase**

The budget request included \$6.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), of which \$88.7 million was for SAG 114 Theater Level Assets and \$943.6 million was for SAG 116 Aviation Assets. The budget request also included \$6.9 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG), of which \$740.7 million was for SAG 11G Mission Support Operations.

The committee remains concerned that the southern border of the United States remains insecure. The committee notes that in testimony on March 12, 2015, Admiral William Gortney, Commander of U.S. Northern Command stated that “the southern border can be more secure.” At the same hearing General John Kelly, Commander of U.S. Southern Command testified that “with the

amount of drugs and people that move across our southwest border, it doesn't seem all that secure to me."

The committee notes that the Army National Guard has been providing support to the Department of Homeland Security along the southwest border under a program entitled Operation Phalanx since 2010. Since its inception, Operation Phalanx has consisted of ground-based Entry Identification Teams, criminal analyst support, and aerial surveillance support to civil authorities along the southwest border. According to the Army National Guard, since Operation Phalanx began in July of 2010, operations have contributed to the apprehension of over 122,000 individuals and the seizure of over 377,000 pounds of marijuana.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following increases in OMARNG: \$7.7 million for SAG 114 Theater Level Assets, and \$13.0 million for SAG 116 Aviation Assets. Additionally, the committee recommends an increase of \$2.6 million in OMANG for SAG 11G Mission Support Operations.

#### **Army National Guard portrait cuts**

The budget request included \$6.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), of which \$59.6 million was for SAG 431 Administration.

The committee understands that a portion of the requested increase is for the Chief National Guard Bureau (CNBG) Heritage Paintings, which the CNGB commissions each year. The committee also understands that this increase would be to pay for a backlog of four other paintings at a cost of \$62,500 thousand per painting, which includes personnel and framing associated costs. The committee believes these funds should be realigned to support higher priority readiness requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$250,000 in OMARNG for SAG 431 Administration.

#### **Army National Guard marketing program reduction**

The budget request included \$283.6 million in Other Personnel Support within Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), of which \$283.0 million was for SAG 434 Other Personnel Support.

The committee understands that \$11.5 million is an increase to the Army Marketing Program. The committee believes that these funds should be realigned to support higher priority readiness requirements.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$11.5 million for SAG 434 Other Personnel Support.

#### **Army National Guard readiness funding increase**

The budget request included \$6.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard (OMARNG), of which \$166.8 million was for \$943.6 million in SAG 116 Aviation Assets and SAG 123 Land Forces Depot Maintenance.

The committee understands that the Army National Guard has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could accelerate readiness recovery while also increasing both actual and simulated flying hour programs increasing aviator readiness.



Accordingly, the committee recommends the following increases in OMARNG: \$39.6 million in Aviation Assets and \$22.5 million for SAG 123 Land Forces Depot Maintenance.

### **Marine Corps readiness unfunded priorities increases**

The budget request included \$42.2 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Navy (OMN) of which \$4.9 billion was for SAG 1A1A Mission and Other Flight Operations, \$376.8 million was for SAG 1A4N Air System Support, \$897.5 million for SAG 1A5A Aircraft Depot Maintenance, \$544.0 million was for SAG 1A9A Aviation Logistics, \$4.4 billion was for BSS1 Base Operating Support, and \$6.4 million for SAG 2B1G Aircraft Activations/Inactivations.

The committee understands that the Marine Corps has identified specific amounts in these readiness accounts that could accelerate readiness recovery. Specifically, the committee understands the Marine Corps has identified aviation readiness gaps in the CH-53E, MV-22, F/A-18, and AV-8B. The committee notes that this recommended increase will improve the Marine Corps' Ready Basic Aircraft goal to meet internal goals for the AV-8B Harrier and improve readiness and availability of the MV-22 aircraft. The committee also notes this recommended increase will reduce expected maintenance time for the AV-8B Harrier, making additional aircraft available to the fleet. Finally, the committee notes that this recommended increase will increase support and counseling services for Marines and their family members.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase in OMN of \$3.3 million to SAG 1A1A Mission and Other Flight Operations, \$13.9 million to SAG 1A4N Air System Support, \$17.0 million to SAG 1A5A Aircraft Depot Maintenance, \$5.3 million to SAG 1A9A Aviation Logistics, \$14.0 million to SAG BSS1 Base Operating Support, and \$0.5 million for SAG 2B1G Aircraft Activations/Inactivations.

### **Criminal Investigative Equipment**

The budget request included \$6.2 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps (OMMC), of which \$2.0 billion was for SAG BSS1 Base Operating Support.

The committee is aware the Marine Corps has identified an unfunded requirement that would improve its criminal investigative capabilities.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.2 million for SAG BSS1 Base Operating Support for criminal investigative equipment.

### **A-10 to F-15E training transition**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$1.7 billion was for SAG 011D Air Operations Training.

The committee understands that within this budget request is \$79.6 million to be used to transition training resources from the A-10 to the F-15E.

The committee believes that the Air Force is proposing the retirement of the A-10 fleet purely on the basis of the fiscal environment and not on grounds of the ability of the combat air forces to effec-

tively meet the requirements of the combatant commanders and defense strategy. The committee also believes that with the A-10 fleet currently engaged in operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, providing a theater security package in Europe to assure our allies and partners, and continuing rotational deployments operations to Afghanistan, divesting this capability at this time incurs unacceptable risk in the capacity and readiness of the combat air forces without a suitable replacement available.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease in OMAF of \$78.0 million in SAG 011D Air Operations Training.

#### **Air Force readiness unfunded priorities increases**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$1.8 billion was for SAG 011C Combat Enhancement Forces and \$1.7 billion was for SAG 011D Air Operations Training.

The Air Force has identified specific amounts in this readiness account that could help accelerate readiness recovery. The committee notes that this recommended increase will improve training capabilities at 18 ranges as well as improve cyber incident reporting.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following increases in OMAF: \$4.3 million to SAG 011C Combat Enhancement Forces and \$37.7 million in OMAF for SAG 011D Air Operations Training.

#### **Joint Enabling Capabilities Command**

The budget request included \$205.1 million in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for Combatant Commanders Core Operations, of which \$41.0 million was for Joint Enabling Capabilities Command (JECC).

The committee notes that JECC provides deployable units for planning, communications, and public affairs as a subordinate command to the U.S. Transportation Command. However, since the creation and establishment of JECC, combatant commands are now organized with planning, communications, and public affairs assets or can obtain these planning, communications, and public affairs forces through the military services.

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

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$41.0 million in OMAF for JECC.

#### **Air Force Headquarters reductions**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$3.3 billion was for SAG 011A Primary Combat Forces, \$1.8 billion was for SAG 011C Combat Enhancement Forces, \$907.4 million was for SAG 012F Tactical Intel and Other Special Activities, and \$1.1 billion was for SAG 043A Security Programs.

The committee is aware of the Air Force's request for increasing civilian end strength within OMAF by 215 full-time employees (FTEs). The committee believes the Air Force has not adequately justified these 215 additional FTEs, and that any unjustified growth in headquarters funding is inconsistent with the 2013 head-

quarter reductions mandated by then-Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel and communicated to the military departments and agencies through a July 31, 2013 memorandum (OSD008519-13) sent by then-Deputy Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease in OMAF to the following: \$2.1 million to SAG 011A Primary Combat Forces, \$14.0 million to SAG 011C Combat Enhancement Forces, \$3.2 million to SAG 012F Tactical Intel and Other Special Activities, and \$4.9 million to SAG 043A Security Programs.

#### **Remotely piloted aircraft**

The budget request included \$35.4 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$359.3 million was for SAG 032A Specialized Skill Training.

The committee is aware that the remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) career field has been under stress due to the high demand of combat operations.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$43.1 million in OMAF to SAG 032A Specialized Skill Training to increase RPA training and schoolhouse throughput for pilots.

#### **Air Force acquisition tools reduction**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$862 million was for SAG 041B Technical Support Activities.

The committee understands that the Air Force is requesting a \$32.4 million increase for “Acquisition Tools, Services, and Training” within Technical Support Activities. The committee understands that the Air Force intends to use a portion of these funds for skills training and officer development within the acquisition workforce. The committee believes these efforts are duplicative of the work done by the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease in OMAF of \$10.0 million for SAG 041B Technical Support Activities.

#### **Air Force enterprise information technology systems**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$3.5 billion was for SAG 3400F Logistics Operations, of which \$1.1 billion is for Base Support. The committee recommends a decrease of \$12.0 million to this account to reduce support for redundant enterprise information systems. The committee notes that the Department of Defense and Air Force is working to continue to reduce its computing infrastructure, including data centers and legacy networks, through shutting down of legacy systems, consolidation of redundant systems, and adoption of advanced commercial technologies, such as cloud computing.

#### **Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System reduction**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$689.7 million was for SAG 042A Administration.

The committee understands that within SAG 042A Administration is a \$65.0 million increase request for Defense Enterprise Accounting and Management System (DEAMS). The committee is aware of \$12.6 million allocated to “Funds required to develop and deploy DEAMS” and \$8.1 million is for “DEAMS sustainment.” The committee is aware that within the Research, Development, Test and Evaluation funding for DEAMS, separate funds are identified for a similar purpose. The committee also understands that, according to the Office of the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, DEAMS has experienced significant software problems and that the program is not currently mature enough to transition to sustainment.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$20.7 million in OMAF to SAG 042A Administration for DEAMS.

#### **EC-130H Buyback**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF).

The committee believes that the Air Force is proposing the retirement of EC-130H Compass Call aircraft purely on the basis of the fiscal environment and not on grounds of the ability of the Air Force to meet effectively the requirements of the combatant commanders and the national defense strategy.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$27.3 million in OMAF for EC-130H buyback.

#### **A-10 Operation and Maintenance Buyback**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), \$3.0 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air Force Reserve (OMAFR), and \$6.9 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard (OMANG).

The committee believes that the Air Force is proposing the retirement of the A-10 fleet purely on the basis of the fiscal environment and not on grounds of the ability of the combat air forces to effectively meet the requirements of the combatant commanders and defense strategy. The committee also believes that with the A-10 fleet currently engaged in operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, providing a theater security package in Europe to assure our allies and partners, and continuing rotational deployments operations to Afghanistan, divesting this capability at this time incurs unacceptable risk in the capacity and readiness of the combat air forces without a suitable replacement available.

Accordingly, the committee recommends the following increases for A-10 buyback: \$235.3 million in OMAF, \$2.5 million in OMAFR, and \$42.2 million in OMANG.

#### **Middle East Assurance Initiative**

The budget request included \$495.7 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, of which \$9.7 million was for the Combatant Commander Exercise Engagement and Training Transformation (CE2T2) program.

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in OMDW for the CE2T2 program for bilateral and multilateral exercises and activities to build the capability, capacity, and interoper-

ability of allies and partner nations in the Middle East to conduct multilateral contingency operations.

The committee notes the need for enhancements in a region of increasing unrest and the importance of the commitment of the United States to provide leadership in order to continue to develop critical multilateral partner capacity and capability as well as the interoperability of those partners with United States forces.

The committee directs the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in coordination with the Commander of United States Central Command, to provide a briefing to the Committees on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate, not later than December 31, 2017, with a summary of the activities conducted with the additional funding.

**Department of Defense Rewards Program reduction**

The budget request included \$1.9 billion in the Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of the Secretary of Defense (SAG 4GTN), of which \$12.3 million was for the Department of Defense (DOD) rewards program.

The committee continues to be concerned that the DOD Rewards Program has been hampered by historical under-execution.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$4.0 million in OMDW for the DOD Rewards Program (SAG 4GTN). Additionally, the committee is encouraged by the DOD Rewards Program as an effective tool against counterterrorism worldwide. The committee is also encouraged by the prospect of DOD developing a budgeting forecasting tool to help improve the use of future resources.

**Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program**

The budget request included \$32.4 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide (OMDW), of which \$32.6 million is for the Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP). While the committee remains supportive of the CTFP, the committee is concerned about the expanding activities and increased operating costs of the CTFP at a time of fiscal challenges. The committee encourages the CTFP to focus its activities on its core counterterrorism training and education mission and a limited number of regions where the threat posed by terrorism is most significant.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$7.0 million in OMDW for the CTFP.

**Funding for impact aid**

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

(Changes in millions of dollars)

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

### **Defense-wide funding decreases for Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA)**

The budget request included \$110.6 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), of which \$33.1 million was for the Defense Industry Adjustment (DIA) program and \$20.0 million was for water and civilian water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

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

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$53.1 million in OMDW for the OEA.

### **Defense-wide funding decrease for base realignment and closure planning and support**

The budget request included \$32.4 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW), of which \$1.3 billion was for SAG 4GTN Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The committee understands that \$10.5 million was to be used for base realignment and closure (BRAC) planning and support. The bill recommended by the committee would prohibit the expenditure of funds for a new BRAC round.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$10.5 million in OMDW for SAG 4GTN Office of the Secretary of Defense.

### **Studies of fleet platform architectures for the Navy**

The budget request included \$1.4 million for Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for SAG 4GTN Admin Service-wide Activities.

This Act includes a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to commission three studies to be submitted to the congressional defense committees on potential future fleet architectures no later than May 1, 2016. These studies would provide competing visions and alternatives for future fleet architectures. One study would be performed by the Department of the Navy, with input from the Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren Division. The second study would be performed by a federally funded research and development center. The third study would be conducted by a qualified independent, non-governmental institute, as selected by the Secretary of Defense.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$1.0 million in OMDW for SAG 4GTN Admin Service-wide Activities for the performance of these studies.

### **A-10 retirement manpower transfer**

The budget request included \$38.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF), of which \$3.3 billion was for SAG 011A Primary Combat Forces (PCF).

The committee believes that the Air Force is proposing the retirement of the A-10 fleet purely on the basis of the fiscal environment, despite concerns that the retirement of the A-10 fleet could adversely impact the ability of the combat air forces to effectively meet the requirements of the combatant commanders and defense strategy. The committee also believes that with the A-10 fleet currently engaged in operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and

the Levant (ISIL), providing a theater security package in Europe to assure our allies and partners, and continuing rotational deployments operations to Afghanistan, divesting this capability at this time incurs unacceptable risk in the capacity and readiness of the combat air forces without a suitable replacement available. Additionally, in fiscal year 2015 the Air Force implemented the move of 18 primary mission aircraft inventory A-10s to backup aircraft inventory status, reducing all but 2 of the A-10 fleet's combat squadrons to 18 primary assigned aircraft each.

The committee understands that a portion of the requested increase for PCF was for the transfer of manpower towards retirement of the A-10.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$1.4 million for SAG 011A PCF.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Army and Air Force full spectrum training requirements**

The committee notes that for more than a decade, the Army and Air Force have focused the training of their forces in support of counterinsurgency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Department of Defense established a range of resource-intensive training requirements deemed necessary to conduct missions in these locations while deprioritizing training in other areas. The committee notes that in the coming years, both the Army and the Air Force will confront an increasingly complex security environment that will demand a full spectrum of missions, ranging from additional counterinsurgency operations to humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. To accomplish a broader set of missions, the committee is encouraged by both services having established plans to refocus their training to conduct the full spectrum of military operations.

However, the committee notes that under the Budget Control Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-25), the Department faces an environment of constrained budgetary resources until at least 2021. For example, in fiscal year 2013, the Department's operation and maintenance accounts—which fund the military services' training programs—were reduced by approximately \$20.0 billion. Due to these sequestration-level budget caps, the Army curtailed training for all units except those deployed, preparing to deploy, or stationed overseas. Meanwhile, the Air Force ceased flight operations from April through June 2013 for about one third of its active duty combat units and reduced the number of its larger training exercises.

Unless the Budget Control Act of 2011 is amended, the Department faces another adverse impact to training and readiness in fiscal year 2016. The committee remains concerned that under sequestration, the Department will be unable to balance necessary training investments with available resources. Additionally, if sequestration persists until 2021, the committee notes that the Department may have to fundamentally reexamine the requirements for training its forces. Finally, the committee notes that the Department should continue to explore how to best achieve additional efficiencies and cost savings during training, while preparing for mission requirements.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide the committee with an assessment of the Army and Air Force training plans and requirements. This assessment shall include, but not be limited to: the extent to which the Army and Air Force have established full-spectrum readiness goals, plans, and timeframes to train their forces; have adjusted training plans and identified resource requirements in light of prepare ready units for counterinsurgency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan; have considered options for increasing the use of simulated training and other technologies to achieve efficiencies or other cost savings, while meeting training requirements; and any other issues the Comptroller General determines relevant and appropriate with respect to Army and Air Force training.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 15, 2016.

#### **Body armor modernization**

The committee continues to monitor the Department of Defense's plans and actions to ensure the continued availability and improvement of the best possible body armor and other protective equipment for our troops serving in harm's way. The committee has received the interim technical study and business case analysis of body armor plates required by the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

The committee looks forward to receiving the final report no later than March 1, 2016 which will evaluate the full range of options for body armor modernization and sustainment. The committee directs that the final report shall include a strategy to address body armor demand and sustainment in light of the current industry consolidation and potential restructuring, to ensure that the Department can respond to future warfighter requirements.

The committee expects the Department to continue to ensure that those who fight to protect our nation have the best available equipment and protection to meet mission requirements, including body armor specifically designed for women. Additionally, the Department is strongly encouraged to apply appropriate resources to ensure the modernization of body armor occurs through the appropriate research, development, test, and evaluation.

#### **Care of stock in storage**

The committee notes that the military services have established several locations of pre-positioned stock and equipment around the globe in support of combatant commanders' requirements for operational plans, training, and contingencies. The committee is concerned such military equipment suffers varying degrees of degradation and corrosion while being stored outdoors for extended periods of time. Such degradation and corrosion is caused by weatherization and equipment being stored in a stagnant state without minimal levels of care of stock in storage (COSIS). The Government Accountability Office has estimated that the Department of Defense incurs over \$20.0 billion every year in corrosion costs for its weapon systems and infrastructure.



The committee is concerned that minimal funding has been allocated to COSIS, historically, and instead has gone to other priorities, which ultimately leads to higher costs in the long-term. Furthermore, the committee believes that moving equipment under basic COSIS and cover—even indoor facilities that are not necessarily climate-controlled or using equipment covers—could generate significant cost avoidance for pre-positioned stock and military equipment.

The committee is aware of a recent effort by the Army in Kuwait to move some pre-positioned equipment to indoor storage, but the committee is concerned that such a move was merely a target of opportunity and not part of a broad strategy backed by effective planning and resources.

Accordingly, the committee strongly urges the Department and the military services to identify and implement opportunities to improve the COSIS and covered storage of its pre-positioned stock, and to notify the committee of potential opportunities where additional resources could be applied to improve COSIS.

Additionally, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 1, 2016 on specific locations and opportunities where COSIS could improve for outdoor pre-positioned stock to ensure equipment is stored in a way that minimizes weatherization and weapon system degradation. The report shall include an estimate of the return on investment of storing pre-positioned equipment indoors.

### **Category I ammunition items in OCONUS environments**

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

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the extent to which the military Services, in accordance with policies and procedures, have: (1) Have conducted physical inventories of Category I ammunition items in OCONUS locations and compared the results to records and adjusted the records as needed; (2) Are able to maintain accountability and track Category I ammunition items while they are being shipped to OCONUS locations and between OCONUS locations, as well as shipments back to the continental United States; and (3) Adhere to policies and procedures for maintaining account-

ability over the process for how Category I ammunition items are distributed, expended, and turned-in in OCONUS locations.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to deliver a report to the committee no later than March 15, 2016.

#### **Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF)**

The committee notes the vital national security contribution of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) to Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and Operation New Dawn as well as its essential role for the military in quickly responding to crisis situations such as humanitarian and disaster relief operations.

The National Airlift Policy of 1987 established clear policy regarding the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF). The committee directs the Department to continue to comply with the National Airlift Policy to maintain the effectiveness of the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) through appropriate peacetime cargo airlift augmentation and training within the military airlift system.

The committee encourages the Department to continue coordination with the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) on matters of long-range planning, capability, training, and readiness.

#### **Commercial innovation in energy technologies**

The committee notes that innovation in advanced energy technologies by the commercial sector is frequently generating both significant revenues for industry, as well as enhancing the energy efficiency of organizations that are adopting novel technical solutions. Similarly, technologies ranging from more energy efficient engines to micro-grids to information technology-based intelligent management of energy and power systems can have significant impacts on defense missions, both improving combat capability and reducing costs.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense (DOD) has had limited success in engaging innovative small businesses and university researchers in the development and maturation of these types of technologies to meet DOD needs. One example of a successful endeavor to identify, develop, and potentially adopt innovative energy technology solutions, especially those being developed in the commercial sector is the Marine Corps' Experimental Forward Operating Base, currently run by the Expeditionary Energy Office. The committee believes that this type of effort should be replicated by other DOD organizations that have a mission to develop and adopt advanced energy technologies to support military missions.

The committee further notes that DOD has a wide range of authorities that can be used to engage with and potentially invest in commercial technologies and non-traditional industry partners to develop next generation, game-changing technologies. Specifically, the committee notes that DOD makes limited use of the authorities to award advanced technology prizes (as codified in section 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and in the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010, Public Law 111-358), funding under Small Business Innovation Research program, transition activities supported by the Rapid Innovation Program, and other flexible and agile acquisition processes.

Accordingly, the committee strongly encourages the Department to consider using these types of authorities to identify and engage innovation companies.

#### **Defense Logistics Agency and military services' integrated demand planning for spare parts**

The committee recognizes that the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) and the military services have jointly worked to integrate demand planning for consumable items to enhance materiel support at shipyards, depots and industrial operation sites. The committee continues to be concerned about DLA's ability to ensure the timely delivery and availability of spare parts to the depots and industrial sites, such as the Navy's Shipyards and Fleet Readiness Centers, Air Force's Air Logistics Centers (ALC), and the Army and Marine Corps' depots. While DLA has provided shipyards and depots with 80 percent of required parts in a timely and effective manner, our military services need 100 percent of the parts delivered on time to have combat/mission ready equipment.

Reports by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) and the Department of Defense have identified shortages of spare parts at depots and shipyards, which affected maintenance operations and weapon system availability and overall readiness. In one report, the GAO analysis of Air Force data showed that the average monthly backorders and part shortages at the ALCs had grown significantly in recent years. The GAO also identified issues between DLA and the Air Force and Navy in support of their depot operations. Specifically, efforts to improve demand forecast accuracy for items needed to support the workload at the depots were not managed through a comprehensive framework and were not producing the intended outcomes.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the extent to which: (1) DLA and the military services have established a framework for monitoring DLA's supply support depots and industrial operations while meeting performance targets for improving materiel availability, reducing backorders, and minimizing the accumulation of excess inventory; (2) backorders for DLA-managed items at the depots and industrial operation sites have affected the availability and readiness of weapon systems; (3) DLA and the military services implemented and measured collaborative forecasting efforts—like demand data exchange or gross demand planning—to integrate demand planning and improve materiel availability in support of efficient operations at the depots and industrial sites; and (4) DLA and the military services identified and applied leading best practices for integrating demand planning that could be used to enhance the availability of DLA-managed consumable items, decrease the likelihood of excess inventory, and improve depot and industrial operations.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a report to the committee no later than March 15, 2016.

#### **Department of Defense airfield reflective pavement markings**

The committee commends the Department of Defense (DOD) for its continued safe execution of airfield operations to include main-

taining and sustaining the airfield environment. The committee understands the Air Force has been assessing its airfield markings to include reflective airfield, runway, and taxiway markings. The assessment includes factors such as reflectivity, friction coefficient, durability, and life cycle costs. This committee encourages all DOD services to assess the different types of reflective materials to maximize safety and ensure Unified Facilities Guide Specifications for pavement markings (UFGS 32 17 23.00 20 Pavement Markings, UFGS 32 17 24.00 10 Pavement Markings) are adequate for minimum reflective marking requirements for continued safe nighttime and low visibility conditions.

#### **Department of Defense energy security and efficiency technologies**

The committee is aware that new energy security and efficiency technology is being tested by the military services at Department of Defense (DOD) installations and is supported by the Department. The committee applauds DOD's efforts to find efficiencies in its energy programs. The committee encourages the types of technology that can provide energy infrastructure protections, maintain vital energy supplies during man-made and natural disasters and achieve energy efficiencies and cost savings. As such, the committee also encourages DOD's continued testing and evaluation of energy security and efficiency technologies and recommends all military services and DOD continue to look for additional evaluation and testing opportunities. Lastly, the committee notes that microgrid demonstrations that specifically target highest reliability of critical infrastructure at low implementation costs will be imperative in today's fiscally constrained environment.

#### **Department of Defense fuel consumption estimates**

The committee remains concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) actual fuel costs have differed considerably from budget estimates. For example, the Department underestimated its fuel costs by about \$3.0 billion for fiscal years 2010 through 2012. The committee notes the inherent challenge the DOD faces in having to plan real-time fuel prices well in advance of execution, and the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found in 2014 that fluctuations in global fuel prices accounted for a large portion of the differences between estimated and actual fuel costs. However, the GAO also found that differences between the military services' estimated and actual fuel consumption levels accounted for, on average, 26 percent of the difference between the DOD's estimated and actual fuel costs for fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

The committee notes that when developing annual operation and maintenance budget requests, the military services develop fuel funding requirements based on their estimated activity levels, such as flying hours, steaming days, tank miles, and base operations, along with the standard price of fuel provided to them by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

The committee believes that as the DOD transitions from large-scale contingency operations in Afghanistan, the services' consumption estimates should be more consistent as full spectrum training resumes. The committee also believes that given recent fuel price

fluctuations due to changes in the global oil market, accurate fuel consumption estimates become even more important in trying to adequately determine budget requests, particularly in times of fiscal constraints.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to provide the committee with an assessment of the military services' approaches to estimating fuel consumption in annual budget requests. This assessment shall include, but not be limited to: the processes the military services use to estimate their fuel consumption requirements each fiscal year, the factors that contribute to any differences between actual and estimated fuel consumption, and the extent to which DOD and the services have considered options for adjusting the approach to estimating fuel consumption in light of any differences in recent years between estimated and actual fuel use.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 15, 2016.

#### **Department of Defense investment in community relations activities**

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) engages in a variety of community relations activities and programs, such as aircraft flyovers and musical performances, which have a goal of increasing the understanding and mission of the DOD. The committee understands that some of these activities are also intended to support recruiting and retention programs. According to the DOD Directive 5410.18, the planning and execution of community relation programs are decentralized because of the variety of local conditions and environments in which they are used. However, because of their decentralized nature, it is difficult to determine the cost or effectiveness of these activities across the Department.

For instance, the committee understands the budget request included \$37.0 million in Military Construction, Army for an instruction building for the U.S. Army band, which does not include the costs of sustainment and operation of the facility. While the committee recognizes that community relations are needed and important, it also is interested in understanding the extent of investment in these activities and their benefits.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to identify the personnel, facilities, and other support costs associated with community relations activities in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and evaluate the extent to which the military services determine requirements for these activities.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 15, 2016.

#### **Depot maintenance core workload capability**

The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense (DOD) maintains many complex weapon systems and equipment that re-

quire regular and emergency maintenance in order to be available for DOD to meet the National Military Strategy. To sustain these weapon systems and equipment, at the depot level, DOD uses both organic depots and contractors. The committee notes that the military services are constantly in the process of assessing the critical skills and competencies necessary by the depot maintenance civilian workforce to support current and future national security requirements, along with projecting trends in the workforce based on expected losses due to retirement and other attrition.

The committee continues to recognize the key role the depots, arsenals, and ammunition plants serve, along with industry. Section 2464 of title 10 United States Code, required DOD to maintain a core maintenance capability—a combination of personnel, facilities, equipment, processes, data, and technology that is government-owned and government-operated—needed to meet mobilization, contingency, and emergency requirements. The committee notes that as DOD continues to operate in a fiscally-constrained environment, DOD will need to prioritize available funds to support the depots to ensure core capabilities are sustained.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the extent to which DOD: uses core capability requirements to manage the current and future depot maintenance workloads, is able to provide information that identifies trends in core capability workloads at selected military depots, and the effects, if any, they are having on capability; and agreements such as public private partnerships with industry and the impact they have on DOD meeting core capability requirements.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 15, 2016.

#### **Effects of operation and maintenance funding levels**

The committee notes that the operation and maintenance (O&M) accounts provide the resources for military readiness and fund programs and activities such as training, maintenance, and base operations. The committee also notes that as a result of sequestration-level budget caps in fiscal year 2013, the Department of Defense's O&M accounts were reduced by approximately \$20.0 billion. Due to these sequestration reductions, the military services took a variety of actions, such as curtailing training, reducing the number of large training exercises, and ceasing flight operations for many combat units. As a result of these actions, and given the time required to retrain personnel and perform deferred maintenance, the military services have faced challenges in restoring their units to pre-sequestration levels of readiness. While the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67) provided some relief to the Department by increasing discretionary spending caps, established under the Budget Control Act of 2011, for fiscal years 2014 and 2015, the committee is concerned that the readiness and cost impacts associated with lower levels of O&M funding over time could lead to a high level of risk in the near future, with significant shortfalls in both present and future capabilities.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the effects of budgetary constraints

on the O&M accounts, including an assessment of, but not limited to the following: the trends in funding provided for the Department's O&M accounts since fiscal year 2009 and a comparison of how O&M resources compared with funding plans; how the Department has identified immediate and long-term readiness and cost impacts resulting from any reductions in O&M resources; and how the Department assessed any degradation, if any, on core mission readiness and identified plans to mitigate such degradation.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 15, 2016.

#### **Encouraging the Use of the Innovative Readiness Training (IRT) Program**

The committee is aware of the readiness challenges facing the Armed Forces due to the constraints put forth by sequestration. Additionally, the committee is aware of the Innovative Readiness Training (IRT) program, which contributes to military readiness and provides realistic training in a joint environment for National Guard, Reserve, and Active-Duty members, preparing them to serve during a national crisis at home or abroad.

The committee understands the IRT program offers complex and challenging training opportunities for domestic and international crises, opportunities which can seldom be replicated outside of these crises. The committee is also aware that states that utilize the IRT program include, Alabama, Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Indiana, Maine, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, and South Dakota.

The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue to utilize the IRT programs as well as the other training opportunities that also provide hands-on and mission-essential training and are available to Active, Reserve, and National Guard forces.

#### **Enhanced Performance Round and Special Operations Science and Technology review**

The committee believes that the Army and Marine Corps have taken duplicative courses of action to improve its 5.56mm small arms ammunition. While the committee recognizes and supports the requirement for an improved small arms round against both hard and soft targets, the committee also believes that the Department may be incurring unnecessary costs to procure, store, and field almost identically-capable small arms ammunition. The committee is also concerned regarding a recent court case alleging that the Army infringed upon a patent in developing the enhanced performance round (EPR).

Additionally, the committee is concerned that an independent comparison of the EPR, or M855A1, and Special Operations Science and Technology (SOST), round has not been completed, leaving both the Army and Marine Corps to develop separate ammunition procurement strategies.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director, Operational Test and Evaluation, to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate

and the House of Representatives no later than March 1, 2016. The report shall include a comparison and analysis of the EPR and SOST rounds to include but not limited to: (1) cost; (2) performance including range, accuracy, and lethality; and (3) effects on the weapon. The report may include a classified annex, as appropriate.

#### **Fabric-based respiratory protective equipment**

The committee is aware of emerging technologies in fabrics and respiratory protection that are designed to minimize service member exposure to inhalation of sand, dust, smoke, and pollutants. The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the relevant military departments and their research, development, test, and evaluation directorates, to submit a report to the committee no later than March 1, 2016 on fabric-based respiratory protective equipment. The report shall evaluate the technology, and document any efforts underway to develop, design, and test wearable fabric-based respiratory protection solutions, and any potential applications for service members and military civilians. The report shall also include an assessment of the commercial availability of any fabric-based respiratory protection.

#### **Foreign language training**

The committee believes that foreign language proficiency, particularly for slang and other colloquialisms in target languages, is an essential component of military readiness. Additionally, the committee understands that foreign language proficiency education materials are utilized by numerous agencies and services, to include but not limited to the Defense Language Institute, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Defense Intelligence Agency, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, members of the intelligence community as well as the Department of State and other non-defense customers. The committee is concerned that reductions to such capabilities may have a far reaching impact on the ability of civilian and military personnel of the Department of Defense, and possibly also the cryptanalytic personnel of other agencies, to support combatant commanders and major commands of the military services.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act that identifies capability gaps in advanced foreign language proficiency within the military services and other relevant U.S. federal government agencies that support Department of Defense and military operations. The committee further directs the Secretary of Defense to consult with such agencies, including the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, in the preparation of this report, providing these agencies with an opportunity to submit additional views to the congressional defense committees as they deem necessary. The committee directs that this report should propose a plan for eliminating shortfalls in advanced foreign language proficiency and include a recommendation as to the most appropriate budget function, such as within a military service, other government agencies that support military operations, or the Office of the Secretary of Defense, for advanced foreign language training. The committee further directs that this re-



port should propose a plan for the aforementioned agencies to identify and reduce duplicative services that could reduce costs while increasing information and skill sharing.

#### **Installation access programs and systems**

The committee continues to be concerned about the lack of coordination among the efforts of the military services and defense agencies to support credentialing at defense installations. The Senate report accompanying S. 2410 (S. Rept. 113–176) of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 directed the Department of Defense (DOD) to provide a report concurrent with the budget submission for fiscal year 2016 that identified DOD credentialing and physical access control programs and systems, including commercially contracted services and other commercially provided services. While DOD delivered an interim report, the final report on physical access control systems has not been received.

The committee directs Secretary of Defense to immediately provide the required report on its efforts to deploy physical access control systems. As directed by the committee, this report should cover all programs and systems intended to provide credentials and/or manage installation access, include all programs and systems the services and DOD have operationally deployed, are in research and development, or in pilot or prototype demonstration, and include both direct and indirect costs.

#### **Major test range and test facility bases reimbursement**

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) established the major range and test facility bases (MRTFBs) management concept to provide effective coordination among military installations, promote multi-service use, and reduce unnecessary duplication of assets.

The committee is aware that MRTFBs in the United States currently are reimbursed for training activities by the training units upon completion of a training event. The committee understands that some training units do not routinely encounter this type of reimbursement process, which may create unnecessary difficulty and confusion for reimbursement at MRTFBs.

Accordingly, the committee urges DOD to examine the current reimbursement process for MRTFBs and, where appropriate, simplify the reimbursement process in order to maximize effectiveness and efficiency for training units.

#### **Medical textile apparel for healthcare workers and patients**

The committee is aware of emerging technologies in textiles and medical apparel that are designed to minimize unanticipated exposures to blood and bodily fluids, by reducing the amount of pathogens on garments and decreasing the risk of infectious disease transmission in healthcare settings. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to incorporate the effective use of such emerging technologies, including innovative textile products designed to reduce the chances of spreading infections in healthcare settings, where appropriate.

**Mentor Protégé program**

The congressionally-mandated Mentor Protégé program is intended to support efforts of small and disadvantaged businesses to partner with established defense suppliers in order to improve their ability to deliver needed technologies and services to the Department of Defense. The committee is concerned that the program may not always be currently executed to most efficiently achieve mandated goals. For example, the committee's analysis of this program indicates that in some cases, protégé firms participating in this program had received millions of dollars in federal prime contract awards prior to the establishment of their Mentor-Protégé agreements. This raises questions as to whether appropriate criteria are in place to ensure that the companies participating as protégés truly require the developmental assistance that is being provided under this program. In addition, the committee is concerned that in some cases the developmental assistance provided by mentors and reimbursed by the Department under this program may not be targeted to those activities most critical to enhancing the capabilities of the supplier base that the Department needs.

The committee will continue to work with the Department to ensure that the program meets the policy goals of enhancing the defense supplier base, in the most effective and efficient manner, and to determine if there are better ways to incentivize participation in the program other than direct reimbursement as well as program metrics that would better convey the actual impact of the development assistance on the protégé's business.

**Obstructions on or near military installations**

The committee is concerned that the installation of renewable energy projects on or near military bases may cause unacceptable interference with military operations or safety. The committee strongly encourages the Department of Defense to ensure the Siting Clearinghouse process appropriately takes into account the views of senior military officers of the uniformed services for the military compatibility of renewable energy projects. The committee believes senior military officials can best assess potential impacts to the safety or readiness of military servicemembers as well as the effectiveness of mitigation strategies proposed for renewable energy projects.

**Operational Energy**

The committee is encouraged by the Department of Defense (DOD)'s fiscal year 2016 commitment to improving military capability, decrease tactical risk, and reduce cost through efforts to improve energy security and to better manage both operational and installation energy.

The committee understands that generators used by the military services consume a large percentage of the fuel used in overseas contingency operations and the Department should continue to examine ways to increase fuel efficiency, improve combat capability, decrease tactical risk, and reduce cost of generators.

Additionally, the committee understands that the Army's planned Abrams tank auxiliary power unit will use 92 percent less fuel idling and 9 percent less fuel during maneuvers. Similarly, the

improved turbine engine program for Army Blackhawk and Apache helicopters is expected to extend combat range by 85 percent.

The committee is also encouraged by the Navy's focus on enhancing combat capability, increasing endurance and range, and using energy investments to increase readiness. The committee understands that planned technologies such as improved ship hull coatings, stern flaps, lighting, and bow bulbs may create an additional week of steaming days on the same amount of fuel. Hybrid electric drives, currently installed in amphibious assault ships, can add 10 steaming days which would allow the Navy and Marine Corps more presence on station and to spend less time refueling and replenishing at sea.

Consequently, the committee encourages DOD to continue the progress made towards improving combat capabilities through appropriate investments in operational and installation energy.

#### **Personal protection equipment**

The committee notes that section 141 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (P.L. 113-66) required the Secretary of Defense to submit, as part of the defense budget materials for each fiscal year, a consolidated budget justification display that covers all programs and activities associated with the procurement of personal protection equipment (PPE).

While the Department of Defense's fiscal year 2016 budget display for PPE is a positive step, the submission did not provide many of the required details regarding body armor components, combat helmets, and combat protective eyewear. The committee expects the Department to comply with section 141 of the fiscal year 2014 NDAA and strongly encourages the Department to consider including similar budget displays for environmental and fire resistant clothing, footwear, and organizational clothing and individual equipment as well.

#### **Red Hill underground fuel storage facility**

The committee is aware that the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) has stated that the Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility "serves as a critical asset supporting United States Pacific Command operations in peacetime and contingency" and will "remain vitally important to our security interests for the next thirty years." The committee is also aware that PACOM, the Department of the Navy, and the Defense Logistics Agency have determined the storage requirement at the Red Hill Underground Fuel Storage Facility to remain between 13 and 15 operational storage tanks to support the most demanding scenario within the Pacific theater, with the ability to bring additional tanks online at the end of the repair and modernization cycle should future requirements warrant. Additionally, the committee is aware that the Naval Facilities Engineering Command is currently conducting an engineering assessment to determine the best available practicable technological (BAPT) solutions for the recapitalization of the storage tanks to ensure long-term integrity and environmental compliance in a cost effective manner. The committee is further aware that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has drafted a proposed rule to amend Title 40 Code of Federal Regulation (Parts 280

and 281) to regulate field-constructed underground storage tanks, such as those at the facility, and directs the Naval Facilities Engineering Command to factor in these potential regulations in their BAPT solutions.

#### **Report on those at-risk of exposure to perfluorochemicals from the Haven Well in Portsmouth, New Hampshire**

The committee notes that in April 2014, the Air Force in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, and the City of Portsmouth—discovered the presence of perfluorochemicals (PFCs) in the Haven Well in Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The presence of the chemicals in the well in Portsmouth is likely due to the Air Force's use of fire-fighting foam at Pease Air National Guard Base.

Research has associated exposure to these chemicals with certain types of cancer. Portsmouth residents who believe they were at risk of exposure have requested tests to check their blood serum levels of PFCs. The committee is unaware of any affirmative steps by the Air Force to identify and notify everyone at risk of contamination from the Haven Well—including the service members and civilians who may have been exposed while stationed at the Pease Air Base.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to submit a report to the defense committees no later than September 30, 2015, detailing the Air Force's efforts to identify and notify the servicemembers and Department of Defense civilian employees who may have been exposed while stationed at Pease. If such notification is not complete by the completion of the report, the Secretary shall include the Air Force's plan to complete the notification within 90 days of submission of the report.

#### **Resilience of Department of Defense-owned utility infrastructure**

The committee notes that Department of Defense (DOD) installations serve as platforms from which the Department deploys forces across the full spectrum of military operations. To accomplish their missions, DOD installations, inside and outside the continental United States, must have assurance that they can continue to operate in the face of man-made and weather-induced utility disruptions that affect electricity, potable water, wastewater, and natural gas utility service. The committee notes that threats—such as cyberattacks—and hazards—such as severe weather events—pose significant risks to the utility infrastructure that provides military installations with utility services. The committee also notes that DOD installations rely upon utility infrastructure owned by non-DOD entities, such as commercial utility companies, and on-installation infrastructure owned by the Department.

The committee believes that the condition of the utility infrastructure can play a significant role in a military installation's resilience to utility disruptions, either by threat or hazard. For example, aging infrastructure is more likely to fail when subjected to extreme weather conditions.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate, (1) from fiscal years 2009 to 2015, utility disruptions on DOD installations that have been caused by

the failure of DOD-owned infrastructure and what have been the operational and fiscal impacts of such disruptions, (2) how DOD has assessed the condition of its utility infrastructure on military installations and invested in the sustainment of its utility infrastructure, (3) to what extent, if any, is information on the condition of DOD-owned utility infrastructure used by the Department when it makes utility resilience or other resources decisions; and (4) any other issues identified by the Comptroller General.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a briefing or deliver a report to the committee no later than March 15, 2016.

### **Tubular light-emitting diode technology**

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

### **Utah Test and Training Range**

The committee recognizes the important role Air Force test and training ranges play in maintaining and improving the readiness, proficiency, safety, and cost effectiveness of Department of Defense personnel and equipment. The committee further recognizes the need for the Air Force to enhance and modernize their ranges to test and train units on fifth-generation weapons systems to maintain the United States Armed Forces' technological advantage over prospective adversaries. Fifth-generation weapons such as the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter and F-22 Raptor are approaching or already attained benchmarks in operational capacity and use. The Long Range Strike Bomber and other advanced weapons continue into planning and development stages. The Department must retain and sustain the capability to test and train appropriately on these technologically advanced weapons systems.

The Utah Test and Training Range (UTTR) provides the largest overland safety footprint available in the Department for aircrew training and weapons testing, to include fifth-generation and future weapons systems. The UTTR provides a realistic and similar terrain to actual combat locations. Each year, the Department submits a Sustainable Ranges Report to Congress, outlining the Department's position on military training range needs, resources, and constraints. Identified in these reports are three needed areas of improvement for UTTR: inability to accommodate fifth-generation aircraft and weapons testing, encroachment through natural community expansion and environmental constraints, and conges-

tion with increased unmanned aerial vehicle testing at U.S. Army Dugway Proving Grounds.

To maintain current UTTR mission capability and meet future mission requirements, the committee recommends the Air Force, Bureau of Land Management, Congress, the State of Utah, local governments, and community leaders continue efforts to create buffer areas surrounding the range to prevent against encroachment, and provide the Department with the necessary capabilities needed to fulfill future mission requirements.

## TITLE IV—MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATIONS

### Subtitle A—Active Forces

#### End strengths for active forces (sec. 401)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize active-duty end strengths for fiscal year 2016, as shown below:

Service	FY 2015 authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2016 request	FY 2015 authorized
Army .....	490,000	475,000	475,000	0	– 15,000
Navy .....	323,600	329,200	329,200	0	+5,600
Marine Corps .....	184,100	184,000	184,000	0	– 100
Air Force .....	312,980	317,000	317,000	0	+4,020
DOD Total .....	1,310,680	1,305,200	1,305,200	0	– 5,480

#### Enhancement of authority for management of end strengths for military personnel (sec. 402)

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 691 of title 10, United States Code. The provision would also amend section 115 of title 10, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Defense and the service secretaries authority to vary military personnel end strengths below those authorized in title IV of this Act.

### Subtitle B—Reserve Forces

#### End strengths for Selected Reserve (sec. 411)

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2016, as shown below:

Service	FY 2015 authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2016 request	FY 2015 authorized
Army National Guard .....	350,200	342,000	342,000	0	– 8,200
Army Reserve .....	202,000	198,000	198,000	0	– 4,000
Navy Reserve .....	57,300	57,400	57,400	0	+100
Marine Corps Reserve .....	39,200	38,900	38,900	0	– 300
Air National Guard .....	105,000	105,500	105,500	0	+500
Air Force Reserve .....	67,100	69,200	69,200	0	+2,100
DOD Total .....	820,800	811,000	811,000	0	– 9,800
Coast Guard Reserve .....	9,000	7,000	7,000	0	– 2,000

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

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize full-time support end strengths for fiscal year 2016, as shown below:

Service	FY 2015 authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2016 request	FY 2015 authorized
Army National Guard .....	31,385	30,770	30,770	0	-615
Army Reserve .....	16,261	16,261	16,261	0	0
Navy Reserve .....	9,973	9,934	9,934	0	-39
Marine Corps Reserve .....	2,261	2,260	2,260	0	-1
Air National Guard .....	14,704	14,748	14,748	0	+44
Air Force Reserve .....	2,830	3,032	3,032	0	+202
DOD Total .....	77,414	77,005	77,005	0	-409

The provision also expresses the sense of Senate that the National Guard Bureau should account for States that routinely recruit and retain members of the National Guard in excess of State authorizations when allocating full-time duty personnel. The committee further recommends that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall take into account the actual number of members of the Army National Guard of the United States serving in each State as of September 20 each year when allocating full-time duty personnel in the Army National Guard of the United States.

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

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the minimum number of military technicians (dual status) for the reserve components of the Army and Air Force as of the last day of fiscal year 2016, as shown below:

Service	FY 2015 authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2016 request	FY 2015 authorized
Army National Guard .....	27,210	26,099	26,099	0	-1,111
Army Reserve .....	7,895	7,395	7,395	0	-500
Air National Guard .....	21,792	22,104	22,104	0	+312
Air Force Reserve .....	9,789	9,814	9,814	0	+25
DOD Total .....	66,686	65,412	65,412	0	-1,274

**Fiscal year 2016 limitation on number of non-dual status technicians (sec. 414)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of non-dual status technicians who may be employed in the Department of Defense as of September 30, 2016, as shown below:

Service	FY 2015 authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2016 request	FY 2015 authorized
Army National Guard .....	1,600	1,600	1,600	0	0



Service	FY 2015 authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2016 request	FY 2015 authorized
Air National Guard .....	350	350	350	0	0
Army Reserve .....	595	595	595	0	0
Air Force Reserve .....	90	90	90	0	0
DOD Total .....	2,635	2,635	2,635	0	0

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

The committee recommends a provision that would establish limits on the number of reserve personnel authorized to be on active duty for operational support under section 115(b) of title 10, United States Code, as of September 30, 2016, as shown below:

Service	FY 2015 authorized	FY 2016		Change from	
		Request	Recommendation	FY 2016 request	FY 2015 authorized
Army National Guard .....	17,000	17,000	17,000	0	0
Army Reserve .....	13,000	13,000	13,000	0	0
Navy Reserve .....	6,200	6,200	6,200	0	0
Marine Corps Reserve .....	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
Air National Guard .....	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0
Air Force Reserve .....	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0
DOD Total .....	69,200	69,200	69,200	0	0

**Chief of the National Guard Bureau authority in increase certain end strengths applicable to the Army National Guard (sec. 416)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Chief of the National Guard Bureau with the authority to increase the fiscal year 2016 end strength of the Selected Reserve personnel of the Army National Guard as specified in section 411(a)(1) by up to 3,000 members, the end strength of the Reserves serving on full-time duty for the Army National Guard as specified in section 412(1) by 615 Reserves, and military technicians (dual status) for the Army National Guard as specified in section 413(1) by 1,111. The provision contains a limitation stating that the Chief of the National Guard Bureau may only increase an end strength using the authority contained in this section if such increase is paid for entirely out of the readiness funds appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for Operation and Maintenance, Army National Guard.

**Subtitle C—Authorization of Appropriations**

**Military personnel (sec. 421)**

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

**Budget Items****Military personnel funding changes**

The amount authorized to be appropriated for military personnel programs include the following changes from the budget request:

(Changes in millions of dollars)

Military Personnel Underexecution .....	- 987.2
Additional support for the National Guard's Operation Phalanx ..	+21.7
Reduction for anticipated cost of TRICARE consolidation .....	- 85.0
TRICARE program improvement initiatives .....	+15.0
Financial literacy improvement .....	+85.0
Foreign currency fluctuation adjustment .....	- 304.0
Total .....	- 1,254.5

The committee recommends a total reduction in the Military Personnel (MILPERS) appropriation of \$1,254.5 million. This amount includes: (1) A reduction of \$987.2 million to reflect the Government Accountability Office's most recent assessment of the average annual MILPERS underexecution; (2) An increase of \$21.7 million to fund increased support for the National Guard's Operation Phalanx mission in support of the United States-Mexico border; (3) A reduction of \$85.0 million to reflect costs avoided by the Department of Defense relative to its proposal to consolidate the TRICARE program; (4) An increase of \$15 million to improve access to care, quality of care, health outcomes, and the experience of care for military beneficiaries under the TRICARE program; (5) An increase of \$85.0 million to reflect the additional financial literacy training recommended by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; and (6) An adjustment of \$304 million to reflect the foreign currency fluctuation.

## **TITLE V—MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY**

### **Subtitle A—Officer Personnel Policy**

#### **Authority of promotion boards to recommend officers of particular merit be placed at the top of the promotion list (sec. 501)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 616 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize an officer promotion board to recommend officers of particular merit to be placed at the top of the promotion list.

#### **Minimum grades for certain corps and related positions in the Army, Navy, and Air Force (sec. 502)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend various provisions of title 10, United States Code, to revise general or flag officer grades in the Army, Navy and Air Force.

The provision would amend section 3023(a) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Army Chief of Legislative Affairs be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.

The provision would amend section 3039(b) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Army Assistant Surgeon General be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.

The provision would amend section 3069(b) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Army Chief of the Nurse Corps be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.

The provision would amend section 3084 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Army Chief of the Veterinary Corps be an officer in a grade above the grade of lieutenant colonel.

The provision would amend section 5027(a) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Navy Chief of Legislative Affairs be an officer in a grade above the grade of captain.

The provision would amend section 5138 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Navy Chief of the Dental Corps be an officer in a grade above the grade of captain. The provision would also remove the authority in section 5138(b) that entitles the Navy Chief of the Dental Corps to the same privileges of retirement as provided for chiefs of bureaus in section 5133 of title 10, United States Code.

The provision would amend section 5150(c) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Navy Directors of Medical Corps be officers in a grade above the grade of captain.

The provision would amend section 8023(a) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Air Force Chief of Legislative Liaison be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.

The provision would amend section 8069(b) of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Air Force Chief of the Nurse Corps be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.

The provision would amend section 8081 of title 10, United States Code, to require that the Air Force Assistant Surgeon General for Dental Services be an officer in a grade above the grade of colonel.

The provision would provide that in the case of an officer who on the date of enactment of the Act is serving in a position that is covered by this provision, the continued service of that officer in such position after the date of enactment of the Act shall not be affected by the provision.

**Enhancement of military personnel authorities in connection with the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 503)**

The committee recommends a provision that would improve the management of the military acquisition workforce and enhance the quality and effectiveness of military acquisition personnel. The committee is concerned that in the years since the passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433) the Department of Defense senior leadership's focus on the importance of the military acquisition workforce has declined. This provision is designed to increase the attractiveness of acquisition functions to skilled military officers and enlisted personnel and would: (1) provide for credit for joint duty assignments for acquisition related assignments in order to broaden the promotion preference and career opportunities of military acquisition professionals; (2) provide for an enhanced dual track career path in combat arms and a functional secondary career in acquisition to more closely align military operational requirements and acquisition; (3) include business and commercial training as joint professional military education; and (4) require an annual report to Congress on promotion rates for officers in acquisition positions.

**Enhanced flexibility for determination of officers to continue on active duty and for selective early retirement and early discharge (sec. 504)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 638(a) of title 10, United States Code, relating to the authority for selective early retirement and early discharges. The provision would eliminate the restriction that the number of officers recommended for discharge by a selection board may not be more than 30 percent of the number of officers in each grade, year group, or specialty (or combination thereof) in each competitive category. The provision would impose the same restriction that applies to boards to select officers for early retirement, which provides that the number of officers recommended for retirement may not be more than 30 percent of the number of officers considered.

**Authority to defer until age 68 mandatory retirement for age of a general or flag officer serving as Chief or Deputy Chief of Chaplains of the Army, Navy or Air Force (sec. 505)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1253 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize service secretaries to defer the retirement of general and flag officers serving as the Chief or Deputy Chief of Chaplains in their respective Services to age 68. Section 1251 of title 10, United States Code, allows for the deferred retirement of regular officers serving as chaplains in grades below general and flag officer grades to age 68. However, no provision is contained in section 1253 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize regular officers serving as chaplains in flag or general officer grades, the grades associated with service as the Chief or Deputy Chief of Chaplains, to serve beyond age 64.

**Reinstatement of enhanced authority for selective early discharge of warrant officers (sec. 506)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 508a of title 10, United States Code, to reinstate authority for the service secretaries to convene, if necessary, selection boards to consider regular warrant officers on the Active-Duty list for involuntary discharge. The authority to selectively discharge regular warrant officers pursuant to section 580a expired on October 1, 1999. The proposal would authorize such boards during the period October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2019.

**Authority to conduct warrant officer retired grade determinations (sec. 507)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1371 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a service secretary to retire warrant officers in the highest grade in which they served satisfactorily before retirement.

**Subtitle B—Reserve Component Management**

**Authority to designate certain Reserve officers as not to be considered for selection for promotion (sec. 511)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 14301 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the secretaries of the military departments to defer promotion consideration for reserve component officers in a non-participatory (membership points only) status. Currently, section 14301 of title 10, United States Code, requires servicemembers identified on the Reserve Active Status List to be considered for promotion to the next higher grade. This includes certain categories of reservists on the Reserve Active Status List who, by Department of Defense guidance, are in the Individual Ready Reserve and the Standby Reserve and who remain eligible for promotion consideration, but are not actively participating in Reserve duty because they are in a status in which they are receiving membership only points for Reserve credit. Under current law, some individuals assigned to the Individual Ready Reserve may be discharged from the reserve component upon their second deferral for promotion because they are consid-

ered to have twice failed for promotion. This provision would provide the reserve component flexibility to remove individuals from promotion consideration during a period when they are least competitive for promotion, and would allow the services to retain servicemembers with significant military training as well as civilian technical and professional skills that could contribute to their desirability for selection to be promoted should the individual elect to return to military service.

**Clarification of purpose of reserve component special selection boards as limited to correction of error at a mandatory promotion board (sec. 512)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 14502(b) of title 10, United States Code, to conform the authority for convening special selection boards for Reserve officers with the authority for Active-Duty officers in cases in which an officer is considered by a mandatory promotion board, but is not selected due to a material error of fact, material administrative error, or the board did not have before it material information for its consideration.

**Reconciliation of contradictory provisions relating to citizenship qualifications for enlistment in the reserve components of the Armed Forces (sec. 513)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 12102(b) of title 10, United States Code, to align the citizenship or residency requirements for enlistment in the reserve components of the Armed Forces with the citizenship requirements for the active components.

**Authority for certain Air Force reserve component personnel to provide training and instruction regarding pilot instructor training (sec. 514)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to utilize, during fiscal year 2016, up to 50 Active, Guard, and Reserve (AGR) members and dual status military technicians to provide training and instruction to active duty and foreign military personnel in excess of what is currently authorized by the AGR and military technician statutes. The provision would also require the Secretary, by no later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, to provide the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives a report setting forth a plan to eliminate pilot instructor shortages within the Air Force using authorities available to the Secretary under current law.

**Subtitle C—General Service Authorities**

**Duty required for eligibility for pre-separation counseling for members being discharged or released from active duty (sec. 521)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary concerned to provide pre-separation counseling to all Active-Duty

servicemembers and all reserve component servicemembers called or ordered to Active Duty or full-time operational support after completion of their first 180 continuous days of service whose discharge or release from Active Duty is anticipated as of a specific date.

**Expansion of pilot programs on career flexibility to enhance retention of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 522)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 533 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to remove the prohibition for participation by members of the Armed Forces serving under an agreement upon entry, or members receiving a critical military skill retention bonus under section 355 of title 37, United States Code, from participating in pilot programs on career flexibility to enhance retention. The provision would also remove the restriction that limits the number of participants in the program to 20 officers and 20 enlisted members who may be selected to participate in the pilot program during a calendar year.

**Sense of Senate on development of gender-neutral occupational standards for occupational assignments in the Armed Forces (sec. 523)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that: (1) the development of gender-neutral occupational standards is vital in determining the occupational assignments of all members of the Armed Forces; (2) studies being conducted by the Armed Forces are important to the development of these standards and should incorporate the best scientific practices available; and (3) the Armed Forces should consider these studies carefully to ensure they do not result in unnecessary barriers to service and that decisions on occupational assignments be based on objective analysis and not negatively impact combat effectiveness, including units whose primary mission is to engage in direct ground combat at the tactical level.

**Subtitle D—Member Education and Training**

**Part I—Educational Assistance Reform**

**Limitation on tuition assistance for off-duty training or education (sec. 531)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary concerned to determine that off-duty training or education through the tuition assistance program is likely to contribute to the professional development of a servicemember. The committee notes that this provision was recommended in the final report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission. The committee strongly recommends good stewardship of the tuition assistance program.

**Termination of program of educational assistance for reserve component members supporting contingency operations and other operations (sec. 532)**

The committee recommends a provision that would sunset the program of educational assistance for reserve component members supporting contingency operations and other operations in 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act. The committee agrees with the finding of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission that this program is duplicative with the Post-9/11 GI Bill, which provides a more robust benefit for service members.

**Reports on educational levels attained by certain members of the Armed Forces at time of separation from the Armed Forces (sec. 533)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require an annual report by each Secretary concerned on the educational levels attained by members of the Armed Forces who transferred unused education benefits to family members pursuant to section 3319 of title 38, United States Code, while serving as members of the Armed Forces and separated from the Armed Forces during the preceding year. The provision was recommended by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

**Sense of Congress on transferability of unused education benefits to family members (sec. 534)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express a sense of Congress that each Secretary concerned should exercise the authority to be more selective in permitting the transferability of unused education benefits to family members in a manner that encourages the retention of individuals in the Armed Forces.

**No entitlement to unemployment insurance while receiving Post-9/11 Education Assistance (sec. 535)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that individuals receiving Post-9/11 Education Assistance may not also receive unemployment insurance while receiving the post-9/11 education benefit.

**Part II—Other Matters**

**Repeal of statutory specification of minimum duration of in-resident instruction for courses of instruction offered as part of Phase II Joint Professional Military Education (sec. 536)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2154 of title 10, United States Code to remove the statutory minimum residency requirements for Joint Professional Military Education Phase II courses taught at the Joint Forces Staff College. The provision would also repeal section 2156 of title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement that the duration of the principal course of instruction offered at the Joint Forces Staff College may not be less than 10 weeks of resident instruction, and allow the Secretary of Defense or the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs



of Staff to designate and certify various curricula and delivery methods that adhere to joint curricula content, student acculturation, and faculty requirements.

**Quality assurance of certification programs and standards for professional credentials obtained by members of the Armed Forces (sec. 537)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2015 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 551 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to require the Secretaries of the military departments to ensure the accreditation provided for servicemembers meet recognized national and international standards.

The committee believes that the Department of Defense must ensure that accrediting bodies meet certain recognized standards in order to allow service members to receive credentials that will have credibility as they seek employment in the private sector. The committee believes the Secretary is in the best position to determine these standards, but urges the Secretary to first review applicable national and international standards, such as the International Organization for Standardization (ISO/IEC) Standard 17024:2012, pertaining to general requirements for bodies operating certification programs.

**Support for athletic programs of the United States Military Academy (sec. 538)**

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 4362 to title 10, United States Code, that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to:

- (1) Enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with the Army West Point Athletic Association (Association) for the purpose of supporting the athletic and physical fitness programs of the United States Military Academy (Academy);
- (2) Establish financial controls to account for resources of the Academy and the Association, in accordance with accepted accounting principles;
- (3) Enter into leases or licenses for the purpose of supporting the athletic and physical fitness programs of the Academy;
- (4) Provide support services to the Association;
- (5) Accept from the Association funds, supplies, and services to support the athletic and physical fitness programs of the Academy;
- (6) Enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with the Association. This provision would also authorize the Association to enter into licensing, marketing, and sponsorship agreements relating to trademark and service marks identifying the Academy, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Army.

**Online access to the higher education component of the transition assistance program (sec. 539)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to notify service members, veterans,

or dependents of the availability of the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program on the Transition GPS Stand-alone Training Internet web site of the Department of Defense. The provision would also direct the Secretary of Defense, in collaboration with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to assess the feasibility of providing access for veterans and dependents to the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program on the eBenefits Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs and tracking the completion of that component through that Internet web site.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a description of the cost and length of time required to provide access and begin tracking completion of the higher education component of the Transition Assistance Program.

### **Subtitle E—Military Justice**

#### **Modification of Rule 304 of the Military Rules of Evidence relating to the corroboration of a confession or admission (sec. 546)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Rule 304(c) of the Military Rules of Evidence to provide that a confession by an accused may be considered as evidence against the accused only if independent evidence, direct or circumstantial, has been admitted into evidence that would tend to establish the trustworthiness of the confession.

#### **Modification of Rule 104 of the Rules for Courts-Martial to establish certain prohibitions concerning evaluations of Special Victims' Counsel (sec. 547)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require Rule 104(b) of the Rules for Courts-Martial be modified within 180 days after the date of enactment to prohibit giving a less favorable rating to any member of the Armed Forces serving as a Special Victims' Counsel because of the zeal with which such Counsel represented a victim.

#### **Right of victims of offenses under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to timely disclosure of certain materials and information in connection with prosecution of offenses (sec. 548)**

The provision would amend section section 806b(a) of title 10, United States Code, (Article 6b(a), UCMJ) to require timely disclosure by the trial counsel to a Special Victims' Counsel, if the victim is so represented, to charges and specifications related to any offenses, motions filed by trial or defense counsel, statements of the accused, statements of the victim in connection with the offense, portions of the government investigation relating to the victim, and the advice, if any, by a staff judge advocate recommending any charge or specification not be referred to trial.

**Enforcement of certain crime victims' rights by the Court of Criminal Appeals (sec. 549)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 806b of title 10, United States Code, (Article 6b, Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)), to allow an interlocutory appeal by a victim based on assertion that the victim's rights at an Article 32, UCMJ investigation were violated.

**Release to victims upon request of complete record of proceedings and testimony of courts-martial in cases in which sentences adjudged could include punitive discharge (sec. 550)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 854(e) of title 10, United States Code (article 54(e), UCMJ), to expand the circumstances under which an alleged victim must be provided a copy of all prepared records of the proceedings of a court-martial.

**Representation and assistance of victims by Special Victims' Counsel in questioning by military criminal investigators (sec. 551)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1044e(f) of title 10, United States Code, to require a military criminal investigator seeking to question an individual eligible for assistance of Special Victims' Counsel (SVC) to inform the victim of the right to be represented by a SVC in connection with such questioning. If a victim invokes the right then the SVC shall assist the victim during questioning, the investigator shall only contact the victim through the SVC, and the military criminal investigations may not question the victim without consent of the SVC.

**Authority of Special Victims' Counsel to provide legal consultation and assistance in connection with various government proceedings (sec. 552)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 1044e(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize Special Victims' Counsel to provide legal consultation and assistance to victims of an alleged sex-related offense, in connection with inspector general and equal opportunity complaints, requests for information under the Freedom of Information Act, and communications with Congress.

**Enhancement of confidentiality of restricted reporting of sexual assault in the military (sec. 553)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend subsection (b) of section 1565b of title 10, United States Code, to provide that federal law protecting the privacy of victims who are servicemembers or adult military dependents and who file restricted reports of sexual assault would preempt any State laws that require mandatory reporting made to a sexual assault response coordinator, a sexual assault victim advocate, or healthcare personnel providing assistance to a military sexual assault victim under section 1525b of title 10, United States Code, except when

reporting is necessary to prevent or mitigate a serious and imminent threat to the health or safety of an individual.

**Establishment of Office of Complex Investigations within the National Guard Bureau (sec. 554)**

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section to Chapter 1101 of title 10, United States Code, that would establish an Office of Complex Investigations within the National Guard Bureau (NGB), with authority to assist the States in administrative investigations of sexual assault involving members of the National Guard, and circumstances involving members of the Guard where States have limited jurisdiction or authority and such other circumstances as the Chief of the NGB directs. It also allows individual investigators established under this provision to request information from any Federal, State or local government.

**Modification of deadline for establishment of Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces (sec. 555)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 546(a)(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to require the Secretary of Defense to establish the Defense Advisory Committee on Investigation, Prosecution, and Defense of Sexual Assault in the Armed Forces not later than 90 days after enactment of this Act.

**Comptroller General of the United States reports on prevention and response to sexual assault by the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve (sec. 556)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report of the extent to which the Army National Guard and Army Reserve have in place policies and programs to prevent and respond to incidents of sexual assault involving members of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve, and provide medical and mental health services to members of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve following a sexual assault, and to identify whether service in the Army National Guard or Army Reserve pose challenges to the prevention of or response to sexual assault. The Comptroller General will provide the initial report Congress not later than April 1, 2016.

**Sense of Congress on the service of military families and on sentencing retirement eligible members of the Armed Forces (sec. 557)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that military juries should not face the difficult choice between imposing a fair sentence or protecting the benefits of a member of the Armed Forces for the sake of family members, that family members of retirement-eligible members should not be adversely affected by the loss of the member’s military benefits as a result of a court-martial conviction, and welcoming the opportunity to work with the Department of Defense to develop authori-

ties to improve the military justice system and protect benefits that military families have helped earn.

**Subtitle F—Defense Dependents’ Education and Military Family Readiness Matters**

**Continuation of authority to assist local educational agencies that benefit dependents of members of the armed forces and Department of Defense civilian employees (sec. 561)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$25.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for continuation of the Department of Defense (DOD) assistance program to local educational agencies that are impacted by enrollment of dependent children of military members and DOD civilian employees.

**Impact aid for children with severe disabilities (sec. 562)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$5.0 million in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide, for impact aid payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7703(d)), using the formula set forth in section 363 of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), for continuation of Department of Defense assistance to local educational agencies that benefit eligible dependents with severe disabilities.

**Authority to use appropriated funds to support Department of Defense student meal programs in domestic dependent elementary and secondary schools located outside the United States (sec. 563)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2243 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of appropriated funds to support student meal programs in domestic defense dependents’ schools located outside of the United States.

**Biennial surveys of military dependents on military family readiness matters (sec. 564)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of the Office of Family Policy of the Department of Defense to conduct biennial surveys of adult dependents of members of the Armed Forces on matters of military family readiness.

**Subtitle G—Miscellaneous Reporting Requirements**

**Extension of semiannual reports on the involuntary separation of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 571)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 525(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to extend the requirement for semiannual reports on involuntary separation of members of the Armed Forces through calendar year 2017.

**Remotely piloted aircraft career field manning shortfalls  
(sec. 572)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the availability of more than 85 percent of fiscal year 2016 operation and maintenance funds for the Office of the Secretary of the Air Force until the Secretary submits a report, not later than 60 days after enactment of this Act, on remotely piloted aircraft career field manning policies and actions the Air Force will take to rectify personnel shortfalls. Such actions should include a description and associated timeline of actions the Air Force will take to increase remotely piloted aircraft career field manpower authorizations and manning levels to at least the equal of the normative levels of manning and readiness of all other combat aircraft career fields, and also recruitment/retention bonuses, incentive pay, use of enlisted personnel, and increased weighting to remotely piloted aircraft personnel on promotion boards as well as ensuring the school house for remotely piloted aircraft personnel is sufficient to meet increased manning demands.

The committee is concerned that the remotely piloted aircraft career field is under severe strain because of increased combatant commander requirements, consistently insufficient Air Force personnel policy actions to improve manning levels, and is compounded by the Air Force losing more remotely piloted aircraft pilots than it is training. The increased demand has resulted in lower crew ratios, longer duty days, and longer time-on-station assignments for affected personnel, and ultimately less capability than required by the combatant commanders.

The Air Force has been playing catch-up in fielding sufficient crews to support the number of medium altitude intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) combat air patrols (CAPs) required to support combatant commander requirements. In 2009, the Air Force was tasked to support 50 CAPs. Air Force plans in 2009 showed that the Air Force would be able to support 50 CAPs with sufficient crews by 2011, and have sufficient crews to support 65 CAPs by fiscal year 2016. Subsequently, the Department increased the demand to 65 CAPs. Last year, the 65-CAP goal was reduced to 55 CAPs, but, even with the reduction, Air Force capabilities have not lived up to the demand or achieved its own projections.

The Air Force still faces a projected annual shortfall in fiscal year 2016 of nearly 400 MQ-1/9 aircraft pilots to sustain the regular Air Force requirement of 1,200 pilots. The Air Force's fiscal year 2016 budget request would increase the number of MQ-9 combat air patrols from 55 to 60, and maintain five combat air patrols for MQ-1. The Air Force indicated in its budget submission that it intends to add 434 personnel authorizations to the MQ-9 force structure, but increased authorizations do not necessarily equate to additional personnel and sufficient manning levels in squadrons. Had the Air Force realized its own proposed manpower authorization increases to the RPA community planned in 2009, we would not be experiencing the current manning shortfalls still plaguing the career field.

**Subtitle H—Other Matters****Part I—Financial Literacy and Preparedness of Members of the Armed Forces****Improvement of financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 581)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require servicemember financial literacy training upon arrival at the first duty station and upon arrival at each subsequent duty station for servicemembers below the pay grade of E-5 in the case of enlisted personnel and below the pay grade of O-4 in the case of officers. The provision would further require financial literacy training for each servicemember at various career and life milestones. The provision would also direct the Department of Defense to include a financial literacy and preparedness survey in the status of forces survey. This provision was recommended by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

**Financial literacy training with respect to certain financial services for members of the uniformed services (sec. 582)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary concerned to provide financial literacy training to members of the uniformed services under the jurisdiction of such Secretary commencing not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. The provision is based on the final report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

**Sense of Congress on financial literacy and preparedness of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 583)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Defense should work with other departments, agencies, and nonprofit organizations to improve financial literacy and preparedness with support from the Joint Chiefs of Staff and service secretaries.

**Part II—Other Matters****Authority for applications for correction of military records to be initiated by the Secretary concerned (sec. 586)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1552(b) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the service secretaries to apply for a correction to military records on behalf of an individual.

**Recordation of obligations for installment payments of incentive pays, allowances, and similar benefits when payment is due (sec. 587)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide statutory authority for the long-established practice of the Department of Defense (DOD) of obligating bonus and special and incentive pay installment payments at the time payment is due and payable.

This provision is in response to a recent U.S. Government Accountability Office opinion, Comp. Gen. B-325526—“Obligation of Bonuses under Military Service Agreements,” July 16, 2014, which concluded that DOD cedes fiscal exposure to servicemembers when it enters into such agreements and should change its obligational practices to obligate the entire bonus amount when the agreement is signed.

**Enhancements to Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program (sec. 588)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181) to enhance and improve the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program for National Guard and Reserve members and their families. The provision would provide flexibility to deliver events and activities through alternate methods, and would eliminate redundancy by reducing the number of required events and activities to a minimum of four during a servicemember’s deployment cycle. The provision would continue strong support for suicide prevention efforts and outreach programs led by the states.

**Priority processing of applications for Transportation Worker Identification Credentials for members undergoing discharge or release from the Armed Forces (sec. 589)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security to afford a priority in the processing of applications for a Transportation Worker Identification Credential (TWIC) submitted by members of the Armed Forces who are undergoing separation, discharge, or release from the Armed Forces under honorable conditions. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to jointly submit a report on the implementation requirements of this provision not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

**Issuance of Recognition of Service ID cards to certain members separating from the Armed Forces (sec. 590)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require Secretary of Defense to issue an identification card that identifies individuals as veterans, personalized with name and photo of the individual. The Secretary of Defense would be authorized to work with retailers for reduced prices on services, consumer products, and pharmaceuticals. Cards would be issued prospectively from 1 year after effective date of the Act.

**Revised policy on network services for military services (sec. 591)**

The committee recommends a provision that would generally prohibit the use of uniformed military personnel in the provision of network services for military installations in the United States.

The committee notes that the current budget environment has forced the Services to significantly reduce end strength. However, the Services now have increasing requirements and demands which require additional people. The committee believes that the Services



must transfer responsibility for certain missions, such as network services, away from military personnel and instead acquire these services as a commodity.

The provision would generally prohibit the use of military personnel to provide network services such as email, voice, file sharing, and directory and Internet services in the United States 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act. The committee believes this will give the Department of Defense (DOD) time to begin a transition plan.

The provision includes both an exception and a waiver to this policy for network services in support of combatant commands, special operations, the intelligence community, or Cyber Command. Further, the Secretary of Defense or Chief Information Officer may waive this provision for safety reasons or combat operations.

The bill provision further requires a report from DOD, which also requires validation from the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) on the potential savings in both resources and military personnel that could be achieved with this section.

**Increase in number of days of Active Duty required to be performed by reserve component members for duty to be considered federal service for purposes of unemployment compensation for ex-servicemembers (sec. 592)**

The committee recommends a provision that would increase from 90 to 180 days the number of continuous days of Active Duty required to be performed by reserve component members for that duty to be considered satisfactory federal service for purposes of unemployment compensation for ex-servicemembers.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Assessment on Servicemembers lacking post-transition housing**

The committee commends the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs in coordinating efforts to combat veteran homelessness. The committee supports the collaboration between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to assist servicemembers during the transition process, particularly the program that identifies servicemembers during the Transition Assistance Program who may lack post-transition housing, and who may therefore be at greater risk for becoming homeless.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, by no later than December 1, 2015, a report on the number of servicemembers who have indicated a lack of post-transition housing during the Transition Assistance process, broken down by fiscal year, gender, location, and who were therefore referred to the Department of Veterans Affairs. The report required shall include an analysis of what steps may be taken to lessen the number of servicemembers with no post-transition housing.

### **Availability of Special Victims' Counsel as Individual Military Counsel**

In section 1716 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), Congress required each military department to provide Special Victims' Counsel to provide legal representation to survivors of alleged sex-related offenses.

Special Victims' Counsel form an attorney-client relationship when representing these survivors throughout the military justice process, where they actively advise the survivors, protect their legal rights, and help them to navigate the military's criminal justice system.

In some cases, survivors also face criminal charges or disciplinary action. Some survivors have expressed a desire to be represented in criminal and adverse administrative actions by their Special Victims Counsel with whom they already have an attorney-client relationship and who understands their personal situation. The committee believes that when survivors become the accused they should, to the maximum extent possible, have a choice over which attorney will represent and advise them.

Article 38(b), Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ)(10 U.S.C. 838), authorizes an accused to be represented by military counsel of his or her own selection if that counsel is determined to be reasonably available under applicable regulations. It is the committee's intent that nothing should preclude a survivor from requesting his or her Special Victims' Counsel as individual military counsel, and that the Special Victims' Counsel should be authorized to represent the survivor in trials by courts-martial, at non-judicial punishment proceedings under Article 15 of the UCMJ (10 U.S.C. 815), and in connection with adverse administrative actions when the counsel is reasonably available. It is the committee's expectation that survivors be provided with a choice of counsel to the maximum extent possible.

### **Changes to the Joint Travel Regulation**

On November 1, 2014, the Department of Defense (DOD) revised Joint Travel Regulations were implemented resulting in a flat rate per diem for travelers performing temporary duty travel (TDY) for more than 30 days in one location. Depending on the duration of the travel, the authorized flat rate was adjusted to reflect 75 percent and 55 percent of the locality rate for long-term TDY with the DOD reimbursing travelers for actual lodging and government meal rates if suitable lodging at the reduced rate is not available.

The committee wants to ensure that the current policy does not discourage some DOD personnel—including civilian workers at shipyards and depots—from volunteering for important TDY assignments.

The committee supports the DOD's initiatives to achieve efficiencies, including in the area of temporary duty travel costs. However, the committee expects the DOD to monitor closely the effect of this new policy to avoid unintended disincentives and ensure that those who volunteer for mission essential travel are fully supported and encouraged.

**Comptroller General of the United States assessment of Department of Defense personnel strategies for unmanned aerial systems**

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the results of a study, conducted by the Comptroller General for the purposes of the report, due no later than March 1, 2016, to examine the Department of Defense's personnel strategies for unmanned aerial systems (UAS). The report shall include an examination of how the services have done the following: (1) Analyzed the personnel requirements for positions required to fly UAS including the existing and future critical skills and competencies needed; (2) examined alternative populations, such as civilians and contractors, that could be assigned to UAS units; (3) coordinated their strategies to recruit and retain personnel to operate UAS; and (4) conducted a cost benefit analysis to determine the risks and advantages of the varying personnel assignment strategies they are pursuing for UAS operators.

**Comptroller General report on Department of Defense credentialing and licensing programs**

In section 551 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291), the committee directed the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Homeland Security with respect to the Coast Guard, to carry out a credentialing program that would allow servicemembers to obtain professional credentials related to their military training that were acquired during service in the Armed Forces. The purpose of this program is to ensure that servicemembers receive professional recognition of skills acquired during military service that translate into civilian life. The committee expects that successful implementation of this program will reduce veteran unemployment and related unemployment costs borne by the military services. The committee is concerned that this program is implemented in a timely fashion, and meets the needs of servicemembers as veteran unemployment and attendant costs remain high. Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review DOD's credentialing and licensing programs, and to provide a briefing on preliminary results by no later than May 1, 2016, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives with a report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of the briefing. The review should address, at a minimum, the following: (1) The extent to which DOD has successfully implemented the credentialing program required by section 551 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015; (2) the challenges that still exist with respect to full implementation; (3) the steps the Department has taken to ensure quality control over the credentialing process with respect to third-party credentialing entities; (4) challenges DOD is encountering regarding compatibility between their credentialing programs with federal, state, and local credentialing requirements; and (5) existing gaps in law and policy with respect to meeting the program's goal of providing professional credentials to

servicemembers, on the basis of their military education and training, before they transition to civilian life.

#### **Cyber security training, testing and certification**

The committee continues to encourage the Department of Defense (DOD) to enhance its ongoing efforts related to providing certifications to personnel pursuant to Department of Defense Directive (DODD) 8570.01. While DODD 8570.01 is highly effective, this program is limited to coverage to only DOD personnel with information assurance (IA) job responsibilities. The committee believes in addition to these IA functions, technical support and network infrastructure oversight remain critical areas for network defense. Ensuring these positions receive training, testing, and industry-recognized certification would enhance the security of DOD networks and ensure members of the Armed Forces receive the same credentials recognized in the civilian workforce. By instituting testing after training, DOD can ensure that cyber security and IT skills are retained. Therefore, the committee urges DOD to include them in DODD 8570.01 and any successor directives.

#### **Disability pilot program feasibility report**

Department of Defense (DOD) civilians with disabilities and servicemembers who have been wounded or injured in the line of duty serve honorably, meet certain standards required for their positions, and contribute to the national security of the United States.

In recognition of the dedicated service of the DOD's disabled civilian employees and servicemembers, and in order to evaluate opportunities to employ the full range of abilities that they may contribute to certain military specialties, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report assessing the feasibility of a pilot program to determine whether civilians with certain medical conditions that are currently grounds for rejection for military service under Department of Defense Instruction 6130.03 may be appointed, enlisted or inducted in the military services.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to prepare the report through the Accession Medical Standards Working Group (AWSWG) that convened in February 2015.

The report should specifically describe a plan to conduct a pilot program that would evaluate conditions necessary to appoint, enlist, or induct, at a minimum, persons with deafness or hearing impairment, amblyopia or partial visual impairment, a lost or missing limb or limbs, paraplegia, a history of surgical procedures, or a history of asthma. The feasibility report should consider whether individuals with certain medical conditions might be more suited to certain jobs than able-bodied individuals, as could be the case with a deaf individual working in high-noise environments.

The report should address validity of assumptions contained in Department of Defense Instruction 6130.03 that result in individuals with designated medical conditions being rejected for military service while currently serving military members with the same or a similar disability may be allowed to continue to serve. The report

should assess the feasibility of including currently-serving military members of DOD and civilians with similar disabilities who are not DOD military members or civilians as participants in a pilot program. The report should identify, at a minimum, the potential size of the cohort (by specific disability); the disabilities that are amenable to objective evaluation through a pilot program; the optimal duration of the potential pilot program; applicability of human subject research requirements to a pilot program; considerations for determining the status of individuals selected to participate in the pilot program when the pilot program is completed; and the likely cost.

The committee notes that Senate Report 113–211, which accompanied H.R. 4870, directed the Department of the Air Force to study the feasibility and advisability of permitting individuals with auditory impairment, including deafness, to access as officers in the Armed Forces.

While this reporting requirement is broader in scope than the report required in Senate Report 113–211, the committee expects the department to coordinate with the Air Force to benefit from their analysis and to avoid duplicative work.

The committee directs that the feasibility report be submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 1, 2016.

#### **Extending Special Victims’ Counsel eligibility for civilian sexual assault survivors**

The statute requiring the military services to provide Special Victims’ Counsel (SVC) to certain victims of alleged sex-related offenses identifies the following individuals as eligible for this assistance: (1) Active duty servicemembers and their dependents; (2) Reserve and National Guard members when on active duty or inactive duty and their dependents; (3) retired servicemembers and their dependents; and (4) certain civilians overseas. Initial reports indicate this novel program that provides victims with their own attorney to represent them during the investigation and prosecution of sexual offenses is well-received by survivors of sexual assaults.

In its initial report, the Judicial Proceedings Panel (JPP), established by section 576 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to conduct an independent review and assessment of judicial proceedings conducted under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, expressed the following initial observation: “The JPP is concerned that the statutory basis creating eligibility for SVC services is tied to eligibility for legal assistance services. This requirement precludes the program from supporting all victims of sexual assault perpetrated by Servicemembers, because many such individuals are not eligible for legal assistance under the statute.” The committee agrees with this observation. Many civilian survivors of a sexual assault perpetrated by a servicemember are not familiar with the military. Navigating the military justice system is especially confusing for civilians unaccustomed to military culture and procedure. Further, this lack of familiarity is compounded by fact that many survivors are young and financially disadvantaged.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to assess the feasibility of providing Special Victims' Counsel to civilian survivors of sexual assaults by a servicemember who are not otherwise eligible for legal assistance services from the military and to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than August 31, 2015. The assessment should address the impact on the current SVC program of extending SVC eligibility to civilian survivors; views of civilian bar associations on providing legal representation to civilians not entitled to legal assistance; and the feasibility of a pilot program in which National Guard and Reserve judge advocates provide military justice and victim advocacy training to civilian attorneys serving military communities.

### **Forensic Experiential Trauma Interview**

The U.S. Army Military Police School is training the next generation of Army criminal investigators and judge advocates in the Forensic Experiential Trauma Interview (FETI), a technique that utilizes the latest information about the parts of the brain that experience trauma, including sexual assault trauma. Because stress and trauma routinely interrupt the memory process, FETI techniques are an important investigatory tool that reduces the inaccuracy of the information obtained from trauma victims, increases the confidence of assault survivors to participate in the criminal justice system, and increases the likelihood of successful criminal convictions without revictimizing survivors in the way that traditional interviews can. The FETI technique also enhances the questioning of suspects, who frequently provide more useful information than would be obtained using traditional interrogation techniques. Bringing the latest science to the fight against sexual assault provides criminal investigators a better way to relate to the survivors' experience, to identify sex offenders, and to hold them accountable.

In light of the demonstrated value of FETI, the committee directs the service secretaries to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than August 31, 2015, that describes how widely FETI training has been provided to criminal investigators and judge advocates of that Service and plans for future training. If any service is not utilizing FETI training, the report should include an explanation of the Service's decision to not employ FETI and a description of the alternative training and techniques used by that Service.

The committee believes that the U.S. Army is a leader in effective interviewing techniques of sexual assault survivors and recommends that the U.S. Army Military Police School, upon the request of other federal agencies, facilitate FETI training of members of that agency whenever possible.

Finally, the Department of Defense's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO) has demonstrated sustained effort to eliminate sexual assault in the Armed Forces. The committee encourages SAPRO to incorporate FETI best practices on how to deal appropriately with sexual assault survivors into all levels of SAPRO's sexual assault prevention and response training.

**Increase in number of persons from U.S. Pacific Command area of operations who receive instruction at military academies**

Each service secretary is authorized to permit up to 60 persons from foreign countries to receive instruction at the military academy of that Service. The committee encourages service secretaries to promote the Asia-Pacific rebalance by increasing, among the 60-persons authorized, the percentage of persons from countries in the U.S. Pacific Command area of operations who receive instruction at the military academies.

**Increasing the transparency of the military justice system**

Making the results of courts-martial public is important to instill public confidence in the administration of justice in the military.

The committee is aware of the current practices of the military services to make the results of general and special courts-martial available to the general public. The Air Force publishes sexual assault courts-martial convictions periodically on the Air Force Judge Advocate General's Corps website. The Marine Corps posts information on courts-martial actions monthly on the Marine Corps homepage. The Army and Navy both publicly release service-wide summaries of courts-martial actions, the results of which are routinely published in military magazines.

The committee believes that transparency of the military justice system would be improved by a more consistent practice by all services to make the results of court-martial available to the public. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to examine the various reporting methods being used and to prescribe a consistent and regular method of making public the results of general and special courts-martial by all the services. The committee believes that the public has an interest in knowing, at a minimum, the date, location, level of courts-martial, name of the accused if convicted, charges, verdict and, if applicable, the sentence adjudged.

**Leadership reorganization of the United States Air Force Judge Advocate General's Corps**

The committee is concerned that the organizational leadership of the United States Air Force Judge Advocate General's Corps has become adversely impacted by the loss of three general officer billets. Former Secretary of Defense Gates directed, in 2011, reductions in flag and general officer billets in the Armed Forces in an initiative to streamline headquarters. That reduction resulted in the loss of several senior officer billets in the Air Force Judge Advocate General's Corps. None of the other military services' judge advocates general corps were similarly affected. The committee commends the intent of the Gates' initiative to make needed and long overdue reductions in the number of flag and general officers in the Armed Forces and is not directing nor does it support an increase in the number of general or flag officers authorized. The impact of the Gates' initiative to the Air Force Judge Advocate General's Corps, however, was to eliminate important professional and career development opportunities for senior judge advocates who form the body of qualified officers from which the Air Force would

select the Judge Advocate General. The loss of these billets occurred during a period of unprecedented growth in the important role of judge advocates in key mission support areas while our Nation is at war. At the same time, senior judge advocates are the key advisers to the Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff of the Air Force to implement congressionally-mandated military justice reforms and new initiatives to combat sexual assault and sexual harassment in the Armed Forces. The essential role for senior judge advocates is expected to continue. Elsewhere in this Act, the committee has directed significant acquisition reforms which would increase the responsibilities of the service chiefs for execution of acquisition of major defense acquisition programs. The Air Force is unique among the military departments in the use of judge advocates in acquisition programs while, as a result of the Gates' initiative, it was required to give up the senior judge advocate general officer billet responsible to lead and supervise the Air Force Judge Advocate General's uniformed acquisition attorneys. Accordingly, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force, with advice from the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, to determine the impact of the elimination of those three general officer positions on the legal leadership for the Department of the Air Force and to report any actions that will be implemented by the Air Force to address this leadership shortfall, and to provide recommendations of any legislative relief necessary to address such impact, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than September 1, 2015.

#### **National Guard and Reserve headquarters**

The committee notes that the reserve component, both the National Guard and Reserves, are key components of the Department of Defense's (DOD) organizational structure and strategic capability. Reserve components comprise approximately 50 percent of the Army's total end strength, while reserve components comprise about 30 percent of the Air Force's total end strength. The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) found in 2013 that amid the DOD's efforts to trim budgets by finding efficiencies and reducing overhead, some reserve component headquarters have grown. In its report, the GAO found the processes intended to efficiently size and oversee reserve component headquarters have not been consistently applied.

The committee is interested in determining whether DOD has taken steps to eliminate overlapping, fragmented, or duplicative functions within the National Guard and Reserve headquarters could lead to greater efficiencies and cost reductions within the reserve components.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate the extent to which the National Guard and Reserves have taken steps to eliminate or consolidate overlapping, fragmented, or duplicative functions, and whether the National Guard reviewed its Joint Force Headquarters for greater efficiencies by consolidating roles that are filled by both Army and Air National Guard members.



The committee directs the Comptroller General to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives no later than March 15, 2016.

#### **Public Schools on Department of Defense Installations**

The committee is aware that there are more than 150 public schools located on Department of Defense installations, serving a significant number of military dependent children. Although these schools are on-base, these schools are run by the local public school districts, but do not receive DODEA funds. Recognizing that many of these schools have severe overcrowding or are in deteriorating physical condition, in fiscal year 2011, the Department of Defense Office of Economic Adjustment was provided authority to evaluate the condition and capacity of such schools, and approved a Priority List in July 2011. The committee recognizes that the Department of Defense has since provided grants to renovate, repair, or expand such public schools on military installations, focusing on the schools with the most severe overcrowding or facilities needs in priority order. Since 2011, many schools on the list may have had changes in enrollment due to military activity, and may have experienced changes in physical condition. Therefore, the committee directs the Department of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees, by September 1, 2016, with an updated assessment and priority list on the condition and capacity of public schools on military installations not already included in bands 1–6 of the July 2011 Priority List.

#### **Punishment for collateral misconduct revealed by reports of sexual misconduct**

The committee agrees with military leaders that a culture of prevention, accountability, dignity, and respect must exist throughout the ranks. Toward that end, any barriers that deter servicemembers from reporting sexual misconduct must be eliminated, and all who courageously report these crimes must be encouraged and staunchly supported.

Surveys indicate that the fear of being punished for minor misconduct serves as a deterrent to the reporting of sexual assault. The larger goal of ensuring that the Armed Forces are cohesive and effective, and that the honor and trust that sustains our Armed Forces is preserved, dictates that the elimination of sexual assault is more important than the punishment of minor misconduct.

The committee encourages military leaders to refrain from punishing servicemembers who report sexual misconduct for minor collateral misconduct, such as underage drinking, fraternization, and adultery when the underlying minor crimes would not have come to the chain of command's attention but for the servicemember's report of sexual misconduct.

#### **Religious freedom and role of military chaplains**

The committee continues to encourage the Department of Defense and Armed Forces to support servicemembers' right to express their sincerely held religious and moral beliefs. Individual expressions of religious and moral beliefs in the military will be accommodated unless it is determined that such individual actions

could have an adverse impact on military readiness, unit cohesion, and good order and discipline. The committee recognizes the vital role of religious beliefs and the expression of faith for many servicemembers and their families. Preserving a military culture that protects the freedom of expression, including the freedom not to believe, is important to the morale and to recruiting and retention in the Armed Forces.

The committee further recognizes that a military chaplain is a certified religious military professional of a qualified religious organization who has satisfied the professional religious education and ecclesiastical qualifications of his or her endorsing agency and is appointed a commissioned officer in an Armed Service's chaplain corps. The chaplain remains a representative of and accountable to the endorsing faith group for the religious ministry he or she provides to members of the Armed Services and to their families. The committee expects that commanders will ensure a chaplain's right to religious expression and to provide religious exercise and guidance that accurately represent the chaplain's faith are protected, respected, and unencumbered by any means contrary to section 533 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) as amended by section 532 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

The committee recognizes the role of the military chaplain in the Armed Forces to care for the spiritual well-being of servicemembers and their families. As part of their service, many chaplains play a critical function in providing for the mental health and emotional needs of servicemembers and their families by helping them to deal with the unique pressures and stresses associated with military service. This includes, but is not limited to, suicide prevention, coping with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, sexual assault, providing marriage and family counseling, and providing religious and moral guidance. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to continue efforts to integrate military chaplains into the programming for mental health and well-being and to provide clear guidance for addressing formations and groups where attendance by service members is required.

The committee also notes the results of a RAND Corporation survey of Army chaplains published on April 7, 2015 which concluded that 44 percent of chaplains and 57 percent of chaplain assistants believe they need more training in suicide prevention treatment. No later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Department of Defense shall provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on shortfalls in suicide prevention training for the chaplain corps in each service branch and a strategy to address these shortfalls.

**Report on review of petitions for review of discharge or dismissal from the Armed Forces of veterans with mental health issues connected with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury**

Section 521 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) requires that any medical advisory opinion issued to a

board for correction of military records regarding a servicemember or former servicemember who was diagnosed while serving in the military as experiencing a mental health disorder include the opinion of a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist if the individual's request for correction of records relates to a mental health disorder. This section also requires that boards for review of discharge or dismissal include, as a member of the board, a clinical psychologist or psychiatrist, or a physician with training on mental health issues connected with post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury, when the board considers a request for review of a discharge or dismissal by a former servicemember (1) who was diagnosed as experiencing post-traumatic stress disorder or traumatic brain injury as a consequence of a deployment in support of a contingency operation, or (2) who was diagnosed while serving in the military as experiencing a mental health disorder.

In addition, on September 3, 2014, the Secretary of Defense issued supplemental guidance to Military Boards for Correction of Military/Naval Records considering discharge upgrade requests by veterans claiming post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). The Secretary directed the boards to give liberal consideration to documentation of one or more symptoms which meet the diagnostic criteria of PTSD or related conditions, giving special consideration to Department of Veterans Affairs' determinations which document PTSD or PTSD-related conditions connected to military service.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than August 31, 2015, on the implementation of these authorities. In addition to describing the implementation of these authorities, the report should include the number of applications submitted to which these authorities apply, and the number of cases in which relief was granted as a result of these new authorities.

#### **Report on Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff decisions on combat integration**

The committee remains interested in the process and results of the military services' and United State Special Operations Command's (SOCOM) implementation of the January 24, 2013, letter from the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff rescinding the direct ground combat exclusion and assignment rule and directing the services and SOCOM to open all closed positions to service by women by January 1, 2016, or to request an exception to policy prior to that date to keep occupations closed. According to the letter, "exceptions must be narrowly tailored, and based on a rigorous analysis of factual data regarding the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed for the position."

The committee directs the Secretary and Chairman to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives by no later than March 1, 2016, a report describing the conclusions reached by the Secretary and Chairman with respect to decisions to open closed occupations to service by women, and the reasons behind such conclusions, with particular reference to the "rigorous analysis of factual data" used in reaching these conclusions.

**Social Security Number Use Reduction Plan**

The committee recognizes that service members are increasingly vulnerable to identify theft, in part because of overly frequent use of Social Security numbers (SSN) in the military for identification purposes. The committee commends the Department of Defense for establishing the SSN Use Reduction Plan in Department of Defense Instruction 1000.30, dated August 1, 2012. The SSN Use Reduction Plan directs that the collection and use of SSNs be reduced or eliminated where possible and requires justification for any continued collection and use of SSNs. The plan identifies the Department of Defense Identification Number as a suitable replacement for SSNs in most processes and business needs and directs that Department of Defense Identification Numbers replace the SSN as the Geneva Conventions Serial Number on Department of Defense identification cards. The committee remains concerned that the collection and use of SSNs remains prolific in Department of Defense systems and forms, including record of service forms, travel and permanent change of station orders, evaluations, and others. The Department of Defense's continued widespread, unnecessary use of SSNs for identification purposes exposes service members to heightened and unacceptable risk of identity theft. Therefore, the committee strongly encourages the Department of Defense to eliminate the use of SSNs as a method of identifying service members.

**Support for military families impacted by grief, behavioral health disorders, or substance abuse**

The committee applauds the Services for their recognition of military family readiness and resilience as vital elements of maintaining an effective fighting force. Ready families require knowledge, skills, and support necessary to respond with resilience to the challenges of military life, including chronic stressors and traumatic events.

Children of members of the Armed Forces experience unique stressors, such as prolonged separation, permanent changes of station, and higher rates of parental alcohol and prescription drug abuse. The committee is aware that childhood and adolescence are particularly important periods for investing in resilience, and research shows the single most influential factor in promoting resilience in children is the presence of supportive relationships, especially parents, but also with adults outside the home. Evidence suggests that providing children and adolescents with opportunities to develop supportive relationships and coping strategies outside the home in environments that provide both warmth and structure contribute positively to resilience building. Accordingly, the committee urges the Secretary of Defense to review and evaluate materials, resources, and programs available to children of members of the Armed Forces dealing with bereavement or a parent, guardian, or sibling who suffers from a behavioral health disorder or substance abuse and to continue to support partnerships with non-governmental organizations to address any identified gaps in support.

## **TITLE VI—COMPENSATION AND OTHER PERSONNEL BENEFITS**

### **Subtitle A—Pay and Allowances**

#### **Fiscal year 2016 increase in military basic pay (sec. 601)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pay raise of 1.3 percent for all members of the uniformed services in pay grades O-6 and below effective January 1, 2016.

#### **Modification of percentage of national average monthly cost of housing usable in computation of basic allowance for housing inside the United States (sec. 602)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 403(b) of title 37, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to reduce the monthly amount of the basic allowance for housing (BAH) by up to 5 percent of the national average for housing for a given pay grade and dependency status. Servicemembers will not see this modification of their BAH until they change duty stations.

#### **Extension of authority to provide temporary increase in rates of basic allowance for housing (sec. 603)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Defense to temporarily increase the rate of basic allowance for housing in areas impacted by natural disasters or experiencing a sudden influx of personnel.

#### **Basic allowance for housing for married members of the uniformed services assigned for duty within normal commuting distance and for other members living together (sec. 604)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 403 of title 37, United States Code, to limit the basic allowance for housing (BAH) for dual military married couples who are assigned within normal commuting distance from each other to one allowance at the with dependent rate, for the member with the higher pay grade. The provision would also limit BAH for uniformed service members above E-3 residing with other uniformed service members to 75 percent of their otherwise prevailing rate, or the E-4 without dependents rate, whichever is greater. Affected members would see no reduction in their BAH as a result of this provision so long as they maintain uninterrupted eligibility to receive BAH within a particular housing area.

**Repeal of inapplicability of modification of basic allowance for housing to benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs (sec. 605)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal subsection (b) of section 604 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) effective January 1, 2016.

**Limitation on eligibility for supplemental subsistence allowances to members serving outside the United States and associated territory (sec. 606)**

The committee recommends a provision that would sunset on September 30, 2016, the supplemental subsistence allowance for servicemembers serving inside the United States. Servicemembers serving outside the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, or Guam would still be eligible to receive the supplemental subsistence allowance from the Department of Defense. The provision is based on the final report of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission.

**Availability of information (sec. 607)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow for the Secretary of Defense to obtain from the Secretary of Agriculture information for the purposes of determining the number of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program applicant households that contain one or more members of a regular or reserve component of the Armed Forces.

**Subtitle B—Bonuses and Special and Incentive Pays**

**One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for reserve forces (sec. 611)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus, the Selected Reserve affiliation or enlistment bonus, special pay for enlisted members assigned to certain high-priority units, the Ready Reserve enlistment bonus for persons without prior service, the Ready Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, the Selected Reserve enlistment and reenlistment bonus for persons with prior service, travel expenses for certain inactive-duty training, and income replacement for reserve component members experiencing extended and frequent mobilization for Active-Duty service.

**One-year extension of certain bonus and special pay authorities for health care professionals (sec. 612)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the nurse officer candidate accession bonus, education loan repayment for certain health professionals who serve in the Selected Reserve, accession and retention bonuses for psychologists, the accession bonus for registered nurses, incentive special pay for nurse anesthetists, special pay for Selected Reserve health professionals in critically short wartime specialties,

the accession bonus for dental officers, the accession bonus for pharmacy officers, the accession bonus for medical officers in critically short wartime specialties, and the accession bonus for dental specialist officers in critically short wartime specialties.

**One-year extension of special pay and bonus authorities for nuclear officers (sec. 613)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the special pay for nuclear-qualified officers extending period of active service, the nuclear career accession bonus, and the nuclear career annual incentive bonus.

**One-year extension of authorities relating to title 37 consolidated special pay, incentive pay, and bonus authorities (sec. 614)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the general bonus authority for enlisted members, the general bonus authority for officers, special bonus and incentive pay authorities for nuclear officers, special aviation incentive pay and bonus authorities for officers, and special bonus and incentive pay authorities for officers in health professions, and contracting bonus for cadets and midshipmen enrolled in the Senior Officers' Training Corps. The provision would also extend for 1 year the authority to pay hazardous duty pay, assignment or special duty pay, skill incentive pay or proficiency bonus, and retention incentives for members qualified in critical military skills or assigned to high priority units.

**One-year extension of authorities relating to payment of other title 37 bonuses and special pays (sec. 615)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the authority to pay the aviation officer retention bonus, assignment incentive pay, the reenlistment bonus for active members, the enlistment bonus, precommissioning incentive pay for 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.

**Increase in maximum annual amount of nuclear officer bonus pay (sec. 616)**

The committee recommends a provision that would increase the maximum annual amount of nuclear officer bonus pay to \$50,000 for retention purposes. This provision would take effect January 1, 2016.

**Repeal of obsolete authority to pay bonus to encourage Army personnel to refer persons for enlistment in the Army (sec. 617)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 3252 of title 10, United States Code. This section authorized the Secretary of the Army to pay bonuses to encourage Army personnel to refer persons for enlistment in the Army. The committee notes

that the recent nationwide Army National Guard Recruiting Assistance Program scandal, which defrauded the American taxpayers of millions of dollars, has given the committee serious doubts as to the wisdom of authorizing such incentive programs.

### **Subtitle C—Travel and Transportation Allowances**

#### **Repeal of obsolete special travel and transportation allowance for survivors of deceased members from the Vietnam conflict (sec. 621)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal section 481f(d) of title 37, United States Code.

### **Subtitle D—Disability Pay, Retired Pay, and Survivor Benefits**

#### **Part I—Retired Pay Reform**

#### **Thrift Savings Plan participation for members of the uniformed services (sec. 631)**

The committee recommends a series of provisions that would implement recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission concerning reform and modernization of the military retirement benefit for new entrants into service. This provision would provide a government-matching Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) element for those who would enter uniformed service on or after January 1, 2018, or a member serving before that date who makes a voluntary election to opt-in to the new plan. The TSP element would provide a 1 percent automatic agency contribution to all uniformed service members who would reach 60 days of service and continue until they would reach their second year of service. Once a servicemember passes the 2 years of service point, that member's TSP account would vest and the Secretary concerned would begin matching TSP contributions up to 5 percent of that servicemember's base pay at 2 years and 1 day of service. Uniformed service members would be automatically enrolled at 3 percent matching contributions with the option to raise or lower their contribution level. TSP government-funded matching contributions would continue until a uniformed service member reaches 20 years of service.

The committee notes that all uniformed service members who would enter and serve prior to the date of implementation of the modernized retirement system would be grandfathered into the old retirement system.

#### **Modernized retirement system for members of the uniformed services (sec. 632)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a new military retirement defined benefit that, when combined with the government-matching Thrift Savings Plan, as described elsewhere in this Act, would comprise a new hybrid retirement system. This new system would apply to new entrants after January 1, 2018, and to those already serving members who choose to opt-in to the new system. The new defined benefit would continue to apply only to those members who reach 20 years of service, with



a multiplier rate of 2.0 times years of service rather than the current rate of 2.5 times years of service.

**Lump sum payments of certain retired pay (sec. 633)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the voluntary election of lump sum payments of retired pay for those serving 20 or more years of service. Members who elect to take the lump sum may choose to take 100 percent or 50 percent of the discounted present value of their defined retirement benefit that would be due to them prior to becoming fully eligible for Social Security.

The committee strongly urges the Secretaries concerned to coordinate with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs on counseling, or otherwise informing, new retirees on the impact this election may have on their eligibility for certain benefits administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

**Continuation pay after 12 years of service for members of the uniformed services participating in the modernized retirement systems (sec. 634)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary concerned to provide continuation pay to servicemembers, serving under the new military retirement system described above, who reach 12 years of service contingent upon such members agreeing to serve another 4 years of service. A member receiving continuation pay may elect to take the continuation pay in a lump sum or in installments of not more than four payments. A member who receives continuation pay and fails to complete the obligated service requirement shall be subject to repayment.

The rate for active duty continuation pay would be 2.5 times a member's monthly basic pay with the Secretary concerned having discretionary authority to increase that amount to up to 13 times monthly basic pay for retention and force shaping purposes. The rate for members of the reserve components would be 0.5 times a reserve member's monthly basic pay with the Secretary concerned having discretionary authority to increase that amount to up to 6 months of monthly basic pay as needed for retention and force shaping purposes. The committee notes that the secretaries concerned would manage continuation pay through their special and incentive pay accounts and should take into consideration any other incentive pay a member may be receiving with any concurrent service obligations owed.

**Authority for retirement flexibility for members of the uniformed services (sec. 635)**

The committee recommends a provision that would give the Secretary concerned the flexibility to modify the years of service required for non-disability retirement under the new military retirement system for particular occupational specialties or other groupings in order to facilitate force shaping or to correct manpower shortages within an occupational specialty. The Secretary concerned shall be required to provide notice to Congress 1 year in advance of making such a change.

**Treatment of Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund as a qualified trust (sec. 636)**

The committee recommends a provision that would treat the Department of Defense Military Retirement Fund as a qualified trust under title 26, United States Code, section 401(a) for purposes of title 26, United States Code, section 1 et seq.

**Part II—Other Matters****Death of former spouse beneficiaries and subsequent remarriages under Survivor Benefit Plan (sec. 641)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1448(b) of title 10, United States Code, to allow for the election of a new spouse beneficiary after the death of a former spouse beneficiary.

**Transitional compensation and other benefits for dependents of members of the Armed Forces ineligible to receive retired pay as a result of court-martial sentence (sec. 642)**

The committee recommends a provision that would add a new section 1059a to title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to carry out a program that would authorize monthly transitional compensation, including commissary and exchange store access, to dependents or former dependents of a member of the Armed Forces who is ineligible to receive retired pay as a result of court-martial sentence. The provision would allow the secretary concerned to determine that a dependent or former dependent would not be eligible for transitional compensation if that person was an active participant in the conduct constituting the offense under chapter 47 of title 10.

**Subtitle E—Commissary and Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentality Benefits and Operations****Commissary system matters (sec. 651)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 2483, 2484, and 2643 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Department of Defense to treat second destination transportation costs for commissary goods and supplies overseas like transportation costs within the United States by transferring those costs to the commissary patron in the price of goods. Those costs would be evenly spread across commissary products worldwide, rather than solely in commissaries overseas, to standardize the value of the commissary benefit to all customers. This provision would also authorize the Department to transfer the cost of obtaining supplies required for the daily operations of commissaries and store-level offices dedicated to supporting commissary operations from the defense working capital fund to the surcharge fund.

**Plan on privatization of the Defense Commissary System (sec. 652)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, not later than March 1, 2016, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, setting forth a plan to privatize the Defense Commissary System, in whole or in part. The plan should ensure the provision of high quality grocery goods and products, savings discounts to patrons, and high levels of customer satisfaction. The Secretary should include with the plan any recommendations for legislative action required by the Department of Defense to implement the plan.

The provision would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide a report that assesses the plan of the Department to privatize the Defense Commissary System to the committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives within 120 days following submission of the report by the Secretary of Defense.

Following submission of the Comptroller General's assessment of the Department's commissary privatization plan, the Department would be required to carry out a 2-year pilot program at no fewer than five commissaries in the largest markets of the commissary system to assess the feasibility and advisability of the plan. The Secretary of Defense may include, as part of the pilot program, an online component to permit eligible beneficiaries, in catchment areas of the commissaries selected for the pilot, to order and purchase grocery goods and products through the Internet and to receive those items through home delivery. Within 180 days after completion of the pilot program, the Secretary of Defense would submit a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that provides an assessment of the commissary privatization plan.

**Comptroller General of the United States report on the Commissary Surcharge, Non-appropriated Fund, and Privately-financed Major Construction Program (sec. 653)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to examine the policies and procedures of the Secretary of Defense to ensure timely notification of construction projects proposed to be funded through the Commissary Surcharge, Non-appropriated Fund, and Privately-financed Major Construction Program of the Department of Defense and to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report containing an assessment of this program no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act. The committee is aware that the Department of Defense has recently completed certain privately-financed major construction projects without prior notification to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, contrary to established, long-standing practice and contrary to the committee's constitutional oversight responsibility and authority.

### Items of Special Interest

#### **Comptroller General of the United States assessment of potential costs and benefits from privatizing Department of Defense commissaries**

Through the Defense Commissary Agency, the Department of Defense (DOD) operates over 240 military commissaries, in the United States and overseas, to sell grocery merchandise and other goods at cost plus a 5 percent surcharge primarily to Active-Duty, National Guard, Reserve, and retired servicemembers and their family members. The Defense Commissary Agency reports that patrons receive an average of 30 percent savings on commissary purchases compared to commercial grocery prices. Military servicemembers consider the commissaries an important benefit because savings derived from commissary purchases increase the overall purchasing power of their annual pay.

Defense appropriations subsidize commissary operations, and to a large degree, contribute to patron savings. In an effort to reduce taxpayer costs of military commissaries, the budget request proposed a reduction in appropriated subsidies to the Defense Commissary Agency over several years. This change in commissary funding would ultimately result in reduced patron savings because commissary prices would likely increase to compensate for lower government subsidies. With the budget request, overseas commissaries and certain commissaries in remote locations in the United States would continue to receive subsidies.

To help Congress better understand the potential impact of operational changes to the commissary system on commissary patrons, section 634 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 conduct a review of the management, food, and pricing options for the commissary system utilizing an independent organization experienced in grocery retail analysis. The committee expects to receive a report in September 2015. The statute, however, did not require an analysis to determine whether privatization would be a viable option for reform of commissary operations.

Therefore, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review opportunities for DOD to privatize the commissary system, in whole or in part, and to provide a report on the results of the study to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives by February 1, 2016. At a minimum, the review should:

- (1) Determine DOD’s requirements and evaluate its methodology for defining the total number and locations of commissaries;
- (2) Determine and evaluate DOD’s costs for commissary operations from fiscal year 2009 through fiscal year 2014;
- (3) Determine and evaluate DOD’s strategy for pricing products sold at commissaries;
- (4) Determine and validate how the Defense Commissary Agency calculates savings to its customers as a result of its pricing strategy;

- (5) Determine to what extent DOD has evaluated the costs or savings and potential benefits to patrons and the government of privatizing the commissary system;
- (6) Determine whether any barriers exist to privatization of the commissary system; and
- (7) Determine and quantify the extent to which patron savings would remain under a commissary privatization model.

**Comptroller General of the United States review of the Department of Defense special and incentive pay program**

Since 2010, the Department of Defense (DOD) has conducted ongoing reviews to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of its special and incentive pay programs. The committee also understands that, in addition to these reviews, DOD continues to implement the consolidation of these pays in accordance with subtitle F of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181). Many factors such as emerging technologies and new missions impact on the types of skills and competencies that the DOD needs to meet mission requirements. The committee is concerned that changes may be needed now to ensure the efficacy of the special and incentive pay program. The committee believes that these pays are not an entitlement. The DOD must continue to carefully scrutinize special and incentive pays, ensuring they are used where needed, particularly in a fiscal environment where every dollar counts, to ensure these pays are used effectively, but not superfluously, to ensure successful recruitment, retention, and assignments in the All-Volunteer Force.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the effectiveness of the DOD’s special and incentive pays program and provide preliminary observations no later than February 5, 2016, and a report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of the preliminary briefing. The review should include: (1) an examination of both active and reserve component special and incentive pay programs, particularly those programs used to recruit and retain individuals for service in high skill occupations such as nuclear maintenance and engineering, pilots, critical language skills, information technology, cyber warfare, and special operations; (2) an analysis of a market-based program that would incentivize top, difficult to replace talent and consider civilian contractor alternatives for skill sets that can be obtained elsewhere and utilized by DOD; and (3) the effect of eliminating or limiting authorizations for special and incentive pay for targeted use at critical career points for skills the DOD cannot replace.

**Comptroller General of the United States review of the Gold Star Advocate Program**

Section 633 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) required each service secretary to designate a servicemember or a civilian employee of their military department to assist spouses and other dependents of members (including reserve component members) who die on active duty through services of the Gold Star Advocate Program. These services include addressing complaints by spouses and other dependents of deceased members regarding casualty assistance or receipt of bene-

fits, providing support to spouses and dependents regarding casualty assistance or receipt of benefits, and making reports to appropriate officials in the Department of Defense or the military department concerned regarding resolution of complaints, including recommendations regarding the settlement of claims with respect to benefits, as appropriate.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Gold Star Advocate Program and to provide a briefing on preliminary results by March 31, 2016, and a report to follow on a date agreed to at the time of the briefing. The review should address the following:

- (1) The extent that each military department has designated a member of the Armed Forces or a civilian employee as a Gold Star Advocate for each of the Armed Forces under their jurisdiction;
- (2) The extent that each military department has effectively publicized the Gold Star Advocate Program to surviving spouses and dependents;
- (3) The extent and frequency that Gold Star Advocates have addressed complaints regarding casualty assistance or receipt of benefits by spouses or other dependents;
- (4) The extent that Gold Star Advocates have developed a process to provide reports to appropriate officials regarding the resolution of complaints or to make recommendations regarding the settlement of claims with respect to benefits; and
- (5) The extent that the Department of Defense has developed a standardized comprehensive training program on casualty assistance.

#### **Report on wait-times at child development centers**

The committee understands that it can be difficult for servicemembers and Department of Defense (DOD) civilians to focus on their duties if they are concerned about the well-being of their family members. For this reason, the committee believes it is in the best interest of the Department to ensure that children of servicemembers and DOD civilians have access to safe, quality, and convenient childcare. The committee has learned that at some military bases, the wait-times for enrolling a child in child development centers exceed 9 months. The committee expects the Department to monitor wait-times closely at DOD child development centers and to develop policies to shorten the wait-times of those facilities significantly.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report, not later than March 31, 2016, listing all DOD child development centers experiencing wait-times greater than 3 months. The report should be organized by state or country (for overseas child development centers) and provide the wait-time at each location as of the date of the report. The report should describe the Department's goal for wait-times and provide an assessment of the steps necessary to meet wait-time goals at child development centers throughout the Department. Finally, the report should include a description of any legislative action required to as-

sist the Department in reducing wait-times at child development centers at military bases.





## **TITLE VII—HEALTH CARE PROVISIONS**

### **Subtitle A—TRICARE and Other Health Care Benefits**

#### **Urgent care authorization under the TRICARE program (sec. 701)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a covered beneficiary under the TRICARE program to access up to four urgent care visits per year without the need to obtain pre-authorization for such visits.

The committee understands that the average cost to TRICARE for an emergency department visit is \$531 while the average cost for urgent care is \$131 per visit. The committee is also aware that TRICARE Prime beneficiaries utilize emergency departments at significantly higher rates than civilians in the private sector. The committee notes that current TRICARE policy requires TRICARE Prime beneficiaries to obtain pre-authorization for urgent care visits. The committee concludes this administrative burden encourages beneficiaries to utilize emergency departments inappropriately for urgent care needs. The committee believes this provision would help beneficiaries choose the most appropriate source for the health care they need and would lower health care costs for the Department of Defense.

The committee recognizes the intent of TRICARE's recently introduced Nurse Advice Line is to direct beneficiaries to the most appropriate level of health care. The committee encourages the Defense Health Agency and the Services to adopt a policy directing military medical treatment facility appointment clerks to refer beneficiaries to the Nurse Advice Line when the appointment clerk cannot provide an acute care appointment within access standards.

#### **Modifications of cost-sharing requirements for the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program (sec. 702)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require modifications of prescription drug co-pays for the TRICARE pharmacy benefits program for years 2016 through 2025. After 2025, the Department of Defense would establish co-pay amounts equal to the co-pay amounts for the previous year adjusted by an amount, if any, to reflect increases in costs of pharmaceutical agents and prescription dispensing fees. With this provision, beneficiaries would continue to receive prescription drugs at no cost in military medical treatment facilities, and there would be no changes to co-pays for survivors of members who died on Active Duty or for a disabled member retired under chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code, and their family members.

Section 702 of the the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public

Law 113–291) authorized modest co-pay increases for certain pharmaceuticals obtained through the TRICARE retail pharmacy network or the mail order pharmacy in fiscal year 2015, but it did not include the Administration’s proposal to increase co-pays in subsequent years through 2024. In deliberations with the House of Representatives last year, there was agreement to reconsider any proposed co-pay changes submitted in the fiscal year 2016 budget request if inadequate defense budget levels continue to threaten military readiness and overall national security. In the committee’s view, the defense budget situation is no better this year, and it may be no better in future years. Therefore, the committee feels compelled to recommend pharmacy co-pay increases again this year.

**Expansion of continued health benefits coverage to include discharged and released members of the Selected Reserve (sec. 703)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1078a of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a member of the Selected Reserve, who is discharged or released under other than adverse conditions from service in the Selected Reserve, to be eligible to enroll, for a period of 18 months, in the Department of Defense program of continued health benefits coverage.

**Expansion of reimbursement for smoking cessation services for certain TRICARE beneficiaries (sec. 704)**

The committee recommends a provision that would expand reimbursement for smoking cessation services for certain TRICARE beneficiaries.

**Pilot program on treatment of members of the Armed Forces for post-traumatic stress disorder related to military sexual trauma (sec. 705)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program to award grants to community partners to provide intensive outpatient programs to treat members of the Armed Forces suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder resulting from military sexual trauma, including treatment for substance abuse, depression, and other issues related to those conditions.

**Subtitle B—Health Care Administration**

**Access to health care under the TRICARE program (sec. 711)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that covered TRICARE beneficiaries obtain health care appointments within access standards and wait-time goals established by the Department of Defense for primary care and specialty care or, if the beneficiary is unable to obtain an appointment within the wait-time goals, to offer the beneficiary an appointment with a contracted health care provider. The provision would also require the Secretary to publish health care access standards in the Federal Register and on a publicly accessible

Internet web site of the Department of Defense and to publish appointment wait-times for primary and specialty care on the publicly accessible Internet web site of each military medical treatment facility.

**Portability of health plans under the TRICARE program (sec. 712)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that beneficiaries who are covered under a TRICARE health plan can seamlessly access health care under that health plan in each TRICARE program region.

**Improvement of mental health care provided by health care providers of the Department of Defense (sec. 713)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that all primary care and mental health care providers of the Department of Defense receive, or have already received, initial evidence-based training on the recognition, assessment, and management of individuals at risk for suicide and any additional training that may be required based on evidence-based changes in mental health practice.

Within 1 year of the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary would be required to provide a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that assesses the mental health workforce of the Department and the long-term mental health care needs of servicemembers and their dependents. The provision would also require the Secretary to develop procedures to measure mental health data relating to outcomes, variations in outcomes among military medical treatment facilities, and barriers to implementation of clinical practice guidelines and other evidence-based treatments by mental health providers of the Department of Defense.

**Comprehensive standards and access to contraception counseling for members of the Armed Forces (sec. 714)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense to provide, through clinical practice guidelines, current and evidence-based standards of care regarding contraception methods and counseling to all health care providers employed by the Department and to ensure service women have access to comprehensive contraception counseling prior to deployment and throughout their military careers. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to establish a uniform, standard curriculum to be used in family planning education programs for all members of the Armed Forces.

**Waiver of recoupment of erroneous payments due to administrative error under the TRICARE Program (sec. 715)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to waive recoupment of payment from a covered TRICARE beneficiary who has benefitted from an erroneous TRICARE payment in which all of the following apply: (1) the payment was made due to an administrative error by an employee of

the Department of Defense or a TRICARE program contractor; (2) the covered beneficiary, or in the case of a minor, the parent or guardian of the covered beneficiary, reasonably believed the covered beneficiary was entitled to the benefit of such payment; (3) the covered beneficiary relied on the expectation of benefit entitlement; and (4) the Secretary determines that a waiver of recoupment of such payment is necessary to prevent an injustice. In the case of administrative error on the part of a TRICARE contractor, the provision would require the Secretary to impose financial responsibility on the contractor for the erroneous payment.

**Designation of certain non-Department mental health care providers with knowledge relating to treatment of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 716)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense, not later than 1 year after enactment of this Act, to develop a system by which any non-Department mental health care provider that meets eligibility criteria relating to knowledge and understanding of military culture and knowledge of evidence-based mental health treatments approved by the Secretary, would receive a mental health provider readiness designation from the Department. The provision would also require the Secretary to establish and update a provider list and maintain a publicly available registry of mental health providers receiving such designation.

**Limitation on conversion of military medical and dental positions to civilian medical and dental positions (sec. 717)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to provide that a medical or dental position within the Department of Defense may not be converted to a civilian medical or dental position unless the Secretary of Defense determines that: (1) the position is not a military essential position; (2) conversion of the position would not result in the degradation of medical or dental care or the medical or dental readiness of the Armed Forces; and (3) conversion of the position to a civilian medical or dental position is more cost effective than retaining the position as a military medical or dental position, consistent with Department of Defense Instruction 7041.04. The committee believes this provision would give the Services more flexibility to achieve the most efficient medical and dental force mix aligned with their operational missions and to correct skill and specialty imbalances within the medical and dental forces.

**Extension of authority for joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund (sec. 718)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1704(e) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) to extend the authority for the joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund from September 30, 2016, to September 30, 2017.

**Extension of authority for DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund (sec. 719)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 8111 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority for the DOD–VA Health Care Sharing Incentive Fund through September 30, 2020.

**Pilot program on incentive programs to improve health care provided under the TRICARE program (sec. 720)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct a pilot program to assess value-based incentive programs to encourage institutional and individual health care providers under the TRICARE program to improve quality of care, experience of care, and health of beneficiaries. Under this provision, the Department of Defense would be required to submit a report, not later than March 15, 2019, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that provides an assessment of each incentive program implemented under this provision along with any recommendations for legislative action to expand provider incentive programs throughout the TRICARE program.

The committee remains concerned that the TRICARE program continues to use a fee-for-service health care delivery model even as more modern health plans now use a variety of value-based delivery models. These value-based models more effectively promote preventive care and improve health outcomes as they foster integrated, coordinated health care delivery while controlling health care costs.

**Subtitle C—Reports and Other Matters**

**Publication of certain information on health care provided by the Department of Defense through the Hospital Compare web site of the Department of Health and Human Services (sec. 731)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary of Health and Human Services to report, and make publicly available through the Hospital Compare Internet web site of the Department of Health and Human Services, information on quality of care and health outcomes regarding patients treated at military medical treatment facilities.

**Publication of data on patient safety, quality of care, satisfaction, and health outcome measures under the TRICARE program (sec. 732)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to publish public data on measures used to assess patient safety, quality of care, patient satisfaction, and health outcomes on the primary Internet web site of the Department of Defense. The provision would also require data for health care provided by a military medical treatment facility to be accessible on the primary Internet web site of that facility.

**Annual report on patient safety, quality of care, and access to care at military medical treatment facilities (sec. 733)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2016, and each year thereafter, a comprehensive report on patient safety, quality of care, and access to care at military medical treatment facilities.

In May 2014, the Secretary of Defense directed a 90-day internal review of the military health system to evaluate patient safety, quality of care, and access to care. The review team completed its work in August 2014, and six civilian subject matter experts in health data, health care quality, and patient safety validated the methodology of the review. The Department of Defense's review team concluded that the military health system provides timely, safe, and quality care. However, reviewers found that the military health system demonstrates performance variability when compared to civilian counterparts and national benchmarks.

As a result of the findings in the report, the Secretary of Defense ordered numerous actions to provide more accountability in the military health system and to improve quality of care and patient safety. The committee commends the Department of Defense for conducting this review of the military health system. The committee intends to conduct rigorous oversight to ensure actions taken by the Department of Defense significantly improve patient safety, quality of care, and access to care in both the direct and purchased care components of the military health system.

**Report on plans to improve experience with and eliminate performance variability of health care provided by the Department of Defense (sec. 734)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a comprehensive report describing the current and future plans, with estimated completion dates, of the Department of Defense to improve the experience of care of beneficiaries and to eliminate performance variability for health care provided in military medical treatment facilities and in the TRICARE purchased care network. This provision would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit, not later than 180 days after the Secretary submits the comprehensive report, a report to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives that assesses the report of the Secretary of Defense.

**Report on plan to improve pediatric care and related services for children of members of the Armed Forces (sec. 735)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, a report setting

forth the plan of the Department to improve pediatric care and related services for children of members of the Armed Forces.

Section 735 of the the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review and analysis of health care provided to dependent children of members of the Armed Forces. The Department of Defense submitted the report in July 2014. Although the report concluded that the military health system meets the health care needs of children, including children with special health care needs, it acknowledged significant gaps and deficiencies in data collection, data utilization, and analysis. The report deeply concerns the committee because data gaps and deficiencies in this area fail to substantiate the conclusion that the military health system meets the health care needs of children, especially those children with special needs.

**Report on preliminary mental health screenings for individuals becoming members of the Armed Forces (sec. 736)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on mental health screenings of individuals before enlistment or accession into the Armed Forces.

**Comptroller General report on use of quality of care metrics at military treatment facilities (sec. 737)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to submit a report, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives on the Department of Defense’s use of quality of care metrics in military treatment facilities.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Annual report on autism care demonstration program**

The joint explanatory statement accompanying section 732 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) required a semi-annual report, without end date, on the status of implementation of the TRICARE autism demonstration project then in progress. That project ended in 2014, and the expanded TRICARE Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration, which incorporates Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) policies into a single program for all TRICARE beneficiaries with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD), succeeded it. This demonstration program concludes on December 31, 2018.

The committee remains keenly interested in the Department of Defense’s response to the needs of children with ASD and directs the Secretary of Defense to report no later than April 1, 2016, and annually thereafter for the duration of the program, on the results of the program. No additional semi-annual reports on the initial TRICARE autism demonstration project are required. The newly required annual report should include a discussion of the evidence

regarding clinical improvement of children with ASD receiving ABA therapy and a description of lessons learned to improve administration of the demonstration program. In the report, the Department should also identify any new legislative authorities required to improve the provision of autism services to beneficiaries with ASD.

#### **Antimicrobial coatings**

The committee notes with concern that hospital-acquired infections (HAIs) are a major, yet preventable, threat to patient safety in both civilian and military healthcare settings. HAIs are responsible for billions of dollars each year in potentially preventable health care expenditures. Research shows that when healthcare facilities and providers are aware of the risks of transmission of infections and take steps to prevent them, rates of some targeted HAIs decrease by more than 70 percent. A key element of HAI prevention is the development and use of antimicrobial materials and coatings. The committee is aware that antimicrobial coatings for medical devices and other touchable surfaces in the hospital and health environment are effective but often costly. Accordingly, the committee encourages the Department of Defense to investigate advanced antimicrobial coating technologies that may enhance durability and lower costs.

#### **Continued support for diagnosis and treatment for traumatic brain injury**

Over the past two decades, our service men and women have been injured in combat areas by Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs), other military explosive devices and by head impacts leading to mild and moderate concussions which have led to both physical and mental brain injuries. These injuries are disabling, as they may induce short-term memory loss, severe headaches, depression, loss of cognitive function, loss of impulse control, anger and, in extreme cases, suicide. The committee remains committed to continuing support and funding for diagnosis and treatment of traumatic brain injury to include potential alternative, evidence-based methods of treatments.

#### **Intensive behavioral counseling**

The committee is aware that cardiovascular disease is a leading cause of death in the United States, and obesity is associated with increased mortality from cardiovascular disease. In August 2014, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) reported evidence that intensive behavioral counseling for overweight or obese adults with increased risk of cardiovascular disease can lead to decreases in blood pressure, blood glucose levels, and body mass index. As a result, the USPSTF recommended that overweight or obese adults with additional cardiovascular disease risk be offered intensive behavioral counseling interventions to promote healthy diets and physical activity to help prevent cardiovascular disease. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to incorporate intensive behavioral counseling in treatment protocols for overweight or obese adults with increased risk for cardiovascular disease.



**Mild traumatic brain injury research**

Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI), including mild traumatic brain injury (mTBI), is a signature wound of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and a subject of growing public health concerns for civilians, particularly in the field of sports medicine. Through funding for TBI and psychological health research in the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs, Congress has annually supported Department of Defense (DOD) research aimed to prevent, mitigate, and treat the effects of combat-related TBI on function, wellness, and overall quality of life, including interventions across the deployment life cycle for warriors, veterans, family members, caregivers, and communities.

The committee recognizes the Department's efforts in recent years to leverage partnerships with academia and the private sector to address health issues of serious concern for military personnel. The committee encourages DOD to maintain its engagement in large-scale studies of mTBI in order to build a deeper understanding of concussion injuries; how they impact the brain; how and to what extent the brain recovers; and how treatment and prevention can be improved. The committee also encourages DOD to leverage private sector and academic partnerships to the greatest extent practicable and to ensure data sets generated through such partnerships contain no personally identifiable information, are protected from disclosure or misuse in accordance with the laws on privacy applicable to such information, and are available as appropriate for further research and to inform concussion care and policy.

**Molecular diagnostics**

The committee understands that early disease detection and intervention can lead to better health outcomes and lower health care costs for patients. The committee is aware of emerging, new technologies that use small sample molecular diagnostic techniques to diagnose and monitor disease, detect disease risk, and allow for development of therapies specifically designed for individual patients. The committee believes that early detection and subsequent management of chronic diseases such as diabetes and cardiovascular disease could present an enormous opportunity for the Department of Defense to reduce its health care costs significantly and to improve the health of military service men and women. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to study how these emerging molecular diagnostic technologies may improve the health and quality of life of military beneficiaries and lower health care costs for the Department.

**Newborn infant screening evaluation and treatment**

The direct and purchased care components of the military health system averaged over 127,000 childbirths annually during the last 3 fiscal years. The committee is aware that current screening tests in the military newborn infant population would yield a minimum of 70 children with treatable rare genetic conditions and a minimum of 200–300 false positive tests that would require further evaluation. Historically, newborn infant screening test requirements for treatable rare genetic conditions have conformed to local

state guidelines. Frequent relocations of military families within the continental United States and overseas have often led to a fragmented system of care for military children with rare genetic diseases.

The committee understands that inadequate specialized treatment and management of infants with positive newborn infant screening tests can lead to poor or devastating outcomes for military families. The committee, therefore, directs the Department of Defense to review its newborn infant screening program to ensure military families have access to specialized follow-up treatment and management of newborn infants with rare genetic conditions.

### **Preseparation counseling on opioid therapy for chronic pain management**

The committee recognizes the persistently high rate of long-term opioid therapy for servicemembers and veterans with chronic pain. While pain is the most frequent presenting complaint of returning Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom soldiers, comorbidities and other factors often mean that long-term opioid therapy is an inappropriate treatment option for many individuals with chronic pain while separating from military service. The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is experiencing a high number of veterans who were prescribed opioids while serving on Active Duty, making it more difficult to transition those veterans to alternative therapies, including those therapies offered as part of the VA's Opioid Safety Initiative designed to reduce the use of opioids by veterans.

The committee recommends, not later than 180 days from the date of this report, that the Department of Defense (DOD) establish a policy to require face-to-face counseling prior to discharge for all servicemembers with prescribed opioids. This counseling should include: 1) disclosure of the risks of long-term opioid use; 2) recognition of relevant co-occurring diagnoses of the individual; and 3) discussion of alternatives to opioid therapy. During counseling, the servicemember should receive a referral for pain management after discharge if required. This policy should include a requirement that DOD include in the data that is provided to the VA a description of the alternative therapies that were discussed with the servicemember during preseparation counseling.

### **Prosthetic socket manufacturing cells**

The committee notes that the extensive use of improvised explosive devices against U.S. forces has dramatically increased the number of military amputees in the health care systems of the Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs. Prosthetic socket fabrication methods vary greatly in technique, quality, and cost, and they are highly reliant upon the skill of the individual prosthetist. Emerging technologies and manufacturing processes have demonstrated potential improvements in socket customization, performance, weight, and standardization at reduced costs.

The committee understands it is now possible to establish a manufacturing framework to digitize and record patient dimensions, preserve and update this information within a patient's electronic health record, and fabricate new or replacement sockets imme-

diately, regardless of patient location. The committee encourages the Department of Defense to modernize its prosthetic socket manufacturing framework to improve the quality of care for military amputees.

### **Reform of the TRICARE program**

Congress established the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission in section 671 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239) to conduct a review of the military compensation and retirement systems and to make recommendations to modernize those systems. The Commission released its report in January 2015. The Commission's health care recommendations included a reform plan to improve access to care and expand beneficiaries' choices of health plans by allowing beneficiaries, other than Active-Duty servicemembers, to obtain health care coverage from a selection of military-unique commercial health insurance plans offered through a new DOD health benefit program administered by the Office of Personnel Management.

Following release of the Commission's report, the Personnel Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate held a hearing to explore the health care recommendations in detail after which staff members met with various stakeholders to ensure full consideration of their views on the recommendations. Throughout those meetings, stakeholders encouraged the committee to take more time to study the healthcare recommendations before enacting comprehensive legislation to reform TRICARE.

Although the committee believes that the Commission's healthcare recommendations may address lingering problems within the military health system, the committee feels it is prudent to take a very deliberate approach to enacting TRICARE reform legislation. The committee must better understand the implications and unintended consequences of any plan to transform a large, complex health program like TRICARE. The committee has recommended provisions in this Act, however, that would ensure the Department of Defense improves access to care, delivers better health outcomes, enhances the experience of care for beneficiaries, and controls health care costs. These provisions help lay the foundation for comprehensive TRICARE modernization and reform legislation in the near future.

### **Training for physician assistants specializing in psychiatric care**

The committee is concerned about the effect of nationwide mental health provider shortages impacting access to quality care for members of the Armed Forces and their families. Demand for mental health services among servicemembers and military families has increased significantly in the past decade. In response to the Senate report accompanying S. 1197 (S. Rept. 113–44), the Department of Defense and Department of Veterans Affairs submitted a joint report in April 2015 indicating near 100 percent staffing for Department of Defense mental health providers, but the number of billets authorized may lag actual requirements.

The committee notes that the most recent report by the National Commission on Certification of Physician Assistants found the number of physician assistants working in psychiatric care increased by more than 17 percent from 2013 to 2014. The physician assistant profession is growing rapidly with a 36 percent increase in the number of certified physician assistants over the past 5 years and an expected 40 percent increase in the number of physician assistant education programs between 2013 and 2018.

The committee is aware that the physician assistant profession has a strong historical relationship with the military and that the Services rely broadly on physician assistants as primary care providers for both the operational forces and their families. With physician assistant manning levels exceeding 100 percent across the Services, the Department of Defense has established fellowship programs to provide physician assistants with specialty training in emergency medicine, orthopedic surgery and general surgery.

The committee applauds the Department of Defense for its support of cost-effective solutions to mental health provider shortages, including established pathways to credential psychologists and nurse practitioners as prescribing providers. The committee further encourages the Department of Defense to consider cost-effective methods of training physician assistants to specialize in psychiatric care.

#### **TRICARE Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration**

The committee is pleased with the initial favorable reports on the success of the TRICARE Comprehensive Autism Care Demonstration. This demonstration, which began on July 25, 2014, combines into one program all TRICARE-covered Applied Behavior Analysis services from the TRICARE Basic Program, the Enhanced Access to Autism Services Demonstration, and the Applied Behavior Analysis Pilot for TRICARE beneficiaries diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). Beneficiaries report that this new program is easier to navigate, that beneficiaries diagnosed with ASD receive the care they need, and that the Department of Defense is addressing challenges as they arise in an effective manner. Although this demonstration is relatively new and is scheduled to run until December 31, 2018, initial reports are sufficiently encouraging that the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to make it a permanent program to ensure that qualified beneficiaries do not face barriers to the care that they need.

## **TITLE VIII—ACQUISITION POLICY, ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT, AND RELATED MATTERS**

### **Acquisition policy reform overview**

With this Act, the committee is embarking on a multi-year effort to improve the underlying structure and process that delivers warfighting capability to the nation. The acquisition system's "rules of the game" provide the incentive structure for how the underlying industrial base is organized, who decides to bid on defense contracts, and who does not. The rules and the resulting structure of the industrial base that supports the Department of Defense are currently not aligned to the emerging national security needs of the coming decades.

The acquisition system is not a stand-alone system. It is comprised of budget, requirements, contracting, engineering, test, audit, oversight, financial, information management, science and technology, and personnel components. Each of these component parts must be aligned and properly incentivized to meet national security goals. One goal of this committee's effort will be to work to align these components and achieve a necessary balance.

On one level the committee's reform efforts are driven by economic efficiency concerns. Current budget constraints argue for significant changes to a woefully inefficient system. Overarching business reform and overhead reductions as outlined in this bill are a necessary first step to free up resources to modernize military capability, and the acquisition process needs to be more efficient to get the best return on those resources.

Still, the committee's primary concern with the acquisition system is that reform is now needed for national security reasons to maintain technological and military dominance. An inadequate acquisition system is leading to the erosion of America's defense technological advantage, which the United States will lose altogether if the Department continues with business as usual. The Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics stated recently: "We've been complacent. Our technological superiority is very much at risk, there are people designing systems [specifically] to defeat us in a very thoughtful and strategic way, and we've got to wake up, frankly." A failing defense acquisition system will not only have budgetary implications, but could set the stage for a future national security crisis.

The reasons for this concern are founded in science and technology research trends. The Department is facing an emerging innovation gap. Commercial research and development (R&D) in the United States overtook government R&D in 1980 and this threshold was one of the key triggers that led to the commercial acquisition reforms of the 1990s. Today, as the Department makes it even

more difficult to access commercial companies and innovation, commercial R&D now represents 75 percent of the national total. A recent financial analysis found that the top four U.S. defense contractors combined spend only 27 percent of what a leading commercial information technology firm spends annually on R&D.

The problem grows worse beyond our borders. Global R&D is now more than twice that of the United States. Chinese R&D levels are projected to surpass the United States in 2022. Even when the Department is innovating, it is moving too slowly. Innovation is measured in 18-month cycles in the commercial market while the Department acquisition cycles are measured in decades. At a recent speech at Stanford University, Secretary Carter stated: “The same Internet that enables Wikipedia also allows terrorists to learn how to build a bomb. And the same technologies we use to target cruise missiles and jam enemy air defenses can be used against our own forces—and they’re now available to the highest bidder. Whether it’s the cloud, infrared cameras, or the GPS signals that provide navigation for ride-sharing apps, but also for aircraft carriers and our smart bombs—our reliance on technology has led to real vulnerabilities that our adversaries are eager to exploit.”

Accessing sources of innovation beyond the Department is critical for national security in the future, especially in areas such as cyber security, robotics, data analytics, miniaturization, and autonomy. However, the defense acquisition system is leading many commercial firms to choose not to do business with the Defense Department, or to limit their engagement in ways that prevent the Department from accessing the critical technologies that these companies have to offer. Export controls, security mandates, and Buy America barriers also limit cooperation with our allies and global commercial firms. In short, the defense acquisition system itself increasingly poses a threat to our future military technological dominance.

For this reason, the United States must create better incentives for innovation by removing unnecessary legislative, regulatory, and cultural barriers to new commercial competition. The Department must also establish alternative acquisition paths to get innovative capabilities to our warfighters in a matter of months, not decades. Ultimately, the defense acquisition system must enable the Department to take advantage of the best minds, firms, and technologies that America, and the world, have to offer.

The provisions of this Act would begin to embark on alternative acquisition pathways to create more efficient and effective results and expand the industrial base that supports the nation’s national security needs. They have been developed based on the committee’s review of acquisition reform, including the implementation of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (WSARA) (Public Law 111–23), and using inputs from the Administration, industry, the Government Accountability Office, and others. The acquisition provisions of this Act reflect four themes to support the establishment and use of these alternative pathways.

The first theme is to establish effective accountability for results. The Act would enhance the role of the service chiefs in acquisition, decentralizing to the maximum extent practicable decision-making authority to the services. The Office of the Secretary of Defense

(OSD) should be providing more insight and identification of best practices to the services rather than duplicative oversight and micromanagement. The method for maintaining accountability within the services is to establish performance contracts (to meet cost, schedule and performance goals) with service chiefs, service secretaries, service acquisition executives and program managers signing up to binding management, requirements, and resource commitments. If programs fail, as measured by a Nunn-McCurdy threshold breach, these programs should then become centrally managed by OSD. The Act also establishes a financial penalty for cost overruns that OSD can use to fund developmental prototypes.

Ultimately, the way for the services to meet their cost, schedule and performance goals and continue to manage their programs is to reform the requirements and budget process for acquisition programs. A time-based requirements process looking at capabilities to be deployed rapidly (within 2 years), in the medium term (within 5 years), or longer than 5 years should be developed that relies on extensive market research and be based in technological reality. The Department should also begin to look at the experience of our allies in how they budget for capital assets and begin a dialogue with the Congress on best practices in capital budgeting that can serve as a basis of future reforms.

The second theme of this effort is to increase access to commercial innovation and competition. The barriers and costs of defense contracting are so great that advanced technology companies and others on the leading edge of innovation choose not to partner with the Department of Defense. Commercial item reforms in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-355) and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-106) were designed to remove many of these barriers such as requirements for government unique accounting systems, cost data, and restrictions on technical data but many of these mandates have returned in law, regulation, and practice. Other transactions authority was another method to entice non-traditional firms into the defense market, but use of this authority has atrophied over the years to an exception basis. Competitive rapid prototyping, open systems and incremental development methods used in the commercial sector have not taken hold at the Department, which continues to rely on an antiquated multi-decade process with "winner take all" competitions that result in single-source contractors.

To address these concerns, the Act's provisions would incentivize commercial innovation by removing barriers to new entrants into the defense market by reforming commercial item, other transactions authority, and technical data (protection of intellectual property rights) authorities. Rapid acquisition authorities would be expanded to better support contingency operations and to address cyber security concerns. A new approach and funding mechanism would be established for a "Middle Tier of Acquisition" to conduct rapid prototyping and rapid fielding that can be deployed within 5 years. Finally, the Act would ensure that the Secretary of Defense has the authority to waive unnecessary acquisition laws to acquire vital national security capabilities and require the development of a series of alternative acquisition pathways using flexible acquisition authorities to maintain U.S. technological superiority.

The third acquisition theme in this Act is to deregulate and streamline to reduce costs and gain efficiencies. This Act includes a number of provisions that would streamline the process for buying weapon systems, services, and information technology by reducing unnecessary requirements and certifications. The committees notes that the implementation of WSARA has so far resulted in reductions in the number of programs reporting unit cost growth. The committee believes that WSARA's knowledge-based acquisition approach, including improved cost estimation, systems engineering, and developmental testing, have helped improve the outcomes of programs. The committee bill retains the positive aspects of these reforms, but attempts to streamline processes to support more rapid and efficient development and delivery of new capabilities. The Act would also establish a review panel similar to the "section 800 expert review panel" of the early 1990's, to identify unneeded acquisition regulations. The Act would also require a study of the regulatory cost premium of the defense-unique acquisition oversight process versus the commercial item acquisition oversight process.

Finally, the Act takes up the challenge to reinvigorate the acquisition workforce. The Act would reauthorize the Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund; authorize the continuation of the civilian acquisition workforce personnel demonstration project; establish several direct hire authorities for engineering and Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) employees to join the acquisition workforce; and enhance military personnel authorities as they apply to the military acquisition workforce giving the service chiefs the ability to manage this workforce more effectively.

The committee believes this is only the beginning of necessary changes to transition what is, in essence, a Cold War management system into one that is more agile and nimble to meet the challenges of a globalized information age. This process will be maintained in future legislation as the committee continues to explore how to change the acquisition system to be more open to next generation technologies that can enable the United States to outpace its adversaries.

### **Subtitle A—Acquisition Policy and Management**

#### **Role of service chiefs in the acquisition process (sec. 801)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2547 of title 10, United States Code, to enhance the role of the service chiefs in the defense acquisition process. This provision would reinforce the roles of the services chiefs in decisions regarding the balancing of resources and priorities, and associated trade-offs among cost, schedule, technical feasibility, and performance on major defense acquisition programs. The provision further defines the role of the principal military deputies to the service acquisition executive to inform the service chief concerned of acquisition issues related to cost, schedule, technical feasibility and performance of acquisition programs. The committee believes that the customer of the defense acquisition system is the military service that will have primary responsibility for fielding the system or systems acquired.



This provision reinforces this concept and also outlines the responsibilities of the customer to ensure that acquisition systems are acquired and managed efficiently and effectively.

**Expansion of rapid acquisition authority (sec. 802)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 806(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note), as amended by section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). This provision would enhance the rapid acquisition authority currently provided to the Secretary of Defense by allowing the Secretary to use this authority for two new categories of supplies and associated support services that the Secretary determines: (1) are urgently needed and impact an ongoing or anticipated contingency operation that, if left unfulfilled, could potentially result in loss of life or critical mission failure; or (2) are urgently needed to eliminate a deficiency that as the result of a cyber attack has resulted in critical mission failure, the loss of life, property destruction, or economic effects, or is likely to result in critical mission failure, the significant loss of life, property destruction, or economic effects.

This provision would also increase the amount of rapid acquisition authority for contingency operations available to the Department from \$200.0 million to \$400.0 million and authorize \$200.0 million for cyber security rapid acquisition authority.

**Middle tier of acquisition for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding (sec. 803)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to issue guidance for an expedited and streamlined “middle tier” of acquisition programs that are intended to be completed within 5 years. These programs would be distinctive from “rapid acquisitions” that are generally completed within 6 months to 2 years and “traditional” acquisitions that last much longer than 5 years.

The provision would establish two acquisition pathways. The first would be a rapid prototyping pathway that can demonstrate new capabilities to meet emerging military needs which could result in a residual operational capability. The second would be a rapid fielding pathway for proven technologies to field production quantities of new or upgraded systems with minimal development required. The provision authorizes the use of expedited and streamlined procedures for both of these pathways. The provision would also authorize the establishment of a Rapid Prototyping Fund to provide funds in addition to other funds that may be available for each rapid prototyping pathway program. This fund would consist of funds appropriated to the account and amounts credited to the account from any penalties levied under section 849 of this Act.

**Amendments to other transaction authority (sec. 804)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a new section in title 10, United States Code, to codify section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994

(Public Law 103–160), which authorizes the use of “other transactions” to carry out prototype projects that should lead to more effective and broader usage of this authority. The amendments would: (1) make section 845 authority permanent; (2) clarify the authority to use section 845 authority to acquire prototypes or follow-on production items to be provided to contractors as government-furnished equipment; (3) clarify that a contractor who has not been required to provide certified cost or pricing data under the Truth in Negotiations Act (Public Law 87–653; 10 U.S.C. section 2306a) in the previous year may qualify as a “non-traditional contractor” under the statute; (4) ensure that innovative small business firms are authorized to participate in other transactions under section 845 without the requirement for a cost-share (except where the small business is partnered with a large business in a transaction); and (5) clarify the use of follow-on production contracts or other transactions authority.

The committee believes that other transactions continue to serve as an important mechanism to provide the Department of Defense with access to innovative, cutting-edge technologies developed by companies that might otherwise be unwilling to do business with the government. The committee supports the use of other transaction authority by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) for this purpose, and urges the military departments to make similar use of the authority.

The committee supports the rapid regulatory implementation of the definitional change in section 812(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The committee is also aware of many interpretive and cultural barriers that have been put in place to impede the use of other transactions.

The committee believes that the authorities of section 3871 of title 10, United States Code, and the related and dependent authorities of Section 845 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103–160), as modified by this provision, should be used to their maximum extent by the Department of Defense and other federal agencies in order to streamline acquisition of innovative research and technology from the private sector.

#### **Use of alternative acquisition paths to acquire critical national security capabilities (sec. 805)**

The committee recommends a provision to require the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures and guidelines for alternative acquisition pathways to acquire capital assets and services that meet critical national security needs. These procedures shall: (1) be separate from existing acquisition procedures; (2) be supported by streamlined contracting, budgeting, and requirements processes; (3) establish alternative acquisition paths based on the capabilities being bought and the time needed to deploy these capabilities; and (4) maximize the use of flexible authorities and programs in existing law and regulation. Time-based acquisition pathways should be linked to any time-based approach for requirements required to be developed under this Title. As the Department of Defense (DOD) considers how to maintain its technological advantage in the future

through strategies such as a “third offset” it should ensure where appropriate that the pathways developed under this provision can deliver needed capabilities in a manner similar to developments during World War II and the two previous offset strategy periods in the 1950s and 1970s.

The committee is concerned that DOD is in danger of losing its technological advantage in many technology areas critical to the national defense and is no longer accessing the most innovative parts of the industrial base. While Congress in the past has granted DOD a number of flexible acquisition authorities and created a number of programs to capture this innovation, many of these authorities or programs have seen little or reduced usage. The provisions included in this Act would strengthen or create a number of new authorities that the Department could use to acquire critical national security capabilities faster.

When reviewing existing authorities the Secretary should consider the following authorities and programs at a minimum: (1) Secretary of Defense waiver of acquisition laws to acquire vital national security capabilities as added by this Act; (2) middle tier acquisition for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding for capabilities to be deployed in 2 to 5 years as added by this Act; (3) rapid acquisition authorities as modified by this Act for capabilities to be deployed in less than 2 years; (4) other transaction authorities as modified by the Act; (5) procurement for experimental purposes authority (section 2373 of title 10, United States Code) as modified by this Act; (6) commercial item acquisition authorities (FAR Part 12) as modified by this Act; (7) exceptional circumstances Truth in Negotiations Act (TINA) (section 2306a of title 10, United States Code and chapter 35 of title 41, United States Code) waivers; (8) procedures under section 2304(c) of the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984 (section 2304 of title 10, United States Code); (9) grants and cooperative research and development agreements; and (10) such programs as the Foreign Comparative Test Program, DOD Challenge Program, and the Small Business Innovation Research program.

This provision would require the Secretary to identify any new authorities required to meet the objectives of this provision and report to Congress on a summary of the guidelines and any recommendations for new legislation necessary to meet the objectives in the guidelines.

**Secretary of Defense waiver of acquisition laws to acquire vital national security capabilities (sec. 806)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive acquisition law or regulation for the purpose of acquiring a capability that is in the vital interest of the United States and is not otherwise available to the Armed Forces of the United States. The Secretary shall notify the congressional defense committees at least 30 days before exercising the waiver authority and designate a senior official who shall be personally responsible and accountable for the rapid and effective acquisition and deployment of the needed capability.

**Acquisition authority of the Commander of United States Cyber Command (sec. 807)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize limited acquisition authority for the Commander of United States Cyber Command (CYBERCOM). The provision is modeled on the authority provided to the Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command, but is limited to the acquisition of non-major systems.

The provision would authorize the development and acquisition of cyber operations-peculiar equipment and capabilities and the acquisition of cyber capability-peculiar equipment, capabilities, and services. The provision would direct that the staff of the Commander include a command acquisition executive who would be responsible for the overall supervision of CYBERCOM acquisition matters. The command acquisition executive would also be responsible for negotiating memoranda of agreement with the military departments, supervising the acquisition of equipment, capabilities, and services, regardless of whether such acquisitions are carried out by the Command or a military department. The command acquisition executive would also be responsible for representing the Command in discussions with the military departments regarding acquisition programs for which the Command is a customer, and working with the military departments to ensure the Command is appropriately represented in discussions with the military departments and joint working groups or integrated product teams.

To support CYBERCOM in fulfilling its acquisition responsibilities, the provision would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide CYBERCOM with the personnel or funding equivalent to ten full-time equivalent personnel to CYBERCOM with experience in program acquisition, the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System process, program management, system engineering, and costing. The personnel or funding equivalent provided would come from existing department resources. The provision would require the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General conduct internal audits and inspections of purchasing and contract actions. The provision would also establish a \$75.0 million cyber operations procurement fund for each fiscal year from fiscal year 2016 through 2021 out of the funds made available in each fiscal year for defense-wide procurement. The provision would sunset on September 30, 2021.

The committee is concerned there is an urgent need for cyber capabilities that is not being fulfilled by the military services. Major investments to date have been heavily weighted towards network defense and network consolidation. For a variety of reasons, the services have failed to adequately prioritize funding in their budget requests for the development of cyber warfighting capabilities. According to the Commander of CYBERCOM in testimony before the committee on March 17, 2015, the Department of Defense is “at a tipping point where we not only need to continue to build on the defensive capability, but we have got to broaden our capabilities to provide policy makers and operational commanders with a broader range of options.”

The committee is also concerned that traditional service-led acquisitions and existing acquisition statutes and regulations lack the flexibility, agility, and speed necessary to deliver cyber capabili-

ties responsively enough to stay ahead of the rapidly evolving threat. According to the Commanding General of Marine Forces Cyberspace Command in testimony before the committee on April 14, 2015, “current acquisition processes do not adequately support the delivery tempo required for emerging cyber solutions. The tempo at which emerging technologies must be acquired to meet cyberspace operational mandates is occurring at a much greater pace, which creates tension within the acquisition process.” This provision would address these shortfalls by providing the Commander of CYBERCOM the limited ability to rapidly procure capabilities to meet the requirements the military services have been unable to meet thus far and are incapable of meeting in operationally relevant ways in the future.

The committee recognizes that CYBERCOM is a new organization that is still maturing and has little experience or expertise in systems acquisition. However, the committee also recognizes that few acquisition models across the DOD have demonstrated successes in acquiring cyber capabilities. The committee believes that if structured appropriately CYBERCOM has the unique opportunity to demonstrate and validate new acquisition approaches. The burden is on CYBERCOM and the Department as a whole to demonstrate that CYBERCOM can effectively exercise these acquisition authorities over the next five years.

There are a number of additional authorities in this title that would also improve the ability of the department to more rapidly acquire cyber capabilities. These include enhancements to commercial item, other transactions, and rapid acquisition authorities. Elsewhere in title XVI of this Act, the committee also recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to designate within 90 days of the date of enactment an entity of the Department of Defense to be responsible for the acquisition of critical cyber capabilities to include: (1) The unified platform; (2) a persistent cyber training environment; and (3) a cyber situational awareness and battle management system. The committee believes that today department entities with existing acquisition experience are best suited for the development of larger foundational programs such as the unified platform. However, in the future the committee envisions the possibility of a shared acquisition approach where the traditional acquisition entities, in partnership with CYBERCOM, fund and develop foundational systems and service specific capabilities. CYBERCOM’s acquisition role would be focused primarily on meeting joint cyber operations-peculiar and cyber capability-peculiar requirements the services are unable to meet.

#### **Advisory panel on streamlining and codifying acquisition regulations (sec. 808)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to establish an advisory panel on streamlining acquisition regulations. This panel would be under the sponsorship of the Defense Acquisition University and the National Defense University.

25 years ago, the committee proposed the establishment of an advisory panel to streamline acquisition laws. This panel, referred to as the Section 800 Panel, was mandated in the National Defense

Authorization Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510) and resulted in many of the reform recommendations that were enacted in the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-355) and the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-106). The Committee believes that in the intervening quarter of a century the acquisition system is again burdened by unnecessary laws and regulations that are creating incentives to slow down acquisition and not obtain the best value when purchasing goods and services for the warfighter and the taxpayer. The committee plans to continue to review and propose streamlining measures to eliminate unnecessary laws that hamper the Department of Defense and its contractors. The committee believes that a parallel effort should be conducted by the Department of Defense with regards to the current regulatory environment.

The provision would create a panel that would be composed of at least nine individuals who are recognized experts in acquisition laws, regulations, and policy. The committee intends that persons appointed to the Advisory Panel be able to devote a substantial amount of time to this drafting effort. The Advisory Panel should not operate as a board that directs the work of a staff. Rather, the primary work should be done by the members of the Panel, with staff serving to provide administrative support and routine research assistance.

The purpose of this Advisory Panel would be to prepare a pragmatic, workable set of recommended changes to current acquisition regulations. The committee recommends that the first set of regulations to review be those that are independent of any statutory mandate. For those regulations based in law, the committee expects that the Advisory Panel would review whether those regulations have evolved over time and may differ from the original intent. The Advisory Panel's mandate should be to trace this evolution and recommend changes where regulatory trends have resulted in actions that have limited necessary discretion or flexibility that exists in current law. The Advisory Panel should seek to limit regulatory provisions to those necessary to structure buyer-seller relations in the context of government procurement, ensure the financial and ethical integrity of government programs, and protect other fundamental governmental policies.

There are several significant industrial base evolutions that did not exist at the time of the section 800 panel report that the Advisory Panel should be cognizant of when it conducts its evaluation. The first is the increasing consolidation of the defense unique industrial base both at the prime and sub-tier levels. The second is the growing dominance of commercial technologies in many areas that are important to the Department of Defense. The third trend is the globalization of the defense and commercial industrial bases and proliferation of advanced commercial and defense technologies.

While the final report of the Advisory Panel would be delivered to the congressional defense committees not later than 2 years after the Panel's establishment, interim reports would be required 6 months and 18 months after the enactment of this Act.

**Review of time-based requirements process and budgeting and acquisition systems (sec. 809)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to review the requirements process to provide for a time-based or phased distinction between capabilities needed to be deployed urgently, within 2 years, within 5 years, and longer than 5 years. While the use of rapid acquisition techniques has led to the establishment of a rapid requirements process, there is no such process that could lead to capabilities being pursued in less than 5 years. This 5-year time is significant in that this was the average time to achieve Initial Operational Capability for many defense programs until the 1970s and is the time it takes for equivalent commercial programs to be deployed today. A recent Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency study found that the current requirements process may be a significant hurdle to the Department being able to conduct short, iterative development and fielding cycles and innovate like the more agile sectors of the commercial market. The committee intends this provision to be linked to others in the Act concerning the use of alternative paths to acquire critical national security capabilities and the middle tier of acquisition for rapid prototyping and rapid fielding. The committee's intent is that these reviews and authorities will offer an opportunity to change the paradigm of defense acquisition from a focus on decade's long development cycles to agile improvement with multiple iterations of capabilities within that same timeframe.

**Improvement of program and project management by the Department of Defense (sec. 810)**

The committee recommends a provision to outline Department of Defense (DOD) responsibilities under chapter 87 of title 10, United States Code for improving program and project management. This provision would require that not later than 1 year after the enactment of this Act that the Secretary of Defense develop Department-wide standards, policies and guidelines for program and project management.

The committee continues to be concerned over the Department's ability to manage service contracts. The committee directs the Department to provide a briefing describing training activities that improve the quality of program management for service contracts. The briefing should include a description of how private sector best practices are evaluated and adopted as part of DOD training and education programs, as well as comparison of current DOD practices with commercial best practices in training and education related to contract services management. The committee expects DOD to provide this briefing no later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

## **Subtitle B—Amendments to General Contracting Authorities, Procedures, and Limitations**

### **Preference for fixed-price contracts in determining contract type for development programs (sec. 821)**

The committee recommends a provision to require the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to be revised to establish a preference for fixed-price contracts, including fixed-price incentive contracts, in the determination of contract type for development programs.

### **Applicability of cost and pricing data and certification requirements (sec. 822)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the applicability of the Truth in Negotiations Act (Public Law 87-653; 10 U.S.C. section 2306a) to offset agreements. The committee is also concerned that the use of contract types other than firm-fixed price are unnecessarily extending the period of performance of these contracts to address the completion of offset agreements.

The committee is aware that Department of Defense (DOD) contracting officials are being put in an untenable situation of overseeing offset agreements by a broad application of the Truth in Negotiations Act. The committee believes this appears to be a violation of the intent of the 1990 Presidential policy on offsets codified in the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1992 (Public Law 102-558, Title 1, Part C, section 123) by putting DOD in the position of negotiating, implementing, and being responsible for U.S. firms' offset agreements by applying fair and reasonable price criteria to these agreements. The committee reiterates that it is the policy of the U.S. government as codified in the Defense Production Act (Public Law 8109774) that offsets for military exports are economically inefficient and distort markets. The committee believes it should not be the policy of the U.S. government to enforce these agreements through contracts. These agreements are strictly between the foreign government and private sector and the law states that "the responsibility for negotiating and implementing offset arrangements, reside with the company involved." Thus, it is up to the foreign government to determine whether it is getting value from the offset agreement and the reasonableness of price paid by a foreign government for a U.S. company to execute an offset agreement should not be of concern to the DOD unless there are believed to be potential violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (section 78dd-1 of title 15, United States Code) or other criminal violations.

### **Risk-based contracting for smaller contract actions under the Truth In Negotiations Act (sec. 823)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Truth in Negotiations Act (Public Law 87-653; 10 U.S.C. section 2306a) to raise the threshold for the requirement to provide certified cost or pricing data in non-price competitive procurements on non-commercial items from the current \$750,000 (\$500,000 adjusted for inflation since 1994) to \$5.0 million. For non-price competitive procurements valued at less than the new threshold of \$5.0



million but more than the current threshold of \$750,000, the Department of Defense (DOD) would be required to establish a risk-based contracting approach, under which certified cost or pricing data would be required for a risk-based sample of contracts, to ensure that DOD is getting fair and reasonable prices for such contracts.

The committee believes that a 100 percent review of certified cost or pricing data on thousands of small contracts is not the best use of DOD's limited acquisition and auditing resources, particularly for those contracts that have been awarded based on a technical competition. By enabling DOD to adopt a risk-based contracting approach, this provision should free up significant resources to be applied in areas where they are likely to achieve a better return. In addition, the provision will enable non-traditional contractors to participate in innovative DOD research projects valued at less than \$5.0 million without triggering government-unique contracting procedures, enhancing DOD's access to cutting-edge technologies developed by companies that might otherwise be unwilling to do business with the government.

**Limitation of the use of reverse auctions and lowest priced technically acceptable contracting methods (sec. 824)**

The committee recommends a provision that would: (1) Prohibit the use of reverse auctions and lowest priced technically acceptable (LPTA) contracting methods for the procurement of personal protective equipment where the level of quality needed or the failure of the item could result in combat casualties; and (2) establish a preference for best value contracting methods when procuring such equipment. The committee is concerned that an overarching bias towards reducing prices paid by the Department of Defense (DOD) to the exclusion of other factors could result in DOD buying low cost products that have the potential to negatively impact the safety of U.S. troops. This could be a particular problem with the quality of personal protective equipment such as helmets, body armor, eye protection, and other similar individual equipment issued to U.S. military personnel. While LPTA and reverse auction contracting techniques are appropriate for some type of purchases, the committee believes that lowest price is not always the best strategy when quality and innovation are needed. In these cases, the committee believes a best value acquisition approach is more appropriate.

**Rights in technical data (sec. 825)**

The committee recommends a provision that: (1) Would clarify procedures for the validation of rights in technical data for subsystems and components of major weapon systems; and (2) establish a government-industry advisory panel on rights in technical data.

The provision would amend section 2321 of title 10, United States Code, that establishes procedures for the validation of rights in technical data. Subsection (f) of this section, added by the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-355), endeavored to protect intellectual property rights in commercial items by adding a presumption that commercial items are devel-

oped exclusively at private expense. Because almost all major weapon systems are developed at government expense, section 802 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) added an exception to the presumption in subsection (f) in the case of items other than commercially available off-the-shelf (COTS) items that are included in major weapon systems.

The exception for major weapon systems in subsection 2321(f) has created two potential problem areas. First, although almost all major weapon systems are developed at government expense, a few major weapon systems and subsystems of major weapon systems are purchased as commercial items—for example, modified civilian aircraft that are purchased for military uses. Section 2321(f) requires the contractor to demonstrate that components of weapon systems were developed at private expense even in the case of commercial-derivative aircraft, commercial-derivative engines, and other weapon systems and subsystems that are purchased as commercial items.

Second, although subsection 2321(f) includes an exception for COTS items that are included in major weapon systems, this exception does not apply if the COTS item is modified in any way for government use. Consequently, if the government insists on a minor modification of a COTS item for the purpose of including it in a weapon system, the burden will fall on the contractor to demonstrate that the item was developed exclusively at private expense.

The provision recommended by the committee would address these problems by clarifying that the presumption that a commercial item was developed exclusively at private expense applies in the case of: (1) A component of a weapon system or subsystem that was acquired as a commercial item; and (2) any other component that is a COTS item or a COTS item with modifications of a type customarily available in the commercial market place or minor modifications made to meet government requirements.

#### **Procurement of supplies for experimental purposes (sec. 826)**

The committee recommends a provision that would update the experimental acquisition authority in section 2373 of title 10, United States Code, to apply to transportation, energy, medical, and space flight and to clarify when provisions of Chapter 137 of title 10 apply to such procurements. The committee believes that the authorities of section 2373 (in addition to other transaction authority in section 2371 and section 845 other transaction prototype authority) offer an alternative acquisition path for the Department of Defense to pursue technologies and solutions from non-traditional contractors to maintain technological superiority in the future.

**Extension of authority to acquire products and services produced in countries along a major route of supply to Afghanistan (sec. 827)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 1 year the authority in section 801(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84).

**Reporting related to failure of contractors to meet goals under negotiated comprehensive small business subcontracting plans (sec. 828)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 834(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–189) to require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress on any negotiated comprehensive subcontracting plan that the Secretary determines did not meet the subcontracting goals negotiated in the plan for the prior fiscal year.

**Competition for religious services contracts (sec. 829)**

The committee recommends a provision to ensure that non-profit organizations can compete for contracts for religious related services on a United States military installation. It has come to the committee's attention that the Department of Defense has at times restricted competition for religious services contracts on U.S. military installations to for-profit firms. The committee believes certain non-profit entities such as religious organizations can provide valuable competition and are well-qualified to participate in this particular category of services and should not be precluded from competing for these types of contracts.

**Treatment of interagency and state and local purchases when the Department of Defense acts as contract intermediary for the General Services Administration (sec. 830)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify that the requirements under chapter 148 of title 10, United States Code would not apply to a contract executed by the Department of Defense where the Department is acting as an intermediary for the General Services Administration (GSA) for purchase of products by other federal agencies or state and local governments. This could be as a result of a transfer of contract responsibility from GSA or where the Department serves as an item manager for these products on behalf of GSA.

**Pilot program for streamlining awards for innovative technology projects (sec. 831)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a pilot program to provide an exception from the requirements under sections 2306a(1) and 2313 of title 10, United States Code, for contracts or subcontracts valued at less than \$7.5 million that are awarded based on a technical merit based selection procedure. Currently, only contract awards based on price competition are exempted from government unique auditing and certified cost and pricing data requirements. Research and development contract

awards such those conducted under a broad agency announcement or the Small Business Innovation Research Program that are based on technical merit based selection procedures are often delayed or competition is limited due to the application of these requirements. This provision would test whether treating a technical based merit competition in the same way as a price competition will lead to better innovative solutions and expanded competition at lower contract award levels. The authority would terminate on October 1, 2020.

### **Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs**

#### **Acquisition strategy required for each major defense acquisition program (sec. 841)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend chapter 144 of title 10, United States Code to add a new section that would require the development of an acquisition strategy for each Department of Defense major defense acquisition program. The program's acquisition strategy is already a core document developed and updated in advance of key program reviews within the Department. This provision would consolidate various related statutory provisions and outline conforming changes to existing statute and establish the importance of the acquisition strategy as the key management document for a major weapon systems acquisition. Currently, a number of sections of law require content to be placed in an acquisition strategy undefined in statute. By codifying the existence of the acquisition strategy and consolidating the various content requirements, this proposal eliminates uncertainty regarding the open-ended range of requirements that can be imposed on an acquisition program's published strategy.

#### **Risk reduction in major defense acquisition programs (sec. 842)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the acquisition strategy developed pursuant to section 2431a of title 10, United States Code as amended by this Act shall include a comprehensive approach to continuously identifying and addressing risk and appropriately minimize concurrency.

The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the acquisition strategy for a major defense acquisition program identifies and documents the major sources of risk for the program (including technical, cost, and schedule risk) and includes a comprehensive approach to retiring that risk. The proposal would require that the comprehensive approach to retiring risk use some combination of 12 different elements, including prototyping and competitive prototyping, design reviews, program phasing, allocating schedule and funding margins to specific risks, multiple design approaches, and others measures. This provision would establish a preference for competitive prototyping and repeal the requirement for mandatory competitive prototyping in section 203 of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23).

**Designation of milestone decision authority (sec. 843)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2430 of title 10, United States Code, to designate the service acquisition executives as the milestone decision authority for major acquisition programs managed by the military services. The Secretary of Defense may designate an alternative milestone decision authority for joint programs, programs managed by defense agencies and other specific cases. The committee is concerned about the amount of time it takes to conduct multiple, duplicative reviews within the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the services.

This provision would decentralize decision making authority for milestone decisions to the services for service-unique programs and would limit the documentation and approvals that would be required for these programs outside of the services to a minimum. The provision would authorize that if a program managed by the services breaches thresholds in the Nunn-McCurdy Act, section 2433 of title 10, United States Code, or has failed to develop an acquisition program baseline within 2 years of program initiation, the Secretary of Defense revoke service milestone decision authority for the program. The Secretary should then consider either terminating the program or managing the program centrally from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The provision would clarify that for service programs where the service acquisition executive is the milestone decision authority the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics and Technology would only exercise advisory authority. The provision would also require that the service secretaries and service chiefs certify in each Selected Acquisition Report that program requirements are stable and funding is adequate to meet cost, schedule and performance objectives for each major defense acquisition program. It is the committee's expectation that the service chiefs and the service secretaries will take all necessary action to ensure that service programs are managed in a way that limits cost, schedule and performance issues and are fully budgeted and have stable requirements.

The transfer of milestone decision authority to the services for applicable defense programs would become effective on October 1, 2016. Prior to the effective date, the Deputy Chief Management Officer shall issue guidance to ensure that acquisition policy, guidance and practices would support a streamlined decision making and approval process that minimizes information requests as required by this provision. Not later than 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan to implement the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics advisory authority for service acquisition programs.

**Revision of Milestone A decision authority responsibilities for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 844)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2366a of title 10, United States Code to require the Department official serving as the milestone decision authority in the defense acquisition process to ensure that specific actions are met before granting a Milestone A approval. This requirement would re-

place current certification requirements that have added unnecessary time and duplicative documentation. This provision would establish the milestone decision authority's responsibility to ensure that an acquisition program has demonstrated sufficient knowledge to enter into a risk reduction phase following Milestone A and has sound plans to progress to the development phase before granting milestone approval.

**Revision of Milestone B decision authority responsibilities for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 845)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2366b of title 10, United States Code, to streamline and simplify legislative requirements for Milestone B approval of major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs). This provision would retain the requirements to make key findings related to program risk, but would require the milestone decision authority to make a determination that appropriate steps had been taken to address such risks, rather than the string of specific certifications required by current law. Under the provision, the only certification that would be required would be a certification of the maturity of key technologies, which has been identified by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) as the key to successful acquisition programs.

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) proposed legislation that would have gone further and eliminated key findings in their entirety, substituting a general requirement for the milestone decision authority to ensure that risks have been reduced and appropriate plans are in place. The committee rejects this approach. Milestone B findings were instituted to instill discipline into a process under which too many MDAPs failed because of unrealistic cost estimates, immature technologies, excessive concurrency, and a failure to perform appropriate system engineering and developmental testing before entering production. The GAO has reported that improved discipline in the acquisition system since the enactment of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 has resulted in improved performance of MDAPs initiated since that time. The committee concludes that we should not now remove this much-needed discipline from the system.

At the same time, the committee acknowledges that the milestone approval process has become too bureaucratic and takes too long. The changes made in the provision recommended by the committee should provide some relief, but more must be done by DOD and the services in implementation and execution of this provision. In February 2015, the GAO reported that it takes over 2 years, on average, to complete the entire set of documents needed for a Milestone B decision. According to GAO: "A primary reason it takes over 2 years to complete the information required for a milestone decision is the large number of stakeholders that review the documents at the many organizational levels above the program office[. . .] The information and documentation required at milestones can be reviewed by as many as eight different organizational levels before a decision is reached on whether a program is ready for the next acquisition phase. In general, the information is reviewed at each level to gain approval before the program provides

the information to the next level. This is done serially, which takes more time.”

The GAO reviewed decision-making practices of commercial companies and found that these companies avoided this kind of layered, sequential decision-making process by using frequent, direct interaction between program officials and senior functional managers to ensure that program documents are sound from the outset. These documents are then subject to one or two levels of review and approval, rather than the multiple levels required by DOD.

The committee concludes that DOD could improve the efficiency of the milestone approval process by first delayering and decentralizing milestone decision authorities as outlined in sections of this Title. In addition, the milestone decision authority should ensure that functional offices in the military services and where appropriate in the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) are regularly consulted as key documents are developed. With the functional offices having informed the development of these documents, they could then be removed as independent approval authorities, except where specifically required by statute. This would enable DOD to institute a streamlined, two- or three-level approval process, including only the Program Executive Officer, the Service Acquisition Executive, and for those programs designated by the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics. The committee notes that this is the chain of command envisioned by the Packard Commission 40 years ago.

The committee directs the Deputy Chief Management Officer, in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology and the service acquisition executives, to develop a streamlined process flow for milestone decisions, under which functional offices in the military services and at OSD are regularly consulted on the development of acquisition documents, but no longer serve as independent approval authorities, except where specifically required by statute. The committee expects senior acquisition officials to begin implementation of the new process flow within 1 year of the date of the enactment of this Act.

**Tenure and accountability of program managers for program development periods (sec. 846)**

The committee recommends a provision that requires the Secretary of Defense to revise Department of Defense guidance for defense acquisition programs to address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program development period of defense acquisition programs. The committee believes that program managers in this phase should be assigned to a program long enough to prepare for a decision on milestone B approval.

**Tenure and accountability of program managers for program execution periods (sec. 847)**

The committee recommends a provision that would address the tenure and accountability of program managers for the program execution period of defense acquisition programs. The provision would require each such program manager to enter into a performance agreement with the milestone decision authority (MDA) that

establishes the expected parameters of performance, including the commitment of the MDA that adequate funding and resources are available and will be provided, and assurance of the program manager that the parameters are achievable. The provision would also require that program managers be given authority comparable to the authority given to private sector program managers and that they be assigned to a program until the delivery of the first production units, with a narrow waiver authority. Past concerns that military program managers' careers would be limited by longer program manager tenures is addressed by provisions that would modify military personnel authorities in this Act.

**Repeal of requirement for stand-alone manpower estimates for major defense acquisition programs (sec. 848)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2343 of title 10, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement for a stand-alone manpower estimate for a program prior to the approval of the system development and demonstration or the production of a major defense acquisition program. A stand-alone requirement is unnecessary and duplicative and this provision would embed an estimate for total required manpower for a program in the requirements for an independent estimate of a program's full life cycle costs.

**Penalty for cost overruns (sec. 849)**

The committee recommends a provision under which each military department would pay an annual penalty in the amount of 3 percent of the cumulative cost overrun on all of its major defense acquisition programs (MDAPs). To avoid "breaking" any individual acquisition program, the annual penalty would be assessed as an across-the-board reduction to the research, development, test, and evaluation account of the military department.

Despite the enactment of the Nunn-McCurdy Act (10 U.S.C. section 2433), which requires a reexamination and revalidation of MDAPs which experience critical cost overruns, the military departments continue to incur huge cost overruns on virtually every program. The cumulative total of these cost overruns is hundreds of billions of dollars.

This Act would give greater responsibility to the services to manage acquisition programs. With this responsibility there is a need for greater accountability. The committee concludes that one way to incentivize the military departments to establish realistic baseline cost estimates for their MDAPs and to stick to these estimates is to assess a significant penalty for cost overruns. To avoid penalizing the military departments for past mistakes, the penalty recommended by the committee would apply only to overruns on MDAPs that received an initial baseline estimate after the enactment of the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23). The funds decremented under this authority would be transferred to the Rapid Prototyping Fund established under section 803 of this Act. The Committee is willing to consider greater budgetary flexibility when MDAPs underrun their estimated costs and requests that the Department develop any nec-



essary legislative proposal for congressional consideration that would be applicable in those cases.

**Streamlining of reporting requirements applicable to Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering regarding major defense acquisition programs (sec. 850)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 138(b) of title 10, United States Code, to change the scope of periodic reports the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering is required to deliver to the congressional defense committees, the Secretary of Defense, and the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics.

**Configuration steering boards for cost control under major defense acquisition programs (sec. 851)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 814 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417) to require each Configuration Steering Board to track any changes in program requirements for a major defense acquisition program and that all such changes must receive approval by the service chief in consultation with the service secretary.

**Subtitle D—Provisions Related to Commercial Items**

**Inapplicability of certain laws and regulations to the acquisition of commercial items and commercially available off-the-shelf items (sec. 861)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2375 of title 10, United States Code, to require the establishment of a list in the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement of inapplicable defense-unique statutes to contracts for commercial items and commercially available off-the-shelf items. These would be in addition to those inapplicable government-wide statutes currently listed in the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) pursuant to section 1906(b) of title 41, United States Code.

The committee is concerned by the growing number of government-unique contract clauses that are now required for FAR Part 12 commercial contracts. By industry estimates these clauses have grown since the mid-1990s from 13 to 63, and in some cases over 80, government-unique contract clauses today. With these requirements come additional costs and regulatory burden ultimately paid by the taxpayer while each added new clause limits the pool of potential commercial companies willing to act as defense suppliers. The committee intends that this provision be used by the Department of Defense to reduce unnecessary requirements on contractors providing commercial items.

**Market research and preference for commercial items (sec. 862)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to issue guidance to ensure that defense acquisition officials fully comply with the requirements of section 2377 of title 10,

United States Code. The committee is concerned that the market research being conducted under 2377 is perfunctory and that the preference for the use of commercial items is being ignored throughout the Department. Guidance issued pursuant to this provision would ensure that commercial information technology products and services are first determined to be unsuitable to the government's needs before purchasing a non-commercial item and that conducted market research be used to inform price reasonableness determinations.

The provision would also require that the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics ensure that the requirements process is in compliance with section 2377(c) of title 10, United States Code, and section 10.001 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

The committee is aware of an effort known as Technology Domain Awareness being considered by the Department of Defense (DOD). Technology proliferation driven by the commercial marketplace and foreign investments threatens the United States' historical military-technology edge. To mitigate this threat, the committee believes DOD must pursue multiple defense innovation efforts that focus on increasing investments in game-changing military capabilities. Given the scale of commercial research and development, it is unlikely that the DOD will regain a leadership position in every technology area relevant to defense. As part of its commercial market research, the committee recommends that DOD consider options to accelerate efforts to deliver Technology Domain Awareness to DOD decision makers. These efforts should consist of information, infrastructure, services, and education designed to increase the DOD's ability to rapidly identify and capitalize on commercial technology innovations and practices relevant to military applications. The committee expects the Department to keep it informed as to the progress of the Technology Domain Awareness initiative.

#### **Continuing validity of commercial item determinations (sec. 863)**

The committee recommends a provision to require the modification of the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement to address the continuing validity of commercial item determinations for multiple procurements. This provision would streamline the commercial item determination process and provide certainty to the government and contractors by presuming that a previous commerciality determination made by an authorized agency official is valid, unless such determination is found to be made in error or based on inadequate information.

#### **Treatment of commercial items purchased as major weapon systems (sec. 864)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2379 of title 10, United States Code, regarding the purchase of commercial items as major weapon systems. This provision would clarify section 2379 by: (1) separating commercial item determinations from price reasonableness determinations; and (2)

spelling out with more specificity the types of information that are required to make price reasonableness determinations.

Section 2379 was enacted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) to ensure that the Department of Defense purchases major weapon systems as commercial items only when it is in the Department’s interest to do so. It was amended two years later in an effort to ensure that when the Department purchases subsystems or components of major weapon systems as commercial items, it obtains sufficient information to determine the reasonableness of price. Under the 2008 amendment, a subsystem or component of a major weapon system may be purchased as a commercial item only if the offeror provides sufficient information to evaluate price reasonableness.

The 2008 amendment created two problems. First, it blurred the lines between price reasonableness determinations and commercial item determinations. Second, the provision provided minimal detail on the types of information that should be required to determine price reasonableness, leading the Office of the Inspector General and others to conclude that in the absence of definitive price information for a particular item, the disclosure of detailed cost data is required. This is a cumbersome process that is inconsistent with standard commercial practices, and adds limited value to improving acquisition outcomes.

The provision recommended by the committee would address the first problem by clarifying that commercial item status is not contingent on the offeror’s disclosure of price information. Contracting officers would still require offerors to disclose information necessary to determine price reasonableness, but commercial item determinations would no longer hinge on that disclosure.

The provision would address the second problem by reaffirming the statutory preference for commercial item price reasonableness determinations based on price information and price analysis, rather than cost information and cost analysis, and spelling out the types of price information that a contracting officer must seek from an offeror before requiring the production of cost information.

The amended provision would not authorize contracting officers to require the submission of cost information with regard to the components of a commercial system or subsystem, with regard to commercially available off-the-shelf (COTS) items, or with regard to any other items that are developed exclusively at private expense. The committee concludes that the amended provision would enable contracting officers to require the submission of information needed to make price reasonableness determinations, while protecting offerors from unnecessary and unreasonable demands for cost information.

#### **Limitation on conversion of procurements from commercial acquisition procedures (sec. 865)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit the conversion of the procurement of a commercial item or commercial service to a non-commercial acquisition procedure unless the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that the Department of Defense will realize a significant cost savings as compared to the cost of procuring a similar quantity of such

item or level of service using commercial acquisition procedures. The committee is concerned that a number of parts, components, services and systems have been converted from Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 12 procurements to FAR Part 15 with no assessment of the costs of these conversions. The Air Force is currently in negotiations to change the contract for the Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) from one governed by FAR Part 12 to one governed by FAR Part 15. The JDAM was one of the most successful acquisition reform pilots authorized under the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-355). Under this authority, the price of JDAMs has consistently dropped over the years while contractors have been incentivized to use their own research and development dollars to continue to increase quality and performance of the munition. The committee is concerned that the cost of this program may increase and that the Department will be forced to fund directly any new quality or performance enhancement.

This provision would ensure that under any such future conversion the Secretary shall, in addition to price changes, factor in forgone commercial research and development costs, transaction costs and increased regulatory costs in converting existing FAR Part 12 contracts. This provision would also require the Department to conduct an inventory (which the Comptroller General will review for accuracy) of all contracts and subcontracts that have been converted from FAR Part 12 to FAR Part 15 over the last 5 years and determine the prices paid before and after the conversion.

**Treatment of goods and services provided by a non-traditional contractors as commercial items (sec. 866)**

The committee recommends a new provision in chapter 140 of title 10, United States Code that authorizes the Department of Defense (DOD) to treat goods and services provided by a non-traditional contractor as defined in section 2302(9) of title 10, United States Code, as a commercial item. The committee believes that it is critical for the Department of Defense to access non-traditional commercial contractors to address future technology challenges where commercial technology is rapidly advancing beyond military technology. There are significant barriers to the participation of these contractors in the DOD marketplace. To overcome those barriers Congress has put in place a patchwork of authorities to allow these firms to participate on a transaction by transaction basis either through the use of other transactions authority or through defining the product or service to be acquired as a commercial item under the commercial item definition in chapter 1 of title 41, United States Code.

This committee recognizes that the defense market is not large enough for some commercial firms to go to the trouble and expense of changing their business processes to comply with a Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15 type contract traditionally used for most defense purchases. This provision would allow the Department to access a greater share of the innovative potential of these commercial, non-traditional firms under FAR Part 12 terms and conditions by treating the entire business unit and what is produced and provided by these units as commercial. Government buy-

ers if they wish to access non-traditional commercial entities will need to conduct extensive market research to first understand the Department of Defense's standing in the relevant commercial sector and market. The Department will also likely need to develop and use price and value based techniques to be used over the course of the relationship with these contractors that will be significantly different than the transactions based approach used to ensure price reasonableness on a contract by contract basis.

### **Subtitle E—Other Matters**

#### **Streamlining of requirements relating to defense business systems (sec. 871)**

The committee recommends a provision to streamline requirements relative to the acquisition of defense business systems. The provision would clarify the lines of responsibility and oversight roles for these types of programs. Further, it would reduce the oversight burden on the Department of Defense (DOD) with respect to lower cost systems. It would also mandate that DOD establish guidance for these types of programs, which would help to improve their cost and schedule outcomes through the emphasis of robust business process re-engineering and requirements refinement, prior to any expensive customization of commercial software.

#### **Acquisition workforce (sec. 872)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1705 of title 10, United States Code, to extend the defense acquisition workforce development fund for 5 additional years and modify the requirements of the biennial strategic workforce plan to assess any new or expanded critical skills or competencies needed by the acquisition workforce. The committee expects that the fund be used to improve the capabilities of the current acquisition workforce in the use of Federal Acquisition Regulation Part 12 commercial contracting and other transactions authority.

#### **Unified information technology services (sec. 873)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Deputy Chief Management Officer (DCMO), the Chief Information Officer (CIO), and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to jointly conduct a business case analysis, with assistance from the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation, as appropriate, to determine the most effective and efficient way to acquire common services across Department of Defense (DOD) networks.

The provision also would require the Secretary of Defense, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, in consultation with the DCMO and CIO, to establish a governance mechanism and process to ensure essential interoperability across DOD networks.

The provision would require that the business case analysis include an assessment of whether DOD should (1) acquire a single set of commercially provided enterprise services for DOD, or allow the military departments and other components to acquire their own; (2) acquire such services as an integrated set from a single provider, or require that each service can be separately acquired;

and (3) acquire multiple versions of each type of service, for services where there is no commercial standard that ensures interoperability across vendor products, to enable interoperability while supporting choice and competition.

The committee is aware that the CIO, the Defense Information Systems Agency, and the military services are monitoring the rapidly advancing commercial technology and offerings for enterprise services, and, in many instances are already capitalizing on these commercial offerings. The committee is also aware that the CIO is now focusing on developing a path forward. The committee is concerned that the scope of the ongoing review is too narrow and that the CIO lacks the tools and authority to implement solutions that are necessary to achieve efficiencies and interoperability.

#### **Cloud strategy for Department of Defense (sec. 874)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Chief Information Officer (CIO), in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and the Chief Information Officers of the military departments, to develop a cloud strategy for the secret level of classified data and the Secret Internet Protocol network (SIPRnet). The strategy would be required to address security requirements, the ability to shift current applications to a cloud computing environment, competitive acquisition, and interoperability with Intelligence Community cloud systems operating at higher classification levels.

The provision would also require the CIO, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and in consultation with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence to develop a consistent pricing and cost recovery process for the use by Department of Defense components of the Intelligence Community's cloud services.

Finally, the provision would require the CIO to assess the feasibility and advisability of imposing a minimum set of open standards for cloud infrastructure, middle-ware, metadata, and application programming interfaces to promote interoperability, information sharing, access to data, and competition.

#### **Development period for Department of Defense information technology systems (sec. 875)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2445b of title 10, United States Code, to modify requirements applicable to a major automated information system program that fails to achieve a full deployment decision within 5 years after the initiation of the program. These systems are intended to primarily use commercially available software and computer systems and the Department of Defense (DOD) has policies in place to change business practices so that commercial solutions can meet the needs for DOD business systems. As such, the committee believes that in most cases, these programs should have very limited developmental risk and as such can be managed as "time-certain" development efforts. The provision would require that any failure to achieve a full deployment decision within five years would trigger

a written determination from the Department of Defense that a longer period of time is needed for the effort.

**Revisions to pilot program on acquisition of military purpose non-developmental items (sec. 876)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 866 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383) to expand the applicability of the pilot program on the acquisition of military purpose non-developmental items to additional classes of contractors and apply the standards of the Competition in Contracting Act of 1984 (10 U.S.C. 2304) to these contracts. In January 2015, the Government Accountability Office reported on the progress of the pilot and found that it was difficult for the Department of Defense (DOD) to test this authority given the legislative constraints of the program. These changes would allow for DOD to effectively test the usefulness of the authority.

**Extension of the Department of Defense Mentor-Protégé pilot program (sec. 877)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend by 1 year the authority in section 831(j) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101–510).

**Improved auditing of contracts (sec. 878)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) to provide outside audit support to non-Defense Agencies upon certification that the backlog for incurred cost audits is less than 12 months of incurred cost inventory. The committee understands that DCAA has made progress in reducing its incurred cost audit backlog but this has come at the expense of a reduction in the number of audits and increased backlogs in other areas of its responsibilities. The committee believes that DCAA management should not be distracted by directing and managing the audit responsibilities of other agencies until its own house is completely in order. The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to use up to 5 percent of the auditing staff of the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense and the service audit agencies and, if necessary, augmented by private audit firms to help address DCAA's audit backlog. The provision would also require the Secretary to review the oversight and audit structure of the Department of Defense with the goal of improving productivity, avoiding duplicative program and contract audits, and streamlining oversight reviews.

**Survey on the costs of regulatory compliance (sec. 879)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to survey the top ten contractors with the highest level of reimbursements for cost-type contracts and identify the cost to industry of regulatory compliance with government unique acquisition regulations and requirements that are not imposed on commercial item contracts. The last such survey, known as the Coopers and Lybrand study, was completed for Secretary of Defense William Perry in December 1994. This study, using an ac-

tivity based costing methodology, found that average acquisition process regulatory compliance costs for defense firms were around 18 percent. The Coopers and Lybrand study was not a comprehensive estimate of all acquisition regulatory costs that industry must comply with, nor did it estimate the costs imposed upon the government to oversee this compliance. Other studies at the time estimated regulatory compliance costs as high as 40 percent of the price paid for a defense contract.

No significant study on the costs of regulatory compliance has been conducted since 1994, while in the last two decades new acquisition regulatory requirements, such as the business system rule, have been imposed on industry to the process of acquiring defense unique products. While many of these requirements are designed to protect the taxpayer, the layering of these requirements upon one another may actually be wasting taxpayer dollars rather than achieving their original objectives. In one example where a contractor for a defense program (the Wideband Global satellite) was allowed to adopt more commercial-like practices to lessen the regulatory compliance burden, the government was able to achieve a significant cost reduction of over \$150.0 million while achieving the same mission capability. The committee believes that it will be more difficult to make decisions about achieving the right balance in oversight requirements on large defense programs without adequate data on the costs of oversight compliance.

**Government Accountability Office report on bid protests  
(sec. 880)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require that the Comptroller General of the United States submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act on the prevalence and impact of bid protests over the previous 10 years. While the general level of bid protests appears to have remained relatively constant in recent years the committee is concerned about the level of protests for large contracts and for follow on contracts that would potentially replace an incumbent contractor. The Comptroller General should also assess the ramifications of the protest process on the actions of the defense acquisition workforce and the feasibility of instituting a system whereby a losing protester would be liable for legal fees and protest costs.

**Steps to identify and address potential unfair competitive  
advantage of technical advisors to acquisition officials  
(sec. 881)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics to issue guidance on identifying and addressing potential unfair competitive advantage of technical advisors to acquisition officials. Organizational conflict of interest and personal conflict of interest issues have been addressed for contractors in previous legislation. While it would be expected that the Undersecretary would review the implementation of these efforts, there has been a neglected aspect of potential conflicts raised when the Department of Defense uses federally funded research and development centers,



other non-profit entities, or federal laboratories that provide technical advice on defense programs and subsequent work has been directed to these entities or their clients. The committee believes that the Department needs to ensure that the engineering and technical advice it is given is free from unmitigated potential conflicts of interest.

**HUBZone qualified disaster areas (sec. 882)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Small Business Act, title 15, United States Code to authorize the inclusion of qualified disaster areas to the Historically Underutilized Business Zone program administered by the Small Business Administration.

**Base closure HUBZones (sec. 883)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the Small Business Act, title 15, United States Code to authorize the inclusion of base closure areas to the Historically Underutilized Business Zone program administered by the Small Business Administration.

**Items of Special Interest**

**AbilityOne Program**

The committee notes that AbilityOne Program is the largest source of employment, on Federal contracts, for individuals who are blind or have significant disabilities in the United States. The program has supported the employment of tens of thousands of people across the United States who are blind or have significant disabilities, including veterans and wounded warriors. The Department of Defense (DOD), through the use of the AbilityOne program, has been able to secure key mission-support services to maintain and improve military readiness, at competitive market prices.

The Committee encourages DOD to continue to cultivate and increase business opportunities through the use of AbilityOne programs. The committee notes that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics issued a memorandum in 2013 challenging acquisition officials to further increase support by procuring more goods and services provided by the AbilityOne Program. The committee also commends AbilityOne's employment of disabled veterans, and encourages AbilityOne to continue its emphasis on hiring disabled veterans in providing essential products and services to support the warfighter and defense missions.

**Acquisition of Commercial Test, Research, and Measurement Capability**

It is the committee's understanding that current Department of Defense (DOD) acquisition practices rely heavily on buying commercially-available off the shelf (COTS) research, test, and measurement equipment for Research Development Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) programs and activities. When this equipment is needed, the committee believes that both DOD and its contractors should assess the best way to acquire such research, test, and measurement capability, particularly when this equipment, once purchased,

is often used for only limited periods of times with a low utilization in an environment where research, testing, and measurement technologies can become obsolete relatively quickly.

The committee believes that as a demonstration of DOD progress toward the use of commercial best practices in support of DOD's Better Buying Power initiative, DOD should assess the value of leasing/rental services for COTS research, test, and measurement equipment capabilities for DOD requirements in support of RD&TE programs and activities rather than purchasing equipment to acquire the capabilities.

The Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition Technology and Logistics should conduct such a review of the acquisition practices for acquiring COTS research, test, and measurement equipment and capabilities and report to the congressional defense committees not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### **Barriers to innovation from non-traditional and commercial contractors**

The Department of Defense (DOD) has relied on its research and development enterprise to produce new and advanced technologies that improve military capabilities and ensure technological superiority over adversaries. Traditionally, the Department has succeeded in maintaining a technology advantage on the battlefield by being a primary driver of technology innovation and making substantial investments in basic and applied research and technology development in the defense industrial base. In the past few decades, however, the focus and pace of scientific and technological innovation has changed dramatically, and the innovation environment in many leading technology areas, such as robotics, cyber, and communications, has shifted away from the government to the commercial sector. Innovation fueled by commercial market forces has largely taken over the government's role in pushing technology advancements. DOD's ability to leverage and exploit technology innovations developed and funded by the commercial sector is critical to its ability to preserve superior warfighting capabilities.

Although DOD has taken some steps in recent years to identify and pursue innovative technologies and products from commercial companies outside the defense industrial base, the committee is concerned that DOD continues to fall behind in leveraging innovation from the commercial sector. Even when the DOD has incorporated commercial components, it is often not nimble enough to refresh this technology and is left relying on obsolete commercial solutions for its major systems. The committee is concerned that a key reason for this situation is that policies, regulations, and processes within DOD may make it difficult for many high-tech companies to collaborate and do business with the Department. The committee has heard from several companies, for example, that government acquisition and contracting regulations, cost accounting standards and audits, and intellectual property policies can be a major deterrent to working with DOD.

This Act proposes many changes to remove the barriers to the participation of commercial contractors in the DOD acquisition process. To gain a better understanding of what impediments would still exist after the passage of this Act and how to address

them, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review examining DOD's efforts to leverage innovative technologies from non-traditional companies. The review should at a minimum, include meetings with selected companies and discussion of potential impediments they perceive or face in conducting business with the Department. Not later than 1 year after enactment of this Act, the results of this review shall be provided to the committee.

#### **Competition in the procurement of collaboration services**

The committee notes that the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) internally developed and is fielding an interim collaboration services tool called Defense Collaboration Services. While DISA has stated that their collaboration services tool will reduce costs and use an open system architecture, the manner in which DISA developed this tool internally raises concerns that cost savings estimates may be overly optimistic and that significant re-configuration will be required to use this tool within the Department of Defense. The degree of user satisfaction with existing and interim collaboration services tools is also unclear.

Further, the committee believes that adequate consideration was not given to competition for this interim service which potentially could improve performance and lower costs. The committee believes that competition from a wide range of alternatives could have a beneficial impact in the area of collaboration services in the Department. The committee urges the DISA to use competition to improve performance and drive down costs for collaboration services.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) to evaluate the Department's use of competition in acquiring collaboration services tools to include the development of its interim collaboration services tools, the comparative costs and capabilities of these tools, and user feedback on both the existing and interim collaboration services, and report to the committee no later than November 30, 2015 with findings and recommendations.

#### **Inspector General report on pricing of engine sustainment contract**

On December 22, 2014, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense issued a report concluding that the Air Force may be paying too much for the sustainment of F117 aircraft engine, the defense version of a commercial aircraft engine that powers hundreds of commercial aircraft currently in service. The report raises concerns about a lack of understanding of the applicable requirements by the Inspector General, the Air Force, and the contractor.

The Inspector General report concluded that the Air Force improperly determined that the sustainment services for the F117 engine were commercial "without assessing whether a commercial market existed." The Inspector General report indicates that this determination should be made on the basis of an assessment of a "current market for any comparable F117 engine fleet management program" by the contractor in the private sector.

The Inspector General's narrowly-constrained view of commercial services is mistaken. Services provided in support of commercial

items are considered commercial services if the source of the item provides “similar services”—not necessarily the same services to the general public (section 103(5) of title 41, United States Code). The committee concludes that this test would be met if, as the Air Force concluded, the contractor provides similar sustainment services for commercial aircraft engines (even if not the same engines) under dozens of fleet management programs valued in the billions of dollars.

On the other hand, the Air Force appears to deserve the Inspector General’s criticism for its failure to perform market research to fully understand the potential marketplace for F117 engine sustainment. Close to a thousand of similar engines remain in service on commercial aircraft. The committee concludes that market research should, at a minimum, identify other potential competitors who might enable the Air Force to avoid a sole source contract for this work.

The contractor, too, has failed to comply with its obligations under the law if, as the Inspector General reports, it has “repeatedly refused” to provide commercial sales data to support the price for F117 sustainment services. Contractors providing commercial items and services are required by law to submit “at a minimum, appropriate information on the prices at which the same item or similar items have previously been sold that is adequate for evaluating the reasonableness of the price for the procurement” (10 United States Code Section 2306a(d)(1)). The committee believes that a company seeking a government contract worth billions of dollars should not have to be subpoenaed to meet this legal requirement.

However, both the Inspector General and the Air Force are mistaken in insisting that the contractor provide detailed information on labor hours and costs, material costs, overhead expenses, subcontractor costs, and profits at this time. Under section 2379(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code, contracting officers may require the submission of cost information, such as information on labor costs, material costs, and overhead rates, only upon a determination that commercial price information alone is not sufficient to determine the reasonableness of price. It is difficult to understand how either the Inspector General or the Air Force could conclude that commercial price information alone is insufficient, when this information has not yet been received from the contractor.

The committee concludes that the interests of the Department of Defense and the taxpayers would be better served if the Inspector General, the Air Force, and the contractor were to better understand and carry out their duties under the statute.

#### **Mitigation strategy to prevent fraud and abuse in the Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Program**

The Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) program was established to ensure veterans with service-connected disabilities have access to opportunities to contract with the federal government. The Department of Defense’s Office of Small Business Programs reported in 2013, the Department awarded over \$6.0 billion in SDVOSB contracts. However, the Department’s reliance on self-certification of veteran status to determine eligibility for

SDVOSB contracts has allowed significant fraud and abuse to persist within the program. The Department of Defense Inspector General (DODIG) estimated in 2012 that in DOD's SDVOSB program alone, more than \$340.0 million was awarded to firms that potentially misstated their SDVOSB status. Each contract awarded to an ineligible firm under SDVOSB program takes an opportunity away from a deserving service-disabled veteran.

To address these concerns, the Committee directs the Secretary of Defense to develop a mitigation strategy to prevent fraud and abuse, and to update the committee not later than 180 days after enactment of this Act. The committee notes that the strategy should incorporate the best practices used by the Department of Veterans Affairs' Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Program to prevent fraud and abuse.

#### **Obtaining technical data for operations, maintenance, installation, and training purposes**

The committee understands the importance of obtaining technical data for operations, maintenance, installation, and training purposes as outlined in section 2320(C)(iii) of title 10, United States Code. The use of computer-based simulator technology for training purposes has significantly evolved in the last decade. The committee is aware that in some cases it has been difficult to obtain the necessary underlying technical data on a defense system to support competition in the development of training simulators. A similar issue has been identified for the maintenance support of commercial derivative aircraft and engines. The committee believes that the government industry panel that would be created elsewhere in this Act would, at a minimum, review the impact of sections 2320 and 2331 of title 10, United States Code, on the competitiveness of the marketplace for training simulators and the sustainment of commercial derivative aircraft and engines.

#### **Review of should-cost process**

Since 2010, the Department of Defense has correctly promoted so-called "should-cost" management, which relies on government and contractor teams to identify errors that can be avoided and process efficiencies that can be gained as well to make technical trade-offs for saving money without compromising requirements. By eliminating inefficient processes and embracing cost savings opportunities, the Department can achieve more affordable programs. Should-cost savings should not be arbitrary, but rather tied to a specific engineering or business change that can be quantified and tracked. To ensure should-cost management achieves its effectiveness potential as an acquisition tool, the process must be transparent and well understood by all parties. The contractor and industry team must participate in the process together.

The committee requests that the Secretary of Defense review the policies, procedures, and regulations governing the proper use of should-cost management to ensure the process is transparent, objective and efficient and, after requisite public comment, to make any necessary changes to these policies, rules and procedures. As a part of this review the Secretary of Defense should also ensure

that acquisition professionals are adequately educated and trained on the proper use of should-cost management.

The committee believes that the elements of a transparent should-cost management process should at a minimum: (1) distinguish between should cost review and analysis of program direct and indirect costs; (2) establish a process for communicating with the contractor the elements of a proposed should-cost evaluation; (3) ensure that every identified should-cost savings opportunity is accurate, complete, and current and is tied to a specific engineering or business change that can be quantified and tracked; (4) identify skills and capabilities for those participating in should-cost management teams to ensure that such teams include sufficient members with broad cross functional experience; (5) ensure appropriate collaboration with the contractor throughout the process; (6) require a process that provides for sufficient analysis that minimizes impact on program schedule; and (7) require a separate audit to be provided to the contractor.

The committee requests that the Secretary of Defense report to the committee on the Department's review within 180 days of enactment of this Act.

### **Security and facility clearances**

The cost to investigate, certify, and maintain security clearances and facility clearances is a tremendous burden on the Department of Defense in labor and resources. It also creates barriers that prevent the sharing of solutions, technology and information, within the government. The clearance processes are a legacy of Cold War requirements and will need to be re-engineered to address the multitude of new threats that now face the nation, but also address industrial base concerns regarding the globalization of technology and ubiquity of commercial information technology.

The committee notes that progress has been made in implementing section 906 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) on personnel security and section 1628 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) on personnel security and insider threat, but is disappointed by the pace of the reform effort. The committee believes that the Department of Defense must continue the process of personnel security clearance reform and as part of this effort review: (1) the value and cost benefits of the current investigative process used in security clearance investigations versus other alternatives; and (2) the productivity and additional value provided by using entities outside of the Department of Defense to perform these investigations.

The committee also believes that the Department should begin the process of reengineering the facility clearance system process. As with the acquisition process as a whole, the security and facility clearance processes need to become more agile, efficient, and timely. This should be done in a way that enhances security but removes unnecessary costs and barriers to the participation of commercial global firms whose business and technical solutions are urgently needed by the Department.

## **TITLE IX—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT**

### **Subtitle A—Department of Defense Management**

#### **Update of statutory specification of functions of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff relating to advice on requirements, programs, and budget (sec. 901)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 153 of title 10, United States Code, relating to functions of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to update that section to reflect additional joint force integration functions performed by the Chairman. An update is necessary as a result of the disestablishment of United States Joint Forces Command on August 31, 2011, and the subsequent deletion of that command from the Unified Command Plan.

#### **Reorganization and redesignation of Office of Family Policy and Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs (sec. 902)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend sections 1781, 1781(a), 1781(c), and 131 of title 10, United States Code, to reorganize and redesignate the Office of Community Support for Military Families with Special Needs and the Office of Family Policy/Children and Youth into the Office of Military Family Readiness Policy. The provision would also require the director of the Office of Military Family Readiness Policy to be a member of the Senior Executive Service or a general or flag officer.

#### **Repeal of requirement for annual Department of Defense funding for Ocean Research Advisory Panel (sec. 903)**

The committee recommends a provision that would strike subsection (c) of section 7903 of title 10, United States Code. In support of the Secretary of Defense's Efficiency Initiatives, the committee's recommendation would eliminate the requirement that the Department of the Navy provide funding to support the functioning of the Ocean Research Advisory Panel. The committee believes that this change is consistent with the function of the panel and that the support responsibilities are more appropriately aligned outside of the Department of Defense.

The committee notes that, as the result of several reorganizations by the administration, the panel now reports to the Executive Office of the President, yet the Department of the Navy maintains responsibility for providing funding and selecting nominees to serve on the panel. The committee is also concerned that the process of selecting nominees has become so slow that the panel currently

does not have a quorum of members and thus has not met in over a year.

The committee believes that the panel can still provide valuable advice to the administration, but may be of limited value to the Department of Defense. Consequently, the Department of the Navy is not well placed to support the panel. The committee recommends that the Executive Office of the President determine by which entity the management and oversight of the panel would be most appropriate.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Special Operations Policy and Oversight Council**

The committee notes that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict (ASD SOLIC) provides “service secretary-like” civilian oversight of U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) within the Department of Defense. These responsibilities include serving as the principal civilian advisor to the Secretary of Defense on all operational, policy, resourcing, and acquisition matters impacting special operations forces (SOF). Given SOCOM’s responsibilities for the readiness of SOF and its unique role as the only combatant command with acquisition authorities, the committee believes the civilian oversight function of the ASD SOLIC is critical to ensuring optimal use of SOF and efficient use of taxpayer dollars. Unfortunately, the committee believes that the ASD SOLIC has not been able to devote sufficient attention and resources to adequately fulfill these “service secretary-like” responsibilities along with other responsibilities related to current military operations, building partner capacity, counternarcotics, stability operations, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, and other issues.

As such, the committee strongly supports the creation of the Special Operations Policy and Oversight Council (SOPOC) by the ASD SOLIC to help fulfill assigned oversight responsibilities and leverage expertise elsewhere within the Office of the Secretary of Defense, including through the participation of the Under Secretaries of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Personnel and Readiness, Intelligence, and Comptroller. The committee understands that the SOPOC has already considered and resolved a number of issues impacting the operational control of SOF and the delineation of funding responsibilities between SOCOM and the military services. The committee strongly encourages further institutionalization of the SOPOC through continued regular meetings and requests that ASD SOLIC keep the committee currently informed of any significant policy or programmatic decisions impacting SOF.



## **TITLE X—GENERAL PROVISIONS**

### **Subtitle A—Financial Matters**

#### **General transfer authority (sec. 1001)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the transfer up to \$4.5 billion of fiscal year 2016 funds authorized in division A of this Act to unforeseen higher priority needs in accordance with normal reprogramming procedures. Transfers of funds between military personnel authorizations would not be counted toward the dollar limitation in this provision.

#### **Annual audit of financial statements of Department of Defense components by independent external auditors (sec. 1002)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense Inspector General to fulfill its statutory audit responsibilities to perform financial statement audits for the military departments and other designated components of the Department by contracting with independent external auditors. The committee notes that some organizations in DOD are already making use of independent audit services. The committee expects that this provision will allow DOD to complete its audit requirements in a more cost effective manner, by leveraging private sector expertise, and in a manner consistent with auditing in other government agencies. The committee expects that for each audit, the Inspector General will evaluate the qualifications of the independent external auditor's staff and their independence, review the scope of the audit work, monitor audit progress, and review, if appropriate, audit documentation. Upon completion of the audit, the Inspector General shall issue a report to Congress that includes the independent external auditor's opinion on the entity's financial statements, as well as any accompanying management letters and any observations on the audit or on the financial statements.

#### **Treatment as part of the base budget of certain amounts authorized for overseas contingency operations upon enactment of an act revising the Budget Control Act discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2016 (sec. 1003)**

If an act is enacted at a later date that would revise the defense and non-defense discretionary spending limits in proportionally equal amounts, than amounts authorized in title XV above \$50.9 billion and equal to the amount of the increase to the defense discretionary cap for fiscal year 2016, will be deemed to be authorized in title III.

**Sense of Senate on sequestration (sec. 1004)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate on the negative impact that the statutory budget caps are having on the Department of Defense and United States national security, as well as the need for legislation to adjust those caps.

The committee acknowledges that the Budget Control Act of 2011 (BCA) represented a step forward in tackling the fiscal imbalances of our country. It took steps to bring down deficits and stabilize debt growth. It included statutory budget caps to ensure Congress appropriated within its means. This was an important improvement to address the national debt, which the former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen, once called the biggest threat to our national security.

However, the BCA also included an enforcement mechanism known as sequestration—shortsighted, non-strategic, and across-the-board cuts to discretionary spending to achieve the BCA’s budget caps. Under sequestration, the size of those spending reductions was designed to be so unacceptable that sequestration would never occur. In its place, Congress was to enact targeted measures to reduce the deficit by at least \$1.2 trillion over 10 years. Ultimately, Congress was unable to fulfill this requirement and the revised budget caps went into effect in March 2013 with enforcement of sequestration.

The committee understands the harmful impacts that these non-strategic cuts to defense spending have had on our national security. The readiness of our military forces have been degraded, equipment maintenance has been postponed, and employees have been furloughed. Furthermore, these sequestration-level budget caps are forcing the Department of Defense to manage the challenges today based on a spend plan set 4 years ago—before the rise of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), the Ebola crisis, and Russia’s aggression in Ukraine.

Additionally, the committee recognizes that there are important non-defense agencies tasked with protecting our security. From the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to the Department of Homeland Security, and even the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Institutes of Health, our nation’s security and well-being are at risk of harm. The impacts of the BCA caps and sequestration have been felt across the country.

There was success in 2013 to enact targeted cuts and adjust some of statutory budget caps. The Murray-Ryan Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 showed there is bipartisan agreement on addressing the budget caps in a balanced, equal way between defense and non-defense accounts. The committee acknowledges the negative impact of the budget caps and the need to adjust them.

**Subtitle B—Counter-Drug Activities**

**Extension of authority to support unified counter-drug and counterterrorism campaign in Colombia (sec. 1011)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 2 fiscal years the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide assistance to support the unified counterdrug and counterterrorism

campaign of the Government of Colombia (Section 1021 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), as most recently amended by section 1011 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291).

The committee notes that the Government of Colombia has made and continues to make progress against transnational criminal organizations and designated foreign terrorist organizations. Further, the committee notes that the Government of Colombia is playing an increasing role in regional security efforts and encourages a continuation of the security partnership between the United States and Colombia.

**Extension and expansion of authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments (sec. 1012)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85), as most recently amended by section 1013 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). Specifically, the provision would extend the Department of Defense’s (DOD) authority to provide additional support for counter-drug activities of certain foreign governments through fiscal year 2017, as well as adds Kenya, Tanzania, and Somalia as countries eligible to receive assistance under this authority.

The committee notes the growing presence of transnational criminal organizations operating across many parts of Africa—a region the committee continues to believe is of increasing importance to the security interests of the United States. As such, the committee encourages the DOD to initiate additional programs in the U.S. Africa Command area of responsibility.

**Subtitle C—Naval Vessels and Shipyards**

**Studies of fleet platform architectures for the Navy (sec. 1021)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to commission three studies to be submitted to the congressional defense committees in unclassified, and to the extent necessary, in classified versions to recommend potential future fleet architectures no later than May 1, 2016. These studies would provide competing visions and alternatives for future fleet architectures. One study would be performed by the Department of the Navy, with input from the Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren Division. The second study would be performed by a federally funded research and development center. The third study would be conducted by a qualified independent, non-governmental institute, as selected by the Secretary of Defense.

The Navy will continue to be built around ships of various kinds and sizes, along with its supporting aircraft. The Navy force structure requirement set forth in the “Annual Long-Range Plan for Construction of Naval Vessels for Fiscal Year 2016” included 11 large-deck aircraft carriers, 88 large surface combatants, 52 small

surface combatants, 34 amphibious ships, 48 attack submarines, and 4 guided missile submarines. Together with associated combat logistics and support ships, the Navy's force structure objective totals 308 ships. Additionally, this force structure includes 10 carrier air wings, additional surface combatant-based helicopters, and land-based maritime patrol aircraft.

This basic combination of ships and aircraft represent the Navy's platform architecture. Since the end of the Cold War, this architecture has remained relatively static, while decreasing in total size. Given the long lead times needed to design and build ships and aircraft, their decades-long operational life, and the relatively low annual rates at which new ships and aircraft are procured, the Navy's overall platform architecture evolves gradually over time.

Due to the confluence of three trends, the committee believes now is the time to identify the naval force structure the Nation will need to plan to meet the operational requirements of the 2030s.

First, 11 U.S. Navy combatant ship classes begin to retire in large numbers between 2020 and 2035, including: *Ticonderoga*-class guided missile cruisers (2020), improved Los Angeles-class submarines (2021), *Nimitz*-class aircraft carriers (2025), *Flight I Arleigh Burke*-class guided missile destroyers (2026), *Ohio*-class guided missile submarines (2026), *Whidbey Island*-class amphibious ships (2027), *Seawolf*-class submarines (2030), *Wasp*-class amphibious ship (2029), *Flight II Arleigh Burke*-class guided missile destroyers (2033), *Littoral Combat Ships* (2033), and *Harpers Ferry*-class amphibious ships (2035). The Navy should urgently develop capability based assessments and analyses of alternatives to identify the best solutions to fill the capability gaps left by these retirements.

Second, as competitor states raise their own modern navies, the maritime domain appears to be shifting in ways that will again challenge the Navy's ability to conduct sea control and project power. It will therefore be vital that the Navy not just invest in more robust naval force, but a fleet adaptable to the challenges of tomorrow's warfighting regimes.

Third, as the *Ohio*-class replacement program proceeds, it is projected to consume the equivalent of one-third to one-half of the historical shipbuilding budget, which is already stretched to maintain the Navy's objective force levels.

Given these fiscal challenges, it is vital for the Navy to review thoroughly its planned architecture and position itself to invest carefully in the future fleet. As a result, the specified studies are directed and \$1.0 million is added to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the performance of these studies.

#### **Amendment to National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund (sec. 1022)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1022(b)(1) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291), which established the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund, to clarify what appropriations may be utilized as a source of transfer funds. The committee's intent is for amounts not to exceed \$3.5 billion from unobligated funds authorized to be ap-

appropriated for fiscal years 2014, 2015, or 2016 in any Department of Defense appropriation to be available for transfer to the National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund. As stated in the existing provision, the transfer authority provided under this provision is in addition to any other transfer authority provided to the Secretary of Defense by law.

**Extension of authority for reimbursement of expenses for certain Navy mess operations afloat (sec. 1023)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority for reimbursement of expenses for certain Navy mess operations afloat authorized in section 1014 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417; 122 Stat. 4585), as amended by section 1021 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383, 124 Stat. 4348), from September 30, 2015 to September 30, 2020, and certain technical and clarifying amendments.

**Subtitle D—Counterterrorism**

**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 (sec. 1031)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States to house detainees transferred from Guantanamo. The prohibition would only be lifted if the Secretary of Defense submits a plan for the disposition of all detainees, as provided in a subsequent section, and the plan is approved by Congress.

**Limitation on the transfer or release of individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo (sec. 1032)**

The stated policy of the United States remains to close the detention facilities at Guantanamo as soon as possible. The committee has long requested a detailed plan for the disposition of all individuals held there. Thus far, the Secretary of Defense has failed to provide such a plan. Prior to authorizing the transfer of detainees into the United States the committee seeks a comprehensive plan that will describe the disposition of all detainees, including where each detainee will be held or transferred, the costs associated with continued detention, the legal risks of any transfer, and what additional authorities are needed.

Therefore, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the transfer to the United States of detainees in Guantanamo except for detention, trial, or incarceration. Such domestic transfers could only occur, however, after the Secretary of Defense determines that the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States, determines that appropriate actions have been taken or will be taken to address any risk to public safety; and notifies appropriate committees of Congress.

The limited authority to transfer detainees to the United States under this provision would only become effective after the Sec-

retary of Defense submits a report detailing a plan for all individuals held at Guantanamo and Congress approves the plan. The provision would provide expedited procedures for congressional consideration of the submitted plan.

**Reenactment and modification of certain prior requirements for certifications relating to transfer of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to foreign countries and other foreign entities (sec. 1033)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of any amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to be used to transfer or release any individual detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity. This prohibition would apply unless the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, provides a written certification to Congress addressing several requirements at least 30 days prior to the transfer of any such individual. This section would also prohibit the Secretary of Defense from using any funds for the transfer of any such individual to the custody or effective control of the individual's country of origin, any other foreign country, or any other foreign entity if there is a confirmed case of any individual transferred from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the same country or entity who engaged in terrorist activity subsequent to their transfer. This section would allow the Secretary of Defense to waive certain certification requirements if the Secretary determines that alternative actions will be taken, that actions taken will substantially mitigate risks posed by the individual to be transferred, and that the transfer is in the national security interests of the United States. Whenever the Secretary uses the waiver, the Secretary must provide a report that includes a copy of the waiver and determination, a statement of the basis for the determination, and a summary of the alternative actions to be taken. The section would also require the certification to include a description for the cooperation for which favorable consideration was so given and a description of operational outcomes, if any, affected by such cooperation. Finally, this section would repeal current law, as contained in section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66).

This provision would expire once a plan for the disposition of all detainees is submitted to Congress and that plan is approved by Congress, as provided for in a subsequent section. The notification requirements of section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) would, at that point, govern foreign transfers.

**Authority to temporarily transfer individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States for emergency or critical medical treatment (sec. 1034)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow for the temporary transfer of detainees held at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to

a Department of Defense medical facility in the United States for the sole purpose of providing the individual medical treatment if the Secretary determines that: the medical treatment is necessary to prevent death or imminent significant injury or harm to the health of the individual; the medical treatment is not available to be provided at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, without incurring excessive and unreasonable costs; the estimated costs of the treatment would be cheaper in the United States; and the Department of Defense has provided for appropriate security measures for the custody and control of the individual during any period in which the individual is temporarily in the United States. The provision also requires notice to Congress and limitations on the exercise of the authority to provide that the individual will be returned to United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba.

**Prohibition on use of funds for transfer or release to Yemen of individuals detained at United States Naval Facility, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1035)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the use of funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of any individual detained in the custody or under the control of the Department of Defense at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the custody or control of the Republic of Yemen or any entity within Yemen.

**Report on current detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, determined or assessed to be high risk or medium risk (sec. 1036).**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a report to Congress, in unclassified form, listing the names of all individuals detained at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, who have been assessed by the Joint Task Force Guantanamo to be a high or medium risk to the United States, its interests, or allies.

**Report to Congress on memoranda of understanding with foreign countries regarding transfer of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 1037).**

The committee recommends a provision that would require a report of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the written memorandum of understanding between the United States Government and the government of the foreign country concerned regarding each individual detained at Guantanamo transferred to a foreign country during the 18-month period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act or, if there was no written memorandum of understanding, the report shall contain an unclassified statement of that fact.

**Semiannual Reports on use of United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and any other Department of Defense or Bureau of Prisons prison or other detention or disciplinary facility in recruitment and other propaganda of terrorist organizations (sec. 1038).**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress every 6 months on the use of Department of Defense and Bureau of Prisons detention facilities for recruitment and as propaganda by terrorist organizations.

**Extension and modification of authority to make rewards for combating terrorism (sec. 1039)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify and extend section 127b of title 10, United States Code. This section authorizes the payment of a monetary amount, or provision of a payment-in-kind, to a person as a reward for providing U.S. Government personnel, or government personnel of allied forces participating in a combined operation with the U.S. armed forces, with information or nonlethal assistance that is beneficial to an operation or activity against international terrorism or beneficial to force protection.

**Subtitle E—Miscellaneous Authorities and Limitations**

**Assistance to secure the southern land border of the United States (sec. 1041)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with concurrence of the Secretary of Homeland Security, to provide assistance to U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the purpose of increasing the ongoing efforts to secure the southern land border of the United States.

The committee is concerned about the security of the U.S. southern land border and notes that in testimony on March 12, 2015, Admiral William Gortney, Commander of U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) stated that “the southern border can be more secure.” At the same hearing General John Kelly, Commander of U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) testified that “with the amount of drugs and people that move across our southwest border, it doesn’t seem all that secure to me.”

The committee supports ongoing efforts by the Department of Defense (DOD) to provide additional assistance to secure the southern land border of the United States and urges DOD to continue these efforts and coordinate with the Secretary of Homeland Security to identify opportunities to provide additional support.

**Protection of Department of Defense installations (sec. 1042)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to protect the buildings, grounds, and property that are under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the Department of Defense (DOD) and persons on that property. The provision provides that the Secretary may designate personnel to: (1) Enforce federal laws and regulations for the protection of persons and property; (2) Carry firearms; (3) Make arrests; and (4) Conduct



investigations of offenses against the property of the DOD. This new authority would not apply in those locations currently under the protection of the Federal Protective Service, for example, office buildings provided by the General Services Administration in which DOD organizations are tenants.

**Strategy to protect United States national security interests in the Arctic region (sec. 1043)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act a report that sets forth an updated military strategy for the protection of United States national security interests in the Arctic region.

**Extension of limitations on the transfer to the regular Army of AH-64 Apache helicopters assigned to the Army National Guard (sec. 1044)**

The committee recommends a provision that would strike “March 31, 2016” each place it appears and inserting “September 30, 2016” in Section 1712 of the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015. The provision would also strike “fiscal year 2015” and insert “fiscal years 2015 and 2016.”

**Treatment of certain previously transferred Army National Guard helicopters as counting against number transferrable under exception to limitation on transfer of Army National Guard helicopters (sec. 1045)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Army not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act to submit a report to the congressional defense committees the number of AH-64 Apaches that have been transferred from the Army National Guard (ARNG) to the original equipment manufacturer for remanufacture. The Secretary of the Army shall treat the number of helicopters specified in the report as counting against the total number of AH-64s that may be transferred from the ARNG to the regular Army pursuant to the Carl Levin National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015.

**Management of military technicians (sec. 1046)**

The committee recommends a provision that would convert not less than 20 percent of the general administration, clerical, and office service occupation positions identified in the report of the Secretary of Defense under section 519 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1397) from military technician (dual status) positions to positions filled by individuals who are employed under section 3103 of title 5, United States Code, by no later than January 1, 2017. The committee also recommends the phased-in termination of military technicians (non-dual status) to begin on January 1, 2017.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit by February 1, 2016, to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the Comptroller General of the United States, a report setting forth the Department of Defense’s plan for converting military technician (dual status) posi-

tions to positions filled by individuals who are employed under section 3103 of title 5, United States Code, to include: (1) An analysis of placing such individuals under the control and authority of the State Adjutants General; (2) an analysis of the employment rights that will now be granted to such individuals; (3) an analysis of any statutory change the Secretary believes is necessary to execute this provision; and (4) such other mechanisms for implementation that the Secretary shall recommend, as appropriate.

**Sense of Congress on consideration of the full range of Department of Defense manpower worldwide in decisions on the proper mix of military, civilian, and contractor personnel to accomplish the national defense strategy (sec. 1047)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express a sense of the Congress that as the Department of Defense makes decisions on military end strength requests, proper sizing of the civilian workforce, and the proper mix of these sources of manpower with contractor personnel to accomplish the National Defense Strategy, the Secretary of Defense should consider the full range of manpower available to the Secretary in all locations worldwide without arbitrarily or exempting any particular group or location of manpower.

**Sense of the Senate on the United States Marine Corps (sec. 1048)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, should remain the Nation's expeditionary crisis response force and that the Marine Corps should be organized, trained, and equipped in the manner and for such purposes specified in section 5063 of title 10, United States Code.

**Subtitle F—Studies and Reports**

**Repeal of reporting requirements (sec. 1061)**

The committee recommends a provision that would eliminate certain required reports. Specifically, the provision would repeal the following report requirements:

- (1) Annual reports on gifts made for the benefit of military musical units required by Section 974(d) of title 10, United States Code;
- (2) Biennial report on space, science, and technology strategy required by Section 2272(a) of title 10, United States Code;
- (3) Annual reports on prizes for advanced technology achievements required by Section 2374(a) of title 10, United States Code;
- (4) Reports on use of temporary authorities for certain positions at DoD research and engineering facilities required by Section 1107 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66);
- (5) Annual reports on advancing small business growth required by Section 1611 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66);

(6) Annual reports on quality assurance programs for medical evaluation boards and related personnel required by Section 524 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239);

(7) Annual impact statement on number of members in integrated disability evaluation system on readiness requirements required by Section 528 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239);

(8) Sense of Congress on notice of unfunded priorities required by Section 1003 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239);

(9) Annual updates on implementation plan for whole-of-government vision prescribed in the national security strategy required by Section 1072 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81);

(10) Reports on Defense Research and Development Rapid Innovation Program required by Section 1073 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383);

(11) Reports on Task Force for Business and Stability Operations in Afghanistan required by Section 1535(a) of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383);

(12) Annual report on the electronic warfare strategy of the Department of Defense required by Section 1053 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84);

(13) Reports on Mitigation of power outage risks for Department of Defense facilities and activities required by Section 335 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417);

(14) Updates of increases in number of units of Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps (JROTC) required by Section 548 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417);

(15) Annual reports on Center of Excellence on traumatic extremity injuries and amputations required by Section 723 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417);

(16) Semi-annual reports on status of Navy Next Generation Enterprise Networks Program required by Section 1034 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417);

(17) Biennial requirement to update Strategic Management Plan required by Section 904(d) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181);

(18) Reports on access of recovering servicemembers to adequate outpatient residential facilities required by Section 1662 of the Wounded Warrior Act (title XVI of Public Law 110-181);

(19) Reports on hypersonics development required by Section 218 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364);

(20) Updates of assistance to local educational agencies experiencing growth in enrollment due to force structure change

and other circumstance required by Section 574 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364);

(21) Annual reports on overhaul, repair, and maintenance of vessels under acquisition policy on obtaining carriage by vessel required by Section 1017 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364);

(22) Reports on annual review of roles and missions of the reserve components required by Section 513(h) of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375);

(23) Annual requirement to submit information regarding information technology capital assets required by Section 351 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314);

(24) Reports on Experimental Personnel Management Program for scientific and technical personnel required by Section 1101 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261).

**Termination of requirement for submittal to Congress of reports required of the Department of Defense by statute (sec. 1062)**

The committee recommends a provision that would, 2 years after the date of enactment of the Act, repeal requirements for recurring reports due to Congress. This would include only report requirements in effect on April 1, 2015.

The committee notes the repeated statements by Department of Defense (DOD) officials on the high number and low utility of some of the recurring reports due to Congress and how the information contained in the reports are often included in other DOD publications.

**Annual submittal to Congress of munitions assessments (sec. 1063)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, not later than March 1, 2016, and each year thereafter, the most current Department of Defense Munitions and Munitions Sufficiency Assessments, as defined in Department of Defense Instruction 3000.04. The provision would also require the Department of Defense to provide the committees the most recently approved Joint Requirements Oversight Council memo resulting from the annual Munitions Requirements Process.

The committee is concerned by the current lack of insight into the requirements driving munitions budgetary decisions and intends to conduct rigorous oversight to ensure actions taken by the Department of Defense adequately address the munitions needs of the Armed Forces. Additionally, the committee intends to focus on the status and planning for munitions stateside infrastructure, transport capability, in-theater storage capacity, and their influence on requirements and combat capability.

**Potential role for United States ground forces in the Pacific theater (sec. 1064)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to conduct a comprehensive operational assessment of a potential future role for U.S. ground forces in the island chains of the western Pacific in creating anti-access/area denial (A2/AD) capabilities in cooperation with host nations to deter and defeat aggression in the region.

The provision would require the assessment of the effectiveness of ground-force deployment of a series of systems and capabilities, including anti-ship mines and missiles, mobile air defense systems, electronic warfare capabilities, communications networks, and maneuver forces to deny access to adversaries, enhance host-nation defenses, and protect U.S. air and naval forces.

The provision would also require an assessment of the geopolitical impact of a long-term U.S. engagement with the island nations of the region to implement a ground forces-based A2/AD strategy. The provision stipulates that the assessment utilize (1) rigorous operations research techniques, war games, and historical analyses of World War II operations; and (2) the resources of Joint Requirements and Analysis Division and the Warfighting Analysis Division of the Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment Directorate of the Joint Staff, the war colleges of the military services, the Office of Net Assessment, United States Pacific Command, and appropriate Federally Funded Research and Development Centers.

Finally, the provision would require the Secretary and the Chairman to complete the assessment within 1 year of the date of enactment, and to brief the results to the appropriate committees of Congress.

The committee is aware that the Office of Net Assessment, the RAND Arroyo center, and the Center for Naval Analyses have already sponsored and conducted multiple studies of potential roles for ground forces in the Pacific theater. These studies suggest the possibility that ground forces could become a pivotal factor in building a viable security posture in the region. The committee also notes that former Secretary of Defense Hagel discussed elements of this concept in a speech to the Association of the United States Army in late 2014. The committee believes that these initial studies justify a significantly more serious examination of the merits of this proposal.

**Subtitle G—Other Matters**

**Technical and clerical amendments (sec. 1081)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make technical and clerical corrections to title 10, United States Code, and various National Defense Authorization Acts.

**Authority to provide training and support to personnel of foreign ministries of defense (sec. 1082)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide training to personnel of foreign ministries of defense (or ministries with security force oversight),

or regional organizations with security missions for the purpose of: (1) enhancing civilian oversight of foreign security forces; (2) establishing responsible defense governance and internal controls in order to help build effective, transparent, and accountable defense institutions; (3) assessing organizational weaknesses and establishing a roadmap for addressing shortfalls; and (4) enhancing ministerial, general or joint staff, service level core competencies such as personnel and readiness, acquisition and logistics, strategy and policy, and financial management.

**Expansion of outreach for veterans transitioning from serving on Active Duty (sec. 1083)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend subsection (c)(2) of section 5 of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act (Public Law 114–2) to expand outreach for veterans transitioning from Active Duty to inform those individuals of community oriented veteran peer support networks and other support programs available to them.

**Modification of certain requirements applicable to major medical facility lease for a Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Tulsa, Oklahoma (sec. 1084)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make modifications to the requirements associated with the amount of usable space, and the length of the lease, for a major veteran’s medical facility in Tulsa, Oklahoma before entering into such a lease.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Air and Missile Defense Radar backfit**

The Navy designed the Air and Missile Defense Radar (AMDR) to be fully scalable and modular to support a variety of shipboard radar applications on a variety of platforms. The first AMDR will be on the second DDG–51 destroyer in the fiscal year 2016 shipbuilding program. As can be seen with the Aegis Ashore program, ship-based radars such as AMDR also provide the foundation for land-based applications.

The committee directs the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition (ASN (RDA)) to provide a report to congressional defense committees on the Navy’s plan to employ AMDR technology in existing and future platforms across the fleet. Additionally, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to report to the congressional defense committees on whether and to what extent the Department of Defense could exploit the AMDR scalability across radar acquisitions by the Army, Air Force, and Missile Defense Agency to realize greater affordability through economies of scale. These reports shall be provided with the fiscal year 2017 budget submission.

**Analysis of domestic Department of Defense installations’ gas and oil reserves**

The committee notes that several domestic military installations are located on proven reserves of natural gas and oil. In some

cases, such installations may benefit from energy developmental projects that provide energy resiliency while also reducing energy costs. Recognizing that tapping into an installation's gas and oil reserves for military purposes has only recently become economically feasible, the Committee needs to understand the possible costs and benefits, as well as the statutory and regulatory issues associated with such a development effort.

Therefore, the committee directs the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations, and Environment, not later than March 1, 2016, to provide an analysis of major Department of Defense installations with likely gas and oil reserves, the expected quality of the gas and oil reserves, the estimated costs and savings of producing gas and oil at such installations, the statutory and regulatory challenges to implementing such energy development projects, potential mission and environmental impacts from such energy development projects, and recommendations for which installations, if any, may benefit from such development.

**Comptroller General of the United States study on options for the Department of Defense close air support mission**

The committee is concerned that the Air Force does not appear to be devoting appropriate attention to the close air support (CAS) mission and capabilities for which it is largely responsible. As such, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a review of the close air support mission with emphasis on:

- (1) Review of historical proposals for distributing close air support responsibilities and force structure among the services;
- (2) The extent to which the Department of Defense has defined CAS requirements and allocated responsibilities and force structure among the services to meet those requirements; and
- (3) The extent to which the Department has evaluated options for distributing CAS responsibilities and capabilities across the services and whether those need to be redistributed, including whether the Air Force's A-10 aircraft fleet and supporting infrastructure could feasibly be transferred to the Army and/or the Marine Corps.

The committee is aware the Comptroller General is conducting a study directed by section 133 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 11309291) to specifically assess platforms used to conduct the close air support mission in light of the recommendation by the Air Force to retire the A-10 fleet. While related, the committee recommends the study in this provision take a broader perspective across the Department with regard to the close air support mission.

The Comptroller General shall brief the committee on his preliminary results by September 30, 2015, with a formal report to be provided, as appropriate, at a later date as agreed to with the committee.

### **Congressional Defense Review to Prepare for Future Strategic Challenges**

For the past 14 years, the United States has been engaged in a long war against terrorist and violent extremist groups. The committee believes that this conflict will persist, at one level or another, across multiple theaters of operation, for some time to come, and that winning this war must be a top priority of the U.S. military and the Department of Defense (DOD).

At the same time, the committee is deeply concerned by the growth of more traditional security threats posed by powerful states, such as China and Russia, and rogue regimes such as Iran and North Korea. States such as these are modernizing their military capabilities, developing advanced technologies that could undermine U.S. military advantages—from precision-guided munitions and advanced sensors, to undersea-warfare and unmanned systems, to offensive cyber and space capabilities—and pursuing strategies that seek to deter the United States from achieving its national security interests and meeting its commitments to allies and partners.

Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter captured this new military challenge well when he said “for decades, U.S. global power projection has relied on the ships, planes, bases, aircraft carriers, satellite networks, and other advanced capabilities that comprise our military’s unrivaled technological edge. But today that superiority is being challenged in unprecedented ways.” In short, for the first time in three decades, the United States faces a potential turning point where our nation’s long-standing military advantages threaten to be eroded by new shifts in the balance of military power.

Accordingly, over the coming 18 months, the committee plans to conduct a comprehensive review of the roles, capabilities/size of the U.S. Armed Forces and DOD in meeting, and succeeding against, these new security challenges, especially those posed by the growing anti-access/area denial capabilities of U.S. adversaries. This review will utilize open hearings, classified briefings, the Government Accountability Office, the Congressional Research Service, Federally Funded Research and Development Centers, and consultation with former senior defense and military leaders and other national security experts. Building on the series of strategy-focused hearings that the committee has already conducted, the committee will deepen its oversight of military strategy while also delving deeper into intelligence and threat assessments, contingency planning, force structure and posture, joint concept development, domestic and overseas basing and infrastructure, theater and strategic lift requirements, munition quality and quantity, and institutional and personnel reforms. The committee will also review civilian personnel policy, DOD infrastructure, and acquisition policies and practices to bring them more into line with the needs of the future.

Ultimately, the committee intends to review each of the major defense acquisition programs and its related industrial base to determine whether they are sufficient and appropriate to meet developing national security challenges. This review will take nothing for granted and will evaluate each program, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in the broader context of the roles, missions, re-



quirements, and other capabilities of the armed services, as well as emerging technologies that could significantly alter previous assumptions underpinning the current programs of record. The committee's future budgetary decisions will be based on the outcome of this strategic review.

The committee acknowledges that for this review to be successful it will require a sustained commitment of many years and potentially multiple chairmen. The much-heralded "offset strategy" of the 1970s required a tremendous amount of intellectual capital and research and development dollars invested over the course of a decade before capabilities like stealth, precision-guided-munitions, and advanced sensors could be effectively deployed. Nevertheless, it is possible to embark upon a new period of sustained military innovation today if DOD, the military services, and industry can be aligned towards this goal. The committee intends to use all of the resources at its disposal to this end.

#### **Cruiser and dock landing ship phased modernization**

The committee is concerned by the partial funding of the Navy cruiser and dock landing ship phased modernization plan. Section 1026 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) and section 8110 of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235) expressed the intent of the congressional defense committees. While the Navy is inducting two guided missile cruisers per year into phased modernization status in fiscal years 2015 and 2016 consistent with that plan, the committee understands the manpower and operations funding for the remaining seven cruisers in the Navy's fiscal year 2015 phased modernization plan are not funded in the future years defense program (FYDP) beyond fiscal year 2016. The committee also understands the Navy is employing a similar partial funding scheme with the three dock landing ships identified for phased modernization.

The committee is concerned by the Navy's failure to program the funds required to continue the phased modernization program approved in section 1026. The committee recommends that the Navy continue to use resources from the Ship Modernization, Operations and Sustainment Fund until they are exhausted. However, beginning with the budget request for fiscal year 2017, the committee directs the Navy to request full funding in fiscal year 2017 and throughout the FYDP for the phased modernization program for cruisers and dock landing ships in the regular appropriations accounts. The committee expects the Navy to fully program across the FYDP for all manpower, readiness, and modernization associated with its phased modernization plan.

#### **Human industrial operations augmentation technology**

The committee is aware of the Department of the Navy's interest in human industrial operations augmentation technology that improves the health and safety of the workforce and reduces the high total ownership cost (TOC) of assets, including U.S. Navy aircraft carriers, surface ships, and submarines. Technological advances are needed to help reduce the labor component of TOC by increasing

productivity, improving quality, and reducing costs associated with workplace injuries, including injuries related to repetitive motions. Exoskeleton-based human augmentation has the potential to remove much of the physical strain from workers who use hand-held tools during the construction, maintenance, repair, and disposal of Navy assets. The application of exoskeleton-based human augmentation technology has the potential to increase productivity and quality while decreasing injury rates, thus significantly improving workforce welfare and reducing TOC.

The committee encourages the Navy to continue to identify commercially-available human industrial operations augmentation technologies that could improve the health and safety of the workforce and reduce the TOC of assets.

#### **National Guard Counterdrug Program**

The committee notes that the Department of Defense (DOD) requests funding annually to support the National Guard Counterdrug Program (CDP). The committee believes that the CDP plays an important role in providing military-specific capabilities and expertise resident within the National Guard to support the counterdrug activities of federal, state, and local authorities. The committee notes that budgetary pressures have led DOD to decrease the annual budget request for the CDP in recent years, which the committee understands may have caused some disruption or curtailment of CDP operations and activities. The committee encourages DOD to continue its support, to the extent practicable, for the CDP and to provide sufficient funding to ensure the effectiveness and sustainability of the program. The committee understands that the National Guard Bureau has expressed concerns about its ability to execute funding for the CDP in a timely manner. The committee encourages DOD to work with the National Guard Bureau to improve fiscal management and execution rates for the CDP and expects to receive periodic updates on the CDP, to include ongoing and planned CDP programs, budget execution rates, and lessons learned.

#### **Shipbuilding industrial base and workload allocation**

The committee understands the Navy is reviewing a 2002 agreement, commonly referred to as the DDG/LPD SWAP 1 agreement, and the subsequent SWAP 2 agreement. Prior to award of the LPD-28 detail design and construction contract and any final decision relating to the SWAP agreements, the Secretary of the Navy is directed to provide the congressional defense committees with a report of the options considered and the rationale used to arrive at the determination.

#### **Unmanned Carrier-Launched Surveillance and Strike (UCLASS) Program**

The committee believes that survivable, air-refuelable, unmanned combat aircraft are critical for countering emerging anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) challenges to U.S. power projection. In this context, the committee views sea-based unmanned combat aircraft as particularly important for giving aircraft carrier air wings an enduring role in the joint family of airborne, long-range, surveil-

lance-strike systems—and thus, maintaining the operational effectiveness and strategic utility of the U.S. carrier fleet. Based on the progress to date in the ongoing Unmanned Combat Air System Demonstration program, the committee is confident that, while additional risk-reduction and experimentation appears necessary, low- to medium-risk acquisition of advanced carrier-based, unmanned combat aircraft could be feasible in the 2020–2025 timeframe.

The committee remains concerned, however, that the Navy’s current requirements for the UCLASS program place disproportionate emphasis on unrefueled endurance to support organic ISR support to the carrier strike group.

The committee sees great promise in the integration of unmanned combat aircraft into future carrier air wings. The committee notes with concern that absent a restructuring of the planned carrier air wing that incorporates unmanned combat aircraft in operationally significant numbers, the relevance of the aircraft carrier—the centerpiece of American global power projection capability—may increasingly be called into question by friends and prospective adversaries alike.



## **TITLE XI—CIVILIAN PERSONNEL MATTERS**

### **Legislative Provisions**

#### **Required probationary period for new employees of the Department of Defense (sec. 1101)**

The committee recommends a provision that would set the required probationary period for new employees of the Department of Defense at 2 years. The provision would also give discretionary authority to the service secretary concerned to extend a probationary period of a new employee of the Department of Defense.

#### **Delay of periodic step increase for civilian employees of the Department of Defense based upon unacceptable performance (sec. 1102)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to encourage employee performance by requiring satisfactory performance for purposes of completion of service required for periodic step increases.

The committee notes that this provision is based on a recommendation of the New Beginnings Design Team, which was composed of management-labor personnel who came from across the country and represented all ranks and a wide range of professional backgrounds to examine the Department of Defense performance management system and to review the statutes and regulations that govern federal hiring.

#### **Procedures for reduction in force of Department of Defense civilian personnel (sec. 1103)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to establish procedures to provide that, in implementing any reduction in force for civilian positions in the Department of Defense in the competitive service or the excepted service, the determination of which employees shall be separated from employment in the Department of Defense shall be made primarily on the basis of performance.

#### **United States Cyber Command workforce (sec. 1104)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide enhanced hiring and retention authorities to the Secretary of Defense for civilians on the staff of the United States Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) and the elements of the CYBERCOM components of the armed services. These enhanced authorities are modeled after the personnel authorities in title 10 provided for the staff of the intelligence components of the Department of Defense. These authorities are also similar to those that Congress provided in 2014 for the cyber workforce at the Department of Homeland Security. The com-

mittee believes that these authorities are a very important factor in attracting and retaining the high caliber of personnel that are critical to the execution of the cyber warfare mission of the Department.

The provision also would require the Secretary of Defense to provide a plan to Congress on implementation of these authorities, and an annual report from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management on how the authorities are being used.

**One-year extension of authority to waive annual limitation on premium pay and aggregate limitation on pay for federal civilian employees working overseas (sec. 1105)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1101 of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417), as most recently amended by section 1101 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), to extend through 2016 the authority of heads of executive agencies to waive limitation on the aggregate of basic and premium pay of employees who perform work in an overseas location that is in the area of responsibility of the commander, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), or a location that was formerly in CENTCOM but has been moved to an area of responsibility for the Commander, U.S. Africa Command, in support of a military operation or an operation in response to a declared emergency.

**Five-year extension of expedited hiring authority for designated defense acquisition workforce positions (sec. 1106)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the expedited hiring authority for designated defense acquisition workforce positions for 5 years.

**One-year extension of discretionary authority to grant allowances, benefits, and gratuities to civilian personnel on official duty in a combat zone (sec. 1107)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1603(a) of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (Public Law 109–234; 122 Stat. 443), to extend for 1 year the discretionary authority of the head of a federal agency to provide allowances, benefits and gratuities comparable to those provided by the Secretary of State to members of the Foreign Service under section 413 and chapter 9 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–465), if such individual is on official duty in Pakistan or a combat zone as defined by section 112(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

**Extension of rate of overtime pay for Department of the Navy employees performing work aboard or dockside in support of the nuclear aircraft carrier forward deployed in Japan (sec. 1108)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 5542(a)(6)(B) of title 5, United States Code, to extend for 1 year the authority for a civilian employee of the Department of the Navy who is assigned to temporary duty to perform work aboard, or dockside in direct support of, the nuclear aircraft carrier that is forward deployed in Japan to receive overtime pay.

**Expansion of temporary authority to make direct appointments of candidates possessing bachelor's degrees to scientific and engineering positions at science and technology reinvention laboratories (sec. 1109)**

The committee notes that the rapid hiring authorities, originally authorized by section 1107(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), have enabled Defense laboratories to better compete with the private sector for the best technical talent emerging from our Nation's science and engineering universities. However, the committee also notes these authorities are still limiting the number of talented individuals that can be brought on board.

Consequently, the committee recommends enhancing the ability of Defense laboratories to rapidly hire world-class technical talent by increasing the limit on the number of bachelor's degree holders hired under these streamlined procedures from 3 percent to 5 percent of total scientific personnel. This provision would bring the limit on bachelor's degree candidates in line with current limits on master's and doctoral level candidates.

**Extension of authority for the civilian acquisition workforce personnel demonstration project (sec. 1110)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1762, title 10, United States Code, to extend the Civilian Acquisition Workforce Personnel Demonstration Project under that section through December 31, 2020.

**Pilot program on dynamic shaping of the workforce to improve the technical skills and expertise at certain Department of Defense laboratories (sec. 1111)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Department of Defense (DOD) laboratories to more dynamically shape their technical workforces to maintain consistency with the accelerating pace of technological change and to meet DOD science and technology mission needs as effectively and efficiently as possible. The committee notes that the workforces of the defense laboratories provide technical support to deployed operational forces, support acquisition programs with technical and engineering expertise to control costs and improve performance, manage complex research and development programs on behalf of taxpayers, and perform world-class, cutting edge research. As technology evolves and accelerates, the laboratories need to build and shape continuously the technical skills in their workforces and effectively move into

new technical mission areas, including laser weapons, cyber security, cognitive science, biotechnology, and other cutting-edge fields of research.

The committee notes that current personnel policies and practices present barriers to the ability of the laboratories to reshape their workforces and to meet technical needs. As a result, the provision would authorize a pilot program that would enable laboratory directors to hire technical experts into flexible length and renewable term appointments. A recent Institute for Defense Analyses study, “Federal Term Appointment Hiring Authorities for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Personnel,” indicated that the use of these term appointments for science and technology missions had a number of benefits, including increased agency control in shaping its STEM workforce to meet current and anticipated needs, improved management of research portfolios through use of expertise from industry and academia, and enhanced ability to recruit high-quality term applicants to work and manage high priority research efforts. The committee believes that these types of appointments are also more consistent with the career ambitions of younger scientists and engineers, who are in general less attracted by the “employment-for-life” model historically favored by federal research institutions.

The provision would also authorize flexibility in applying existing authorities for accessing the expertise of recently retired technical personnel and in offering voluntary early retirement and voluntary separation incentives. The provision would make these workforce shaping tools more readily available to laboratory directors, enabling them to better shape the technical skill mix of the laboratories.

**Pilot program on temporary exchange of financial management and acquisition personnel (sec. 1112)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of the temporary assignment of financial management and acquisition personnel to nontraditional defense contractors as defined by section 2303(9) of title 10, United States Code, and of covered employees of such contractors to the Department of Defense. Nontraditional defense contractors are commercial companies who either do not do business with the Department of Defense or do so exclusively through commercial terms and conditions. The committee believes that any exchange of government personnel with industry designed to improve skills and knowledge of finance and acquisition should be with those types of firms that do not traditionally do business with the Department of Defense and as such may offer different business management approaches to address similar problems. These firms also do not pose the same potential conflict of interest concerns that any exchange with a traditional defense contractor would pose. This authority would expire on September 30, 2019.



**Pilot program on enhanced pay authorities for certain acquisition and technology positions in the Department of Defense (sec. 1113)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a pilot program to assess the feasibility and advisability of using a higher level pay authority to attract and retain high quality acquisition and technology experts in positions responsible for management and developing complex, high cost, technological acquisition efforts of the Department of Defense. The committee is concerned that in some cases the Department of Defense cannot competitively compensate the senior level government program managers and engineers required for the government to oversee major defense acquisition programs. This provision would allow in select cases for the Department of Defense to pay a higher rate of compensation to recruit and retain senior acquisition officials who are exceptionally well qualified. These officials would be limited to a 5 year term that should correspond to a major weapons systems program development or execution period as defined elsewhere in this Act. This authority would expire on October 1, 2020.

**Pilot program on direct hire authority for veteran technical experts into the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 1114)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a 5-year pilot program for the service acquisition executives of each military department to directly appoint qualified veteran candidates for scientific, technical, engineering, and mathematics positions in the defense acquisition activities. This direct hire authority would be limited to no more than 1 percent of the total number of positions in the acquisition workforce in each military department that are filled as of the close of the previous fiscal year.

**Direct hire authority for technical experts into the defense acquisition workforce (sec. 1115)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the service secretaries of each military department to directly appoint qualified candidates possessing a scientific or engineering degree to positions in the defense acquisition activities. This direct hire authority would be limited to no more than 5 percent of the total number of scientific and engineering positions in the acquisition workforce in each military department that are filled as of the close of the previous fiscal year. This authority would expire December 31, 2020.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Report on comparison of cost performance of functions by Department of Defense civilian personnel with cost of performance of functions by Department contractors**

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the Comptroller General of the United States, a report setting forth the results of a study, conducted by the Secretary for the purposes of the report, of a comparison of the

fully-burdened cost of performance of functions by Department of Defense (DOD) civilian personnel with the fully-burdened cost of the performance of functions by DOD contractors by no later than February 1, 2016. The study shall include:

(1) an assessment of performance of such functions at six DOD installations selected by the Secretary for purposes of the study from among DOD installations at which functions are performed by an appropriate mix of civilian personnel and contractors, with four such installations to be located in the continental United States and two such installations to be located outside the continental United States;

(2) an accounting of the fully-burdened cost of DOD civilian personnel and contractors performing functions for DOD (including costs associated with training, benefits, reimbursable costs under chapter 43 of title 41, United States Code, and facility overhead) in order to permit a direct comparison between the cost of performance of functions by DOD civilian personnel and the cost of the performance of functions by contractors;

(3) a comparison of the cost of performance of the full range of functions, required expertise, and managerial qualities required to adequately perform the function to be compared, including:

(a) secretarial, clerical, or administrative duties, including data entry;

(b) mid-level managers and other personnel possessing special expertise or professional qualifications;

(c) managers and other leadership; and

(d) personnel responsible for producing congressionally-directed reports.

The committee recommends that, in conducting the study, the Secretary should take into account the policy that inherently governmental functions vital to the national security of the United States may not be performed by contractor personnel. The report required shall include an assessment of the flexible employment authorities available to the Secretary for the employment and retention of civilian employees of the DOD, including an identification of such additional flexible employment authorities as the Secretary considers appropriate to shape the civilian personnel workforce of the DOD. Not later than 120 days after receipt of such report, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report that includes an assessment of the adequacy and sufficiency of the report submitted by the Secretary, including any recommendations for policy or statutory change as the Comptroller deems appropriate.

#### **Report on Department of Defense application of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act**

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the results of a study, conducted by the Comptroller General for the purposes of the report, due no later than February 1, 2015, to examine the military services' application of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (FECA) to determine: (1) whether the FECA program

creates disincentives to return to work; (2) whether the Services have appropriate access to the FECA database in order to validate and examine employee injury records to manage return-to-work outcomes; (3) whether FECA benefits may be converted to retirement benefits at retirement age; and (4) how many non-working employees remain on the Services' payrolls despite being over social security retirement age.



## **TITLE XII—MATTERS RELATING TO FOREIGN NATIONS**

### **Subtitle A—Training and Assistance**

#### **One-year extension of funding limitations for authority to build the capacity of foreign security forces (sec. 1201)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for 1 year the funding limitations for the Department of Defense to build the capacity of foreign security forces under section 2282, title 10, United States Code.

#### **Extension, expansion, and modification of authority for reimbursement to the Government of Jordan for border security operations (sec. 1202)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize assistance to the Governments of Jordan and Lebanon in any fiscal year through fiscal year 2020 for the purposes of supporting and enhancing efforts of those governments to support and sustain security along their borders with Syria and/or Iraq. Regarding assistance to the Government of Lebanon, the provision would prohibit reimbursement of Hezbollah or any forces other than the armed forces of Lebanon.

The actions of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and other terrorist groups present a serious threat to Jordan and Lebanon. As such, it is in the United States' national security interest to respond to this increased threat to Jordan and Lebanon by providing the necessary assistance.

#### **Extension of authority to conduct activities to enhance the capability of foreign countries to respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction (sec. 1203)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to provide Weapons of Mass Destruction incident response training and basic equipment to foreign first responders until September 30, 2018.

#### **Redesignation, modification, and permanent extension of National Guard State Partnership Program (sec. 1204)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2014 (Public Law 114–66) to provide for the extension of the Department of Defense State Partnership Program and direct the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and Under Secretary of Defense (Policy) to conduct a advisability and feasibility study as to whether a central fund should be created to support the activities associated with the State Partnership Program.

**Authority to provide support to national military forces of allied countries for counterterrorism operations in Africa (sec. 1205)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize through September 30, 2018 the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide, on a non-reimbursable basis, logistic support, supplies, and services to the national military forces of an allied country conducting counterterrorism operations in Africa if the Secretary of Defense determines that the provision of such support is (1) in the national security interests of the United States; and (2) critical to the timely and effective participation of such national military forces in such operations.

The committee's intent is for this authority to address situations similar to ongoing U.S. support to Operation Barkhane, a French-led counterterrorism operation in the Sahel region of Africa that, to date, has been funded under an emergency declaration by the president under section 506(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195), as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2318(a)(1).

**Authority to build the capacity of foreign military intelligence forces (sec. 1206)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Director of National Intelligence and Secretary of State, to provide intelligence training to foreign military intelligence units to increase partner capacity.

**Prohibition on assistance to entities in Yemen controlled by the Houthi movement (sec. 1207)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit assistance to an entity in Yemen controlled by members of the Houthi movement unless the Secretary of Defense determines the provision of such assistance is important to the national security interests of the United States.

**Report on potential support for the vetted Syrian opposition (sec. 1208)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the military support the Secretary considers necessary to provide to recipients of assistance under section 1209 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) upon their return to Syria.

**Subtitle B—Matters Relating to Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq**

**Drawdown of United States forces in Afghanistan (sec. 1221)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that:

- (1) the drawdown of United States forces in Afghanistan should be based on security conditions in Afghanistan and U.S. security interests in the region; and

(2) as the Afghan National Defense Security Forces continue to develop security capability and capacity, an appropriate U.S. and international presence should continue, upon invitation by the Government of Afghanistan, to provide adequate capability and capacity to retain gains made to date and continue counterterrorism operations in Afghanistan against terrorist organizations that can threaten United States interests or the U.S. homeland.

The provision would also require a certification by the President to the congressional defense committees that the reduction of U.S. forces in Afghanistan will result in an acceptable level of risk to U.S. national security objectives taking into consideration the security conditions on the ground. The provision would provide for a waiver of such certification with an associated notification.

**Extension and modification of Commanders' Emergency Response Program (sec.1222)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make up to \$10.0 million available during fiscal year 2016 for the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP) in Afghanistan under section 1201 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81) as amended. The provision would also authorize certain payments to redress injury and loss in Iraq in accordance with the authorities and limitations in section 8121 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2015 (division C of Public Law 113-235), other than subsection (h) of such section.

**Extension of authority to transfer defense articles and provide defense services to the military and security forces of Afghanistan (sec. 1223)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through December 31, 2016, the authority under section 1222 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) to transfer defense articles being drawn down in Afghanistan, and to provide defense services in connection with such transfers, to the military and security forces of Afghanistan. The provision would also extend through fiscal year 2016 the exemption for excess defense articles (EDA) transferred from Department of Defense stocks in Afghanistan from counting toward the annual limitation on the aggregate value of EDA transferred under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (Public Law 87-195).

**Extension and modification of authority for reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations (sec. 1224)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend for fiscal year 2016 the authority to make Coalition Support Funds (CSF) payments under section 1233 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), as amended. Under this section the Secretary of Defense may use CSF to reimburse certain or designated nations for support provided to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Afghanistan or to use

such funds to provide specialized training or loan specialized equipment to key nations participating in coalition operations in Afghanistan. The provision would limit the total amount of CSF that could be provided in fiscal year 2016 to \$1.2 billion. Of this amount, the amount of CSF that could be provided to Pakistan would be limited to \$900.0 million. The provision would also extend for 1 year certain notifications and certification requirements relating to CSF payments to Pakistan. The provision would extend for 1 year the restriction on the Secretary of Defense from waiving the certification requirements relating to \$300.0 million of the \$900.0 million and add the requirement for the Secretary to certify that the Government of Pakistan has taken actions to promote stability in Afghanistan.

The provision also includes a pilot program that authorizes the use of up to \$100.0 million of the \$900.0 million authorized for Pakistan for stability activities in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas, including for such activities undertaken by the Pakistan military and the Pakistan Frontier Corps Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. The provision would require a report on the use of CSF funds for such activities.

**Prohibition on transfer to violent extremist organizations of equipment or supplies provided by the United States to the Government of Iraq (sec. 1225)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit provision of assistance authorized by section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to an organization determined to be a violent extremist organization. The provision prohibits providing assistance under this authority unless appropriate steps have been taken by the Government of Iraq to safeguard against transferring or otherwise providing such assistance to violent extremist organizations.

The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the congressional defense committees not later than 30 days after a determination by the Secretary that equipment provided pursuant to such authorization has been subsequently transferred to or acquired by a violent extremist organization. The committee is concerned that such equipment, intended to be provided for the purpose of assisting the Government of Iraq, may end up in the possession of violent extremist organizations.

The provision would also require a description of the criteria used to determine which organizations are violent extremist organizations and therefore unsuitable to receive or possess equipment or supplies provided by the United States to the Government of Iraq as well as the end-use monitoring or other policies and procedures put in place to promote accountability. The intent of such policies and procedures is to help prevent transfer to or acquisition by violent extremist organizations that could include certain Shia militias, Sunni extremists, or other groups assessed to have hostile intent towards the United States or United States Armed Forces.



**Report on lines of communication of Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant and other foreign terrorist organizations (sec. 1226)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report on the lines of communication that enable the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant, Jabhat al-Nusra, and other foreign terrorist organizations that facilitate assistance through countries bordering on Syria.

**Modification of protection for Afghan allies (sec. 1227)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa program.

**Extension of authority to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (sec. 1228)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend through fiscal year 2016 the authority under section 1215 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) as amended, for the Secretary of Defense to support the operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSC–I). The provision would authorize the use of up to \$80.0 million in fiscal year 2016 to support OSC–I operations and activities.

The provision would also update reporting requirements to reflect the need for OSC–I to coordinate efforts with assistance provided pursuant to section 1236 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) and the committee’s concern for maintaining accountability of equipment provided to the Government of Iraq.

**Sense of Senate on support for the Kurdistan Regional Government (sec. 1229)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate urging the United States, in coordination with coalition partners, to provide, in an expeditious and responsive manner and without undue delay, security assistance to the security forces of the Kurdistan Regional Government. The committee emphasizes that the defeat of the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant is critical to maintaining a unified and integrated Iraq.

**Subtitle C—Matters Relating to Iran**

**Modification and extension of the annual report on the military power of Iran (sec. 1241)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the annual report on the military power of Iran as required by section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) through 2021, as well as make other modifications.

**Subtitle D—Matters Relating to the Russian Federation****Ukraine security assistance initiative (sec. 1251)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide security assistance and intelligence support to military and other security forces of the Government of Ukraine for the purposes of: (1) enhancing the defensive combat capabilities of the military and other security forces of the Government of Ukraine to defend Ukraine against further aggression; (2) assisting Ukraine in developing combat capability to defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine; and (3) supporting Ukraine in defending itself against actions by Russia and Russian-backed separatists in violation of the ceasefire agreements of September 5, 2014, and February 11, 2015.

The committee notes that the authority granted in this provision would not authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Ukraine for the purpose of conducting combat operations.

The committee is deeply concerned about the continuing aggression by Russia and Russian-backed separatists in violation of the ceasefire and continues to emphasize the importance of providing security assistance and intelligence support, including lethal military assistance, to the Government of Ukraine to build its capacity to defend its territory and sovereignty and to support the integrity of the ceasefire agreement.

The committee notes the commencement of training of Ukrainian security forces using the authority under section 1207 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), as amended, for the Global Security Contingency Fund and supports the expansion of this program to additional units of the Ukrainian Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Defense.

**Eastern European Training Initiative (sec. 1252)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to conduct the Eastern European Training Initiative (EETI) to provide multilateral or regional training, and pay the incremental expenses of participating in such training, for countries in Eastern Europe that are a signatory to the Partnership for Peace Framework Documents but not a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or that became a NATO member after January 1, 1999. The committee notes the purpose of such training is to promote interoperability, improve the ability of participating countries to respond to external threats including from hybrid warfare, and increase the ability of NATO to take collective action when required.

The committee believes that training under the EETI should be provided only to the newer NATO members and appropriate non-NATO countries participating in the NATO Partnership for Peace program, in particular those countries that are at risk or may become at risk of intimidation from external threats to their sovereignty or territorial integrity from neighboring countries.

**Increased presence of United States ground forces in Eastern Europe to deter aggression on the border of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (sec. 1253)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, by the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, assessing options for expanding the presence of U.S. ground forces of the size of a brigade combat team in Eastern Europe to respond, along with European allies and partners, to the security challenges posed by Russia and to increase the combat capability of allied forces to respond to unconventional or hybrid warfare tactics like those used by Russia in Crimea and eastern Ukraine. The committee believes that any increases in the presence of U.S. ground forces in Eastern Europe should be matched by similar increases in the commitment of ground forces by European allies and partners for these purposes.

**Sense of Congress on European Defense and North Atlantic Treaty Organization spending (sec. 1254)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress urging the United States to encourage North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies to meet defense budget commitments made at the Wales Summit in September 2014 and to continue to coordinate defense investments to improve deterrence against Russian aggression and terrorist organizations and more appropriately balance defense spending across the alliance.

**Additional matters in annual report on military and security developments involving the Russian Federation (sec. 1255)**

The committee recommends a provision that would add a reporting requirement to section 1245 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) requiring an assessment of the force structure and capabilities of Russian military forces stationed in the Arctic region, Kaliningrad, and Crimea, as well as an assessment of the Russian military strategy in the Arctic region.

The committee is concerned about increased Russian military activity in the Arctic region and notes that Russian activities and apparent ambitions could present challenges to international law, norms, and agreements relating to the Arctic region.

**Report on alternative capabilities to procure and sustain nonstandard rotary wing aircraft historically procured through Rosoboronexport (sec. 1256)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require an independent assessment directed by the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics in consultation with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to report on the feasibility and advisability of using alternative industrial base capabilities to procure and sustain nonstandard rotary wing aircraft historically acquired through the Russian state corporation Rosoboronexport. The assessment would include an analysis of the

economic impact as well as alterations that would be required for waivers of foreign military sales requirements and procedures for approval of airworthiness certificates.

The committee notes that the use of alternative industrial base capability to divest reliance on Rosoboronexport could benefit United States national security interests, deny financial support to the Russian Federation, and could potentially benefit U.S. and Ukrainian commercial interests.

### **Subtitle E—Matters Relating to the Asia-Pacific Region**

#### **South China Sea Initiative (Sec. 1261)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide equipment, supplies, and training to national military or other security forces of foreign countries to respond to threats to maritime security. The provision would authorize \$50.0 million with increase in future years, in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Global Train and Equip Program to provide assistance to the recipient countries, which include Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam. The provision would require that the Secretary of Defense provide prior notification to the congressional defense committees not later than 15 days before exercising this authority.

#### **Sense of Congress reaffirming the importance of implementing the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region (Sec. 1262)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the United States continue to implement the rebalance of U.S. forces to the Asia-Pacific region. The committee believes that the withdrawal of U.S. forces from the Pacific theater of operations would undermine the rebalance and that forces should be increased consistent with commitments already made by the Department of Defense and aligned with the requirement to maintain a balance of military power that favors the United States and its allies in the region.

#### **Sense of the Senate on Taiwan Asymmetric Military Capabilities and Bilateral Training Activities (Sec. 1263)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the United States continue to make available to Taiwan such defense articles and services as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense, including support for Taiwan's innovative and asymmetric measures to balance the growing capabilities of the People's Republic of China. The committee also believes that military forces of Taiwan should be encouraged to participate in bilateral training activities hosted by the United States that support the credible deterrent capabilities of Taiwan, including the Red Flag exercise conducted at Eielson Air Force Base, Alaska, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada.

### **Subtitle F—Reports and Related Matters**

**Item in quarterly reports on assistance to counter the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant on forces ineligible to receive assistance due to a gross violation of human rights (sec. 1271)**

The committee recommends a provision that would add an additional element to the quarterly progress report required under section 1236 (the “Iraq Train and Equip authority”) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The additional element to be included in the report would be a list of units restricted from receiving assistance under the Iraq Train and Equip authority as a result of vetting required by the authority or by section 2249e, title 10, United States Code, including, as applicable, a description of information relating to gross violations of human rights and association with or assistance from the Government of Iran, unless such vetting has been waived under subsection (j) of the Iraq Train and Equip authority.

**Report on bilateral agreement with Israel on joint activities to establish an anti-tunneling defense system (sec. 1272)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to conduct a feasibility and advisability study of the entry of the United States and Israel into a bilateral agreement through which the two governments could conduct cooperative anti-tunneling research, development, and testing, and submit their findings to the appropriate congressional committees.

The committee notes that both Israel and the United States confront threats on their borders from tunnels used by foreign terrorist organizations and transnational criminal organizations. Given these common threats and our ongoing cooperation with Israel on issues of mutual concern, the committee notes there may be opportunities for additional collaboration on this issue and awaits the Secretary’s report.

**Sense of Senate and report on Qatar fighter aircraft capability contribution to regional security (sec. 1273)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of the Senate that the United States should promptly consider the sale of fighter aircraft to the Government of Qatar. The provision would also require a report describing the risks and benefits as they relate to the sale of fighter aircraft to the Government of Qatar.

### **Subtitle G—Other Matters**

**NATO Special Operations Headquarters (sec. 1281)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend, for 3 years, the authority under section 1244(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2541), as most recently amended by section 1272(a) of the Na-

tional Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2023).

**Two-year extension and modification of authorization for non-conventional assisted recovery capabilities (sec. 1282)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authority of the Department of Defense (DOD) to establish, develop, and maintain non-conventional assisted recovery (NAR) capabilities for 2 additional years. The provision would also designate the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict (ASD SOLIC) as the primary civilian within DOD with programmatic and policy oversight responsibilities for such activities. Given the sensitive nature of NAR activities, including the authorized use of irregular forces, groups, and individuals, the committee believes that ASD SOLIC is the most appropriate civilian office within the Department to exercise oversight of such activities and associated policies. Furthermore, the committee directs the Department to provide ASD SOLIC resourcing commensurate with these responsibilities, with assistance and support from the Defense POW/MIA Accounting Agency as appropriate.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Additional Analysis of People’s Liberation Army Cyber Capabilities**

The committee is concerned about the growing offensive cyber capabilities of the People’s Republic of China. The Annual Report to Congress on Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China 2015 concluded that “Chinese offensive cyberspace operations could support A2/AD by targeting critical nodes to disrupt adversary networks throughout the region.” The report also noted that, “In 2014, numerous computer systems around the world, including those owned by the U.S. Government, continued to be targeted for intrusions, some of which can be attributed directly to the Chinese Government and military.”

The committee believes that China’s growing cyber capabilities warrant additional review and analysis in both classified and unclassified form. Therefore, the committee recommends the Department of Defense provide a more holistic assessment of offensive and defense cyber capabilities within the People’s Liberation Army, the Chinese Ministry of State Security, and non-state actors seeking to further Chinese political and strategic goals as a part of the 2016 Annual Report to Congress on Military and Security Developments Involving the People’s Republic of China. In particular, the committee is interested in an assessment of Chinese capabilities for integrating cyber activity into conventional and unconventional operations, China’s ability to avoid attribution while executing or facilitating offensive cyber operations, and China’s assistance to other countries to assist in building cyber capabilities.

**Annual report on the military power of Iran**

The committee remains concerned about the threat posed by Iran’s nuclear and ballistic missile development programs. The

committee notes that last year, the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, testified that, “We judge that Iran would choose a ballistic missile as its preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons. . .” In February, Iran successfully launched the Safir long-range missile system. In 2013, the National Air and Space Intelligence Center (NASIC) made the following statement about this system:

Iran could develop and test an ICBM capable of reaching the United States by 2015. Since 2008, Iran has conducted multiple successful launches of the two-stage Safir space launch vehicle (SLV) and has also revealed the larger two stage Simorgh SLV, which could serve as a test bed for developing ICBM technologies.

The committee remains interested in an update from the Secretary of Defense on Iran’s ballistic missile development programs. The committee notes that section 1245 Of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010, as amended (Public Law 111–84) requires the Secretary of Defense to submit, on an annual basis, a report on the military power of Iran. The committee notes that previous versions of this report have provided useful information on Iran’s military power, including its ballistic missile capabilities and developments. The report is due January 30 of each year. However, the committee notes that, as of May 2015, the report has not been provided to Congress. Given the longstanding nature of this reporting requirement, the committee expects the prompt delivery of this report each year. Given this delay, upon the delivery of the report covering 2014, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to Congress a briefing on the report which—in addition to covering information from 2014— should also provide an update from the report’s information cut-off date to the present on any developments within Iran’s ballistic missile program that would, at a minimum, contain the information required in section 1245(b)(4).

#### **Briefing on United States Unmanned Aerial System Export Requests**

The committee notes that in the context of the threat presented by the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) in the Middle East and elsewhere, coalition countries have requested specific U.S. military assets and assistance to support their efforts. The committee values the contributions of these countries and urges continued consideration of their requests.

The committee recognizes that some of these coalition countries, including the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the United Arab Emirates, have requested Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) capability.

The committee notes that appropriate transfers of UAS technology can help build the capacity of partner nation military forces, foster interoperability with the United States, support critical counterterrorism objectives, and sustain the defense industrial base. The Committee also supports expeditious interagency review of all letters of request or license applications for the export of such systems to these partners and allies in the Middle East whose military requirements demand assets that provide persistent intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to provide a briefing, not later than September 15, 2015, to congressional defense and foreign relations committees on any UAS requests from Jordan and other Middle Eastern countries that are contributing to Operation Inherent Resolve. The briefing should include the dates that requests were received, specific issues under consideration, waiver recommendations, and expectations for completing the review for each request.

### **Countering Russian propaganda**

The committee has watched with increasing concern the proliferation and expansion of Russian propaganda not only in Eastern Europe, but also throughout Central and Western Europe to levels not seen since the end of the Cold War. Russian-speaking populations in Eastern Europe in former Soviet Union nations, including North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, are especially vulnerable to propaganda that could be used to create more favorable conditions for future Russian aggression. Moreover, the sophistication and pervasiveness of outlets such as the Russia Today (RT) television network that broadcast in multiple languages in Western European democracies is cause for concern.

The committee notes that Russian propaganda has promoted a false narrative on the nature, scope, and cause of the conflict in Crimea and eastern Ukraine and has unfortunately achieved some success with targeted audiences in obscuring attribution for Russian-driven aggression and disregard for sovereignty, territorial integrity, and international law.

The committee recognizes that propaganda is a critical element of Russia's "hybrid warfare" concept. The speed and reach of Russian propaganda and the ambiguity it creates pose a challenge to NATO collective defense and the political consensus upon which it relies.

Therefore, the committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Secretary of State with the objective of developing a strategy, including supporting resources, to counter Russian propaganda in Europe.

### **Designation of lead Inspector General for Overseas Contingency Operations in Afghanistan**

The committee supports the designation by the Chair of the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency of a lead inspector general for overseas contingency operations for Operation Freedom's Sentinel in Afghanistan on April 1, 2015, in compliance with section 8L of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), as amended by section 848 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 1851).

The committee recognizes the importance of a lead inspector to coordinate and optimize the collection and reporting of information across agencies and inspectors general and the need to establish clear oversight by the appointment of such a lead inspector general as intended and required by section 848. The committee expects the lead inspector general to assist in the refinement of the size,



functions and purpose of the inspector general mission taking into consideration the reduction of United States forces in Afghanistan.

### **Organizational management of Department of Defense security assistance programs**

At present, the Department of Defense's (DOD) security assistance and security cooperation programs are overseen and implemented by a multiple offices, including the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy (USD-P), the geographic combatant commands, the military services, the Joint Staff, and Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD-AT&L). The divergent lines of responsibility and reporting exacerbate DOD's challenges in aligning security cooperation programs coherently in support of strategic defense objectives. No office or management official within OSD, underneath the level of the Secretary of Defense, has the authority to look across the security assistance and cooperation enterprise and make binding strategic decisions to align DOD's policies and resources in a manner that is consistent with its strategic priorities and to curtail redundancy.

The committee believes that efforts to date by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) to rationalize oversight and management of DOD security assistance and security cooperation programs across the Department have not gone far enough. DOD should reevaluate the organizational structure and responsibilities within OSD to streamline oversight and implementation responsibilities for DOD security assistance and cooperation activities.

As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to conduct an organizational review of security assistance and security cooperation program oversight and management responsibilities across DOD and, in particular, an examination of the distribution of resources and policy oversight responsibilities within OSD-P, and to submit to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives and the Senate a detailed summary of its findings no later than March 31, 2016.

This review, at a minimum, should: (1) identify all security assistance and security cooperation programs available to the Department and the offices in DOD that are responsible for policy oversight, program management, and implementation of such programs; (2) review the roles and responsibilities for policy oversight, program management, and execution of security cooperation programs of relevant offices and components; (3) make recommendations to improve policy oversight and program management for DOD security assistance and security cooperation activities, which may include consolidation of oversight and management responsibilities into one functional office; (4) describe the processes for articulating security cooperation priorities, and aligning resources and activities with those priorities, across DOD and identify opportunities for improvement, where appropriate; (5) describe evaluation and monitoring mechanisms to assess security assistance and cooperation programs and ensure lessons learned and best practices are incorporated into program formulation and implementation; and (6) any other matters the Secretary determines to be appropriate to inform the committee of its findings and recommendations.

**Report on capability of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to respond to unconventional or hybrid warfare tactics such as used by the Russian Federation in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine**

The committee is concerned about the capability of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to respond to unconventional or hybrid warfare tactics such as those used by the Russian Federation in Crimea and eastern Ukraine due to the ambiguous nature of those tactics and the resultant challenges of attribution. As such, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report not later than September 1, 2016 to the congressional defense committees on recommendations for improving the alliance's response options, decision-making processes and implementation timelines for addressing the use of unconventional or hybrid warfare tactics such as those used by the Russian Federation. The report should include:

- (1) An identification of the unconventional or hybrid tactics the Russian Federation may employ against NATO nations;
- (2) A consolidation of tactics identified pursuant to paragraph (1) into a set of possible scenarios to be used to analyze potential response options by NATO;
- (3) An assessment of the response options NATO could potentially pursue for each of the scenarios identified pursuant to paragraph (2);
- (4) Recommendations to improve response options, decision-making processes, and implementation timelines for the scenarios identified pursuant to paragraph (2);
- (5) An assessment of implementation by NATO of commitments made at the Wales Summit regarding the Readiness Action Plan;
- (6) Recommendations, if any, for exercises or mechanisms to improve the ability of NATO to consult and reach consensus in scenarios relating to the employment of unconventional or hybrid tactics; and
- (7) Such other matters as the Secretary considers appropriate.

**Support of foreign forces participating in operations against the Lord's Resistance Army**

The Lord's Resistance Army (LRA) has perpetrated atrocities throughout central Africa for more than two decades, which have included murder, rape, and the abduction of children to serve as child soldiers. The committee notes the important progress the African Union Regional Task Force (AU-RTF) and other regional partners have made in combatting the threat posed by the LRA. These operations have resulted in the removal of several key LRA leaders and contributed to an increase in defections. The committee notes that support provided by the Department of Defense (DOD) under Operation Observant Compass (OOC) has played a key role in enabling counter-LRA operations. The committee further notes that section 1208 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66) authorizes the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to provide logistic support, supplies, and services, and intelligence support to

foreign forces participating in operations to mitigate and eliminate the threat posed by the LRA. The committee believes that continued DOD support, specifically additional enablers and actionable intelligence, is required to increase the effectiveness of partner operations to eliminate the threat posed by Joseph Kony and the LRA and encourages DOD to continue such assistance.

### **United States-Indonesia military cooperation**

The committee notes Indonesia's remarkable achievements as it has developed its economy, consolidated its democratic institutions, and improved its self-defense capabilities since the fall of the Suharto government in 1998. Furthermore, the committee acknowledges the progress the Indonesian government has made on human rights issues, including progress on civilian control over the military. The committee looks for Indonesia to continue improving its human rights record and building a more inclusive democratic process. As the largest country in Southeast Asia and the most populous Muslim-majority nation in the world, the committee believes Indonesia represents a critical partner for the United States in the Asia-Pacific region.

The committee strongly supports President Jokowi's declared vision of building Indonesia into a "global maritime axis." The committee welcomes an Indonesia with the infrastructure, industrial base, training, and capabilities that will allow it to benefit from and contribute to regional maritime commerce and security.

In the security domain, the committee notes that Indonesia has committed to a military modernization effort known as the Minimum Essential Force (MEF) through 2024. The MEF is focused on enhancing the naval and air force capabilities of the archipelagic state's military (known as the Tentara Nasional Indonesia, or TNI) to address both traditional and nontraditional security concerns. Nevertheless, the committee understands Indonesia's military modernization has suffered from a lack of resources, ill-equipped infrastructure, and aging defense research facilities.

The committee recognizes that the United States-Indonesia Comprehensive Partnership, signed in 2010, provides the relationship with a mechanism to help enhance Indonesia's defense capabilities. The committee believes the Department of Defense (DOD) should consider all available opportunities to continue to expand the depth and breadth of the defense relationship. Specifically, the committee believes the United States should look to the following priorities:

- (1) Continue to deepen the military-military relationship in ways that effectively grow the organizations that enable the development, sustainment, and use of military power. Building such ties will require engagement both by senior leaders and at the working level. More specifically, the United States should focus on providing training to civilian and military officials to improve the management of full life-cycle costs of defense programs. In this regard, the committee is encouraged by the recent memorandum of understanding between the Indonesian Defense Minister and the Defense Institution Reform Initiative (DIRI);

- (2) Continue to utilize bilateral and multilateral exercises that enhance the TNI's command, control, communications,

computers, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (C4ISR) capabilities. In this regard, the committee sees value in expanding Indonesia's participation in Cooperation Afloat Readiness and Training, Rim of the Pacific, and Red Flag exercises. Over the longer-term, exercises should work towards encouraging more joint operations between the various TNI services;

(3) Emphasize Foreign Military Sales that will contribute to Indonesia's naval, air, and C4ISR capabilities; and

(4) Move to normalize relations between the United States military and the Indonesian Special Forces Command, Komando Pasukan Khusus (Kopassus), as it continues to improve its record on human rights.

Therefore, the Secretary of Defense is directed to provide a briefing to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate no later than December 30, 2015 on the DOD's current and planned defense cooperation with Indonesia.

## **TITLE XIII—COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION**

### **Subtitle A—Funding Allocations**

#### **Specification of Cooperative Threat Reduction funds (sec. 1301)**

The committee recommends a provision that would define the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs, define the funds as authorized to be appropriated in section 301 of this bill, and authorize CTR funds to be available for obligation for 3 fiscal years.

#### **Funding allocations (sec. 1302)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$358.5 million, the amount of the budget request, for the Cooperative Threat Reduction program.



## **TITLE XIV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**

### **Subtitle A—Military Programs**

#### **Working Capital Funds (sec. 1401)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the appropriations for the Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### **National Defense Sealift Fund (sec. 1402)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the appropriations for the National Defense Sealift Fund at levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### **Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense (sec. 1403)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the appropriations for Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction, Defense, at levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### **Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities, Defense-wide (sec. 1404)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the appropriations for Drug Interdiction and Counterdrug Activities, Defense-wide, at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### **Defense Inspector General (sec. 1405)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

#### **Defense Health Program (sec. 1406)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Defense Health Program activities at the levels identified in section 4501 of division D of this Act.

### **Subtitle B—Other Matters**

#### **Authority for transfer of funds to Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund for Captain James A. Lovell Health Care Center, Illinois (sec. 1411)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to transfer \$120.4 million from the Defense

Health Program to the Joint Department of Defense-Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility Demonstration Fund created by section 1704 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) for the operations of the Captain James A. Lovell Federal Health Care Center.

**Authorization of appropriations for Armed Forces Retirement Home (sec. 1412)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$64.3 million to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the operation of the Armed Forces Retirement Home.

**Inspections of the Armed Forces Retirement Home by the Inspector General of the Department of Defense (sec. 1413)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1518 of the Armed Forces Retirement Home Act of 1991 (24 U.S.C. 418) to require the Inspector General of the Department of Defense to conduct an inspection of the Armed Forces Retirement Home not less than once every 3 years and to authorize the Inspector General to determine the scope of the inspection through a risk-based analysis of the operations of the home. The provision would also remove the requirement for the Inspector General to provide the report not later than 90 days after the inspection.

**Budget Items**

**United States Southern Command unfunded priorities increase**

The budget request included \$739.0 million in drug interdiction and counterdrug activities, of which \$23.1 million is for U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) Central American and Caribbean CN Operation Support [Project Code (PC) 9493], and \$13.7 million is for SOUTHCOM Section 1033 Support [PC9494]. SOUTHCOM has identified specific resource mission shortfalls that impact its detection and monitoring support to maritime interdiction operations in Central America. In written testimony submitted to the committee on March 12, 2015, General John Kelly, Commander of SOUTHCOM, stated that “homeland defense does not begin at the ‘one yard line’ of our Southwest border, but instead extends forward, throughout the hemisphere, to keep threats far from our nation’s shores.” Further, the committee believes that increased support to detection, monitoring, and interdiction efforts in the region is required to combat the growth in trafficking of illicit drugs, such as heroin and methamphetamine, that is having a devastating impact on many U.S. communities.

Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$4.7 million PC 9493 and \$25.3 million for PC 9494 in drug interdiction and counterdrug activities for SOUTHCOM detection and monitoring and maritime interdiction support operations in Central America.



**Drug Demand Reduction Program**

The budget request included \$739.0 million for the Department of Defense’s (DOD) Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense-wide, and \$111.6 million for the DOD’s Drug Demand Reduction Program. The committee recommends a decrease of \$8.0 million in Drug Interdiction and Counter-drug Activities, Defense-wide, and increase of \$8.0 million in Drug Demand Reduction Program.

The committee supports the ongoing efforts of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness to expand the existing Drug Demand Reduction Program testing program to include prescription and synthetic drugs. Further, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to program funding for these activities in future years.

**Department of Defense Inspector General Research, Development, Test & Evaluation reduction**

The budget request included \$5.1 billion in Research, Development, Test & Evaluation (RDT&E), Defense-wide of which \$4.7 million was for the SAG 4GTV Office of the Inspector General (OIG).

After discussions with the OIG, the committee understands that portions of this funding are no longer needed due to delays in program development.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$2.6 million in RDT&E for the SAG 4GTV DIG. Additionally, the committee strongly encourages the DODIG to take steps to improve the planning, programming, budgeting and execution associated with development of information technology systems and capabilities to support its mission, ensuring that these activities conform to best practices and can serve as a model for the Department of Defense.

**Department of Defense Inspector General procurement reduction**

The budget request included \$5.1 billion in Procurement, Defense-wide of which \$1.0 million was for SAG 4GTV Office of the Inspector General (OIG).

After discussions with the OIG, the committee understands that the OIG has withdrawn its request for procurement funding for fiscal year 2016 based on the lack of identified need.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$1.0 million for the SAG 4GTV OIG.

**Defense Health Program (sec. 1406)**

The amount authorized to be funded for the Defense Health Program includes the following changes from the budget request.

(Changes in millions of dollars)

Reduction for combating antibiotic resistant bacteria .....	- 16.5
Total .....	- 16.5

The committee recommends a reduction in the Defense Health Program of \$16.5 million for combating antibiotic resistant bacteria to support the President’s global health security agenda initiative, which the committee did not adopt.

### **Foreign currency fluctuation deduction**

The budget request included \$32.2 billion for Defense Health Program.

The committee believes that when foreign currency fluctuation (FCF) rates are determined by the Department of Defense, the balance of the FCF funds should be considered, particularly if the balance is close to the cap of \$970.0 million. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has informed the committee that as of March 2015, the Department has not transferred in any prior year unobligated balances to replenish the account for fiscal year 2015 from a beginning balance of \$970.0 million. GAO analysis projects that the Department will experience a net gain of \$739.8 million in fiscal year 2015 due to favorable foreign exchange rates, of which \$456.1 million is attributed to Operation and Maintenance (O&M). Additionally, GAO analysis projects the Department will experience a net gain of \$891.4 million in fiscal year 2016 in FCF, of which \$587.4 million is attributed to O&M.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$36.4 million from Defense Health Program for FCF.

### **Items of Special Interest**

#### **Clarification of funding available for additional support for counter-drug activities and activities to counter transnational organized crime**

The committee is concerned by the threat posed by transnational organized crime (TOC) to United States national security. Testimony before the committee by the Commander of U.S. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) and the Commander of U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) emphasized the increasingly complex and global nature of these illicit networks and highlighted that a whole-of-government approach is required to effectively counter the threat posed by TOC. The committee notes that the Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime, released by the President on July 19, 2011, sought to establish a framework for the United States to “combat TOC networks that pose a strategic threat to Americans and to U.S. interests in key regions.”

In recognition of this emerging security reality, section 1012 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) amended the Department’s longstanding authority to provide support for counter-drug activities to other governmental agencies, commonly referred to as “section 1004,” to also include the authority to provide support to counter-TOC activities. It was the committee’s intent that funds under the drug interdiction and counter drug activities account, which have historically been available to support counterdrug activities under this authority, shall also be available to support counter-TOC activities authorized under the aforementioned section 1012 of Public Law 113–291.

#### **Comptroller General review of electronic waste recycling**

The committee notes that modern electronics used by the Department of Defense (DOD) may contain valuable, recyclable materials, including strategic and critical materials of rare earth elements.

The committee also notes that through the proper disposal of end-of-life electronics, recyclable materials may be able to be reclaimed for use in DOD advanced technology programs and the National Defense Stockpile. The committee is interested in understanding more about how DOD plans for and executes the disposal and recycling of electronics.

Accordingly, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of: (1) information on the disposition of used DOD electronics, including the volume of electronics that are recycled, reused, refurbished, and de-manufactured; (2) information on the value of all strategic and critical materials, including rare earth elements, recovered from recycled electronics used by DOD since fiscal year 2010; (3) information on the models used by DOD for the collection and capture of strategic and critical materials from used electronics, including any benefits and challenges associated with the models; and (4) an identification and assessment of potential opportunities for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of DOD efforts to recover strategic and critical materials from used DOD electronics.

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide a report to the committee no later than March 1, 2016.



## **TITLE XV—AUTHORIZATION OF ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**

### **Subtitle A—Authorization of Additional Appropriations**

#### **Purpose (sec. 1501)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish this title and make authorization of appropriations available upon enactment of this Act for the Department of Defense, in addition to amounts otherwise authorized in this Act.

#### **Overseas contingency operations (sec. 1502)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize additional appropriations for overseas contingency operations.

#### **Procurement (sec. 1503)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriation for procurement activities at the levels identified in section 4102 of division D of this Act.

#### **Research, development, test, and evaluation (sec. 1504)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriation for research, development, test, and evaluation activities at the levels identified in section 4202 of division D of this Act.

#### **Operation and Maintenance (sec. 1505)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriations for operation and maintenance activities at the levels identified in section 4302 of division D of this Act.

#### **Military personnel (sec. 1506)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriations for military personnel activities at the levels identified in section 4402 of division D of this Act.

#### **Working capital funds (sec. 1507)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriations for the Defense Working Capital Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

#### **Drug interdiction and counter-drug activities, defense-wide (sec. 1508)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriations for the Drug Interdiction and Counter-

Drug Activities, Defense-Wide at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

**Defense Inspector General (sec. 1509)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriations for the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Defense identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

**Defense Health Program (sec. 1510)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriations for the Defense Health Program activities identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act.

**Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (sec. 1511)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the additional appropriations for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Funds at the levels identified in section 4502 of division D of this Act. Amounts authorized in this fund will be available for obligation for 2 fiscal years.

**Subtitle B—Financial Matters**

**Treatment as additional authorizations (sec. 1521)**

The committee recommends a provision that would state that the amounts authorized to be appropriated in this title are in addition to amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated by this Act.

**Special transfer authority (sec. 1522)**

The committee recommends a provision that would allow the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to \$4.0 billion of overseas contingency operation funding authorized for fiscal year 2016 in this title. This transfer authority would be in addition to the authority provided to the Secretary elsewhere in this Act.

**Subtitle C—Limitations, Reports, and Other Matters**

**Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (sec. 1531)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require that amounts authorized for the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) for fiscal year 2016 continue to be subject to the conditions specified in subsections (b) through (g) of section 1513 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), as amended. The provision would also extend the authority under subsection 1532(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) to accept certain equipment procured using ASFF funds and to treat such equipment as Department of Defense stocks.

**Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund (sec. 1532)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund and would thereby provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to investigate,

develop and provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facilities, personnel, and funds to assist in the defeat of improvised explosive devices for operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, and other operations or military missions designated by the Secretary.

The committee notes that JIEDDO has continued to reduce its size from a peak of more than 4,200 personnel and a \$4.5 billion annual budget to 1,100 personnel and \$450.0 million, with plans to reduce further. The committee awaits the plan to consolidate and align all of the rapid acquisition or quick reaction capability organizations, including JIEDDO, and certain other organizations as directed in section 1533 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), and where appropriate to eliminate such organizations.

The committee expects that the decision on JIEDDO’s disposition (consolidation with another defense agency, military service entity, or stand-alone organization) will be made as part of the Secretary’s review to streamline the Department of Defense management and operational headquarters. The streamlining of Department of Defense management and operational headquarters is described in another provision in title III of this Act.

**Availability of Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund funds for training of foreign security forces to defeat improvised explosive devices (sec. 1533)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$30.0 million of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2016 for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund to fund training activities for foreign security forces to increase the effectiveness of such forces in defeating improvised explosive devices. The provision would require such training be provided only pursuant to other provisions of law and also requires the Secretary of Defense to coordinate the provision of training to the extent practicable with requests received from the geographic combatant commander.

The committee emphasizes the importance of ensuring that a flexible and responsive approval process is established to support the provision of this training.

**Budget Items**

**Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund**

The budget request includes \$493.3 million for the Joint Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Defeat Fund, of which the request included \$188.3 million Joint IED Defeat Organization’s (JIEDDO) staff and infrastructure account and \$219.6 million for its network attack account. The committee recommends sustaining JIEDDO’s funding at fiscal year 2015 levels and therefore recommends a reduction of \$43.8 million to JIEDDO’s staff and infrastructure account and \$4.5 million to the network attack account.

**Office of Security Cooperation-Iraq**

The budget request included \$9.1 billion for Operation and Maintenance, Air Force (OMAF) for overseas contingency operations, of

which \$204.7 million was for SAG 042G Other Servicewide Activities.

The committee understands that this request included \$143.0 million to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$63.0 million for SAG 042G Other Service Activities due to a lack of justification in the budget request.

#### **Reimbursement of certain coalition nations for support provided to United States military operations**

The budget request included \$1.7 billion in Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide (OMDW) for the Defense Security Cooperation Agency for Overseas Contingency Operations, of which \$1.3 billion was for the reimbursement of key nations for support provided to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Afghanistan. The committee recommends a decrease of \$100.0 million in OMDW as the number of U.S. forces and the scope of associated military operations in Afghanistan draws down. A provision related to the authorization for the use of such funds is included in title XII of this Act.

#### **Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund**

The budget request included \$2.1 billion in overseas contingency operations funding for the Counterterrorism Partnerships Fund (CTPF). The committee is concerned that the budget justification materials did not provide sufficient levels of detail to support the budget request. Therefore, the committee recommends a reduction of \$1.1 billion for CTPF.

The committee continues to support the CTPF and the Department's proposed regional approach for counterterrorism operations and building partnership capacity (BPC) activities described in the budget justification materials. The committee is concerned that the increase in requested funding for BPC efforts could outpace the ability of foreign partners to absorb and sustain the assistance beyond the logistic support provided under such BPC programs. As such, the committee encourages the Department to incorporate training of partner nation maintenance and logistic personnel to enhance the sustainability of capabilities provided through this program. Additionally, the committee directs that any proposal to undertake BPC activities using CTPF funding shall include a detailed sustainment plan for the capabilities to be provided, which should be broadly-vetted across the interagency. The plan should also include a description of the planned transition of sustainment responsibilities from CTPF-funded programs.

Further, the committee notes with concern the growing malign influence of Iranian supported proxy militant groups throughout the Middle East and Africa, commonly referred to as the Iran Threat Network (ITN). These activities contribute to regional instability, undermine U.S. national security interests, and directly threaten U.S. partners in the affected regions. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to present a plan to counter the ITN to the committee by December 31, 2015. Further, the committee directs that up to \$50.0 million of the funds authorized to



be appropriated for the CTPF be made available to support counter-ITN efforts.

In preparation for the fiscal year 2017 budget request, the committee directs the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and Under Secretary of Defense (Policy) to conduct a review of the feasibility and advisability of consolidating additional building partnership capacity funding, including non-counterterrorism related funding, into a building partner capacity fund and to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees on their findings no later than November 30, 2015.

#### **Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative**

The budget request included no funding for a Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative. The committee recommends an increase of \$300.0 million for this initiative. A provision related to the authorization for the use of such funds is included in title XII of this act.

#### **Items of Special Interest**

##### **Joint Improvised Explosive Device Analysis Tool**

The committee notes that the Army has decided not to field Joint Improvised Explosive Device Analysis Tool (JIST) software after spending more than \$10.0 million developing it in conjunction with the Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Organization (JIEDDO). While the committee understands that the Army intends to use an existing software program resident in the Distributed Common Ground Station-Army (DCGS-A) program to meet the requirement for counter-improvised explosive devices (IED) forensic analysis, the critical nature of the IED threat may demand a dedicated software analysis tool to meet certain intelligence analysis requirements. Therefore, the committee urges the Army to consider including IED forensic analysis tools as part of any planned DCGS-A Increment 2 competition. The committee requests that the Army keep the committee informed of its plan in this regard.



## **TITLE XVI—STRATEGIC PROGRAMS, CYBER, AND INTELLIGENCE MATTERS**

### **Subtitle A—Space Activities**

#### **Integrated policy to deter adversaries in space (sec. 1601)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to establish an interagency process to develop a policy to deter adversaries in space. This integrated deterrence policy would be developed with the objectives of (1) reducing risks to the United States and its allies in space; and (2) protecting and preserving the rights, access, capabilities, use, and freedom of action of the United States in space and the right of the United States to respond to an attack in space and, if necessary, deny adversaries the use of space capabilities hostile to the national interests of the United States. The provision would require the President to provide a report setting forth the deterrence policy and the answers to Enclosure 1, regarding offensive space control policy, of the classified annex to this Act, to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives within 180 days of the date of enactment. If the report required and the answers to Enclosure 1 are not provided within 180 days of the date of enactment, the provision would prohibit, until provided, the obligation or expenditure of \$10.0 million of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2016 to provide support services to the Executive Office of the President.

The committee is concerned that China and Russia have weaponized space and seek to gain an asymmetric advantage against the United States by holding United States space capabilities at risk. To counter growing Chinese and Russian aggression in space, the committee believes a multifaceted strategy will be necessary and that the deterrence policy that would be required by this provision is a critical element of that strategy. Elsewhere in the classified annex of this act, the committee discusses additional elements of that strategy.

Elsewhere in this act, the committee recommends a provision prohibiting the obligation or expenditure of \$10.0 million of the unobligated balance of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to provide support services to the Executive Office of the President, until the President submits to the congressional defense committees the integrated cyber deterrence policy required by section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–61). The committee hopes including the funding limitation in this provision will incentivize the President to meet the deadline this provision would establish.

**Principal advisor on space control (sec. 1602)**

The committee recommends a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to designate an individual who is already a full time equivalent of the Department of Defense to serve as the Principal Space Control Advisor, who shall act as the principal advisor to the Secretary on space control activities.

The committee believes that the space control mission will see significant growth in the coming years. The committee believes that because of the growing importance of space control capabilities, the establishment of a Principal Space Control Advisor would be necessary to coordinate and lead department-wide efforts, streamline decision making, and enhance the level of focus across the department and interagency.

**Exception to the prohibition on contracting with Russian suppliers of rocket engines for the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program (sec. 1603)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note) by adding a special rule for Phase 1A competitive opportunities. For not more than nine competitive Phase 1A launches, the special rule would allow the Secretary of Defense to award a contract requiring the use of a rocket engine designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation that is eligible for the existing waiver or exception requirements as specified in the existing statute. If a circumstance arises during the Phase 1A period where a launch provider is awarded a competitive contract and requires a rocket engine unable to meet the waiver or exception requirements, the provision would allow for the Secretary to waive the waiver or exception. In order to qualify for the new special rule, all engines that meet the waiver or exception of the existing statute must first be used.

The committee notes that for the Phase 1A competitive period, this could result in as few as zero Russian rocket engines or up to nine, depending upon the outcome of the competitions. The committee believes that the continued use of Russian rocket engines represents a threat to our national security and that their use should be minimized to the greatest extent practicable.

National Security Presidential Directive 40 states that Assured Access to Space is “a requirement for critical national security, homeland security, and civil missions and is defined as a sufficiently robust, responsive, and resilient capability to allow continued space operations, consistent with risk management and affordability. The Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as appropriate, are responsible for assuring access to space.” The committee notes that under section 1608, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) is not prohibited from procuring launches that utilize rocket engines manufactured or designed in the Russian Federation. The committee also notes that NASA has contracts for numerous launches that rely on Russian rocket engines for the foreseeable future. While the committee does not condone the use of Russian rocket engines for NASA purposes, the committee recog-

nizes that assured access to space can still be met if a national emergency required the use of a NASA procured launch for Department of Defense purposes.

**Elimination of launch capabilities contracts under Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle program (sec. 1604)**

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the Secretary of Defense from awarding a contract, renewing a contract, or maintaining a separate contract line item for the procurement of property or services for space launch capabilities under the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) program. The provision would define space launch capabilities as work associated with supporting launch infrastructure maintenance and sustainment, program management, systems engineering launch site operations, launch site depreciation, and maintenance commodities. The provision would allow for the Secretary to waive the requirement and award a separate contract or maintain a separate contract line item for launch capabilities only if the Secretary determines and reports to the congressional defense committees 30 days prior to executing a waiver that: (1) awarding or renewing, or maintaining a separate contract line item for launch capabilities is necessary for the national security interests of the United States and the contract or contract line item does not support space launch activities using rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation; and (2) failing to award or renew such a contract or maintain such a contract line item would have significant consequences to national security and result in the significant loss of life or property or economic harm. The provision would not apply to the placement of orders or the exercise of options under the contract numbered FA8811-13-C-003 and awarded on December 18, 2013. That exception would expire on September 30, 2019.

The EELV Launch Capability (ELC) was created in 2005 by the Air Force to augment a fragile domestic industrial base and maintain a national capability to launch national security payloads as set forth in National Security Presidential Directive-40 (NSPD-40). Since 2005, the Air Force has spent billions of dollars supplementing the infrastructure and capacity of the incumbent launch provider. Also since 2005, new launch providers have entered the market and created competition. The committee believes that with the introduction of space launch competition, launch capability subsidies inappropriately inhibit fair competition and are no longer necessary. The Commander of Air Force Space Command testified to this point before Congress on March 25, 2015 when he stated "I don't think you can have fair competition with that contract in place." To ensure a fair competitive environment in the future, the committee believes that all future competitive launch opportunities should require a bid price that provides a fully burdened launch service cost.

The committee recognizes that a limited need for launch capability funding could arise in order to meet certain heavy launch requirements that are at significant near-term risk, since the incumbent launch provider announced its intention to no longer produce the Delta IV line of launch vehicles. The Delta IV rocket, which uses a rocket engine designed and manufactured in the United

States, is being discontinued prior to its replacement with a new domestically sourced capability. This will leave the incumbent launch provider with only the Atlas V rocket, which uses a rocket engine designed and manufactured in the Russian Federation. The committee is troubled by the incumbent launch provider's decision, given the billions of dollars the taxpayer has provided to the incumbent provider to maintain the capability. The committee also believes that this decision, which may be a result of the prospect of increasing space launch competition, should not create an impression of a lack of competition.

Because of the unique role of the Delta IV in meeting our national security space requirements, the provision includes a limited national security waiver as long as the contract does not support space launch activities using rocket engines designed or manufactured in the Russian Federation.

**Allocation of funding for Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Program (sec. 1605)**

The committee recommends a provision realigning the cost share of the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) Launch Capabilities (ELC) between the Air Force and the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO). The provision would require, for fiscal years 2017, 2018, or 2019, that the Air Force request for ELC funding bear the same ratio to the total number of Air Force cores to be procured under the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle Launch Services (ELS).

The committee is concerned that the existing Memorandum of Understanding between the Air Force and the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), dated October 7, 2011 provides a disproportionate cost share agreement for the ELC of 75 percent costs to the Air Force and 25 percent of costs to the NRO. The committee believes that this cost share unfairly burdens the Air Force. For example, in fiscal year 2016 the Air Force request of five cores represents just 55.5 percent of the total number of cores requested. In fiscal year 2017, while the NRO projects a request of seven cores, the Air Force projects a request of just five cores, or only 42 percent of the total buy. The committee recognizes that actual launch capability costs in a given year may not be based on the ratio of ELS versus ELC, but believes basing the cost share on the actual number of cores procured in a given year is the most equitable way to share ELC requirements under the current block buy.

Elsewhere in this Act, the committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the award of a new contract, the renewal of an existing contract, or maintaining a separate contract line item for ELC. The committee expects that after the current block buy, future EELV contracts will reflect the total cost of a launch under fully burdened launch services contracts.

**Inclusion of plan for development and fielding of a full-up engine in rocket propulsion system development program (sec. 1606)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 1604 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law

113–291) to include a plan for the development and fielding of a full-up engine. The committee emphasizes the importance of expediting the developing of a rocket propulsion system by 2019, consistent with the requirements of section 1604.

**Limitations on availability of funds for the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (sec. 1607)**

The committee recommends a provision prohibiting the use of funds authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 2016 and any unobligated funds made available for appropriation in fiscal year 2015 for the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP) or the launch of Defense Meteorological Satellite Program satellite #20 (DMSP–20) until the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff jointly certify to the congressional defense committees that: (1) relying on civil and international contributions to meet space-based environmental monitoring requirements is insufficient or is a risk to national security and launching DMSP–20 will meet those requirements; (2) launching DMSP–20 is the most affordable solution to meeting requirements validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council; and (3) nonmaterial solutions within the Department of Defense, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), or National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) are incapable of providing a solution for cloud characterization and theater weather requirements as validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council.

The committee understands that the Space Based Environmental Monitoring Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) assumed continued international support from a Geostationary European Weather Satellite over the Indian Ocean. With that assumption, the AOA concluded that DMSP–20 was not needed. The committee now understands that since the completion of that AOA, a decision was made by an international partner to no longer provide coverage over the Indian Ocean, leading to possibility of a weather gap as early as 2017. While the committee believes a solution should be identified to address that gap, the committee is not convinced that launching DMSP–20 is the most cost effective solution. According to the Air Force, a satellite in geostationary orbit is ideal for meeting cloud characterization and theater weather requirements by providing updates to users every 30 minutes. Attempting to conduct the same cloud characterization and theater weather observations using DMSP–20 in Low-Earth Orbit requires multiple satellites and delivers updates to users once every 4 hours, an almost 90 percent reduction in capability.

The committee believes that better alternatives to meeting the potential space weather gap exist and should be explored prior to spending between \$400.0 million and \$500.0 million to launch DMSP–20 later this decade. For example, the committee understands that the potential gap could be mitigated by simply relocating an existing on-orbit NOAA asset with excess capacity or by hosting appropriate electro-optical infrared sensors on future Department of Defense or commercial satellites.

To evaluate these lower cost, higher value options, the committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States (GAO) to assess whether alternatives for addressing the potential Indian

Ocean weather gap exist, and if so, whether those options would be less costly than launching DMSP-20. The committee directs GAO to report their findings in a briefing to the committee by no later than October 1, 2015. In their analysis, GAO should review any current or planned space systems of the Department of Defense (to include the National Reconnaissance Office), NASA, and NOAA. The committee directs the GAO to assess specifically whether the relocation of NOAA Geostationary Operational Environmental Satellite (GOES), or the hosting of an appropriate electro-optical infrared sensor on an alternative Department of Defense or commercial satellite, could address any future gaps at a lower cost.

**Quarterly reports on Global Positioning System III space segment, Global Positioning System operational control segment, and Military Global Positioning System User Equipment acquisitions programs (sec. 1608)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to provide quarterly reports to the Comptroller General of the United States on the Global Positioning System III (GPS III) space segment, the Global Positioning System Operational Control Segment (GPS OCX), and the Military Global Positioning System User Equipment (MGUE) acquisition programs. The provision would require that each report include: (1) the status on cost, schedule, and performance; (2) a detailed description of any technical risk impacting cost, schedule, and performance; (3) any changes to program requirements; (4) an assessment of how risks are to be addressed and their associated costs; and (5) an assessment of the extent the segments are synchronized. The provision would require the Comptroller General to provide a briefing to the congressional defense committees within 30 days of receiving the first report and as necessary after subsequent reports. The reporting requirement would sunset on the date at which GPS III, GPS OCX, and MGUE reach their full operational capabilities.

The committee is concerned the GPS III and GPS OCX programs are facing a number of development issues that have resulted in significant cost increases and schedule delays. According to Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimates, GPS III is currently \$471.0 million (11 percent) over its initial total program cost estimate and the first GPS III satellite is not scheduled to launch until January 2016, a 21 month delay. Similarly, GPS OCX is failing to meet many of its cost and schedule requirements. According to GAO, the GPS OCX Block 0 delivery has been delayed until April 2016, and the program is not expected to meet its initial operational capability until January 2020, a 53 month delay. According to a recent GAO assessment, MGUE is accelerating risk reduction efforts in software and security certification. However, there is concern given a November 2014, Office of Test and Evaluation assessment that found that MGUE's development maturity was overstated and that the program has asserted technical maturity not yet demonstrated.



**Plan for consolidation of acquisition of commercial satellite communications services (sec. 1609)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Department of Defense Executive Agent for Space to submit by January 31, 2016 a plan to the congressional defense committees for consolidating the acquisition of commercial satellite communications (COMSATCOM) services from across the Department of Defense into a program office in the Air Force Space and Missile Systems Center. The plan would require consolidation to take place within a 3-year period. It would also require an assessment of the current management and overhead costs, a projection of the consolidated management and overhead costs, and an estimate of the cost of consolidation. The provision would require the Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to review and validate each of the estimates.

In the Senate report to accompany S. 1197 (S. Rpt. 113–44) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66), the committee required the Secretary of Defense to provide a report detailing a 5-, 10-, and 25-year strategy for using an appropriate mix of Department of Defense and COMSATCOM bandwidth. That plan was provided to the committee in August 2014. In the plan’s discussion on demand predictions, it described the choices the Department must weigh in determining the appropriate mix between military satellite communications (MILSATCOM) satellites and the purchase of affordable COMSATCOM services. For years, the purchase of COMSATCOM services has been highly inefficient, and the committee believes that there are a number of approaches being considered to enhance efficiency, such as the establishment of a COMSATCOM working capital fund. The committee believes that if efficiencies can also be gained by consolidating the acquisition of all COMSATCOM services into a program office co-located with the MILSATCOM program office at the Air Force Space and Missile Systems Center, then such moves should be considered.

**Council on oversight of the Department of Defense Positioning, Navigation, and Timing Enterprise (sec. 1610)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish a council to review and be responsible for the Department of Defense positioning, navigation, and timing enterprise, including positioning, navigation, and timing services provided to civil, commercial, scientific and international users. This council would terminate 10 years after the date of enactment.

**Analysis of Alternative for Wide-band Communications (sec. 1611)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require an analysis of alternatives for the replacement of the Wideband Global Satellite System with a report due to the congressional defense committees by March 31, 2017. The analysis shall take into account future bandwidth of space, air, and ground communications systems.

**Expansion of goals for pilot program for acquisition of commercial satellite services (sec. 1612)**

The committee recommends a provision that 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) to include improvements in communications capability as a goal of pilot programs for commercial satellite communications.

The committee notes the effort the Department has made towards pathfinder pilot projects for satellite communications capability. However, the committee is concerned that the Department is focused solely on savings for legacy satellite communication capability and not also seeking to achieve potential order-of-magnitude improvements in satellite capability at current or lower costs. For example, the Department should consider pilot projects that address the growing demand for full-motion video in support of Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) platforms used by combatant commanders.

The committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to prepare a briefing or a report to the committee no later than June 30, 2016 on the status and plans for this pilot program.

**Streamline commercial space launch activities (sec. 1613)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the commercial space sector, and the heads of other executive agencies as appropriate to report annually on actions taken to remove duplication and minimize inconsistencies across the federal government for commercial space launch requirements and approval. The report shall be submitted to the congressional defense committees, the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation and the House Committee on Science, Space and Technology.

**Subtitle B—Cyber Warfare, Cyber Security, and Related Matters**

**Authorization of Military Cyber Operations (sec. 1621)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, and (when authorized by the President to do so) to conduct a military cyber operation in response to malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a United States person by a foreign power (as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801)).

The committee is concerned by the growing number and severity of malicious cyber activities being carried out against the United States and its interests. The committee is also concerned that failing to impose meaningful consequences on those seeking to harm the United States through the cyber domain will embolden our adversaries and lead to more severe attacks in the future. The committee believes that the fielding of a well-trained and highly-capable cyber force is fundamental to the national security of the United States and the deterrence of future cyber conflict.

**Designation of Department of Defense entity responsible for acquisition of critical cyber capabilities (sec. 1622)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to designate within 90 days of the date of enactment an entity of the Department of Defense (DOD) to be responsible for the acquisition of critical cyber capabilities to include: (1) the unified platform, (2) a persistent cyber training environment, and (3) a cyber situational awareness and battle management system.

The committee believes these cyber acquisitions are foundational capabilities that are essential to the equipping of the Cyber Mission Force. The committee is disappointed that the DOD has not made sufficient progress in recognizing the need for these capabilities, developing requirements for them, designating responsibilities for acquiring them, and requesting funding for them in the fiscal year 2016 budget request. The committee urges the Secretary to quickly designate an entity of the DOD to execute these acquisitions as programs of record, and to ensure that they are properly resourced and prepared to proceed as expeditiously as possible. The committee also expects that if United States Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) is not designated as the responsible entity, CYBERCOM will be an active participant in all significant programmatic decisions with the designated DOD entity regarding acquisition programs for which the Command is a customer.

The committee is concerned there are urgent needs for cyber capabilities that are not being fulfilled by DOD's acquisition process or by the military services. The committee has long been concerned that traditional acquisition practices and existing acquisition statutes and regulations lack the flexibility, agility, and speed necessary to deliver cyber capabilities responsively enough to stay ahead of the rapidly evolving threat. The committee has enacted legislation that invited the Department to construct a tailored cyber acquisition process to match this threat, with meager results thus far. The committee encourages the Secretary to consider whether traditional service-led acquisition strategies are appropriate for the development of these foundational capabilities.

Elsewhere, in Title VIII of this act, the committee recommends a provision that would grant the Commander of CYBERCOM the authority to conduct acquisition activities. The committee believes that there is a class of cyber tools, applications, and other tailored capabilities, beyond the large scale efforts identified in this provision, that traditional service-led acquisition processes cannot support in operationally responsive timeframes. For such cyber operations-peculiar equipment and capabilities, the committee believes the Commander of CYBERCOM is uniquely positioned to identify, acquire, and field those tools and applications that require significant tailoring and customization.

The committee notes that the ability of CYBERCOM, or the services and defense agencies, to quickly acquire and integrate new tools, applications, and weapons depends on the quality of the design and engineering of the foundational capabilities addressed in this provision.

**Incentive for submittal to Congress by President of integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyberspace (sec. 1623)**

Section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (127 Stat. 837; Public Law 113–66), required the President to establish an interagency process to provide for the development of an integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyberspace. The provision required the President, not later than 270 days after the date of enactment, which occurred on December 26, 2013, to submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth that integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyberspace.

The report required has not been provided.

The committee recommends a provision that would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of \$10.0 million of the unobligated balance of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Defense to provide support services to the Executive Office of the President, until the President submits to the congressional defense committees the report required by section 941 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014.

**Authorization for procurement of relocatable Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (sec. 1624)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$10.6 million of the unobligated amounts made available in fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for the Army for the procurement of a relocatable Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) for the Cyber Center of Excellence at Fort Gordon, Georgia.

The Department of Defense requested \$10.6 million, on behalf of the Army, on February 6, 2015, for a new start approval to transfer funding to procure six SCIF-level classrooms. According to the reprogramming documentation (DoD Serial Number FY 15–06PA) provided to the committee, the Army has a new requirement for the Cyber Center of Excellence at Fort Gordon, Georgia to establish a cyber-school in fiscal year 2015 for which six SCIF-level classrooms will be necessary to support the anticipated training throughput.

The committee strongly supports the rapid development and deployment of a well-trained and highly capable Cyber Mission Force. However, the committee believes requests for new-start authorizations through the reprogramming process should be limited only to the most urgent circumstances and should be directly linked to an urgent warfighting need as identified by a combatant commander or the Joint Chiefs of Staff through an urgent operational needs or similar request. While the reprogramming request did not reach that threshold, the committee does believe the request has merit and meets validated requirements. Therefore, the committee recommends it be authorized in this Act.

**Evaluation of cyber vulnerabilities of major weapon systems of the Department of Defense (sec. 1625)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to evaluate the cyber vulnerabilities of every major Department of Defense weapons system by not later than December 31, 2019.

The provision would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan, within 180 days of the enactment of this Act, identifying the weapons systems that will be evaluated and an estimate of the funding required for conducting the assessments. The provision would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prioritize the order of system evaluations based on the criticality of each major weapon system, the employment of forces, and threats. The provision would require that the assessments build upon and not be duplicative of ongoing efforts such as the Navy's "Task Force Cyber Awakening" and the Air Force's "Task Force Cyber Secure." The provision would require the Secretary to keep the congressional defense committees regularly apprised of the activities underway, to include the number of completed evaluations and the number of evaluations remaining. The provision would require the Secretary to develop strategies for mitigating the risks of cyber vulnerabilities to major weapons systems. The provision would also authorize \$200.0 million to begin the cyber vulnerabilities assessments in fiscal year 2016.

The committee believes that this evaluation should cover all major weapons systems and that exceptions should be limited. Any decision to exempt a particular weapons system from being evaluated requires a certification to the congressional defense committees that an assessment is not necessary because a cyber vulnerability would have minimal operational impact.

#### **Assessment of capabilities of United States Cyber Command to defend the United States from cyber attack (sec. 1626)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Principal Cyber Advisor (PCA) to sponsor an independent panel to assess the ability of the National Mission Forces of the U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) to reliably prevent or block large-scale attacks on the United States by foreign powers with capabilities comparable to those of countries like China, Iran, North Korea and Russia in the 2020 and 2025 timeframes.

In addition, the provision would require the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in consultation with the PCA, to conduct a series of war games through the Warfighting Analysis Division of the Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment Directorate of the Joint Staff to assess the strategy, assumptions, and capabilities of CYBERCOM to prevent large-scale cyber attacks by foreign powers with the capabilities described above.

The provision requires that the results of these assessments be conveyed to Congress not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The Department of Defense (DOD) published a new Cyber Strategy document in April, 2015. The document states that "If directed by the President or the Secretary of Defense, the U.S. military may conduct cyber operations to counter an imminent or on-going attack against the U.S. homeland or U.S. interests in cyberspace. The purpose of such a defensive measure is to blunt an attack and prevent the destruction of property or the loss of life." The document acknowledges that "the Defense Department's capabilities cannot necessarily guarantee that every cyberattack will be denied successfully," and emphasizes the necessity for DOD to improve its in-

telligence capabilities to anticipate threats, and gain knowledge of “key adversary human and technical networks.” The document also states that DOD will conduct an “annual comprehensive review of DOD’s defend the nation capabilities.”

The committee concurs that it is critical for the leadership of the executive branch and Congress to gain an understanding of the prospects for blunting and preventing destructive cyber attacks. Independent assessments need to be part of this process.

**Biennial exercises on responding to cyber attacks against critical infrastructure (sec. 1627)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct national-level cyber exercises not less frequently than once every 2 years for a period of 6 years. In preparing and executing these exercises, the Secretary would be required to coordinate with the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the FBI, and the heads of the critical infrastructure sector-specific agencies designated under Presidential Policy Directive 21. The Secretary also would be required to consult with governors of the States and the owners and operators of critical infrastructure. The exercises would be based on scenarios in which critical infrastructure is attacked through cyberspace and the President directs the Secretary to defend the Nation and to provide support to civil authorities in responding and recovering from the attacks.

The provision specifies that the purposes of the exercises are to (1) improve cooperation and coordination across the government and industry; (2) develop and practice command and control, communications and information sharing processes and capabilities; (3) identify gaps and problems requiring new or enhanced training, capabilities, procedures, or authorities; and (4) identify interdependencies, strengths, and weaknesses.

The provision also would require the Secretary to vary, from exercise-to-exercise, the assumptions and conditions for the exercise, including (1) the size, scope, duration, and sophistication of the simulated cyber attacks; (2) the degree of warning and knowledge about the attack and the means used, as well as the degree of delegation of authority from the President to react, including with pre-planned responses; (3) the effectiveness of United States Cyber Command’s National Mission Forces in preempting, blunting, and defeating attacks, including through the use of offensive capabilities; (4) the effectiveness of attacks on critical infrastructure; and (5) the effectiveness of resilience and recovery mechanisms.

Finally, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to coordinate with interagency partners to develop equitable cost-sharing agreements for the exercises.

The committee believes that the complexity of cross-jurisdictional coordination required to react to serious cyber attacks on the Nation demands the types of exercises mandated by this provision. It is imperative that federal agencies, States, and the private sector not only understand their own roles and missions, but become more capable through the practice of effective joint operations. It is imperative, too, for all elements of this integrated team to understand

the challenges and limitations facing the Nation in preventing attacks from reaching critical infrastructure.

### **Subtitle C—Nuclear Forces**

#### **Designation of Air Force officials to be responsible for policy on and procurement of Nuclear Command and Control Communications Systems (sec. 1631)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of the Air Force to designate a senior acquisition official responsible for ensuring the procurement and integration of Air Force Nuclear, Command and Control (NC3) Systems. The Air Force is responsible for over 70 percent of the Department's NC3 systems, which communicate with high reliability across space, air and ground environments. However, as the NC3 system begins modernization there have been examples where integration has failed. The Advanced Extremely High Frequency Satellite System was developed independently of its terminal—the Family of Beyond Line of Sight Terminal (FAB–T), which is to be placed on ground and aircraft command posts as well as long range bombers. The result is that the satellite system is now deploying with its terminal system for command posts well behind in acquisition and even further behind for the bomber aircraft. The individual appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force shall be responsible long range system planning and procurement of this highly redundant and interconnected communications system to avoid future FAB–T failures.

#### **Comptroller General of the United States review of recommendations relating to the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 1632)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Comptroller General of the United States to review the Department of Defense's approach for addressing the recommendations included in reports stated below, as well as subsequent recommendations of the Office of Cost Analysis and Performance Evaluation (CAPE), which is charged with monitoring these and subsequent recommendations resulting from the meetings of the Nuclear Deterrence Enterprise Group (NDERG).

The committee directs the Comptroller General to provide an initial assessment in the form of a briefing, to be followed by a written report, to the congressional defense committees no later than February 12, 2016 that addresses the following:

- (1) To what extent has the Department of Defense (DOD) established a process to implement the recommendations in the reports and subsequent recommendations of the NDERG;
- (2) To what extent has DOD established a process to track the Department's progress in implementing these recommendations as well as provide an annual updated list of such recommendations;
- (3) To what extent has the CAPE Office determined whether each recommendation has been effective; and
- (4) Any related matters the Comptroller General deems appropriate in consultation with the congressional defense committees.

The committee notes that the Independent Review of the Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise Report (June 2014) and the Internal Assessment of the Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise examined the nuclear deterrent mission in the Department of Defense and identified leadership, organization, investment, morale, policy, procedural, and other shortcomings that are adversely impacting the mission. The report included recommendations to address the Department's management of nuclear personnel, security requirements for nuclear weapons, and the availability of key equipment and support parts, among other issues. The Department has stated that the budget request includes additional investments to address these recommendations, identifying over \$1.0 billion for fiscal year 2016 and nearly \$8.5 billion from fiscal years 2016–2020. DOD has also established the NDERG to monitor implementation of the recommendations included in the nuclear enterprise review report.

#### **Assessment of global nuclear environment (sec. 1633)**

The committee recommends a provision that would direct the Department of Defense Director of Net Assessment, in coordination with the Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, to conduct an assessment of the global security environment with respect to nuclear weapons and the role of United States nuclear forces, policy, and strategy in that environment. Not later than November 15, 2016, the Director of Net Assessment shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on its findings. The assessment should include experts outside the Department of Defense with particular emphasis on those individuals and independent institutions with demonstrated expertise in strategy and net assessment methodology.

The committee notes that the nuclear competition has become both different and in some ways more complex than was the case during the Cold War, which was essentially a bipolar nuclear competition between the United States and Soviet Union.

There is significant risks to the security and safety of the U.S. homeland and U.S. military assets should nuclear deterrence fail in this changing nuclear competition environment. Over the past quarter century new nuclear powers have emerged. North Korea is now a nuclear-armed state, and Iran has consistently sought to acquire a nuclear capability. A regional nuclear competition has emerged in South Asia between India and Pakistan. Another may soon emerge in the Middle East, potentially a multilateral competition. There are concerns that a nuclear-armed Iran may trigger a nuclear proliferation cascade across the Middle East, involving Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and perhaps other states as well. As the United States and Russia have reduced their arsenals to levels far below those of the Cold War, the barrier to entry to great power nuclear status has been lowered to levels that could tempt other nuclear powers to increase their arsenals to these lesser “superpower” levels. Such a multipolar nuclear competition would likely be characterized by an intense “n-player” or multipolar competition to gain advantage, increasing uncertainty over the nuclear military balance, and crisis instability. The proliferation of nuclear weapons to states whose strategic decision making and crisis response sys-



tems are quite different from our own raises concerns regarding how leaders in these states would calculate cost, benefit, and risk when it comes to decisions about use of nuclear weapons.

The character of the nuclear competition is undergoing a fundamental and potentially dangerous shift with respect to the security of the United States, its allies, and partners. Therefore, there is a need for a thorough net assessment of the new nuclear environment, which objective should be to minimize the risk to key U.S. security interests. Such an assessment should involve the following:

(1) A statement of U.S. vital security interests, both near term and long term, that could be significantly affected by the competition among current and potential future nuclear powers;

(2) An examination of how the other current and prospective nuclear powers view nuclear weapons, to include their rationale for maintaining a nuclear arsenal, the role nuclear weapons play in advancing their geopolitical objectives, their nuclear doctrine, the circumstances under which they would employ nuclear weapons, and how;

(3) An evaluation of key trends in nuclear force developments, to include weapons and delivery systems, among existing and prospective nuclear powers;

(4) An identification and analysis of other key military capabilities that exert significant influence on the nuclear competition, to include early warning and command and control systems; conventional precision strike (with emphasis on prompt global strike); advanced air and missile defenses; cyber weapons and cyber defenses; and emerging capabilities that could significantly influence the competition, such as directed-energy systems;

(5) An examination of the geographic factors affecting the competition, particularly those that affect early/attack warning and those that could find nuclear strikes transiting the sovereign territory of third-party states, to include space over flight; and

(6) An analysis of the dynamics of multipolar or "n-player" nuclear competitions involving three or more nuclear powers.

(7) The risk and probability of nuclear deterrence failing measured in percent per year of annualized risk through different failure modes (a nuclear terrorist event, a tactical nuclear attack, a strategic nuclear attack), an event tree analysis of deterrence failure modes, and the uncertainty in those probabilities and ways to reduce that uncertainty.

In the course of addressing these factors, such an assessment should develop and analyze a range of contingencies/scenarios ranging from crises that examine short-term factors, to the characteristics of a long-term competition. These contingencies and/or scenarios should include crises emerging from the ongoing competition in the near-to-mid term future, out to 10 years, involving:

(1) The United States and individual nuclear powers;

(2) The United States and multiple nuclear powers;

(3) Two other nuclear powers;

(4) Three or more other nuclear powers; and

(5) Regional and cross-regional geography, to include contingencies/scenarios in Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, and East Asia, and contingencies/scenarios that transcend regions (e.g., South and East Asia). While conducting the assessment, the committee expects the Director of Net Assessment to assume that the size and characteristics of U.S. nuclear forces remains largely unchanged from its current form. However, the Director may consider alternative configurations of U.S. nuclear forces, insofar as doing so is relevant and beneficial to the required analysis.

**Deadline for Milestone A decision on Long-Range Standoff Weapon (sec. 1634)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to make a Milestone A decision on the Long-Range Standoff Weapon no later than May 31, 2016.

**Availability of Air Force procurement funds for certain commercial off-the-shelf parts for intercontinental ballistic missiles fuzes (sec. 1635)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$13.7 million in Missile Procurement, Air Force, for the procurement of covered parts pursuant to contracts entered into under section 1645 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat.)

**Sense of Congress on policy on the nuclear triad (sec. 1636)**

The committee recommends a provision which states the sense of the Congress that retaining all three legs of the nuclear triad is the highest priority mission of the Department of Defense and will best maintain strategic stability at a reasonable cost, while hedging against potential technical problems and vulnerabilities. The provision would state that it is the policy of the United States to sustain and modernize or replace the triad of strategic nuclear delivery systems, including heavy bombers equipped with nuclear gravity bombs and air-launched nuclear cruise missiles; land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles; and ballistic missile submarines equipped with submarine launched ballistic missiles. The provision would also state that it is the policy of the United States to operate, sustain, and modernize or replace a capability to forward-deploy nuclear weapons and dual capable fighter-bomber aircraft. The committee believes these capabilities serve to deter potential adversaries and assure allies and partners of the United States through a strong and long-term commitment to the nuclear deterrent of the United States to achieve a modern and responsive nuclear infrastructure to support the full spectrum of deterrence requirements.

**Subtitle D—Missile Defense Programs**

**Plan for expediting deployment time of continental United States interceptor site (sec. 1641)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a plan for expediting the deploy-

ment time for a potential future continental United States interceptor site by at least 2 years, and submit to the congressional defense committees a report on such plan not later than 30 days after the transmittal of the environmental impact assessment required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013.

The committee notes that the environmental impact study for the four sites being examined for a potential continental United States interceptor site is scheduled to be completed in 2016. According to the Missile Defense Agency, should the decision be made to move forward with an additional interceptor site, the overall timeline to achieve Initial Operational Capability is approximately 5 years. The committee is concerned that this timeline may be too lengthy if necessary to react to the deployment of intercontinental-range ballistic missiles in Iran. In such a circumstance, it would be advantageous to understand if, and how, an additional interceptor site in the United States could be made operational in 3 years or less. Such an assessment may include a description of legislative and administrative actions that may be necessary to shorten the deployment time and any acquisition risks associated with a shorter deployment time.

The provision would also require the Comptroller General to assess the Department's report on the deployment plan and submit a report to the congressional defense committees with findings and recommendations.

**Additional missile defense sensor coverage for the protection of the United States homeland (sec. 1642)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in cooperation with the relevant combatant command, to deploy by not later than December 31, 2020, a long-range discrimination radar or other appropriate tracking and discrimination sensor capabilities in a location optimized to support the defense of the homeland of the United States against emerging long-range ballistic missile threats from Iran.

The committee notes that the currently deployed ground-based midcourse missile defense system protects the entire United States homeland, including the East Coast, against the threat of limited ballistic missile attack from North Korea and Iran. In testimony to the committee on March 25, 2015, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency stated, "the discrimination capability of the system" is one of the "two fundamental means for improving homeland missile defense capability and capacity." Furthermore, according to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, long-range discrimination radar will provide larger hit assessment coverage, thereby enabling improved warfighting capabilities to manage ground-based interceptor inventory and improve the capacity of the ballistic missile defense system. The Department of Defense will deploy by 2020 a new midcourse tracking radar to provide persistent coverage and improve discrimination capabilities against threats to the United States homeland from the Pacific, an action this committee endorses.

According to testimony before the committee by the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Iran has the "means and motivation to develop longer-range missiles, including an

ICBM. Iran publically stated that it intends to launch a space-launch vehicle as early as this year capable of intercontinental ranges, if configured as such.” Accordingly, this committee believes that additional missile defense sensor discrimination capabilities are needed to enhance the protection of the United States homeland against long-range ballistic missiles from Iran.

**Air defense capability at North Atlantic Treaty Organization missile defense sites (sec. 1643)**

The committee recommends a provision that would express the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the relevant combatant command, should ensure that arrangements are in place, including support from North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies, to provide anti-air defense capability at all NATO missile defense sites in support of phases 2 and 3 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach. Not later than 30 days after a site achieves full operating capability, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report describing the plan of the Secretary to provide anti-air defense capability at the site.

**Availability of funds for Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system (sec. 1644)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$41.4 million for the Department of Defense to provide to the Government of Israel to procure the Iron Dome short-range rocket defense system, including for co-production of Iron Dome parts and components in the United States by United States industry. The provision would also provide that these funds shall be available subject to the terms and conditions in the “Agreement Between the Department of Defense and the Ministry of Defense of the State of Israel Concerning Iron Dome Defense System Procurement,” signed on March 5, 2014, subject to an amended agreement to be negotiated for co-production of Iron Dome radar components.

The provision would also require that not later than 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics shall jointly submit to the congressional defense committees a certification that the agreement specified above is being implemented and an assessment detailing any risks relating to the implementation of the agreement.

**Israeli cooperative missile defense program codevelopment and potential coproduction (sec. 1645)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$150.0 million for the Missile Defense Agency to provide to the Government of Israel to procure the David’s Sling Weapon System and \$15.0 million for the Arrow 3 Upper Tier Interceptor program, including for co-production of parts and components in the United States by United States industry.

The funds may be disbursed after certain conditions, which include a certification by the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, that the United States has entered into a bilateral

agreement with the Government of Israel that accomplishes the following: (1) Establishes the terms of co-production of parts and components; (2) establishes complete transparency on the Israeli requirement for the number of interceptors and batteries; (3) allows the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics to establish technical milestones for co-production and procurement and establish joint approval processes for third party sales; and (4) in the case of co-production for the David's Sling Weapon System, not less than half of such co-production is carried out by the United States.

**Development and deployment of multiple-object kill vehicle for missile defense of the United States homeland (sec. 1646)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to conduct rigorous flight testing of the multi-object kill vehicle by not later than 2020 and field such vehicle as soon as technically practicable. The provision would also direct that the management of the multi-object kill vehicle program shall report directly to the Deputy Director of the Missile Defense Agency.

The Director of the Missile Defense Agency testified before this committee that “these multi-object kill vehicles will revolutionize our missile defense architecture, substantially reducing the interceptor inventory required to defeat an evolving and more capable threat to the homeland.” The committee also observes that the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, testified before the committee that the multiple-object kill vehicle concept is one of his top missile defense priorities.

The Missile Defense Agency will begin concept definition of a multiple-object kill vehicle leading to a Milestone A technology maturation and risk reduction decision in fiscal year 2017. According to briefings provided to committee staff on February 20, 2015, by the Missile Defense Agency, a prototype could be available in the fiscal year 2020 to 2022 timeframe, with fielding sometime in the post-2025 period. The committee believes that the multiple-object kill vehicle could contribute critical capabilities to the future of the ballistic missile defense of the United States homeland, particularly against the evolving threats from North Korea and Iran.

**Requirement to replace capability enhancement I exoatmospheric kill vehicles (sec. 1647)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Director of the Missile Defense Agency to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all remaining ground-based interceptors (GBIs) of the ground-based midcourse defense system that are armed with the capability enhancement I exoatmospheric kill vehicle are replaced with the redesigned exoatmospheric kill vehicle (RKV) before September 30, 2022.

The committee supports the Missile Defense Agency's plan to develop an RKV that increases reliability, performance, producibility, and affordability. As required by section 1663 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291), the committee agrees on

the need for a rigorous acquisition process, including prototype testing, to ensure that the RKV works in an operationally effective and cost-effective manner.

The committee notes that according to written testimony by the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, “upgrading the kill vehicle on the GBI and enhancing the homeland defense sensor network are higher priorities and prerequisites for improving protection against limited ICBM attack,” and that initial deployment of the RKV is anticipated in 2020. Given the planned availability of the RKV in 2020, the committee believes it could be feasible to replace the remaining 17 capability enhancement I exoatmospheric kill vehicles within 2 years, or by 2022. The committee notes that emplacement of the capability enhancement II exoatmospheric kill vehicles will take place at the rate of 8 to 10 per year in 2015, 2016 and 2017, demonstrating that it could be possible to increase the rate of production for the RKV to stay ahead of the North Korean and potential Iranian ICBM threat.

#### **Airborne boost phase defense system (sec. 1648)**

The committee notes that in his speech of March 17, 2015, Deputy Secretary of Defense Robert Work highlighted the challenge of developing a low-cost way to defeat inbound missile raids. According to Deputy Secretary of Defense Work, “this doesn’t have to entail a kinetic solution—in fact, shooting down incoming missiles with our own missiles can put us on the wrong side of the cost imposition equation. We need to come up with other ideas to defeat this threat.” Likewise, the Commander, U.S. Northern Command, said on April 7, 2015, “if I had one more dollar to do ballistic missile defense . . . I would put it against those technologies that allow us to get to the correct side of the cost curve,” and “we need to be able to start knocking them down in the boost phase . . . and not rely on the midcourse phase where we are today.”

To address the growing threat posed by increasingly accurate and longer-range ballistic and cruise missiles, the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), in collaboration with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the military departments, is pursuing a suite of laser technologies that could serve as a cost-effective solution for destroying cruise missiles and ballistic missiles in the boost phase. A successful airborne laser system could transform U.S. missile defense capabilities against a broad range of missile threats, and place defense on the winning side of the offense-defense cost curve.

The committee supports MDA’s efforts to develop and demonstrate compact, efficient laser technology for missile defense applications and, in parallel, to explore the potential for developing and integrating a laser into a high-altitude, long-endurance aerospace vehicle. Under current plans, the goal of MDA is to demonstrate a 100 kilowatt high energy laser by fiscal year 2020, which could serve as the basis for a boost phase missile defense weapon system.

Accordingly, the committee recommends a provision that would prioritize technology investments in the Department of Defense to support efforts by MDA to develop and deploy a boost phase airborne laser weapon system by fiscal year 2025. The provision encourages collaboration and cooperation between MDA and other

Department of Defense components, and directs the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional defense committees with a report, within 120 days of enactment of this Act, of Department of Defense efforts to develop and deploy a boost phase airborne laser weapon system for missile defense.

**Extension of limitation on providing certain sensitive missile defense information to the Russian Federation (sec. 1649)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Section 1246(c)(2) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 923) to extend the limitation on providing certain sensitive missile defense information to the Russian Federation for fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

**Extension of requirement for Comptroller General of the United States review and assessment of missile defense acquisition programs (sec. 1650)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 1120981) to continue to require the Comptroller General to review, for fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the annual reports of the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) on acquisition baselines and variances and assess the extent to which MDA has achieved its acquisition goals and objectives. The provision would also extend the reports required on activities of the Missile Defense Executive Board.

The committee notes that the Government Accountability Office (GAO) has played an instrumental role over many years in the oversight of missile defense acquisition programs, and in helping improve the oversight and accountability of such programs. The existing legislative mandate for GAO's review of missile defense acquisition programs would otherwise expire, and the committee believes it is important for GAO to continue its review.

**Subtitle E—Other Matters**

**Measures in response to violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty by the Russian Federation (sec. 1661)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the President to notify the appropriate congressional committees with respect to whether the Russian Federation has flight-tested, deployed, or possesses a military system that has achieved an initial operating capability that is in violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty or has begun taking measures to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty. The provision would also require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the status of updates provided to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and other allies of the United States on the Russian Federation's flight testing, operational capability, and deployment of ground-launched ballistic missiles in violation of the INF Treaty. The provision would state that it is the sense of the Congress that the deployment of

a nuclear ground-launched cruise missile by the Russian Federation would pose a dangerous threat to the United States and its allies; the Russian Federation has established an increasing role for nuclear weapons in its military strategy; efforts to compel the Russian Federation to return to compliance are in the best interests of the United States, but cannot be open-ended; and efforts by the United States to develop military and non-military options for responding to violations of the INF Treaty could encourage the Russian Federation to return to compliance with the INF Treaty.

If, on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Russian Federation has not begun taking measures to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty, the provision would require the Secretary of Defense to, within 120 days, submit to Congress a plan with respect to developing the following military capabilities: (a) Counterforce capabilities to prevent INF Treaty-range ground-launched ballistic missile and cruise missile attacks; (b) counter-vailing strike capabilities to enhance the forces of the United States or allies of the United States; and (c) active defenses to defend against intermediate-range ground launched cruise missile attacks. The provision directs the President to include in the plan such other options as the President considers useful to encourage the Russian Federation to return to full compliance with the INF Treaty.

The committee believes the development and deployment of a nuclear ground-launched cruise missile by the Russian Federation in violation of the INF Treaty would pose a dangerous threat to the United States and its allies, and that efforts taken by the President to compel the Russian Federation to return to compliance with the INF Treaty must be persistent and are in the best interests of the United States, but cannot be open-ended.

**Modification of notification and assessment of proposal to modify or introduce new aircraft or sensors for flight by the Russian Federation under the Open Skies Treaty (sec. 1662)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify Section 1242(b) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) by adding a requirement to include an assessment by the commander of each combatant command potentially affected by a proposal of the Russian Federation to modify or introduce a new aircraft or sensor for flight under the Open Skies Treaty, including an assessment of the potential effects of the proposal on operations and any potential vulnerabilities. The provision would also require that not later than 30 days after the date of any meeting of the Open Skies Consultative Commission, the Secretary of Defense submit to the defense committees of Congress a report on such meeting, including a description of any agreements entered into during such meeting, and whether any such agreement will result in a modification to the aircraft or sensors that will be subject to the Open Skies Treaty.



**Milestone A decision for the conventional prompt global strike weapons system (sec. 1663)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to make a Milestone A decision for the conventional prompt global strike program no later than September 30, 2020, or 8 months after the successful completion of the Intermediate Range Flight 2 test.

**Budget Items**

**Conventional prompt global strike**

The budget request included \$79.0 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense Wide, PE 64165D8Z, for conventional prompt global strike development.

The committee is aware that the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) identified development of conventional prompt global strike capabilities as a key initiative for the defeat of time-urgent regional threats. The Department of Defense is examining sea-based and ground-based concepts and technology in advance of a future program of record. The Flight Experiment–I flight test scheduled for March 2017 will, if successful, mature and demonstrate key technologies needed by both land- and sea-based prompt global strike systems. In support of these efforts, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 64165D8Z for conventional prompt global strike development.

Elsewhere in this report, the committee recommends a provision that would direct the Secretary of Defense to make a Milestone A decision for the conventional prompt global strike weapons system not later than September 30, 2020, or 8 months after the successful completion of Intermediate Range Flight 2, whichever is earlier.

**Divert attitude control system in support of multi-object kill vehicle**

The budget request included \$43.3 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, PE 63178C, for Weapons Technology in support of the Missile Defense Agency, including \$13.0 million for interceptor technology.

The committee notes that the Missile Defense Agency is pursuing research and development on the next generation divert attitude control system (DACS), which is critical for a successful multi-object kill vehicle program. According to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, a multi-object kill capability would “revolutionize” the missile defense architecture, permitting the destruction of several threat objects with a single ground-based interceptor missile. The committee believes the multi-object kill vehicle program should be a high priority of the Missile Defense Agency. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million in PE 63178C to reduce development risk for the next generation divert attitude control system.

**Fiber combining laser prototype**

The budget request included \$43.3 million in Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, PE 63178C, for Weap-

ons Technology in support of the Missile Defense Agency, including \$30.3 million for directed energy research.

The committee notes that the Missile Defense Agency, in collaboration with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, is pursuing a suite of laser technologies that, when combined with high-altitude, long-endurance unmanned aerial vehicles, could serve as a cost-effective solution for destroying cruise missiles and ballistic missiles. The committee notes that the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Commander of U.S. Northern Command believe this technology holds great promise. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in PE 63178C for the Missile Defense Agency to develop a prototype fiber combining laser suitable for flight testing on an unmanned aerial vehicle as soon as possible.

#### **Funding for U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs**

The budget request included \$102.8 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, PE 63913C, for U.S.-Israeli cooperative missile defense programs, including \$11.0 million to improve the existing Arrow Weapon System; \$55.1 million for continued development of the Arrow-3 upper tier interceptor missiles; and \$36.7 million for the David's Sling short range ballistic missile defense system. These systems are part of Israel's layered missile defenses against missiles and rockets of varying ranges. The United States is jointly developing and co-managing these systems to ensure they are compatible and interoperable with U.S. missile defense systems. The Government of Israel has requested an additional \$166.0 million for the Arrow program and the David's Sling program to address the growing short-range and long-range ballistic missile threat.

The committee recommends an increase of \$166.0 million in PE 63913C for continued development of the Arrow-3 upper tier interceptor missile and the David's Sling short range ballistic missile defense system.

#### **Multiple Object Kill Vehicle**

The budget request included \$46.7 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, PE 63294C, for Common Kill Vehicle Technology, which includes development of the Multiple Object Kill Vehicle (MOKV). According to the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, a multi-object kill capability would "revolutionize" the missile defense architecture, permitting the destruction of several threat objects with a single ground-based interceptor missile. The committee believes the MOKV program should be a high priority of the Missile Defense Agency. Accordingly, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in PE 63294C for the MOKV development program.

#### **Operationally Responsive Space program**

The budget request included \$6.5 million for the Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) program, Air Force exhibit R-1, line 44, Program Element 64857F. The committee recommends an increase of \$13.5 million to continue the development of a Space Based Sur-

veillance System prototype satellite as well as a follow-on simplified weather satellite. In addition the committee encourages the program and the department to continue its efforts in the low-cost launch of small payloads. The committee recognizes that as space threats increase, the importance of rapid reconstitution grows dramatically. The committee commends the Department's decision to use the program's streamlined acquisition authorities within the Air Force's Space and Missile Systems Center to prototype systems that if successful will transition into traditional space acquisition programs.

### **Redesigned Kill Vehicle**

The budget request included \$266.7 million for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-wide, PE 64874C, for improved homeland defense interceptors. This program will develop a new kill vehicle, known as the Redesigned Kill Vehicle (RKV), for the ground-based interceptor that supports defense of the United States homeland against long-range ballistic missile attack. The RKV will improve the reliability, producibility, affordability, and performance of the current capability enhancement I and II exoatmospheric kill vehicles for the ground based interceptor.

The committee notes that improving the reliability of the ground-based interceptor is a top priority for the Director of the Missile Defense Agency and the Commander of U.S. Northern Command. The committee strongly concurs with this priority. According to the Missile Defense Agency, the first flight test of the RKV is scheduled for fiscal year 2018, followed by an intercept flight test in the third quarter of fiscal year 2019. Limited initial production of the RKV could begin in fiscal year 2020, with four production article RKVs available by the end of fiscal year 2021. The committee is concerned that this schedule may not stay ahead of the evolving threat from North Korea and Iran. Therefore, the committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in PE 64874C for risk reduction activities associated with the development of the RKV.

### **Sharkseer zero day defense for enterprise email**

The National Security Agency (NSA), at the direction of the Chief Information Officer, established a program called Sharkseer to provide non-signature-based defenses against previously unknown and morphing malware at the Department of Defense (DOD) enterprise perimeter. Sharkseer seeks to identify and integrate best-of-breed advanced commercial products. Congress added \$28.0 million in fiscal year 2015 funding to start the program and to deploy capabilities to all of the DOD Internet Access Points (IAPs).

The budget request for fiscal year 2016 included \$42.0 million in NSA funding to fully field and sustain Sharkseer to all IAPs. However, this funding only addressed capabilities to inspect and block web traffic. Separately, the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) sought funding for DOD Enterprise Email services, which included a request for protecting that email traffic with Sharkseer. That overall initiative was not approved prior to the transmittal of the fiscal year 2016 budget. As a result, the funding request does

not provide the funding necessary to address the protection of email traffic.

Email that enters the DOD is a primary avenue that malign actors use to compromise DOD networks and computer systems. Accordingly, the committee recommends increased funding for DISA to field Sharkseer capabilities to protect against compromises through email traffic. The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to Program Element 33140G, line 7, defense-wide procurement, and an increase of \$10.0 million for defense-wide operations and maintenance for this purpose.

The committee directs that the Sharkseer systems for web and email traffic be integrated, and that DOD ensure that malware identified by Sharkseer be rapidly and automatically used to tip other defensive systems across the Department, including the Cyber Protection Teams.

#### **Standard Missile-3 block IB**

The budget request included \$147.8 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, line 25, for the Missile Defense Agency for advanced procurement of the Standard Missile-3 IB (SM-3 IB) missile. The committee is concerned that this funding, in support of multi-year procurement, is early to need. The committee recommends a decrease of \$147.8 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, line 25, for the Standard Missile-3 IB missile program. The committee recommends an increase of \$147.8 million in Procurement, Defense-wide, line 24, for the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense program distributed as follows: \$117.9 million to increase SM-3 IB quantities from 40 to 49 missiles; \$2.6 million to increase SM-3 IB canisters from 41 to 50; and \$27.3 million for missile test participation costs.

#### **U.S. Cyber Command Technology Development**

The budget request included \$19.1 million for the U.S. Cyber Command Technology Development program's Combatant Command Support project, Air Force exhibit R-2A, Program Element 36250F, project number 646008. The Combatant Command Support project supports the development and testing of various tools critical to achieving combatant command military objectives. The committee recommends an increase of \$15.0 million because the committee is concerned that the capacity to meet the cyber effects requirements of the combatant commands is too limited and that additional funding is necessary to meet both current and future cyber requirements.

#### **Items of Special Interest**

##### **Assessment of the information security threats of wireless-enabled capabilities at Department of Defense facilities**

The committee directs the Secretary of Defense to provide to the congressional defense and intelligence committees an assessment of the information security threats to and vulnerabilities posed by Wi-Fi, Distributed Antenna Systems, and wireless-enabled endpoints installed in Department of Defense (DOD) facilities, including DOD combat support agencies. The report shall identify any entities currently allowing wireless connections to classified and unclassified

networks and a detailed description comparing information assurance protections in place on wireless versus wired networks to prevent unauthorized access and cyber intrusions to networks. This report shall identify if any single lines of defense exist that could result in the compromise of DOD or Intelligence Community networks. The report shall be due no later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act.

#### **Comptroller General review of space system acquisition and acquisition oversight**

The committee has grown increasingly concerned by the disjointed nature of Department of Defense space system acquisition and acquisition oversight. Over the past two decades, various commissions and reviews have found governance over Department of Defense space system acquisitions and operations to be fragmented and overlapping, leading to significant cost increases, delays in delivering capabilities, program cancellations, and inefficient operations. Over the past 10 years, the Department of Defense has made a number of changes to its space leadership including: creation of the Defense Space Council; alignment of Air Force space system acquisition leadership under a single headquarters organization; creation of the Space and Intelligence Office within the office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; and disestablishing the National Security Space Office and Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Networks and Information Integration; among other changes.

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to brief the congressional defense committees by March 1, 2016 on the effectiveness of the Department of Defense's space acquisition and acquisition oversight model. The committee is interested in better understanding how the existing framework has influenced decision making and accountability and whether efforts intended to reduce fragmentation and overlap have been effective. The committee also directs the Comptroller General of the United States to evaluate what additional changes, if any, could be considered to improve governance of space system acquisitions and operations.

#### **Continuation of nuclear command, control and communications assessments by the Government Accountability Office**

The committee directs the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to update recent prior assessments of nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) acquisition programs with an interim briefing the congressional defense committees no later than September 30, 2015, and a briefing no later than January 31, 2016.

The committee values the ongoing work of the GAO in reviewing the NC3 acquisition programs. Similar to space acquisition programs, NC3 acquisition is a systems of systems process, which takes years to oversee on a continuous basis to determine if the programs are achieving the desired cost, scope, and schedule.

### **Missile Defense Agency assessment of capabilities to defend against current and projected missile threats**

The committee recognizes that the current Ballistic Missile Defense System protects the entire United States homeland, including Hawaii, against the threat of limited ballistic missile attack from North Korea. However, the committee acknowledges that North Korea is developing advanced missile technologies, and claims to have tested several of them, including a submarine-launched ballistic missile. By expanding persistent sensor discrimination capabilities, the Ballistic Missile Defense System would be better enabled to respond to emerging ballistic missile threats involving countermeasures and decoys. The committee is aware that, in response to a request from the Commander of U.S. Northern Command, the Missile Defense Agency is exploring potential solutions for additional sensor coverage of Hawaii. Additionally, the Department of Defense is currently conducting an analysis of alternatives related to homeland ballistic missile defense sensor and discrimination capabilities, as directed by the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291). The committee supports these efforts and encourages the Department to prepare recommendations from these analyses in advance of the fiscal year 2017 budget submission.

To ensure that Hawaii continues to be protected under the Ballistic Missile Defense System in the face of evolving ballistic missile threats and capabilities, the committee requires the Missile Defense Agency to conduct an assessment and provide a report no later than 90 days after the enactment of this act to the congressional defense committees.

The report shall include an assessment of the current Ballistic Missile Defense System’s ability to protect Hawaii against current missile threats and the projected threats we could face in 2 and 5 years, and options for modifying or augmenting systems to ensure that Hawaii remains protected from possible rogue nation missile attacks. The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

### **Organization of the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear Deterrence Mission**

The Nuclear Enterprise Review (NER) conducted by the Department of Defense in 2014 made a variety of recommendations regarding changes to the organization of the Department of Defense to enable focused coordination of the nation’s nuclear deterrence mission. The independent review led by two former senior military officers recommended that the Secretary of Defense, “direct that the loosely federated nuclear activities within [the Office of the Secretary of Defense] and the Air Force be brought together into a coherent and synchronized structure that focuses on direction and support for the nuclear forces.” The internal review conducted by the Department echoed these findings and made similar recommendations.

The committee is concerned that recent structural changes within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) may lead to the opposite result in the long term. The elimination last year of the posi-

tion of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Strategic Affairs may bring decreased policy focus on nuclear deterrence issues. Furthermore, division of responsibilities for various components of the nuclear mission (e.g., nuclear weapons, delivery systems, and command and control) within the Office of the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics could lead to similar end results. While the committee supports management specialization and seeking efficiencies within OSD, such efforts must not come at the expense of the recently renewed focus on nuclear deterrence.

**Report on Advanced Extremely High Frequency Terminals for bomber aircraft**

The Secretary of the Air Force shall report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2016, on alternatives to the current program of record for the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) terminals to be used in long range strike bomber aircraft, specifically the B-52, B-2, and Long Range Strike Bomber.

**Report on Follow-On Commander's Evaluation Tests and Demonstration and Shake Out tests**

The Secretary of the Navy shall report to the congressional defense committees on Follow-on Commander's Evaluation Tests (FCET) and Demonstration and Shake Out (DASO) tests for fiscal year 2016. In addition, the Secretary of the Navy shall report to the congressional defense committees on a plan for future reporting of FCET and DASO tests to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2016.

**Report on space-based missile defense interceptor**

The committee supports the Missile Defense Agency's (MDA) efforts to consider additional capabilities to prevent ballistic missile attack on the United States, including solutions that would reduce cost-per-kill. Additionally, the committee is aware of technology development that focuses on interception in the boost phase of a ballistic missile. The committee believes that such capabilities that are both cost-effective and operationally reliable should be explored.

The Senate-passed version of the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 required the Department of Defense to conduct an independent assessment of the feasibility and advisability of developing a space-based interceptor (SBI) element to the ballistic missile defense system. This study was completed in April 2011 and submitted to Congress. Among its findings, the study determined that "the creation, deployment, and operation of an SBI system would provide a number of strategic benefits but would also face certain challenges."

In order to understand the current status of technologies under development and those that are potentially capable of providing a space-based element to the ballistic missile defense system, the committee directs MDA to submit a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act that includes the following elements: (1) an assessment of the need for a space-based interceptor element to the ballistic

missile defense system, including an assessment of the extent to which there is a ballistic missile threat that such an interceptor would address; (2) whether other elements of the ballistic missile defense system could be modified to meet that threat; (3) an assessment of the components and capabilities and the maturity of critical technologies necessary to make such a space-based interceptor element operational; (4) an estimate of the total cost for the life cycle of such a space-based interceptor element, including the costs of research, development, demonstration, procurement, deployment, and launching of the element; (5) an assessment of the effectiveness of such a space-based interceptor element in intercepting ballistic missiles and the survivability of the element in case of attack; (6) an assessment of possible debris generated from the use or testing of such a space-based interceptor element; and (7) an assessment of any command, control, or battle management considerations of using such a space-based interceptor element, including estimated timelines for the detection of ballistic missiles, decision-making with respect to the use of the element, and interception of the missile by the element. The report shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

#### **Reserve component Cyber Protection Teams**

The committee has a strong interest in Department of Defense (DOD) plans for establishing Cyber Protection Teams (CPTs) in the reserve components to meet the needs of United States Cyber Command (CYBERCOM), and the states, in defending DOD networks and assisting the states in the event of serious cyber attacks.

The committee notes that the Army and the Army reserve components intend to field 21 CPTs in fiscal years 2016–2018, one in active status, and 10 each in the Guard and Reserve. These CPTs are not currently planned to be included in the forces assigned to CYBERCOM. The Air Force intends to establish 12 CPTs in the Air National Guard, which will be manned to achieve the equivalent of 2 active CPTs dedicated to the Cyber Mission Forces (CMF) on behalf of the Air Force.

The committee commends the Department and the reserve components for planning for a robust number of CPTs, but has concerns about implementation. Specifically, training costs have not been budgeted yet, and the Department does not yet have a plan for sustaining the current training infrastructure after fiscal year 2016, when funding provided by the Office of the Secretary of Defense for the standup of the CMF ends.

The Army Reserve included \$10.6 million in the budget request for training the 3 CPTs it plans to establish in fiscal year 2016. However, the \$9.0 million required to train the 3 Army National Guard CPTs to be fielded in 2016 has not yet been allocated. Out-year funding to train the remaining 14 CPTs is not budgeted.

The committee directs the following actions. First, the committee directs the Army and Army National Guard to notify the congressional defense committees when a decision is made to allocate funding in fiscal year 2016 for training the CPTs.

Second, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Principal Cyber Advisor (PCA), the Commander of CYBERCOM, and the Chief of the National Guard



Bureau to report to the congressional defense committees on how the basing and intended use of the reserve component CPTs reflects an appropriate balance between, on the one hand, the core mission of the reserve component's CPTs to provide surge capacity for CYBERCOM, and, on the other hand, the needs of the states, and the defense of the reserve components' networks.

Third, the committee directs the PCA, the Service Secretaries, and the Commander of CYBERCOM to develop a plan for the Services to sustain the individual training capabilities that have been centrally funded and maintained since the CMF were first created. The committee urges the Department to create a federated and joint training model and discourages having each service build separate training capabilities for its cyber contingent. The committee directs that the plan provide for a training capacity in fiscal years 2017 and 2018 that is adequate to complete all required training for the reserve component CPTs and the sustainment of the active CMF units. The plan should be available for briefing to the congressional defense committees when the President submits the budget request for fiscal year 2017.

#### **Solid Rocket Motor industrial base**

The committee recognizes that the Air Force is currently exploring options to acquire the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD), a replacement for the Minuteman III (MMIII) system. The Committee understands that the Air Force's acquisition decisions will have lasting impacts on the health and viability of the Solid Rocket Motor (SRM) industrial base, a vital element of the defense industrial base that supports U.S strategic forces.

The committee believes that sustaining two healthy SRM sources is critical to the long term viability of the Nation's strategic triad, both as a hedge against a single point of failure and as a means of promoting competition in GBSD, which will involve the development, acquisition, and sustainment of rocket motors to replace the MMIII's three booster stages. As with all major acquisition programs, and consistent with current Department of Defense policy, the committee strongly believes the use of full and open competition will provide the best opportunity for Air Force to benefit from the innovation, improved contractor performance, and cost reduction during development, acquisition, and sustainment of the booster stages.

#### **Space control modeling and simulation range**

The Secretary of Defense shall report to the congressional defense committees on a plan for a modeling and simulation range for offensive and defensive space control activities no later than February 28, 2016.

#### **The importance and use of U.S. FAA licensed spaceports**

The committee appreciates the unique importance of U.S. FAA licensed spaceports and recognizes and when appropriate, encourages the use of U.S. FAA commercially-licensed spaceports and launch and range complexes that provide mid- to low-inclination orbits or polar high-inclination orbits in support of national security space capabilities. The committee recognizes that these federally-li-

censed, non-federally owned launch facilities, are available to meet the requirements for the national security space program from the Department of Defense (DOD), Air Force Space Command.

The Pacific Spaceport Complex-Alaska (PSCA) has supported numerous launches for Air Force Space Command including specific national security launches. It remains the only commercial polar launch range available in the United States and PSCA, a state-of-the-industry spaceport on Kodiak Island, Alaska, provides access to space for vital government and commercial interests. The Mid Atlantic Regional Spaceport (MARS) at Wallops Island, Virginia provides medium-class and small-class launch capabilities for the DOD. It has launched numerous missions for DOD with its agency partners, Air Force Space Command, ORS, and MDA. MARS provides assured/responsive access to mid-to-low inclination orbits for payloads up to 14,000 lbs.

The committee believes that these two facilities can be used, when appropriate, to support the national security space program.

#### **Upgrades to the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System**

The committee notes that the architecture of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System is in need of hardware and software upgrades to improve reliability and maintainability and eliminate obsolescence. The committee recognizes that significant improvements are being made to the interceptors to correct the problems with the existing kill vehicles discovered in flight tests, to increase survivability of the boosters, and to ensure reliability throughout the service life of the fleet. The committee supports the Missile Defense Agency's (MDA) efforts to accomplish these improvements, along with the refurbishment of Missile Field 1 and deployment of an additional 14 ground-based interceptors at Fort Greely, Alaska. The budget request for MDA prioritizes investments in these areas and this committee will continue to monitor progress toward these goals.

Additionally, the committee notes that section 1665 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291) requires the Director of the MDA, in coordination with the Commander of the United States Northern Command, to submit a report to the congressional defense committees setting forth the status of current and planned efforts to improve the homeland ballistic missile defense capability of the United States. Elements of this report include the status of such efforts as fielding the additional 14 ground-based interceptors and refurbishing Missile Field 1 at Fort Greely; improving the capabilities of the ground-based interceptors deployed with upgraded capability enhancement-I and capability enhancement-II exo-atmospheric kill vehicles; developing, testing, and fielding the next generation exo-atmospheric kill vehicle; and improving sensor and discrimination capabilities, including the deployment of a long-range discrimination radar. The committee strongly encourages MDA to submit this report promptly.

The committee further directs MDA to submit a report to the congressional defense committees within 90 days of completion of the above-mentioned report that addresses the status of efforts to enhance the ground-based interceptor stockpile reliability program;

to implement upgrades to the ground-based midcourse defense ground system (to include fire control nodes, fire control software, command launch equipment, and data terminals) to improve reliability and eliminate obsolescence; and to upgrade the Early Warning Radars in Clear, Alaska, Shemya, Alaska and Cape Cod, Massachusetts.



## **DIVISION B—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS**

### **Summary and explanation of funding tables**

Division B of this Act authorizes funding for military construction projects of the Department of Defense (DOD). It includes funding authorizations for the construction and operation of military family housing as well as military construction for the reserve components, the defense agencies, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program. It also provides authorization for the base closure accounts that fund military construction, environmental cleanup, and other activities required to implement the decisions in base closure rounds.

The tables contained in this Act provide the project-level authorizations for the military construction funding authorized in Division B of this Act and summarize that funding by account.

The fiscal year 2016 budget requested \$8.3 billion for military construction and housing programs. Of this amount, \$6.6 billion was requested for military construction, \$1.4 billion for the construction and operation of family housing, and \$251.3 million for base closure activities.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations for military construction, housing programs, and base closure activities totaling \$8.3 billion. The total amount authorized for appropriations reflects the committee's continuing commitment to invest in the recapitalization of DOD facilities and infrastructure.

### **Short title (sec. 2001)**

The committee recommends a provision that would designate division B of this Act as the "Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016."

### **Expiration of authorizations and amounts required to be specified by law (sec. 2002)**

The committee recommends a provision that would establish the expiration date for authorizations in this Act for military construction projects, land acquisition, family housing projects, and contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program as of October 1, 2018, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later.



## **TITLE XXI—ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**

### **Summary**

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$743.3 million for military construction and \$493.2 million for family housing for the Army for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$721.7 million for military construction and \$493.2 million for family housing for fiscal year 2016.

The budget request included \$37.0 million for an instruction facility for the U.S. Army Band at Joint Base Myer-Henderson Hall, Virginia. The committee recommends no funding for this project and applies the savings to higher priority unfunded military construction projects in fiscal year 2016. The committee believes that many of the challenges associated with the current facility may be addressed through a combination of facilities additions, minor military construction, and/or renovation.

The budget request included \$43.0 million for a Homeland Defense Operations Center at Joint Base San Antonio, Texas. The committee defers consideration of the authorization for this facility until after the completion of the plan for reducing administrative and headquarters activities required elsewhere in this bill.

Additionally, the committee recommends a reduction of \$52.0 million from prior-year authorization of appropriations to reflect project cancellations and bid savings and applies such savings to high priority unfunded military construction projects in fiscal year 2016.

The committee recognizes that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes the Army has identified significant unfunded military construction priorities, including two access control points at Fort Meade, Maryland and an unaccompanied personnel barracks at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The committee notes that these projects were identified as the top priorities of the Chief of Staff of the Army and Commander of U.S. Southern Command, respectively. Funding for these projects has been added as outlined in the tables in sections 2101 and 4601.

### **Authorized Army construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2101)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Active Duty component of the Army for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Family housing (sec. 2102)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Army for fiscal year 2016. This provision would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

**Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2103)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to improve existing family housing units of the Department of the Army in an amount not to exceed \$3.5 million.

**Authorization of appropriations, Army (sec. 2104)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Army authorized for construction for fiscal year 2016. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the Active-Duty component of the Army. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2105)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2101(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239) for construction of a cadet barracks building at the United States Military Academy, New York, to include mechanical equipment and associated distribution lines.

**Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2106)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81) for three projects until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

**Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2107)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in section 2101 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239) for seven projects until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

**Additional authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2016 project (sec. 2108)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Army to carry out a \$12.4 million project to con-



struct a vehicle bridge and traffic circle to facilitate traffic flow to and from the medical center at Rhine Ordnance Barracks, Germany, using host-nation payment-in-kind funding.

**Limitation on construction of new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba (sec. 2109)**

The committee recommends a provision that would limit funding authorized by the bill for new facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, until the Secretary of Defense certifies to the congressional defense committees that any new construction of facilities at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, have enduring military value independent of a high-value detention mission.



## TITLE XXII—NAVY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

### Summary

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$1.6 billion for military construction and \$369.6 million for family housing for the Navy for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$1.7 billion for military construction and \$369.6 million for family housing for fiscal year 2016.

The budget request included \$44.5 million for a raw water pipeline from Camp Pendleton to the City of Fallbrook in order to allow the city to access water from the Santa Margarita watershed. The project would also provide upgrades to the existing Camp Pendleton water system. The committee notes that the requested project is intended to represent a physical solution to ongoing litigation over water rights between the Fallbrook Public Utilities District (FPUD) and the Navy. However, given that negotiations between the Navy and the FPUD to resolve this litigation are ongoing, the committee believes that this project is early to need. Therefore, the committee recommends no funds for this project and directs the Secretary of the Navy to submit a rescoped project that would provide the funds needed for the upgrade of the Camp Pendleton water system. The Secretary may, to the extent funds are provided from the State of California, the City of Fallbrook, or another source outside the Department of Defense, enter into an agreement to construct both the military and civilian elements of the projects as outlined by the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11). Prior to entering into such an agreement, the Secretary is directed to notify the congressional defense committees of the proposed terms including the cost allocation between the Department of Defense and civilian authorities.

The budget request also included \$48.3 million for the Townsend Range Expansion, including \$5.0 million for two civilian fire stations in Long and McIntosh Counties, Georgia. The committee authorizes \$43.3 million for the Townsend Range expansion without the two civilian fire stations. The committee does not believe the Navy has the authority to construct fire stations for which it will not have operational control.

The committee recognizes that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes the Navy has identified significant unfunded priorities for military construction in support of the Marine Corps, including air field security improvements at Cherry Point, North Carolina; a KC–130J enlisted air crew trainer at Miramar, California; an LHD pad conversion and new MV–22 landing pads at Marine Corps base, Hawaii; range safety improvements at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina; installation operations facilities at Camp Pendleton, Cali-

fornia; and a replacement fire station for the Basic School at Quantico, Virginia. The committee notes that these projects were identified as the top priorities of the Commandant of the Marine Corps. Funding for these projects has been added as outlined in the tables in sections 2201 and 4601.

**Authorized Navy construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2201)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Navy and Marine Corps military construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Family housing (sec. 2202)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Navy for fiscal year 2016. This provision would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

**Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2203)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to improve existing family housing units of the Department of the Navy in an amount not to exceed \$11.5 million.

**Authorization of appropriations, Navy (sec. 2204)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the Active Duty component military construction and family housing projects of the Department of the Navy authorized for construction for fiscal year 2016. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the Active-Duty components of the Navy and the Marine Corps. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2205)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112-81; 125 Stat. 1666), for three projects until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2206)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2201(a) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239), for seven projects until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

## **TITLE XXIII—AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**

### **Summary**

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$1.4 billion for military construction and \$491.7 million for family housing for the Air Force in fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$1.4 billion for military construction and \$491.7 million for family housing for fiscal year 2016.

Additionally, the committee recommends a decrease of \$50.0 million from prior-year authorization of appropriations to reflect project cancellations and bid savings and applies such savings to high priority unfunded military construction projects in fiscal year 2016.

The committee recognizes that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes the Air Force has identified significant unfunded military construction priorities including: a new communications facility at Luke Air Force Base, Arizona; a fixed ground control station facility at Holloman Air Force Base, New Mexico; an air traffic control tower at McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas; an expansion of the Air Support Operations Center at Fort Drum, New York; and a consolidated communications facility at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana. The committee notes that these projects were identified as the top priorities of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. Funding for these projects has been added as outlined in the tables in sections 2301 and 4601.

### **Authorized Air Force construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2301)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize Air Force military construction projects for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

### **Family housing (sec. 2302)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize new construction, planning, and design of family housing units for the Air Force for fiscal year 2016. This provision would also authorize funds for facilities that support family housing, including housing management offices, housing maintenance, and storage facilities.

### **Improvements to military family housing units (sec. 2303)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to improve existing family housing units

of the Department of the Air Force in an amount not to exceed \$150.7 million.

**Authorization of appropriations, Air Force (sec. 2304)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the active component military construction and family housing projects of the Air Force authorized for construction for fiscal year 2016. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the active-duty component of the Air Force. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2010 project (sec. 2305)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2301(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) for a ground control tower at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, to include the installation of communications cabling.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project (sec. 2306)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2301 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66) for the construction of an operations facility at Royal Air Force Station Lakenheath, United Kingdom, to allow for construction at an unspecified worldwide location.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 project (sec. 2307)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2301 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291) for the construction of a KC–46A Alter Composite maintenance shop at McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, to allow for a 7,500 square foot facility consistent with Air Force guidelines for such facilities.

**Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2308)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in section 2301 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) for one project until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

**Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2309)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in section 2301 of the Military Construction Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239)

for one project until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.





## **TITLE XXIV—DEFENSE AGENCIES MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**

### **Summary**

The budget request included authorization of appropriations of \$2.3 billion for military construction for the defense agencies and \$58.7 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2016.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$2.1 billion for military construction and \$58.7 million for family housing for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2016.

The budget request included \$49.7 million for the Defense Logistics Agency Headquarters Facility Replacement at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The committee defers consideration of the authorization for this facility until after the completion of the plan for reducing administrative and headquarters activities required elsewhere in this bill.

Additionally, the committee recommends a decrease of \$120.0 million from prior-year authorization of appropriations to reflect project cancellations and bid savings and applies such savings to high priority unfunded military construction projects in fiscal year 2016.

### **Authorized Defense Agencies construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2401)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the defense agencies for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

### **Authorized energy conservation projects (sec. 2402)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to carry out energy conservation projects. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

### **Authorization of appropriations, Defense Agencies (sec. 2403)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the military construction and family housing projects of the defense agencies authorized for construction for fiscal year 2016. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction and family housing projects for the defense agencies. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2012 project (sec. 2404)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authority contained in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) for the High Performance Computing Center at Fort Meade, Maryland, to include a generator plant capable of providing 60 megawatts of backup electrical power.

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2405)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) for three projects until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2406)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) for eight projects until October 1, 2016, or the date of enactment of an act authorizing funds for the military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

**Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2014 project (sec. 2407)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2401 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (division B of Public Law 113–66) for an ambulatory health center at Fort Knox, Kentucky, which was subsequently cancelled by the Department of Defense, by substituting authorization for a 102,000 square foot medical clinic at the same location and extending the authority until October 1, 2018, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2019, whichever is later. With the drawdown in military personnel at Fort Knox, the required level of medical support has been similarly reduced.

## **TITLE XXV—NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM**

### **Summary**

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$120.0 million for military construction in fiscal year 2016 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Security Investment Program. The committee recommends the requested amount.

### **Authorized NATO construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2501)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to make contributions to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program in an amount equal to the sum of the amount specifically authorized in section 2502 of this title and the amount of recoupment due to the United States for construction previously financed by the United States.

### **Authorization of appropriations, NATO (sec. 2502)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations of \$120.0 million for the U.S. contribution to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program for fiscal year 2016.



## **TITLE XXVI—GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES**

### **Summary**

The Department of Defense requested authorization of appropriations of \$517.3 million for military construction in fiscal year 2016 for facilities for the National Guard and reserve components.

The committee recommends authorization of appropriations of \$636.8 million for military construction in fiscal year 2016 for facilities for the National Guard and reserve components. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the state list table included in this report.

The committee recognizes that in difficult budget times military construction funding is often deferred in favor of other priorities and notes the National Guard and Reserve forces have identified significant unfunded military construction priorities, including a tactical aerial unmanned systems hangar at Fort Stewart, Georgia; an equipment concentration point at Fort A.P. Hill, Virginia; an access control point at Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico; an aviation classification and repair depot at Gulfport, Mississippi; a fire station/security complex at Dobbins, Georgia; a space control facility at Cape Canaveral, Florida; an F-22 composite repair facility at Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, Hawaii; a building modification for the KC-46 fuselage trainer at Pease, New Hampshire; operations and deployment facilities at Bradley Air National Guard Base, Connecticut; and a vehicle maintenance shop at Camp Foley, Alabama. The committee notes that these projects were identified as the top unfunded priorities of their respective service chiefs or the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. Funding for these projects has been added as outlined in the tables in this title and section 4601.

### **Subtitle A—Project Authorizations and Authorizations of Appropriations**

#### **Authorized Army National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2601)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army National Guard for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

#### **Authorized Army Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2602)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Army Reserve for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Authorized Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2603)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Navy Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Authorized Air National Guard construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2604)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air National Guard for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Authorized Air Force Reserve construction and land acquisition projects (sec. 2605)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize military construction projects for the Air Force Reserve for fiscal year 2016. The authorized amounts are listed on an installation-by-installation basis.

**Authorization of appropriations, National Guard and Reserve (sec. 2606)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for the reserve component military construction projects authorized for construction for fiscal year 2016 in this Act. This provision would also provide an overall limit on the amount authorized for military construction projects for each of the reserve components of the military departments. The state list contained in this report is the binding list of the specific projects authorized at each location.

**Subtitle B—Other Matters**

**Modification and extension of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2013 project (sec. 2611)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorization contained in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–81) for construction of an Army Reserve Center at Aberdeen Proving Ground, Maryland, to allow its construction in the vicinity at Aberdeen Proving Ground. The provision would also extend the authorization for this project until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

**Modification of authority to carry out certain fiscal year 2015 projects (sec. 2612)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify the authorizations contained in section 2604 and 2605 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (division B of Public Law 113–291), for construction of a Guardian Angel Operations facility at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, and construction of a consolidated Secure Compartmented Information Fa-

cility at Fort Smith Municipal Airport, Arkansas to provide for increased costs associated with these projects.

**Extension of authorizations of certain fiscal year 2012 projects (sec. 2613)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in section 2602 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (division B of Public Law 112–81) for two projects until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.

**Extension of authorization of certain fiscal year 2013 projects (sec. 2614)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the authorization contained in sections 2601, 2602, and 2603 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112–239) for five projects until October 1, 2016, or the date of the enactment of an act authorizing funds for military construction for fiscal year 2017, whichever is later.





## **TITLE XXVII—BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACTIVITIES**

### **Summary and explanation of tables**

The budget request included \$251.3 million for the ongoing cost of environmental remediation and other activities necessary to continue implementation of the 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005 Base Realignment and Closure rounds. The committee recommends this amount. The detailed funding recommendations are contained in the state list table included in this report.

### **Authorization of appropriations for base realignment and closure activities funded through Department of Defense Base Closure Account (sec. 2701)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for ongoing activities that are required to implement the decisions of the 1988, 1991, 1993, 1995, and 2005 Base Realignment and Closure rounds.

### **Prohibition on conducting additional base realignment and closure (BRAC) round (sec. 2702)**

The committee recommends a provision that would make clear that nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize a future Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round. Elsewhere in the bill, the committee recommends a reduction of \$10.5 million for BRAC planning activities.



## **TITLE XXVIII—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION GENERAL PROVISIONS**

### **Subtitle A—Military Construction Program and Military Family Housing Changes**

#### **Authority for acceptance and use of contributions for certain mutually beneficial projects (sec. 2801)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend Subchapter II of Chapter 138 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to accept cash contributions from partner countries for the purpose of the payment of costs in connection with mutually beneficial construction, maintenance, and repair projects. Such projects would be required to support bilateral defense cooperation agreement, or otherwise benefit the United States, as determined by the Secretary of Defense.

#### **Change in authorities relating to scope of work variations for military construction projects (sec. 2802)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2853 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize a military service to increase the scope of a military construction project by up to 10 percent once the service secretary involved approves the increase and notifies the congressional defense committees of the increase and the reasons for it.

The committee recognizes that there are valid reasons why the square footage of a facility might be appropriately increased as new electronic systems are incorporated, new security requirements are identified, or other needs emerge after authorization. Rather than requiring a delay in the project as new authority is sought, or suboptimizing the project in order to avoid delays, the committee believes that the ability of a service to increase the scope by up to 10 percent, subject to congressional notification and a waiting period of 14 days, is warranted.

#### **Extension of temporary, limited authority to use operation and maintenance funds for construction projects in certain areas outside the United States (sec. 2803)**

The committee recommends a provision that would reauthorize contingency construction authority in certain areas outside the United States for an additional year.

#### **Modification of reporting requirement on in-kind construction and renovation payments (sec. 2804)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide an annual report to the congress-

sional defense committees on the in-kind construction and renovation payments received by the Department of Defense during the preceding fiscal year.

The provision would also repeal the existing requirement for the Comptroller General to provide such a report.

**Lab modernization pilot program (sec. 2805)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Secretary of Defense to use funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) for the construction of laboratory facilities at Department of Defense RDT&E installations. Such projects would be required to comply with section 2802 of title 10, United States Code, be included in the President's budget submission, and be specifically appropriated for such purposes. Authorized facilities would also be required to support the science and technology requirements of more than one military department or agency, or a technology development program consistent with the technology offset program authorized elsewhere in this Act.

**Conveyance to Indian tribes of certain housing units (sec. 2806)**

The committee recommends a provision that would permit service secretaries to convey excess relocatable military housing units to certain Indian tribes, at no cost, and without consideration. The provision also provides a mechanism that would allow tribes to make requests to the military services. The recommended provision would expand the existing Air Force program for conveyance of relocatable military housing units enacted by section 2308 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) and allows for conveyance of excess relocatable military housing units by other military services.

**Subtitle B—Real Property and Facilities Administration**

**Utility systems conveyance authority (sec. 2811)**

The committee recommends a provision that would clarify section 2688(j) of title 10, United States Code, to allow for conveyance of additional utility systems to an entity already operating other utility systems on a joint base if doing so would be in the best interest of the government and is supported by an independent cost estimate.

The committee notes that there has been confusion about whether the definition of a utility system for the treatment of wastewater includes the treatment of stormwater. The committee believes, consistent with the Department of Defense's interpretation, that wastewater includes stormwater.

**Leasing of non-excess property of military departments and defense agencies; treatment of value provided by local education agencies and elementary and secondary schools (sec. 2812)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 2667 of title 10, United States Code, by authorizing the Sec-

retary concerned to lease non-excess property for consideration in an amount below fair market value if the lease is to a local education agency or an elementary or secondary school. This provision is intended to help local education agencies and schools that are providing support for military families.

**Modification of facility repair notification requirement (sec. 2813)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 2811 of title 10, United States Code, by adding new congressional notifications for facility repair projects that are expected to cost more than 75 percent of the estimated cost of a military construction project to replace the facility or the facility is located at an overseas location that has not been designated a main operating base or forward operating site. These new reporting requirements would only apply to facility repair projects that are expected to cost more than \$1.0 million.

**Increase of threshold of notice and wait requirement for certain facilities for reserve components and parity with authority for unspecified minor military construction and repair projects (sec. 2814)**

The committee recommends a provision that would modify section 18233a of title 10, United States Code, relating to unspecified minor military construction and repair of facilities for the reserve components to conform to sections 2805 and 2811 of title 10, United States Code.

**Subtitle C—Land Conveyances**

**Release of reversionary interest retained as part of the conveyance to the economic development alliance of Jefferson County, Arkansas (sec. 2821)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend the terms of conveyance contained in section 2827 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 104–201) to allow the conveyance for other than the conditions contained in the section 2827, if the Economic Development Alliance pays fair market value for the property and the costs associated with conveyance are born by the Economic Development Alliance.

**Items of Special Interest**

**Kwajalein Atoll infrastructure**

The committee recognizes the unique and important nature of test facilities on the Kwajalein Atoll and appreciates the U.S. Army Installation Management Command's (IMCOM) Long-Term Management Plan for the Kwajalein Atoll, submitted to the committee on February 9, 2015. However, given the remote location and the difficult environmental conditions present on the atoll, the committee believes that continued vigilance and additional facilities investments will be necessary in future years to maintain required capabilities. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Army to provide the congressional defense committees an updated

report on the IMCOM's infrastructure goals and an updated 5-year profile of planned facilities recapitalization for the Kwajalein Atoll with the fiscal year 2017 budget request and subsequent budget requests through fiscal year 2021. Furthermore, the committee notes that elsewhere in this Act, an additional \$34.0 million has been provided to correct facilities sustainment, recapitalization, and maintenance deficiencies identified as an unfunded requirement by the Chief of Staff of the Army.

#### **Military construction delay report**

The committee notes that the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) and the Consolidated Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–117) included \$10.7 million for the construction of a control tower at Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma. Multiple contract problems have caused an unacceptable delay in the construction of the tower and although it was projected to be completed by fiscal year 2012, it is still not finished.

The committee is concerned about mission and cost impacts caused by the delays associated with this project. Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the congressional defense committees, not later than August 1, 2015, detailing the timeline from passage of the Fiscal Year 2010 Authorization and Appropriations Acts to the completion of the tower and an explanation of delays and cost increases associated with this project. The report should also include any remedial, legal, or disciplinary actions taken against contractors or others involved in the delays and cost issues and any lessons learned that could be applied to future projects.

#### **Military construction supporting major range and test facility bases**

The committee is concerned about the lack of investment and sustainment of Major Range and Test Facility Bases (MRTFB). The committee notes that in the last 5 years only seven Military Construction (MILCON) projects have been requested in direct support of test and evaluation missions at MRTFBs nationwide. In fact, some MRTFBs have not received a MILCON project in support of test and evaluation missions in over a decade. The committee is also aware that the Strategic Plan for Department of Defense Test & Evaluation (T&E) Resources from March 2013, noted, “Due to age and outmoded technology, many test facilities are increasingly difficult to sustain and/or maintain. Obsolescence and deterioration contribute significantly to increased levels of maintenance, reductions in reliability, and an overall increase in operating costs. Services are under pressure to keep existing ground test facilities viable and relevant to meet immediate and forecasted needs. Across all services, there has been a downward trend in T&E MILCON appropriations to address ongoing maintenance, sustainment, and modernization needs of our T&E facilities. Further analysis is required (e.g., recapitalization rate) to provide a comprehensive assessment of MRTFB-only MILCON needs and investments.”

The committee recognizes the difficult overall budget environment for MILCON, but notes that the Department of Defense's fis-

cal year 2016 budget request still only funds two additional MILCON projects in direct support of test and evaluation missions. The committee awaits the comprehensive assessment of MRTFB-only MILCON needs and investments, and urges the Department of Defense to ensure appropriate funding is requested to support current and projected future operations.

### **Military training ranges for Special Operations Forces**

The committee notes that in the report submitted to Congress in response to section 344 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81) on Training Range Infrastructure for Special Operations Forces, the Commander of United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM) noted that while SOCOM and the Services have worked together to greatly improve the access to and capabilities at training ranges used by Special Operations Forces (SOF), defense budget reductions have forced the military services to “reduce or eliminate training range modernization and recapitalization programs and to reduce sustainment and operating funds.” These budget reductions have a direct impact on training and overall readiness of SOF at a time of continued high operational tempo and evolving threats are stretching the ability of training ranges to support the unique training requirements of SOF.

The committee receives annual updates from the Department of Defense (DOD) on the status of all test and training ranges through Sustainable Ranges Reports (SRR) to Congress, which summarizes the DOD’s actions to ensure the long-term sustainability of its training ranges. The SRR responds to Section 366 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314), which requires DOD to develop and submit to Congress a comprehensive plan to address training constraints caused by limitations on the use of available military lands, marine areas, and airspace in the United States and overseas. While each service identifies in the report critical issues affecting the training of general purpose forces, the unique training requirements of SOF are rarely specifically addressed.

The committee notes that in the December 2013 submission of the 2025 Air Test and Training Range Enhancement Plan, in response to section 343 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–81), the Air Force described efforts with SOCOM to transform the Melrose Military Range in New Mexico into a premier range supporting SOF and its intent to partner with SOCOM on future investments. However, the report does not satisfy the requirement of section 343 to submit a list of prioritized improvements and modernization of the facilities, equipment, and technology supporting the infrastructure in order to provide a test and training environment that accurately simulates and or portrays the full spectrum of threats and targets of likely United States adversaries in 2025 nor does it propose a list of prioritized projects, easements, acquisitions, or other actions, including estimated costs required to upgrade the test and training range infrastructure, taking into consideration the criteria set forth in the legislation.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of Defense to submit a report, not later than March 1, 2016, on a comprehensive range plan to include proposed investments over the next five years by the Air Force and SOCOM to address the training range requirements of Melrose Range. The report should describe requirements and proposed funding to maximize the available range training space and safety margins for air to ground integration training with other DOD and SOCOM components. The report should also describe any planned transition from basic bombing and gunnery to integrated air and ground training and any associated requirements for expansion of land or infrastructure at the range. The report should note the extent to which such requirements are addressed in the budget request for fiscal year 2017 and future years defense plan.

The committee also strongly encourages the Secretary of Defense to include in future SRR reports to Congress a review of the general capabilities, critical issues, and future capabilities necessary for ranges supporting unique SOF training requirements.

#### **Redevelopment of the former Indiana Army Ammunition Plant**

The committee is aware of ongoing efforts between the Army and the local reuse authority to finalize property conveyance at the inactivated Indiana Army Ammunition Plant (INAAP). This conveyance was authorized by the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–736) for the purpose of developing the site “as an industrial park to replace all or part of the economic activity lost at the inactivated plant.” In executing land transfers, the Army is obligated to fully comply with requirements of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–510) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–580). In return, the local reuse authority is obligated by statute to pay fair market value for conveyed property as determined by the Secretary in accordance with Federal appraisal standards and procedures. The committee expects both the Army and the local reuse authority to abide by the mutually-agreed terms of the Memorandum of Agreement governing the conveyance and to work in good faith to resolve environmental and liability concerns related to hazardous waste on the property. The committee further encourages the Army and the local reuse authority to expedite actions necessary to execute remaining conveyances in a timely fashion.

#### **Repair by replacement**

The committee is aware that some within the Department of Defense interpret section 2811 of title 10, United States Code, as providing authority to conduct “repair by replacement” or, in other words, replacement of an entire facility using operation and maintenance funds. However, the committee notes that section 2811 specifically prohibits the “construction of new facilities or additions to existing facilities.” Under this authority, replacement of a component of a complete and useable facility or system is allowable so long as it does not increase the capacity of the component or facility (unless to correct a life, safety, or code deficiency), but replace-



ment of an entire facility is prohibited and should be accomplished via military construction.

Given confusion within the Department regarding allowable activities under section 2811, the committee urges the Assistant Secretary of Defense Energy, Installations and Environment to review relevant written guidance memoranda and issue clarifications as necessary.

#### **Safe and suitable housing for junior enlisted servicemembers**

The committee believes that the services have a responsibility to provide safe and suitable housing for servicemembers—including junior enlisted personnel living in unaccompanied housing.

The committee notes the unacceptable conditions of Building 191 at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. Building 191 violates current state and federal building and fire codes, does not have an operational fire suppression system, and features heating, ventilation, air conditioning, power distribution, and lighting systems that are at the end of their life cycle. The same barracks building does not have code compliant fresh air ventilation and there have been sewage failures, rodent problems, mold problems, and regular hot water failure.

The committee believes junior enlisted sailors should not have to live in such conditions. The committee is concerned that the project to tear down Building 191—and replace it with a new Junior Enlisted Unaccompanied House (P-285)—was originally planned for fiscal year 2015 and has been postponed to fiscal year 2016 and then to fiscal year 2018. The committee believes it is difficult for the Navy to justify continued deferral of P-285, especially in light of some of the lower priority military construction projects in its FY 2016 request and given the unacceptable conditions found in Building 191 at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

In the fiscal year 2017 budget request, the committee expects the Navy to request funding for P-285 or to justify why such a request is not a priority for the Navy.



**DIVISION C—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AUTHORIZATIONS AND OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**

**TITLE XXXI—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

**Overview**

Title XXXI authorizes appropriations for atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy for fiscal year 2016, including: the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment; research and development; nuclear weapons; naval nuclear propulsion; environmental restoration and waste management; operating expenses; and other expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91). This title authorizes appropriations in three categories: (1) National Nuclear Security Administration; (2) defense environmental cleanup; and (3) other defense activities.

The committee recommends a provision allocating funding consistent with the funding allocations in section 4701. The committee notes that recent actions taken at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), and its projected initial operating date of March 2016, necessitate quarterly reporting to the congressional defense committees on actions taken towards bringing WIPP towards full operational status, including key milestones, status of any capital projects under Department of Energy Order 413.3, as well as obligations and expenditures of fiscal year 2015 funding. Such reporting shall be due within 30 days of the quarter for which it is reporting. The committee further requests the General Accountability Office review these quarterly updates and report to the congressional defense committees on significant findings and trends in the above tasks.

The committee further directs the Government Accountability Office to continue its ongoing evaluation of the Hanford Waste Treatment Plant in the areas of cost-schedule performance, technology readiness levels, contractor assurance system, and other agreements to be mutually agreed upon with a briefing to the committee due no later than February 28, 2016.

**Subtitle A—National Security Programs Authorizations**

**National Nuclear Security Administration (sec. 3101)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize a total of \$12.8 billion for the Department of Energy in fiscal year 2015 for the National Nuclear Security Administration to carry out programs necessary to national security.

**Defense environmental clean-up (sec. 3102)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$5.1 billion for defense environmental cleanup activities at the Department of Energy. The defense environmental cleanup activities support the cleanup of contaminated facilities, soil, ground, and surface water, and the treatment and disposal of radioactive and other waste generated through the production of nuclear weapons and weapons materials.

**Other defense activities (sec. 3103)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize \$774.4 million for other defense activities for fiscal year 2016, including funds for health, safety, and security, the Office of Legacy Management, and Nuclear Energy.

**Subtitle B—Program Authorizations, Restrictions, and Limitations****Responsive capabilities program (sec. 3111)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to establish and carry out a program to exercise the technical capabilities of the NNSA with respect to design and production of nuclear weapons to ensure that NNSA is ready to respond to future uncertainties not addressed by existing life extension programs.

The program shall be integrated across the science, engineering, design, and manufacturing cycle of the NNSA, and integrate physics, engineering, and production capabilities into joint test assemblies and designs. The program shall result in: (1) Physics models of components and systems, capable of being certified as safe and reliable in the absence of testing, and contribute to the predictive design framework; (2) shortened engineering design cycles that minimize the amount of time leading to an engineering prototype; and (3) rapid manufacturing capabilities to reduce the time and cost of production.

In January 2015, the United States Strategic Command issued a report titled “Report on Balance in Nuclear Weapons Program.” The report found that “the nation requires an agile and capable infrastructure with requisite capacities able to respond to technical and geopolitical developments. Investments in processing and production infrastructure are needed to enhance the nation’s ability to respond to uncertainty. Additionally, a full design and production capability is a critical component of the U.S. nuclear deterrent.”

The committee notes it is the view of the Director of the Sandia National Laboratory that we must “engage in a long-term transformation of the approach to the design, development, qualification, and production of nuclear weapons. Lowering the cost, reducing the time to deploy, and being responsive to changing external threats will help assure we continue to meet the nation’s needs into the future. The nature of the emerging threat itself provides another strategic reason for ensuring we are not surprised.” Likewise, the Director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory has told this committee that “mission success depends on the laboratories’

science and technology excellence and their ability to deliver innovative, cost-efficient solutions.”

The committee authorizes \$20.0 million in fiscal year 2016, identified elsewhere in the committee report, to commence a responsive capabilities program.

**Long-term plan for meeting national security requirements for unencumbered uranium (sec. 3112)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to submit a plan, on even-numbered years, with the President’s budget submission, for meeting the national security requirements for unencumbered uranium through 2065. Unencumbered uranium is uranium for which the United States has no obligations to foreign governments to use uranium only for peaceful purposes. The committee remains concerned about accurately accounting for the inventory of existing unencumbered uranium that is allocated for national security purposes as well as future costs for any future production options being considered and policy options that could help offset such costs.

**Defense nuclear nonproliferation management plan (sec. 3113)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require in each odd numbered year that the Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), submit a management plan of defense nuclear nonproliferation programs of the NNSA. Updates to this plan are required in each even numbered year.

**Plan for deactivation and decommissioning of non-operational defense nuclear facilities (sec. 3114)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to develop a plan to perform a cost-benefit analysis of defense nuclear facilities requiring deactivation and decommissioning as to whether they should be kept in cold shutdown awaiting demolition, or accelerated to save long-term storage costs. The plan will be required beginning every even calendar year no later than March 31, 2016, and end after the fifth report submission on March 31, 2026. The committee is concerned about the large inventory of nonoperational buildings at active defense nuclear facilities, such as at the Y-12 plant, some dating to the Manhattan Project, that continue to sit idle and must be continuously maintained in a safe condition by the National Nuclear Security Administration instead of being transferred to the Office of Environmental Management for demolition. The accelerated cleanup of the Rocky Flats plant saved the taxpayer billions of dollars. The committee expects the Department of Energy will take a similar approach with these facilities.

**Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant contract oversight (sec. 3115)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to arrange to have an owner’s agent assist the Secretary in carrying out oversight responsibilities associated with Hanford Waste Treatment and Immobilization Plant contract DE-

AC27-01RV14136. Since the current contractor for the Waste Treatment Plant is its own design agent, the owner's design agent will act as an independent expert on the project.

**Assessment of emergency preparedness of defense nuclear facilities (sec. 3116)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Secretary of Energy to include in each award-fee evaluation conducted of a management and operating contract for a Department of Energy defense nuclear facility in 2016, or any even-numbered year thereafter, an assessment of the adequacy of the emergency preparedness of that facility, including an assessment of the seniority level of employees and contractors of the Department of Energy that participate in emergency preparedness exercises at that facility.

The committee is concerned that on September 3, 2014, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) issued a recommendation to the Department of Energy that it make specific improvements in its emergency management directive and strengthen the implementation of its emergency management requirements to ensure the continued protection of workers and the public. The DNFSB attributed observed problems to the absence of sound emergency preparedness and response programs at defense nuclear facilities. The committee notes that the Secretary of Energy accepted the recommendation on November 7, 2014, and is in the process of developing an implementation plan to accomplish the improvements.

**Laboratory- and facility-directed research and development programs (sec. 3117)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 4811(c) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act (50 U.S.C. 2791(c)) to strike the 6 percent upper bound for National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) weapons laboratory-directed research and development programs with a floor not to go below 5 percent and with an upper bound not to exceed 8 percent. The committee recommends a similar provision recommended for NNSA weapons production facilities and the Nevada Site Office with an upper bound of 4 percent. These funds have served as the source of new innovations throughout the NNSA complex, keeping scientists and engineers at the cutting edge of technology, which translates into cost-saving innovations for the nation's stockpile program, with an ability to meet any future uncertainties that might arise. The funds are also used to attract young scientists and engineers to mentor under senior personnel to ensure there is a fresh talent pool coming into the NNSA complex on an enduring basis.

**Limitation on bonuses for employees of the National Nuclear Security Administration who engage in improper program management (sec. 3118)**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide authority to the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to withhold bonus payments to employees who engage

in improper program management on the date such a determination is made.

**Modification of authorized personnel levels of the Office of the Administrator for Nuclear Security (sec. 3119)**

The committee recommends a provision that permits the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to hire above the statutory limit of 1,690 full-time positions using up to 100 exempt employees hired under section 3241 of the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (50 U.S.C section 2441). The committee recognizes the need of the NNSA to hire positions that are unique to the Administration in areas such as cost evaluation, program management, science and engineering, and encourages the Administrator to use exempt hiring to bring new expertise into the NNSA.

**Modification of submission of assessments of certain budget requests relating to the nuclear weapons stockpile (sec. 3120)**

The committee recommends a provision that would extend the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) annual reporting deadline for reviewing the budget of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) weapons program from 90 days to 150 days in odd-numbered years when NNSA is required to submit a detailed Stockpile Stewardship Management Plan (SSMP).

Each fiscal year, section 3113 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383), requires GAO to report not later than 90 days after NNSA submits its nuclear security budget material to Congress on an assessment of whether the budget materials provide sufficient funding for the modernization of the nuclear security enterprise. GAO reviews budgetary materials that include the SSMP, which NNSA is required to develop in consultation with the Department of Defense. GAO would be required to submit a detailed report in odd-numbered years and a summary in even-numbered years. However, for the odd-numbered years, NNSA's detailed SSMP is frequently issued 60 days after the agency issues its nuclear security budget materials. This delay significantly reduces GAO's time to review detailed SSMP information and still meet the 90-day statutory reporting deadline.

**Repeal of phase three review of certain defense environmental cleanup projects (sec. 3121)**

The committee recommends a provision that would repeal phase three of section 3134 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) as the Government Accountability Office has reported on all phases of this project.

**Modifications to cost-benefit analysis for competition of management and operating contracts (sec. 3122)**

The committee recommends a provision that would amend section 3121 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239) to make technical corrections to increase the utility of reports on competition for management and op-

erating contracts at facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration and change the timing of the Government Accountability Office's review to assess whether estimated cost savings and other benefits are actually occurring as planned.

**Review of implementation of recommendations of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise (sec. 3123)**

The committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration to enter into agreements with the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Public Administration to assess implementation of recommendations of the Congressional Advisory Panel on the Governance of the Nuclear Security Enterprise that can be carried out without additional legislation. In addition to monitoring implementation, the agreement should specify that the two entities should determine whether the implementation was effective in addressing the problem it was intended to solve. The agreement shall utilize the procedures of the National Academies in reviewing and publishing the joint report.

**Budget Items**

**Defense Environmental Cleanup, Los Alamos National Laboratory**

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million to the Department of Energy Defense Environmental Clean-up account to accelerate the cleanup of transuranic waste at the Los Alamos National Laboratory, and in particular to enhance the ability to sort, track and re-package transuranic waste drums. These actions are needed to avoid future preventable incidents associated with the Los Alamos drum that underwent an exothermic reaction at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

**Deferred Maintenance**

The budget request for the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) contained \$257.7 million for Recapitalization and \$227.0 million for Maintenance. Respectively, these programs fund day-to-day preventative or corrective maintenance activities and efforts to reduce the large backlog of deferred maintenance across the nuclear security enterprise. Fiscal Year 2016 budget justification materials submitted by NNSA note that NNSA's deferred maintenance backlog is over \$3.6 billion and growing.

The committee is encouraged that the Administrator and the Secretary have taken steps to stop the growth in the backlog of deferred maintenance, but believes more must be done to actually decrease the total amount of the backlog. Therefore, the committee recommends \$407.7 million for Recapitalization, an increase of \$150.0 million to the budget request.

**Enhanced surveillance**

The committee recommends an increase of \$10.0 million to the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Weapons Account, Engineering, Enhanced Surveillance. This program provides



important models and tools used to predict the aging of nuclear weapons systems, which is of importance to combatant commanders and the Nuclear Weapons Council in determining whether a life-extension program will be required.

### **Plutonium disposition program**

The Department of Energy (DOE) continues to struggle with its plutonium disposition program, the intent of which is for the United States and Russia to each dispose of 34 metric tons of surplus weapons-grade plutonium—an agreement between the two countries was signed in 2000 and updated in 2011. The existing strategy is based on constructing a facility to fabricate mixed oxide (MOX) nuclear fuel and irradiating this fuel in specially-modified commercial nuclear reactors. Once used and removed from a reactor, the plutonium can no longer be readily used to make a nuclear weapon.

In 2013, in light of the cost increases and the current budget environment associated with the MOX facility and the overall Plutonium Disposition program, DOE's fiscal year 2014 budget request stated that the strategy for converting plutonium to MOX fuel may be much higher than initially anticipated. The budget request announced that, as a result of these projected cost increases, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) would slow down activities associated with the current plutonium disposition strategy and conduct an analysis of alternatives to complete the mission more efficiently.

In April 2014, DOE released its analysis of the existing MOX strategy and four other alternatives including downblending the 34 metric tons and disposing this material at DOE's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP), or at a new repository that would need to be constructed if WIPP could not be modified to dispose of this downblended material. The April 2014 analysis found that the downblending option was significantly less expensive than the other four alternatives examined.

An April 2015 independent analysis conducted by the Aerospace Corporation of the lifecycle costs associated with the MOX and downblended options also concluded that the downblending option was significantly less expensive than the MOX option. Although cost is a factor in considering disposition strategies, it is important to note that the only option that meets the requirements outlined in the Plutonium Management and Disposition Act (PMDA), signed by the United States and Russia, is MOX. All other alternatives would not only require that we renegotiate the PMDA with Russia, but will likely also require statutory and regulatory changes that could cause additional delay.

The committee is concerned, however, that these analyses inadequately assessed the technical, regulatory, and political feasibility of the downblending option. To address these inadequacies, the committee directs NNSA to prepare an analysis of the downblending option that includes answers to the following questions:

- (1) What is the capital cost, operating and maintenance cost, other program costs, and overall lifecycle costs associated with the optimal downblending strategy?

(2) What is the existing subscribed capacity at WIPP and how would DOE accommodate the volume of downblended material from the 34 metric tons from the plutonium disposition program? Since WIPP is currently not accepting transuranic waste as a result of the February 2014 accident, and thus created a backlog of waste that is being temporarily stored at multiple sites, when would the first shipment of plutonium be transported to WIPP if this option was selected? What costs are associated with this delay?

(3) Would the WIPP Land Withdrawal Act need to be modified to accommodate this additional volume? If yes, how long with this likely take to complete? What, if any, costs are associated with this delay?

(4) Are there statutory changes or other regulations that would need to be modified to support the downblending option? If so, how long would it take to change these regulations and what are the associated costs?

(5) Would a new geologic repository be needed to accommodate all or some of this additional volume? If so, what would be the potential cost and schedule of siting, constructing, and operating such a repository? By way of comparison, what was the capital cost of constructing WIPP?

(6) What is the optimal blending of weapons-grade plutonium with inert material to maximize space in a repository?

(7) How might the percentage of plutonium in containers of downblended material affect the security requirements associated with transporting the material to a repository, the security requirements at the repository, and the ability of international monitors to monitor the downblended material in a repository?

(8) What are the nonproliferation and arms control concerns associated with disposing of weapons-grade plutonium in containers that lack a radioactive barrier in a repository?

(9) Would the PMDA need to be renegotiated if MOX was no longer the preferred option for the United States to dispose of 34 metric tons of plutonium? What are the concerns associated with this action?

(10) What are the technical impediments to downblending weapons-grade plutonium from pit and non-pit sources?

(11) What are the views of the US Environmental Protection Agency, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and State of New Mexico in pursuing a downblend strategy?

The fiscal year 2016 budget request includes \$345.0 million in Nonproliferation Construction for the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility (MFFF). The committee recommends an increase of \$5.0 million for Nonproliferation Construction to support analysis of the downblending alternative. The committee requests that all cost analyses conducted as part of this analysis follow the best practice guidance of the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) Cost Estimating and Assessment Guide.

The committee requests the Department of Energy to conduct a two-step analysis of alternative uses for the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility (MFFF) should an alternative plutonium disposition strategy be adopted and this facility were no longer needed for this pur-

pose. To preserve the long-term mission for the Savannah River Site, (1) identify potential long-term mission needs at the Savannah River Site over the next 30 to 50 years, and (2) using best practices identified by the GAO, conduct an analysis of alternatives to identify how these mission needs could be met by using the MOX Fuel Fabrication Facility.

The analysis for the downblending option and the alternatives to using the MFFF shall be due to the congressional defense committees no later than October 31, 2015. The committee directs the Government Accountability Office to review the NNSA analysis as outlined in this section with a report to the congressional defense committees no later than 30 days after receipt of the NNSA analysis.

#### **Responsive capabilities program**

The committee recommends an increase of \$20.0 million in fiscal year 2016 to support the establishment of a new responsive capabilities program within the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). Elsewhere in this bill, the committee recommends a provision that would require the Administrator of the NNSA to establish and carry out a program to exercise the technical capabilities of the NNSA with respect to design and production of nuclear weapons to ensure that NNSA is ready to respond to future uncertainties not addressed by existing life-extension programs.

The program shall be integrated across the science, engineering, design, and manufacturing cycle of the NNSA, and integrate physics, engineering, and production capabilities into joint test assemblies and designs. The program shall result in: (1) physics models of components and systems, capable of being certified as safe and reliable in the absence of testing, and contribute to the predictive design framework; (2) shortened engineering design cycles that minimize the amount of time leading to an engineering prototype; and (3) rapid manufacturing capabilities to reduce the time and cost of production.

#### **Uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund**

The committee notes that a legislative assumption accompanies the budget request of \$471.8 million for the uranium enrichment decontamination and decommissioning fund, to reauthorize section 1101 of the Energy Policy Act of 2002 (Public Law 102-48, 42 U.S.C. 2297g) for matching industry contributions. As in fiscal year 2015, this legislation was not reauthorized and the committee assumes it will not be reauthorized again this year. Accordingly, the committee recommends a decrease of \$471.8 million.

#### **Items of Special Interest**

##### **Ability of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board to communicate with the Secretary of Energy**

Section 312 of the 1954 Atomic Energy Act, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 2268a) says in part “Mission—The mission of the Board shall be to provide independent analysis, advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy to inform the Secretary in the role

of operator and regulator of defense nuclear facilities of the Department of Energy, in providing adequate protection of public health and safety at such defense nuclear facilities.” Due to the recent reorganization of the Department to form an Office of the Undersecretary for Management and Performance, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) no longer reports directly to the Secretary of Energy. It has been lowered within this relatively new organization to the Associate Under Secretary for Environment, Health, Safety and Security. This re-organization leaves the committee with the impression that the Department is not adhering to the statutory language (as found in section 312), and intent of the DNFSB organization act, and that is to report to the Secretary of Energy on matters concerning the adequate protection of the public health and safety of defense nuclear facilities.

The committee directs the Secretary of Energy to report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2016 on actions the Secretary will or has taken to ensure that the DNFSB has the ability to interact with, and report to the Secretary of Energy (as found in section 312 of the DNFSB organization act) on matters involving adequate protection of the public health and safety of defense nuclear facilities.

#### **Interoperable Warhead—1**

The committee recognizes that future life extension programs for U.S. nuclear weapons components and stockpile systems, such as the Interoperable Warhead—1 (IW-1), will face technical challenges. Maintaining readiness to meet these challenges during the 5 year delay of the IW-1 program, which will develop the first interoperable nuclear packages for both Air Force and Navy ballistic missile systems under the Nuclear Weapons Council’s “3+2” strategy, is important for future confidence in the nation’s nuclear deterrent. Technical capabilities essential to our nuclear readiness reside in the National Nuclear Security Administration’s (NNSA) national laboratories and production and testing organizations; they comprise areas of nuclear design and engineering, advanced simulation and experimentation, science, surveillance, and production.

Technical questions concerning IW-1 need to be understood and addressed. Integration of the IW-1 nuclear package into different Air Force and Navy missiles with different space, weight, and operational requirements, while assuring the accuracy of warhead delivery in both systems, could be problematic. This and other concerns will also pertain to future life-extension programs beyond IW-1. For example, the goal to enhance surety of stockpile systems increases technical challenges. Optimizing system design to best meet requirements involves technical trade studies, presently incomplete for the IW-1, that draw on all nuclear capabilities listed above to ensure component and weapon system certification. Other difficult technical questions surround pit reuse, which may become a key ingredient of life extension programs in the future. In addition to drawing on nuclear design, simulation, experimental validation capabilities, trade studies concerning pit reuse will involve pit production capability and capacity issues.

The committee feels strongly that maintaining the readiness of scientists, engineers and production staff by challenging them to address these and other crucial technical issues during the 5-year delay of the IW-1 program will be essential to this and other stockpile life extension programs.

#### **Lithium supply and demand**

The Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration shall report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28, 2016 on the supply and demand for lithium to be used on weapons production through 2045.

#### **Microlab Technology Transfer**

The committee is aware that directors of national laboratories, as well as a Brookings Institution study, have recognized that most national laboratories are located outside of major metropolitan areas, and most lab research occurs “behind the fence” of main campuses, inaccessible to the public. The study recommends establishing off-campus microlabs that would serve as the “front-door” to national laboratories to give academia, local government, businesses owners, and communities direct access to the equipment, facilities, and personnel of national labs.

The committee therefore directs the Administrator to work with the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) lab directors to develop a plan for a “microlab” program in order to accelerate technology transfer from NNSA national laboratories, weapons production plants and facilities operated by the Nevada Site Office to private industry. The committee expects the Administrator to include an estimate of the associated costs, need, and benefit for establishing a microlab at a facility, and require cost-sharing from academia, local government, and private industry. The committee encourages the Administrator to work with the Department of Energy’s Office of Technology Transitions and consider utilizing funds under the statutorily created Energy Technology Commercialization Fund (TCF) to help establish the federal share of establishing a microlab. The committee directs NNSA to brief the congressional defense committees on the plan no later than September 31, 2015.

#### **Report on program management at the National Nuclear Security Administration**

The committee directs the Comptroller General of the United States to report to the congressional defense committees no later than February 28th, 2016, on the program management capabilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA).

The NNSA is organized into program offices to manage a wide variety of programs and relies on federal program and project managers as well as contracting officers to ensure that resources are used effectively and that programs and projects achieve their missions on time and on budget. The committee believes that these officials should also be held accountable when resources are not used effectively, programs or projects do not achieve their missions on time or on budget, or when programs or projects experience other types of management challenges.

A number of NNSA programs and projects have suffered significant delays and cost overruns or other forms of mismanagement that raise questions about how these managers interact, coordinate, and are held accountable. For example, the Government Accountability Office's 2015 high-risk report indicated that the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement project, the Mixed Oxide Fuel Fabrication Facility, and the Uranium Processing Facility (UPF) have all suffered extensive cost growth and schedule delays. In addition, the NNSA created a program manager position for NNSA's uranium program after a peer review of the UPF project found, among other things, that the program lacked a firm requirement in terms of how much uranium is needed by the program over the next 20 years.

In light of these past incidents, the report shall examine: (1) the extent to which NNSA's programs and projects have program or project managers; (2) the technical qualifications and training required to become an NNSA program manager, project manager, or contracting officer and the extent to which those currently holding these positions meet those requirements; (3) the extent to which NNSA has clearly defined roles and responsibilities for its program managers, project managers, and contracting officers; and (4) the mechanisms in place to hold responsible officials accountable for program and project performance, and the extent to which NNSA has used these mechanisms.

## **TITLE XXXII—DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD**

### **Authorization for Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (sec. 3201)**

The committee recommends a provision that would authorize the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board at \$29.2 million.

## **DIVISION D—FUNDING TABLES**

### **Authorization of amounts in funding tables (sec. 4001 )**

The committee recommends a provision that would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D of this Act, subject to reprogramming in accordance with established procedures.

Consistent with the previously expressed views of the committee, the provision would also require that decisions by an agency head to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on authorized, transparent, statutory criteria, or merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of sections 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

### **Clarification of applicability of undistributed reductions of certain operation and maintenance funding among all operation and maintenance funding (sec. 4002)**

The committee recommends a provision that clarifies that the undistributed reductions in funding for operation and maintenance due to bulk fuel purchases and foreign currency fluctuations, as shown in table 4301, can be applied to all operation and maintenance funding, regardless if funding is available in table 4301 or table 4302.

### **Funding tables (secs. 4101–4701)**

The committee recommends provisions that provide line-item guidance for the funding authorized in this Act. The provisions display the line-item funding requested by the administration in the fiscal year 2016 budget request and show where the committee either increased or decreased the requested amounts.

The Department of Defense may not exceed the authorized amounts, as set forth in the provision or, if unchanged from the administration request, as set forth in budget justification documents of the Department of Defense, without a reprogramming action in accordance with established procedures.





# SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE</b>			
<b>NATIONAL DEFENSE BASE BUDGET</b>			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY (BUDGET SUB-FUNCTION 051)</b>			
<b>DIVISION A: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS</b>			
<b>TITLE I--PROCUREMENT</b>			
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY .....	5,689,357	26,000	5,715,357
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY .....	1,419,957	190,000	1,609,957
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY .....	1,887,073	70,611	1,957,684
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY .....	1,233,378	-10,952	1,222,426
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY .....	5,899,028	-358,000	5,541,028
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....	16,126,405	2,346,700	18,473,105
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....	3,154,154	48,668	3,202,822
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC .....	723,741		723,741
SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY .....	16,597,457	1,656,000	18,253,457
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....	6,614,715	-13,400	6,601,315
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS .....	1,131,418	107,885	1,239,303
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....	15,657,769	814,944	16,472,713
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....	2,987,045		2,987,045
SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....	2,584,061	-288,569	2,295,492
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE .....	1,758,843	38,500	1,797,343
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....	18,272,438	41,146	18,313,584
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	5,130,853	210,651	5,341,504
JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND .....	99,701		99,701
<b>SUBTOTAL, TITLE I--PROCUREMENT .....</b>	<b>106,967,393</b>	<b>4,880,184</b>	<b>111,847,577</b>
<b>TITLE II--RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION</b>			
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY .....	6,924,959	91,668	7,016,627
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY .....	17,885,916	41,292	17,927,208
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF .....	26,473,669	-533,490	25,940,179
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW .....	18,329,861	1,507,207	19,837,068
OPERATIONAL TEST & EVAL, DEFENSE .....	170,558		170,558
<b>SUBTOTAL, TITLE II--RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>69,784,963</b>	<b>1,106,677</b>	<b>70,891,640</b>

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>TITLE III--OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY .....	35,107,546	-8,233,294	26,874,252
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES .....	2,665,792	18,789	2,684,581
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG .....	6,717,977	19,119	6,737,096
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY .....	42,200,756	-16,810,316	25,390,440
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS .....	6,228,782	-1,931,024	4,297,758
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES .....	1,001,758	-41,086	960,672
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE .....	277,036	-2,473	274,563
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE .....	38,191,929	-14,242,964	23,948,965
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE .....	3,064,257	-103,216	2,961,041
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG .....	6,956,210	-120,815	6,835,395
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	32,440,843	-998,802	31,442,041
MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS .....	1,664,342		1,664,342
<b>SUBTOTAL, TITLE III--OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....</b>	<b>176,517,228</b>	<b>-42,446,082</b>	<b>134,071,146</b>
<b>TITLE IV--MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>			
Military Personnel Appropriations .....	130,491,227	-1,254,500	129,236,727
Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Fund Contributions .....	6,243,449		6,243,449
<b>SUBTOTAL, TITLE IV--MILITARY PERSONNEL .....</b>	<b>136,734,676</b>	<b>-1,254,500</b>	<b>135,480,176</b>
<b>TITLE XIV--OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS</b>			
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY .....	50,432		50,432
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE .....	62,898		62,898
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	45,084		45,084
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA .....	1,154,154		1,154,154
NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND .....	474,164		474,164
CHEM AGENTS & MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION .....	720,721		720,721
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF .....	850,598	30,000	880,598
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL .....	316,159	-3,600	312,559
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM .....	32,243,328	-52,940	32,190,388
<b>SUBTOTAL, TITLE XIV--OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS .....</b>	<b>35,917,538</b>	<b>-26,540</b>	<b>35,890,998</b>
<b>TOTAL, DIVISION A: DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS .....</b>	<b>525,921,798</b>	<b>-37,740,261</b>	<b>488,181,537</b>
<b>DIVISION B: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS</b>			
<b>MILITARY CONSTRUCTION</b>			
ARMY .....	743,245	-21,500	721,745
NAVY .....	1,605,929	59,360	1,665,289
AIR FORCE .....	1,354,785	11,400	1,366,185
DEFENSE-WIDE .....	2,300,767	-169,700	2,131,067
ARMY NATIONAL GUARD .....	197,237	51,300	248,537
AIR NATIONAL GUARD .....	123,538	23,600	147,138
ARMY RESERVE .....	113,595	34,200	147,795
NAVY RESERVE .....	36,078		36,078
AIR FORCE RESERVE .....	46,821	10,400	57,221
NATO SECURITY INVESTMENT PROGRAM .....	120,000		120,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION .....</b>	<b>6,641,995</b>	<b>-940</b>	<b>6,641,055</b>

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>FAMILY HOUSING</b>			
CONSTRUCTION, ARMY .....	99,695		99,695
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY .....	393,511		393,511
CONSTRUCTION, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS .....	16,541		16,541
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS ..	353,036		353,036
CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE .....	160,498		160,498
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE .....	331,232		331,232
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	58,668		58,668
<b>SUBTOTAL, FAMILY HOUSING .....</b>	<b>1,413,181</b>		<b>1,413,181</b>
<b>BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE</b>			
ARMY .....	29,691		29,691
NAVY .....	157,088		157,088
AIR FORCE .....	64,555		64,555
<b>SUBTOTAL, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE .....</b>	<b>251,334</b>		<b>251,334</b>
<b>TOTAL, DIVISION B: MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZA- TIONS .....</b>	<b>8,306,510</b>	<b>-940</b>	<b>8,305,570</b>
<b>TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY (BUDGET SUB- FUNCTION 051) .....</b>	<b>534,228,308</b>	<b>-37,741,201</b>	<b>496,487,107</b>
<b>ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (BUDGET SUB-FUNCTION 053)</b>			
<b>DIVISION C: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AND INDEPENDENT FEDERAL AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS</b>			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AUTHORIZATIONS</b>			
<b>ENERGY PROGRAMS</b>			
NUCLEAR ENERGY .....	135,161		135,161
<b>SUBTOTAL, ENERGY PROGRAMS .....</b>	<b>135,161</b>		<b>135,161</b>
<b>NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION</b>			
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES .....	8,846,948	180,000	9,026,948
DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION .....	1,940,302	5,000	1,945,302
NAVAL REACTORS .....	1,375,496		1,375,496
FEDERAL SALARIES AND EXPENSES .....	402,654		402,654
<b>SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION</b>	<b>12,565,400</b>	<b>185,000</b>	<b>12,750,400</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES</b>			
DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP .....	5,527,347	-451,797	5,075,550
OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES .....	774,425		774,425
<b>SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL AND OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVI- TIES .....</b>	<b>6,301,772</b>	<b>-451,797</b>	<b>5,849,975</b>
<b>SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AUTHORIZATIONS .....</b>	<b>19,002,333</b>	<b>-266,797</b>	<b>18,735,536</b>

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>TOTAL, DIVISION C: DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY AND INDEPENDENT FEDERAL AGENCY AUTHORIZATIONS</b> .....	<b>19,002,333</b>	<b>-266,797</b>	<b>18,735,536</b>
<b>ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (BUDGET SUB-FUNCTION 053)</b> .....	<b>19,002,333</b>	<b>-266,797</b>	<b>18,735,536</b>
<b>TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE FUNDING, BASE BUDGET REQUEST</b> .....	<b>553,230,641</b>	<b>-38,007,998</b>	<b>515,222,643</b>
<b>NATIONAL DEFENSE OCO BUDGET REQUEST</b>			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY (BUDGET SUB-FUNCTION 051)</b>			
<b>PROCUREMENT</b>			
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY .....	164,987		164,987
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY .....	37,260		37,260
PROCUREMENT OF W&TCV, ARMY .....	26,030		26,030
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY .....	192,040		192,040
OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY .....	1,205,596		1,205,596
JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND .....	493,271	-48,271	445,000
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....	217,394		217,394
WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....	3,344		3,344
PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC .....	136,930		136,930
OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....	12,186		12,186
PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS .....	48,934		48,934
AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....	128,900		128,900
MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....	289,142		289,142
PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE .....	228,874		228,874
OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....	3,859,964		3,859,964
PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	212,418		212,418
<b>SUBTOTAL, PROCUREMENT</b> .....	<b>7,257,270</b>	<b>-48,271</b>	<b>7,208,999</b>
<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION</b>			
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY .....	1,500		1,500
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY .....	35,747		35,747
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AF .....	17,100		17,100
RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, DW .....	137,087		137,087
<b>SUBTOTAL, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION</b> .....	<b>191,434</b>		<b>191,434</b>
<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>			
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY .....	11,382,750	7,616,786	18,999,536
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES .....	24,559		24,559
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ARNG .....	60,845		60,845
AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND .....	3,762,257		3,762,257
IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND .....	715,000		715,000
SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND .....	600,000		600,000

## SUMMARY OF NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY .....	5,131,588	16,106,810	21,238,398
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS .....	952,534	1,862,836	2,815,370
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES .....	31,643		31,643
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE .....	3,455		3,455
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE .....	9,090,013	13,312,681	22,402,694
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE .....	58,106		58,106
OPERATION & MAINTENANCE, ANG .....	19,900		19,900
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	5,805,633	-100,000	5,705,633
<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....</b>	<b>37,638,283</b>	<b>38,799,113</b>	<b>76,437,396</b>
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>			
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS .....	3,204,758		3,204,758
<b>SUBTOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL .....</b>	<b>3,204,758</b>		<b>3,204,758</b>
<b>OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS</b>			
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE .....	2,500		2,500
WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	86,350		86,350
DRUG INTERDICTION & CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF .....	186,000		186,000
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL .....	10,262		10,262
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM .....	272,704		272,704
COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND .....	2,100,000	-1,100,000	1,000,000
UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE .....	0	300,000	300,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS .....</b>	<b>2,657,816</b>	<b>-800,000</b>	<b>1,857,816</b>
<b>TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (BUDGET FUNCTION 050) OCO BUDGET REQUEST .....</b>	<b>50,949,561</b>	<b>37,950,842</b>	<b>88,900,403</b>
<b>TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (BUDGET FUNCTION 050) .....</b>	<b>604,180,202</b>	<b>-57,156</b>	<b>604,123,046</b>
<b>MEMORANDUM: NON-DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS</b>			
TITLE XIV—ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME (FUNCTION 600) .....	64,300		64,300
<b>MEMORANDUM: TRANSFER AUTHORITIES (NON-ADDS)</b>			
TITLE X—GENERAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY .....	[5,000,000]		[4,500,000]
TITLE XV—SPECIAL TRANSFER AUTHORITY .....	[3,500,000]		[4,000,000]



# NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

## NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>SUMMARY DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE</b>			
<b>NATIONAL DEFENSE (050)</b>			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY, BASE BUDGET (051) ...	534,228,308	-37,741,201	496,487,107
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053) .....	19,002,333	-266,797	18,735,536
OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS .....	50,949,561	37,950,842	88,900,403
<b>TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE (050) .....</b>	<b>604,180,202</b>	<b>-57,156</b>	<b>604,123,046</b>
<b>OTHER DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS PROGRAMS OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION OF THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OR ALREADY AUTHORIZED</b>			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY (051)</b>			
DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT PURCHASES .....	47,000		47,000
INDEFINITE ACCOUNT: DISPOSAL OF DOD REAL PROPERTY ....	6,000		6,000
INDEFINITE ACCOUNT: LEASE OF DOD REAL PROPERTY .....	35,000		35,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY (051) .....</b>	<b>88,000</b>		<b>88,000</b>
<b>ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)</b>			
FORMERLY UTILIZED SITES REMEDIAL ACTION PROGRAM .....	104,000		104,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053) .....</b>	<b>104,000</b>		<b>104,000</b>
<b>DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)</b>			
OTHER DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS .....	7,545,000		7,545,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054) .....</b>	<b>7,545,000</b>		<b>7,545,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, OTHER DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS (050) .....</b>	<b>7,737,000</b>		<b>7,737,000</b>
<b>DISCRETIONARY BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION (050)</b>			
<b>NATIONAL DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY AUTHORIZATIONS (050)</b>			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--MILITARY (051) .....	585,265,869	209,641	585,475,510
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053) .....	19,106,333	-266,797	18,839,536
DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054) .....	7,545,000		7,545,000
<b>TOTAL, DISCRETIONARY BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION, 050 .....</b>	<b>611,917,202</b>	<b>-57,156</b>	<b>611,860,046</b>

## NATIONAL DEFENSE BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION—Continued

(In Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>NATIONAL DEFENSE MANDATORY PROGRAMS, CURRENT LAW (CBO BASELINE)</b>			
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY (051)</b>			
CONCURRENT RECEIPT ACCRUAL PAYMENTS TO THE MILITARY RETIREMENT FUND .....	6,932,000		6,932,000
REVOLVING, TRUST AND OTHER DOD MANDATORY .....	1,135,000		1,135,000
OFFSETTING RECEIPTS .....	-1,593,000		-1,593,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE-MILITARY (051) .....</b>	<b>6,474,000</b>		<b>6,474,000</b>
<b>ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053)</b>			
ENERGY EMPLOYEES OCCUPATIONAL ILLNESS COMPENSATION PROGRAMS AND OTHER .....	1,168,000		1,168,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053) .....</b>	<b>1,168,000</b>		<b>1,168,000</b>
<b>DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054)</b>			
RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION TRUST FUND .....	59,000		59,000
PAYMENT TO CIA RETIREMENT FUND AND OTHER .....	514,000		514,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054) .....</b>	<b>573,000</b>		<b>573,000</b>
<b>TOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE MANDATORY PROGRAMS (050) ...</b>	<b>8,215,000</b>		<b>8,215,000</b>
<b>DISCRETIONARY AND MANDATORY BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION (050)</b>			
<b>DISCRETIONARY AND MANDATORY BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION (050)</b>			
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE--MILITARY (051) .....	591,739,869	209,641	591,949,510
ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES (053) .....	20,274,333	-266,797	20,007,536
DEFENSE-RELATED ACTIVITIES (054) .....	8,118,000		8,118,000
<b>TOTAL, BUDGET AUTHORITY IMPLICATION (050) .....</b>	<b>620,132,202</b>	<b>-57,156</b>	<b>620,075,046</b>



**TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT**

# TITLE XLI—PROCUREMENT

## SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT.

### SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT (In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>							
<b>FIXED WING</b>							
2	UTILITY F/W AIRCRAFT .....	0	879			0	879
4	MQ-1 UAV .....	15	260,436			15	260,436
<b>ROTARY</b>							
6	HELICOPTER, LIGHT UTILITY (LUH) .....	28	187,177			28	187,177
7	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN .....	64	1,168,461			64	1,168,461
8	AH-64 APACHE BLOCK IIIA REMAN (AP) .....	0	209,930			0	209,930
11	UH-60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP) .....	94	1,435,945			94	1,435,945
12	UH-60 BLACKHAWK M MODEL (MYP) (AP) .....	0	127,079			0	127,079
13	UH-60 BLACK HAWK A AND L MODELS .....	40	46,641			40	46,641
14	CH-47 HELICOPTER .....	39	1,024,587			39	1,024,587
15	CH-47 HELICOPTER (AP) .....	0	99,344			0	99,344
<b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>							
16	MQ-1 PAYLOAD (MIP) .....	0	97,543			0	97,543
19	MULTI SENSOR ABN RECON (MIP) .....	0	95,725			0	95,725
20	AH-64 MODS .....	0	116,153			0	116,153
21	CH-47 CARGO HELICOPTER MODS (MYP) .....	0	86,330			0	86,330
22	GRCS SEMA MODS (MIP) .....	0	4,019			0	4,019
23	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP) .....	0	16,302			0	16,302

24	EMARSS SEMA MODS (MIP) .....	0	13,669	0	13,669
25	UTILITY/CARGO AIRPLANE MODS .....	0	16,166	0	16,166
26	UTILITY HELICOPTER MODS .....	0	13,793	0	13,793
28	NETWORK AND MISSION PLAN .....	0	112,807	0	112,807
29	COMMS, NAV SURVEILLANCE .....	0	82,904	0	82,904
30	GATM ROLLUP .....	0	33,890	0	33,890
31	RQ-7 UAV MODS .....	0	81,444	0	81,444
	<b>GROUND SUPPORT AVIONICS</b>				
32	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY EQUIPMENT .....	0	56,215	0	56,215
33	SURVIVABILITY CM .....	0	8,917	0	8,917
34	CMWS .....	0	78,348	0	78,348
	Army UPL for AH-64 ASE: urgent survivability requirement .....				26,000
					[26,000]
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>				
35	AVIONICS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	6,937	0	6,937
36	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT .....	0	64,867	0	64,867
37	AIRCREW INTEGRATED SYSTEMS .....	0	44,085	0	44,085
38	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL .....	0	94,545	0	94,545
39	INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....	0	1,207	0	1,207
40	LAUNCHER, 2.75 ROCKET .....	0	3,012	0	3,012
	<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b> .....	<b>280</b>	<b>5,689,357</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>5,715,357</b>
	<b>MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>				
	<b>SURFACE-TO-AIR MISSILE SYSTEM</b>				
1	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) .....	0	115,075	0	115,075
2	MSE MISSILE .....	80	414,946	80	614,946
	Army UPL for Patriot PAC 3 for improved ballistic missile defense .....				200,000
					[200,000]
	<b>AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM</b>				
3	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY .....	113	27,975	113	27,975
4	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MSLS (JAGM) .....	0	27,738	0	27,738
	<b>ANTI-TANK/ASSAULT MISSILE SYS</b>				
5	JAVELIN (AAWS-M) SYSTEM SUMMARY .....	331	77,163	331	77,163

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
6	TOW 2 SYSTEM SUMMARY .....	1,704	87,525			1,704	87,525
8	GUIDED MLRS ROCKET (GMLRS) .....	1,668	251,060			1,668	251,060
9	MLRS REDUCED RANGE PRACTICE ROCKETS (RRPR) .....	3,121	17,428			3,121	17,428
	<b>MODIFICATIONS</b>						
11	PATRIOT MODS .....	0	241,883			0	241,883
12	ATACMS MODS .....	0	30,119		-10,000	0	20,119
	Early to need .....	0			[-10,000]	0	
13	GMLRS MOD .....	0	18,221			0	18,221
14	STINGER MODS .....	0	2,216			0	2,216
15	AVENGER MODS .....	0	6,171			0	6,171
16	ITAS/TOW MODS .....	0	19,576			0	19,576
17	MLRS MODS .....	0	35,970			0	35,970
18	HIMARS MODIFICATIONS .....	0	3,148			0	3,148
	<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>						
19	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....	0	33,778			0	33,778
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>						
20	AIR DEFENSE TARGETS .....	0	3,717			0	3,717
21	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MISSILES) .....	0	1,544			0	1,544
22	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT .....	0	4,704			0	4,704
	<b>TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b> .....	<b>7,017</b>	<b>1,419,957</b>		<b>190,000</b>	<b>7,017</b>	<b>1,609,957</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY</b>						
	<b>TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>						
1	STRYKER VEHICLE .....	0	181,245			0	181,245
	<b>MODIFICATION OF TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>						

2	STRYKER (MOD) .....	0	74,085	0	74,085
3	STRYKER UPGRADE .....	62	305,743	62	305,743
5	BRADLEY PROGRAM (MOD) .....	0	225,042	0	225,042
6	HOWITZER, MED SP FT 155MM M109AG (MOD) .....	0	60,079	0	60,079
7	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM) .....	30	273,850	30	273,850
8	IMPROVED RECOVERY VEHICLE (M88A2 HERCULES) .....	31	123,629	31	195,629
	16 M88A2s to supports modernization of ABCTs and industrial base .....				72,000
					[72,000]
9	ASSAULT BRIDGE (MOD) .....	0	2,461	0	2,461
10	ASSAULT BREACHER VEHICLE .....	0	2,975	0	2,975
11	M88 FOV MODS .....	0	14,878	0	14,878
12	JOINT ASSAULT BRIDGE .....	4	33,455	4	33,455
13	M1 ABRAMS TANK (MOD) .....	0	367,939	0	367,939
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>				
15	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (TCV-WTCV) .....	0	6,479	0	6,479
	<b>WEAPONS &amp; OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES</b>				
16	MORTAR SYSTEMS .....	0	4,991	0	4,991
17	XM320 GRENADE LAUNCHER MODULE (GLM) .....	0	26,294	0	26,294
18	PRECISION SNIPER RIFLE .....	0	1,984	0	0
	Early to need .....				-1,984
					[-1,984]
19	COMPACT SEMI-AUTOMATIC SNIPER SYSTEM .....	0	1,488	0	0
	Early to need .....				-1,488
					[-1,488]
20	CARBINE .....	0	34,460	0	34,460
21	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION .....	0	8,367	0	14,767
	Transferred funds .....				6,400
					[6,400]
22	HANDGUN .....	0	5,417	0	0
	RFP release delayed, early to need .....				-5,417
					[-5,417]
	<b>MOD OF WEAPONS AND OTHER COMBAT VEH</b>				
23	MK-19 GRENADE MACHINE GUN MODS .....	0	2,777	0	2,777
24	M777 MODS .....	0	10,070	0	10,070
25	M4 CARBINE MODS .....	0	27,566	0	27,566
26	M2 50 CAL MACHINE GUN MODS .....	0	44,004	0	44,004
27	M249 SAW MACHINE GUN MODS .....	0	1,190	0	1,190

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
28	M240 MEDIUM MACHINE GUN MODS .....	0	1,424			0	1,424
29	SNIPER RIFLES MODIFICATIONS .....		2,431		-1,400	0	1,031
	Early to need .....	0			[-1,400]	0	
30	M119 MODIFICATIONS .....	0	20,599			0	20,599
32	MORTAR MODIFICATION .....	0	6,300			0	6,300
33	MODIFICATIONS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) .....	0	3,737			0	3,737
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>						
34	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (WOCV-WTCV) .....	0	391		2,500	0	2,891
	Transfer funds .....				[2,500]		
35	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (WOCV-WTCV) .....	0	9,027			0	9,027
36	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS .....	0	304			0	304
37	SMALL ARMS EQUIPMENT (SOLDIER ENH PROG) .....	0	2,392			0	2,392
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY .....</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>1,987,073</b>		<b>70,611</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>1,957,684</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</b>						
	<b>SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION</b>						
1	CTG, 5.56MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	43,489			0	43,489
2	CTG, 7.62MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	40,715			0	40,715
3	CTG, HANDGUN, ALL TYPES .....	0	7,753		-952	0	6,801
	Program funding ahead of need .....				[-952]		
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES .....	0	24,728			0	24,728
5	CTG, 25MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	8,305			0	8,305
6	CTG, 30MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	34,330			0	34,330
7	CTG, 40MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	79,972		-10,000	0	69,972
	Early to need .....				[-10,000]		

	<b>MORTAR AMMUNITION</b>				
8	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....	0	42,898	0	42,898
9	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....	0	43,500	0	43,500
10	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....	0	64,372	0	64,372
	<b>TANK AMMUNITION</b>				
11	CARTRIDGES, TANK, 105MM AND 120MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	105,541	0	105,541
	<b>ARTILLERY AMMUNITION</b>				
12	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	57,756	0	57,756
13	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	77,995	0	77,995
14	PROJ 155MM EXTENDED RANGE M982 .....	0	45,518	0	45,518
15	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL .....	0	78,024	0	78,024
	<b>ROCKETS</b>				
16	SHOULDER LAUNCHED MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES .....	0	7,500	0	7,500
17	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES .....	0	33,653	0	33,653
	<b>OTHER AMMUNITION</b>				
18	CAD/PAD, ALL TYPES .....	0	5,639	0	5,639
19	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES .....	0	9,751	0	9,751
20	GRENADES, ALL TYPES .....	0	19,993	0	19,993
21	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES .....	0	9,761	0	9,761
22	SIMULATORS, ALL TYPES .....	0	9,749	0	9,749
	<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>				
23	AMMO COMPONENTS, ALL TYPES .....	0	3,521	0	3,521
24	NON-LETHAL AMMUNITION, ALL TYPES .....	0	1,700	0	1,700
25	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION (AMMO) .....	0	6,181	0	6,181
26	AMMUNITION PECULIAR EQUIPMENT .....	0	17,811	0	17,811
27	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION (AMMO) .....	0	14,695	0	14,695
	<b>PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT</b>				
29	PROVISION OF INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....	0	221,703	0	221,703
30	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS DEMILITARIZATION .....	0	113,250	0	113,250
31	ARMS INITIATIVE .....	0	3,575	0	3,575
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</b> .....	<b>0</b>	<b>1,233,378</b>	<b>-10,952</b>	<b>1,222,426</b>

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>							
<b>TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>							
1	TACTICAL TRAILERS/DOLLY SETS .....	0	12,855			0	12,855
2	SEMITRAILERS, FLATBED: .....	0	53			0	53
4	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE .....	450	308,336			450	308,336
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) .....	166	90,040			166	90,040
6	FIRETRUCKS & ASSOCIATED FIREFIGHTING EQUIP .....	0	8,444			0	8,444
7	FAMILY OF HEAVY TACTICAL VEHICLES (FHTV) .....	273	27,549			273	27,549
8	PLS ESP .....	0	127,102			0	127,102
10	TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE PROTECTION KITS .....	0	48,292			0	48,292
11	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP .....	0	130,993			0	130,993
12	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS .....	0	19,146			0	19,146
<b>NON-TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>							
14	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES .....	0	1,248			0	1,248
15	NONTACTICAL VEHICLES, OTHER .....	0	9,614			0	9,614
<b>COMM—JOINT COMMUNICATIONS</b>							
16	WIN-T—GROUND FORCES TACTICAL NETWORK .....	0	783,116		-200,000	0	583,116
	Delayed obligation of prior year funds .....				[-200,000]		
17	SIGNAL MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....	0	49,898			0	49,898
18	JOINT INCIDENT SITE COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY .....	0	4,062			0	4,062
19	JCSSE EQUIPMENT (USREDCOM) .....	0	5,008			0	5,008
<b>COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS</b>							
20	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE WIDEBAND SATCOM SYSTEMS .....	0	196,306			0	196,306
21	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS .....	0	44,998		-15,000	0	29,998
	Early in need in FY16 due to one year delay .....				[-15,000]		



22	SHF TERM .....	0	7,629	0	7,629
23	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (SPACE) .....	0	14,027	0	14,027
24	SMART-T (SPACE) .....	0	13,453	0	13,453
25	GLOBAL BROADCAST SVC—GBS .....	0	6,265	0	6,265
26	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (TAC SAT) .....	0	1,042	0	1,042
27	ENROUTE MISSION COMMAND (EMC) .....	0	7,116	0	7,116
	<b>COMM—C3 SYSTEM</b>				
28	ARMY GLOBAL CMD & CONTROL SYS (AGCCS) .....	0	10,137	0	10,137
	<b>COMM—COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS</b>				
29	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM .....	0	64,640	0	64,640
30	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MMVR) .....	0	27,762	0	27,762
31	RADIO TERMINAL SET, MIDS LVT(2) .....	0	9,422	0	9,422
32	AMC CRITICAL ITEMS—OPA2 .....	0	26,020	0	26,020
33	TRACTOR DESK .....	0	4,073	0	4,073
34	SPIDER APLA REMOTE CONTROL UNIT .....	0	1,403	0	1,403
35	SPIDER FAMILY OF NETWORKED MUNITIONS INCR .....	0	9,199	0	9,199
36	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM COMM/ELECTRONICS .....	0	349	0	349
37	TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS AND PROTECTIVE SYSTEM .....	0	25,597	0	25,597
38	UNIFIED COMMAND SUITE .....	0	21,854	0	21,854
40	FAMILY OF MED COMM FOR COMBAT CASUALTY CARE .....	0	24,388	0	24,388
	<b>COMM—INTELLIGENCE COMM</b>				
42	CI AUTOMATION ARCHITECTURE .....	0	1,349	0	1,349
43	ARMY CA/MISO GPF EQUIPMENT .....	0	3,695	0	3,695
	<b>INFORMATION SECURITY</b>				
45	INFORMATION SYSTEM SECURITY PROGRAM-ISSP .....	0	19,920	0	19,920
46	COMMUNICATIONS SECURITY (COMSEC) .....	0	72,257	0	72,257
	<b>COMM—LONG HAUL COMMUNICATIONS</b>				
47	BASE SUPPORT COMMUNICATIONS .....	0	16,082	0	16,082
	<b>COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS</b>				
48	INFORMATION SYSTEMS .....	0	86,037	0	86,037
50	EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....	0	8,550	0	8,550
51	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM .....	0	73,496	0	73,496

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
<b>ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)</b>							
54	JIT/CIBS-M .....	0	881			0	881
55	PROPHET GROUND .....	0	63,650		-15,000	0	48,650
	Unjustified program growth .....				[-15,000]		
57	DCGS-A (MIP) .....	0	260,268			0	260,268
58	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND STATION (JTAGS) .....	0	3,906			0	3,906
59	TROJAN (MIP) .....	0	13,929			0	13,929
60	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (INTEL SPT) (MIP) .....	0	3,978			0	3,978
61	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRTING AND COLL(CHARGCS) .....	0	7,542			0	7,542
62	CLOSE ACCESS TARGET RECONNAISSANCE (CATR) .....	0	8,010			0	8,010
63	MACHINE FOREIGN LANGUAGE TRANSLATION SYSTEM-M .....	0	8,125			0	8,125
<b>ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)</b>							
64	LIGHTWEIGHT COUNTER MORTAR RADAR .....	0	63,472			0	63,472
65	EW PLANNING & MANAGEMENT TOOLS (EWPMT) .....	0	2,556			0	2,556
66	AIR VIGILANCE (AV) .....	0	8,224			0	8,224
67	CREW .....	0	2,960			0	2,960
68	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITIE .....	0	1,722			0	1,722
69	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES .....	0	447			0	447
70	CI MODERNIZATION .....	0	228			0	228
<b>ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)</b>							
71	SENTINEL MODS .....	0	43,285			0	43,285
72	NIGHT VISION DEVICES .....	0	124,216			0	124,216
74	SMALL TACTICAL OPTICAL RIFLE MOUNTED MLRF .....	0	23,216			0	23,216
76	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION FAMILY OF SYSTEMS .....	0	60,679			0	60,679
77	FAMILY OF WEAPON SIGHTS (FWS) .....	0	53,453			0	53,453
78	ARTILLERY ACCURACY EQUIP .....	0	3,338			0	3,338

79	PROFILER .....	0	4,057	0	4,057
81	JOINT BATTLE COMMAND—PLATFORM (JBC-P) .....	0	133,339	0	133,339
82	JOINT EFFECTS TARGETING SYSTEM (JETS) .....	0	47,212	0	47,212
83	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIP (LLDR) .....	0	22,314	0	22,314
84	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMCB XM32 .....	0	12,131	0	12,131
85	MORTAR FIRE CONTROL SYSTEM .....	0	10,075	0	10,075
86	COUNTERFIRE RADARS .....	0	217,379	0	142,379
	Under execution of prior year funds .....				-75,000
	<b>ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS</b>				[-75,000]
87	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY .....	0	1,190	0	1,190
90	AIR & MSL DEFENSE PLANNING & CONTROL SYS .....	0	28,176	0	28,176
91	IAMD BATTLE COMMAND SYSTEM .....	0	20,917	0	20,917
92	LIFE CYCLE SOFTWARE SUPPORT (LCSS) .....	0	5,850	0	5,850
93	NETWORK MANAGEMENT INITIALIZATION AND SERVICE .....	0	12,738	0	12,738
94	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) .....	0	145,405	0	145,405
95	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM-ARMY (GCSS-A) .....	0	162,654	0	146,654
	Program growth .....				-16,000
	<b>ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION</b>				[-16,000]
96	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (IPP) .....	0	4,446	0	4,446
98	RECONNAISSANCE AND SURVEYING INSTRUMENT SET .....	0	16,218	0	16,218
99	MOD OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (ENFIRE) .....	0	1,138	0	1,138
100	ARMY TRAINING MODERNIZATION .....	0	12,089	0	12,089
101	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP .....	0	105,775	0	93,775
	Reduce IT procurement .....				-12,000
102	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEMS FAM .....	0	18,995	0	18,995
103	HIGH PERF COMPUTING MOD PGM (HPCMP) .....	0	62,319	0	62,319
104	RESERVE COMPONENT AUTOMATION SYS (RCAS) .....	0	17,894	0	17,894
	<b>ELECT EQUIP—AUDIO VISUAL SYS (A/V)</b>				
106	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (SURVEYING EQUIPMENT) .....	0	4,242	0	4,242
	<b>ELECT EQUIP—SUPPORT</b>				
107	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (C-E) .....	0	425	0	425
108	BCT EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES .....	0	7,438	0	7,438

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
108A	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>	0	6,467			0	6,467
	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....						
	<b>CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT</b>						
109	PROTECTIVE SYSTEMS .....	0	248			0	248
110	FAMILY OF NON-LETHAL EQUIPMENT (FNLE) .....	0	1,487			0	1,487
112	CBRN DEFENSE .....	0	26,302			0	26,302
	<b>BRIDGING EQUIPMENT</b>						
113	TACTICAL BRIDGING .....	0	9,822			0	9,822
114	TACTICAL BRIDGE, FLOAT-RIBBON .....	0	21,516			0	21,516
115	BRIDGE SUPPLEMENTAL SET .....	0	4,959			0	4,959
116	COMMON BRIDGE TRANSPORTER (CBT) RECAP .....	0	52,546			0	52,546
	<b>ENGINEER (NON-CONSTRUCTION) EQUIPMENT</b>						
117	GRND STANDOFF MINE DETECTN SYSM (GSTAMIDS) .....	0	58,682			0	58,682
118	HUSKY MOUNTED DETECTION SYSTEM (HMDS) .....	0	13,565			0	13,565
119	ROBOTIC COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM (RCSS) .....	0	2,136			0	2,136
120	EOD ROBOTICS SYSTEMS RECAPITALIZATION .....	0	6,960			0	6,960
121	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQPMT (EOD EQPMT) .....	0	17,424			0	17,424
122	REMOTE DEMOLITION SYSTEMS .....	0	8,284			0	8,284
123	< \$5M, COUNTERMINE EQUIPMENT .....	0	5,459			0	5,459
124	FAMILY OF BOATS AND MOTORS .....	0	8,429			0	8,429
	<b>COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
125	HEATERS AND ECU'S .....	0	18,876			0	18,876
127	SOLDIER ENHANCEMENT .....	0	2,287			0	2,287
128	PERSONNEL RECOVERY SUPPORT SYSTEM (PRSS) .....	0	7,733			0	7,733
129	GROUND SOLDIER SYSTEM .....	0	49,798			0	49,798
130	MOBILE SOLDIER POWER .....	0	43,639			0	43,639

132	FIELD FEEDING EQUIPMENT .....	0	13,118	0	13,118
133	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM .....	0	28,278	0	28,278
135	FAMILY OF ENGR COMBAT AND CONSTRUCTION SETS .....	0	34,544	0	34,544
136	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5M (ENG SPT) .....	0	595	0	595
	<b>PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT</b>				
137	QUALITY SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT .....	0	5,368	0	5,368
138	DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS, PETROLEUM & WATER .....	0	35,381	0	35,381
	<b>MEDICAL EQUIPMENT</b>				
139	COMBAT SUPPORT MEDICAL .....	0	73,828	0	73,828
	<b>MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT</b>				
140	MOBILE MAINTENANCE EQUIPMENT SYSTEMS .....	0	25,270	0	25,270
141	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (MAINT EQ) .....	0	2,760	0	2,760
	<b>CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT</b>				
142	GRADER, ROAD MTZD, HVY, 6X4 (CCE) .....	0	5,903	0	5,903
143	SCRAPERS, EARTHMOVING .....	0	26,125	0	26,125
146	TRACTOR, FULL TRACKED .....	0	27,156	0	27,156
147	ALL TERRAIN CRANES .....	0	16,750	0	16,750
148	PLANT, ASPHALT MIXING .....	0	984	0	984
149	HIGH MOBILITY ENGINEER EXCAVATOR (HMEE) .....	0	2,656	0	2,656
150	ENHANCED RAPID AIRFIELD CONSTRUCTION CAPAP .....	0	2,531	0	2,531
151	FAMILY OF DIVER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	446	0	446
152	CONST EQUIP ESP .....	0	19,640	0	19,640
153	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (CONST EQUIP) .....	0	5,087	0	5,087
	<b>RAIL FLOAT CONTAINERIZATION EQUIPMENT</b>				
154	ARMY WATERCRAFT ESP .....	0	39,772	0	39,772
155	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5.0M (FLOAT/RAIL) .....	0	5,835	0	5,835
	<b>GENERATORS</b>				
156	GENERATORS AND ASSOCIATED EQUIP .....	0	166,356	0	166,356
157	TACTICAL ELECTRIC POWER RECAPITALIZATION .....	0	11,505	0	11,505
	<b>MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT</b>				
159	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS .....	0	17,496	0	17,496
	<b>TRAINING EQUIPMENT</b>				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
160	COMBAT TRAINING CENTERS SUPPORT .....	0	74,916			0	74,916
161	TRAINING DEVICES, NONSYSTEM .....	0	303,236		-25,000	0	278,236
	Unjustified program growth .....				[-25,000]		
162	CLOSE COMBAT TACTICAL TRAINER .....	0	45,210			0	45,210
163	AVIATION COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER .....	0	30,068			0	30,068
164	GAMING TECHNOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF ARMY TRAINING .....	0	9,793			0	9,793
	<b>TEST MEASURE AND DIG EQUIPMENT (TMD)</b>						
165	CALIBRATION SETS EQUIPMENT .....	0	4,650			0	4,650
166	INTEGRATED FAMILY OF TEST EQUIPMENT (IFTE) .....	0	34,487			0	34,487
167	TEST EQUIPMENT MODERNIZATION (TEMOD) .....	0	11,083			0	11,083
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
169	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	17,937			0	17,937
170	PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEMS (OPA3) .....	0	52,040			0	52,040
171	BASE LEVEL COMMON EQUIPMENT .....	0	1,568			0	1,568
172	MODIFICATION OF IN-SVC EQUIPMENT (OPA-3) .....	0	64,219			0	64,219
173	PRODUCTION BASE SUPPORT (OTH) .....	0	1,525			0	1,525
174	SPECIAL EQUIPMENT FOR USER TESTING .....	0	3,268			0	3,268
176	TRACTOR YARD .....	0	7,191			0	7,191
	<b>OPA2</b>						
177	INITIAL SPARES—C&E .....	0	48,511			0	48,511
	<b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b> .....	<b>889</b>	<b>5,899,028</b>		<b>-358,000</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>5,541,028</b>
	<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>						
	<b>COMBAT AIRCRAFT</b>						
2	F/A-18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET .....	0	0	12	1,150,000	12	1,150,000



SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	AV-8B Link 16 upgrades, unfunded requirement .....				[3,300]		
31	ADVERSARY .....	0	5,816			0	5,816
32	F-18 SERIES .....	0	978,756		170,000	0	1,148,756
	Jamming protection upgrades, unfunded requirement .....				[170,000]		
34	H-53 SERIES .....	0	46,887			0	46,887
35	SH-60 SERIES .....	0	107,728			0	107,728
36	H-1 SERIES .....	0	42,315			0	42,315
37	EP-3 SERIES .....	0	41,784			0	41,784
38	P-3 SERIES .....	0	3,067			0	3,067
39	E-2 SERIES .....	0	20,741			0	20,741
40	TRAINER A/C SERIES .....	0	27,980			0	27,980
41	C-2A .....	0	8,157			0	8,157
42	C-130 SERIES .....	0	70,335			0	70,335
43	FEWSG .....	0	633			0	633
44	CARGO/TRANSPORT A/C SERIES .....	0	8,916			0	8,916
45	E-6 SERIES .....	0	185,253			0	185,253
46	EXECUTIVE HELICOPTERS SERIES .....	0	76,138			0	76,138
47	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT .....	0	23,702			0	23,702
48	T-45 SERIES .....	0	105,439			0	105,439
49	POWER PLANT CHANGES .....	0	9,917			0	9,917
50	JPATS SERIES .....	0	13,537			0	13,537
51	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT .....	0	131,732			0	131,732
52	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES .....	0	202,745			0	202,745
53	COMMON DEFENSIVE WEAPON SYSTEM .....	0	3,062			0	3,062
54	ID SYSTEMS .....	0	48,206			0	48,206
55	P-8 SERIES .....	0	28,492			0	28,492



56	MAGTF EW FOR AVIATION .....	0	7,680		0	7,680
57	MQ-8 SERIES .....	0	22,464		0	22,464
58	RQ-7 SERIES .....	0	3,773		0	3,773
59	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY .....	0	121,208	23,000	0	144,208
	MV-22 Integrated Aircraft Survivability .....			[15,000]		
	MV-22 Ballistic Protection .....			[8,000]		
60	F-35 STOVL SERIES .....	0	256,106		0	256,106
61	F-35 CV SERIES .....	0	68,527		0	68,527
62	QRC .....	0	6,885		0	6,885
	<b>AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>					
63	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....	0	1,563,515		0	1,563,515
	<b>AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP &amp; FACILITIES</b>					
64	COMMON GROUND EQUIPMENT .....	0	450,959		0	450,959
65	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....	0	24,010		0	24,010
66	WAR CONSUMABLES .....	0	42,012		0	42,012
67	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES .....	0	2,455		0	2,455
68	SPECIAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	50,859		0	50,859
69	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION .....	0	1,801		0	1,801
	<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b> .....	<b>117</b>	<b>16,126,405</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>2,346,700</b>	<b>18,473,105</b>
	<b>WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>					
	<b>MODIFICATION OF MISSILES</b>					
1	TRIDENT II MODS .....	0	1,099,064		0	1,099,064
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>					
2	MISSILE INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....	0	7,748		0	7,748
	<b>STRATEGIC MISSILES</b>					
3	TONIAHAWK .....	100	184,814	49	30,000	214,814
	Combined with 47 FY15 OCO missiles, returns production to MSR .....			49	[30,000]	
	<b>TACTICAL MISSILES</b>					
4	AMRAAM .....	167	192,873		167	207,873
	Additional captive air training missiles .....				[15,000]	

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
5	SIDEWINDER .....	227	96,427			227	96,427
6	JSOW .....	0	21,419			0	21,419
7	STANDARD MISSILE .....	113	435,352			113	435,352
8	RAM .....	90	80,826			90	80,826
11	STAND OFF PRECISION GUIDED MUNITIONS (SOPGM) .....	27	4,265			27	4,265
12	AERIAL TARGETS .....	0	40,792			0	40,792
13	OTHER MISSILE SUPPORT .....	0	3,335			0	3,335
	<b>MODIFICATION OF MISSILES</b>						
14	ESSM .....	30	44,440			30	44,440
15	ESSM (AP) .....	0	54,462			0	54,462
16	HARM MODS .....	0	122,298			0	122,298
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT &amp; FACILITIES</b>						
17	WEAPONS INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....	0	2,397			0	2,397
18	FLEET SATELLITE COMM FOLLOW-ON .....	0	39,932			0	39,932
	<b>ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
19	ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	57,641		3,668	0	61,309
	Classified Program .....				[3,668]		
	<b>TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP</b>						
20	SSTD .....	0	7,380			0	7,380
21	MK-48 TORPEDO .....	8	65,611			8	65,611
22	ASW TARGETS .....	0	6,912			0	6,912
	<b>MOD OF TORPEDOES AND RELATED EQUIP</b>						
23	MK-54 TORPEDO MODS .....	0	113,219			0	113,219
24	MK-48 TORPEDO ADCAP MODS .....	0	63,317			0	63,317
25	QUICKSTRIKE MINE .....	0	13,254			0	13,254
	<b>SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						

26	TORPEDO SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	67,701	0	67,701
27	ASW RANGE SUPPORT .....	0	3,699	0	3,699
	<b>DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION</b>				
28	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION .....	0	3,342	0	3,342
	<b>GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS</b>				
29	SMALL ARMS AND WEAPONS .....	0	11,937	0	11,937
	<b>MODIFICATION OF GUNS AND GUN MOUNTS</b>				
30	CIWS MODS .....	0	53,147	0	53,147
31	COAST GUARD WEAPONS .....	0	19,022	0	19,022
32	GUN MOUNT MODS .....	0	67,980	0	67,980
33	AIRBORNE MINE NEUTRALIZATION SYSTEMS .....	0	19,823	0	19,823
	<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>				
35	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....	0	149,725	0	149,725

**TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY** ..... **762** **3,154,154** **49** **48,668** **811** **3,202,822**

361

**PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY & MC**

**NAVY AMMUNITION**

1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS .....	0	101,238	0	101,238
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES .....	0	67,289	0	67,289
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION .....	0	20,340	0	20,340
4	PRACTICE BOMBS .....	0	40,365	0	40,365
5	CARTRIDGES & CART ACTUATED DEVICES .....	0	49,377	0	49,377
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES .....	0	59,651	0	59,651
7	JATOS .....	0	2,806	0	2,806
8	LRLAP 6" LONG RANGE ATTACK PROJECTILE .....	0	11,596	0	11,596
9	5 INCH/54 GUN AMMUNITION .....	0	35,994	0	35,994
10	INTERMEDIATE CALIBER GUN AMMUNITION .....	0	36,715	0	36,715
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION .....	0	45,483	0	45,483
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO .....	0	52,080	0	52,080
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION .....	0	10,809	0	10,809
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	4,469	0	4,469

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
<b>MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION</b>							
15	SMALL ARMS AMMUNITION .....	0	46,848			0	46,848
16	LINEAR CHARGES, ALL TYPES .....	0	350			0	350
17	40 MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	500			0	500
18	60MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	1,849			0	1,849
19	81MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	1,000			0	1,000
20	120MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	13,867			0	13,867
22	GRENADES, ALL TYPES .....	0	1,390			0	1,390
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES .....	0	14,967			0	14,967
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES .....	0	45,219			0	45,219
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES .....	0	29,335			0	29,335
27	NON LETHALS .....	0	3,868			0	3,868
28	AMMO MODERNIZATION .....	0	15,117			0	15,117
29	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	11,219			0	11,219
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY &amp; MC .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>723,741</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>723,741</b>
<b>SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY</b>							
<b>OTHER WARSHIPS</b>							
1	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM .....	0	1,634,701			0	1,634,701
2	CARRIER REPLACEMENT PROGRAM (AP) .....	0	874,658			0	874,658
3	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE .....	2	3,346,370			2	3,346,370
4	VIRGINIA CLASS SUBMARINE (AP) .....	0	1,993,740		800,000	0	2,793,740
	Accelerate shipbuilding funding .....				[800,000]		
5	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS .....	1	678,274			1	678,274
6	CVN REFUELING OVERHAULS (AP) .....	0	14,951			0	14,951

7	DDG 1000 .....	0	433,404		0	433,404
8	DDG-51 .....	2	3,149,703	400,000	2	3,549,703
	Incremental funding for one DDG-51 .....			[400,000]		
10	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP .....	3	1,356,991		3	1,356,991
	<b>AMPHIBIOUS SHIPS</b>					
12	LPD-17 .....	1	550,000	97,000	1	550,000
13	AFLOAT FORWARD STAGING BASE .....	0	0	[97,000]	0	97,000
	Accelerate shipbuilding funding .....			[97,000]		
15	LHA REPLACEMENT .....	0	277,543	199,000	0	476,543
	Accelerate LHA-8 advanced procurement .....			[199,000]		
XX	LX (R) AP .....	0	0	51,000	0	51,000
	Accelerate LX (R) .....			[51,000]		
XXX	LCU Replacement .....	0	0	34,000	1	34,000
	Accelerate LCU replacement .....			[34,000]		
	<b>AUXILIARIES, CRAFT AND PRIOR YR PROGRAM COST</b>					
17	TAO FLEET OILER .....	1	674,190		1	674,190
19	MOORED TRAINING SHIP (AP) .....	0	138,200		0	138,200
20	OUTFITTING .....	0	697,207		0	697,207
21	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR .....	5	295,630		5	295,630
22	SERVICE CRAFT .....	0	30,014		0	30,014
23	LCAC SLEP .....	4	80,738		4	80,738
24	YP CRAFT MAINTENANCE/ROH/SLEP .....	0	21,838		0	21,838
25	COMPLETION OF PY SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS .....	0	389,305		0	389,305
XX	T-ATS(X) Fleet Tug .....	0	0	75,000	1	75,000
	Accelerate T-ATS(X) .....			[75,000]		
	<b>TOTAL SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION, NAVY</b> .....	<b>19</b>	<b>16,597,457</b>	<b>1,656,000</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18,253,457</b>
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>					
	<b>SHIP PROPULSION EQUIPMENT</b>					
1	LM-2500 GAS TURBINE .....	0	4,881		0	4,881
2	ALLISON 501K GAS TURBINE .....	0	5,814		0	5,814

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
3	HYBRID ELECTRIC DRIVE (HED) .....	0	32,906			0	32,906
	<b>GENERATORS</b>						
4	SURFACE COMBATANT HM&E .....	0	36,860			0	36,860
	<b>NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT</b>						
5	OTHER NAVIGATION EQUIPMENT .....	0	87,481			0	87,481
	<b>PERISCOPES</b>						
6	SUB PERISCOPES & IMAGING EQUIP .....	0	63,109			0	63,109
	<b>OTHER SHIPBOARD EQUIPMENT</b>						
7	DDG MOD .....	0	364,157		60,000	0	424,157
	Restore additional DDG BMD modernization (CNO UPL) .....				[60,000]		
8	FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT .....	0	16,089			0	16,089
9	COMMAND AND CONTROL SWITCHBOARD .....	0	2,255			0	2,255
10	LHA/LHD MIDLIFE .....	0	28,571			0	28,571
11	LCC 19/20 EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE PROGRAM .....	0	12,313			0	12,313
12	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT .....	0	16,609			0	16,609
13	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	10,498			0	10,498
14	VIRGINIA CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	35,747			0	35,747
15	LCS CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	48,399			0	48,399
16	SUBMARINE BATTERIES .....	0	23,072			0	23,072
17	LPD CLASS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	55,283			0	55,283
18	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP .....	0	18,563			0	18,563
19	DSSP EQUIPMENT .....	0	7,376			0	7,376
21	LCAC .....	0	20,965			0	20,965
22	UNDERWATER EOD PROGRAMS .....	0	51,652			0	51,652
23	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	102,498			0	102,498
24	CHEMICAL WARFARE DETECTORS .....	0	3,027			0	3,027

25	SUBMARINE LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEM .....	0	7,399	0	7,399
	<b>REACTOR PLANT EQUIPMENT</b>				
27	REACTOR COMPONENTS .....	0	296,095	0	296,095
	<b>OCEAN ENGINEERING</b>				
28	DIVING AND SALVAGE EQUIPMENT .....	0	15,982	0	15,982
	<b>SMALL BOATS</b>				
29	STANDARD BOATS .....	0	29,982	0	29,982
	<b>TRAINING EQUIPMENT</b>				
30	OTHER SHIPS TRAINING EQUIPMENT .....	0	66,538	0	66,538
	<b>PRODUCTION FACILITIES EQUIPMENT</b>				
31	OPERATING FORCES IPE .....	0	71,138	0	71,138
	<b>OTHER SHIP SUPPORT</b>				
32	NUCLEAR ALTERATIONS .....	0	132,625	0	132,625
33	LCS COMMON MISSION MODULES EQUIPMENT .....	0	23,500	0	23,500
34	LCS MCM MISSION MODULES .....	0	85,151	0	29,351
	Procurement in excess of need ahead of satisfactory testing .....				-55,800
					[-55,800]
35	LCS SUW MISSION MODULES .....	0	35,228	0	35,228
36	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS) .....	0	87,627	0	22,027
	Procurement in excess of need ahead of satisfactory testing .....				-65,600
					[-65,600]
	<b>LOGISTIC SUPPORT</b>				
37	LSD MIDLIFE .....	0	2,774	0	2,774
	<b>SHIP SONARS</b>				
38	SPQ-9B RADAR .....	0	20,551	0	20,551
39	AM/SQQ-89 SURF ASW COMBAT SYSTEM .....	0	103,241	0	103,241
40	SSN ACOUSTICS .....	0	214,835	0	234,835
	Towed Array-undefunded requirement .....				20,000
					[20,000]
41	UNDERSEA WARFARE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	7,331	0	7,331
42	SONAR SWITCHES AND TRANSDUCERS .....	0	11,781	0	11,781
	<b>ASW ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT</b>				
44	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE SYSTEM .....	0	21,119	0	21,119
45	SSTD .....	0	8,396	0	8,396
46	FIXED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM .....	0	146,968	0	146,968

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
47	SURTASS .....	0	12,953			0	12,953
48	MARITIME PATROL AND RECONNAISSANCE FORCE .....	0	13,725			0	13,725
	<b>ELECTRONIC WARFARE EQUIPMENT</b>						
49	AN/SLQ-32 .....	0	324,726		28,000	0	352,726
	SEWIP Block II unfunded requirement .....				[28,000]		
	<b>RECONNAISSANCE EQUIPMENT</b>						
50	SHIPBOARD IW EXPLOIT .....	0	148,221			0	148,221
51	AUTOMATED IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM (AIS) .....	0	152			0	152
	<b>SUBMARINE SURVEILLANCE EQUIPMENT</b>						
52	SUBMARINE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT PROG .....	0	79,954			0	79,954
	<b>OTHER SHIP ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT</b>						
53	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT CAPABILITY .....	0	25,695			0	25,695
54	TRUSTED INFORMATION SYSTEM (TIS) .....	0	284			0	284
55	NAVAL TACTICAL COMMAND SUPPORT SYSTEM (NTCSS) .....	0	14,416			0	14,416
56	ATDLS .....	0	23,069			0	23,069
57	NAVY COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NCCS) .....	0	4,054			0	4,054
58	MINESWEEPING SYSTEM REPLACEMENT .....	0	21,014			0	21,014
59	SHALLOW WATER MCM .....	0	18,077			0	18,077
60	NAVSTAR GPS RECEIVERS (SPACE) .....	0	12,359			0	12,359
61	AMERICAN FORCES RADIO AND TV SERVICE .....	0	4,240			0	4,240
62	STRATEGIC PLATFORM SUPPORT EQUIP .....	0	17,440			0	17,440
	<b>TRAINING EQUIPMENT</b>						
63	OTHER TRAINING EQUIPMENT .....	0	41,314			0	41,314
	<b>AVIATION ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT</b>						
64	MATCALS .....	0	10,011			0	10,011
65	SHIPBOARD AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL .....	0	9,346			0	9,346



66	AUTOMATIC CARRIER LANDING SYSTEM .....	0	21,281	0	21,281
67	NATIONAL AIR SPACE SYSTEM .....	0	25,621	0	25,621
68	FLEET AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEMS .....	0	8,249	0	8,249
69	LANDING SYSTEMS .....	0	14,715	0	14,715
70	ID SYSTEMS .....	0	29,676	0	29,676
71	NAVAL MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS .....	0	13,737	0	13,737
	<b>OTHER SHORE ELECTRONIC EQUIPMENT</b>				
72	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND & CONTROL .....	0	1,314	0	1,314
74	TACTICAL/MOBILE C4I SYSTEMS .....	0	13,600	0	13,600
75	DCGS-N .....	0	31,809	0	31,809
76	CANES .....	0	278,991	0	278,991
77	RADIAC .....	0	8,294	0	8,294
78	CAMES-INTELL .....	0	28,695	0	28,695
79	GPETE .....	0	6,962	0	6,962
80	MAF .....	0	290	0	290
81	INTEG COMBAT SYSTEM TEST FACILITY .....	0	14,419	0	14,419
82	EMI CONTROL INSTRUMENTATION .....	0	4,175	0	4,175
83	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	44,176	0	44,176
	<b>SHIPBOARD COMMUNICATIONS</b>				
84	SHIPBOARD TACTICAL COMMUNICATIONS .....	0	8,722	0	8,722
85	SHIP COMMUNICATIONS AUTOMATION .....	0	108,477	0	108,477
86	COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS UNDER \$5M .....	0	16,613	0	16,613
	<b>SUBMARINE COMMUNICATIONS</b>				
87	SUBMARINE BROADCAST SUPPORT .....	0	20,691	0	20,691
88	SUBMARINE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT .....	0	60,945	0	60,945
	<b>SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS</b>				
89	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS .....	0	30,892	0	30,892
90	NAVY MULTIBAND TERMINAL (NMT) .....	0	118,113	0	118,113
	<b>SHORE COMMUNICATIONS</b>				
91	JCS COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT .....	0	4,591	0	4,591
92	ELECTRICAL POWER SYSTEMS .....	0	1,403	0	1,403
	<b>CRYPTOGRAPHIC EQUIPMENT</b>				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
93	INFO SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) .....	0	135,687			0	135,687
94	MIO INTEL EXPLOITATION TEAM .....	0	970			0	970
	<b>CRYPTOLOGIC EQUIPMENT</b>						
95	CRYPTOLOGIC COMMUNICATIONS EQUIP .....	0	11,433			0	11,433
	<b>OTHER ELECTRONIC SUPPORT</b>						
96	COAST GUARD EQUIPMENT .....	0	2,529			0	2,529
	<b>SONOBUOYS</b>						
97	SONOBUOYS—ALL TYPES .....	0	168,763			0	168,763
	<b>AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
98	WEAPONS RANGE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	46,979			0	46,979
100	AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	123,884			0	123,884
103	METEOROLOGICAL EQUIPMENT .....	0	15,090			0	15,090
104	DCRS/DPL .....	0	638			0	638
106	AIRBORNE MINE COUNTERMEASURES .....	0	14,098			0	14,098
111	AVIATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	49,773			0	49,773
	<b>SHIP GUN SYSTEM EQUIPMENT</b>						
112	SHIP GUN SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT .....	0	5,300			0	5,300
	<b>SHIP MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIPMENT</b>						
115	SHIP MISSILE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	298,738			0	298,738
120	TOMAHAWK SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	71,245			0	71,245
	<b>FBM SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
123	STRATEGIC MISSILE SYSTEMS EQUIP .....	0	240,694			0	240,694
	<b>ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
124	SSN COMBAT CONTROL SYSTEMS .....	0	96,040			0	96,040
125	ASW SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	30,189			0	30,189
	<b>OTHER ORDNANCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						

129	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL EQUIP .....	0	22,623	0	22,623
130	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	9,906	0	9,906
	<b>OTHER EXPENDABLE ORDNANCE</b>				
134	TRAINING DEVICE MODS .....	0	99,707	0	99,707
	<b>CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>				
135	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES .....	0	2,252	0	2,252
136	GENERAL PURPOSE TRUCKS .....	0	2,191	0	2,191
137	CONSTRUCTION & MAINTENANCE EQUIP .....	0	2,164	0	2,164
138	FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT .....	0	14,705	0	14,705
139	TACTICAL VEHICLES .....	0	2,497	0	2,497
140	AMPHIBIOUS EQUIPMENT .....	0	12,517	0	12,517
141	POLLUTION CONTROL EQUIPMENT .....	0	3,018	0	3,018
142	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION .....	0	14,403	0	14,403
143	PHYSICAL SECURITY VEHICLES .....	0	1,186	0	1,186
	<b>SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>				
144	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT .....	0	18,805	0	18,805
145	OTHER SUPPLY SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	10,469	0	10,469
146	FIRST DESTINATION TRANSPORTATION .....	0	5,720	0	5,720
147	SPECIAL PURPOSE SUPPLY SYSTEMS .....	0	211,714	0	211,714
	<b>TRAINING DEVICES</b>				
148	TRAINING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	7,468	0	7,468
	<b>COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>				
149	COMMAND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	36,433	0	36,433
150	EDUCATION SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	3,180	0	3,180
151	MEDICAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	4,790	0	4,790
153	NAVAL MIP SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	4,608	0	4,608
154	OPERATING FORCES SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	5,655	0	5,655
155	C4ISR EQUIPMENT .....	0	9,929	0	9,929
156	ENVIRONMENTAL SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	26,795	0	26,795
157	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT .....	0	88,453	0	88,453
159	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY .....	0	99,094	0	99,094
	<b>OTHER</b>				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
160	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE SERVICE .....	0	99,014			0	99,014
	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>						
160A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	21,439			0	21,439
	<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>						
161	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....	0	328,043			0	328,043
	<b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,614,715</b>		<b>-13,400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,601,315</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS</b>						
	<b>TRACKED COMBAT VEHICLES</b>						
1	AAV7A1 PIP .....	0	26,744			0	26,744
2	LAV PIP .....	0	54,879			0	54,879
	<b>ARTILLERY AND OTHER WEAPONS</b>						
3	EXPEDITIONARY FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM .....	0	2,652			0	2,652
4	155MM LIGHTWEIGHT TOWED HOWITZER .....	0	7,482			0	7,482
5	HIGH MOBILITY ARTILLERY ROCKET SYSTEM .....	0	17,181			0	17,181
6	WEAPONS AND COMBAT VEHICLES UNDER \$5 MILLION .....	0	8,224			0	8,224
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>						
7	MODIFICATION KITS .....	0	14,467			0	14,467
8	WEAPONS ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM .....	0	488			0	488
	<b>GUIDED MISSILES</b>						
9	GROUND BASED AIR DEFENSE .....	0	7,565			0	7,565
10	JAVELIN .....	0	1,091			0	1,091
11	FOLLOW ON TO SMAW .....	0	4,872			0	4,872
12	ANTI-ARMOR WEAPONS SYSTEM-HEAVY (AAWS-H) .....	0	668			0	668
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>						

13	MODIFICATION KITS .....	0	12,495	140,000	0	152,495
	Additional missiles .....			[140,000]		
	<b>COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS</b>					
14	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER .....	0	13,109		0	13,109
15	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (C) .....	0	35,147		0	35,147
	<b>REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT</b>					
16	REPAIR AND TEST EQUIPMENT .....	0	21,210		0	21,210
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)</b>					
17	COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM .....	0	792		0	792
	<b>COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)</b>					
19	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) .....	0	3,642		0	3,642
20	AIR OPERATIONS C2 SYSTEMS .....	0	3,520		0	3,520
	<b>RADAR + EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>					
21	RADAR SYSTEMS .....	0	35,118		0	35,118
22	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (GATOR) .....	3	130,661	-1	2	98,546
	Not meeting performance reqs reduce until technology is refined .....					
23	RQ-21 UAS .....	4	84,916		4	84,916
	<b>INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>					
24	FIRE SUPPORT SYSTEM .....	0	9,136		0	9,136
25	INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	29,936		0	29,936
28	DCGS-MC .....	0	1,947		0	1,947
	<b>OTHER COMM/ELEC EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>					
31	NIGHT VISION EQUIPMENT .....	0	2,018		0	2,018
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT (NON-TEL)</b>					
32	NEXT GENERATION ENTERPRISE NETWORK (NGEN) .....	0	67,295		0	67,295
33	COMMON COMPUTER RESOURCES .....	0	43,101		0	43,101
34	COMMAND POST SYSTEMS .....	0	29,255		0	29,255
35	RADIO SYSTEMS .....	0	80,584		0	80,584
36	COMM SWITCHING & CONTROL SYSTEMS .....	0	66,123		0	66,123
37	COMM & ELEC INFRASTRUCTURE SUPPORT .....	0	79,486		0	79,486
	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>					
37A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	2,803		0	2,803

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE VEHICLES</b>							
38	COMMERCIAL PASSENGER VEHICLES .....	0	3,538			0	3,538
39	COMMERCIAL CARGO VEHICLES .....	0	22,806			0	22,806
<b>TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>							
41	MOTOR TRANSPORT MODIFICATIONS .....	0	7,743			0	7,743
43	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE .....	109	79,429			109	79,429
44	FAMILY OF TACTICAL TRAILERS .....	0	3,157			0	3,157
<b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>							
45	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	6,938			0	6,938
<b>ENGINEER AND OTHER EQUIPMENT</b>							
46	ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL EQUIP ASSORT .....	0	94			0	94
47	BULK LIQUID EQUIPMENT .....	0	896			0	896
48	TACTICAL FUEL SYSTEMS .....	0	136			0	136
49	POWER EQUIPMENT ASSORTED .....	0	10,792			0	10,792
50	AMPHIBIOUS SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	3,235			0	3,235
51	EOD SYSTEMS .....	0	7,666			0	7,666
<b>MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT</b>							
52	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT .....	0	33,145			0	33,145
53	GARRISON MOBILE ENGINEER EQUIPMENT (GMEE) .....	0	1,419			0	1,419
<b>GENERAL PROPERTY</b>							
57	TRAINING DEVICES .....	0	24,163			0	24,163
58	CONTAINER FAMILY .....	0	962			0	962
59	FAMILY OF CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT .....	0	6,545			0	6,545
60	FAMILY OF INTERNALLY TRANSPORTABLE VEH (ITY) .....	0	7,533			0	7,533
<b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>							
62	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	4,322			0	4,322

63	<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>	0	8,292	0	8,292	0	8,292
	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....						
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS</b> .....	<b>116</b>	<b>1,131,418</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>107,885</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>1,239,303</b>
	<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>						
	<b>TACTICAL FORCES</b>						
1	F-35 .....	44	5,260,212		-99,100	44	5,161,112
	Efficiencies and excess cost growth .....				[-99,100]		
2	F-35 (AP) .....	0	460,260			0	460,260
	<b>TACTICAL AIRLIFT</b>						
3	KC-46A TANKER .....	12	2,350,601		-24,000	12	2,326,601
	FY15 excess to need by \$24 million due to program delays .....				[-24,000]		
	<b>OTHER AIRLIFT</b>						
4	C-130J .....	14	889,154			14	889,154
5	C-130J (AP) .....	0	50,000			0	50,000
6	HC-130J .....	5	463,934			5	463,934
7	HC-130J (AP) .....	0	30,000			0	30,000
8	MC-130J .....	8	828,472			8	828,472
9	MC-130J (AP) .....	0	60,000			0	60,000
	<b>MISSION SUPPORT AIRCRAFT</b>						
11	CIVIL AIR PATROL A/C .....	6	2,617			6	2,617
	<b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>						
12	TARGET DRONES .....	75	132,028			75	132,028
14	RQ-4 .....	0	37,800			0	37,800
15	MQ-9 .....	29	552,528	24	480,000	53	1,032,528
	Accelerating procurement schedule to meet CCDR demand .....			24	[480,000]		
	<b>STRATEGIC AIRCRAFT</b>						
17	B-2A .....	0	32,458			0	32,458
18	B-1B .....	0	114,119			0	114,119
19	B-52 .....	0	148,987			0	148,987
20	LARGE AIRCRAFT INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES .....	0	84,335			0	84,335

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
<b>TACTICAL AIRCRAFT</b>							
22	F-15 .....	0	464,367		249,304	0	713,671
	EPAWSS upgrade .....				[11,600]		
	F-15C AESA radars .....			6	[48,000]		
	F-15D AESA radars .....			24	[192,500]		
	ADCP II upgrades .....				[10,000]		
	F-15C MIDS JTRS transfer to RDT&E .....				[-6,387]		
	F-15E MIDS JTRS transfer to RDT&E .....				[-6,409]		
23	F-16 .....	0	17,134			0	17,134
24	F-22A .....	0	126,152			0	126,152
25	F-35 MODIFICATIONS .....	0	70,167			0	70,167
26	INCREMENT 3.2B .....	0	69,325			0	69,325
<b>AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT</b>							
28	C-5 .....	0	5,604			0	5,604
30	C-17A .....	0	46,997			0	46,997
31	C-21 .....	0	10,162			0	10,162
32	C-32A .....	0	44,464			0	44,464
33	C-37A .....	0	10,861			0	10,861
<b>TRAINER AIRCRAFT</b>							
34	GLIDER MODS .....	0	134			0	134
35	T-6 .....	0	17,968			0	17,968
36	T-1 .....	0	23,706			0	23,706
37	T-38 .....	0	30,604			0	30,604
<b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>							
38	U-2 MODS .....	0	22,095			0	22,095
39	KC-10A (ATCA) .....	0	5,611			0	5,611



40	C-12 .....	0	1,980	0	1,980
42	VC-25A MOD .....	0	98,231	0	98,231
43	C-40 .....	0	13,171	0	13,171
44	C-130 .....	0	7,048	0	130,248
	C-130H Electronic Prop Control System - UPL .....				123,200
	C-130H In-flight Prop Balancing System - UPL .....				[13,500]
	C-130H T-56 3.5 Engine Mods .....				[1,500]
	Funds added to comply with Sec 134, FY15 NDAA .....				[33,200]
	C-130J MODS .....	0	29,713	0	[75,000]
45	C-135 .....	0	49,043	0	29,713
46	COMPASS CALL MODS .....	0	68,415	0	49,043
47	Modification for restored EC-130H .....	0		0	97,115
48	RC-135 .....	0	156,165	0	156,165
49	E-3 .....	0	13,178	0	13,178
50	E-4 .....	0	23,937	0	23,937
51	E-8 .....	0	18,001	0	18,001
52	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM .....	0	183,308	0	183,308
53	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS .....	0	44,163	0	44,163
54	H-1 .....	0	6,291	0	6,291
55	UH-1N REPLACEMENT .....	0	2,456	0	2,456
56	H-60 .....	0	45,731	0	45,731
57	RQ-4 MODS .....	0	50,022	0	50,022
58	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS .....	0	21,660	0	21,660
59	OTHER AIRCRAFT .....	0	117,767	0	115,521
	C2ISR TDL transfer to COMSEC equipment .....				-2,246
60	MQ-1 MODS .....	0	3,173	0	[ -2,246]
61	MQ-9 MODS .....	0	115,226	0	3,173
63	CV-22 MODS .....	0	58,828	0	115,226
	<b>AIRCRAFT SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b> .....				58,828
64	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS .....	0	656,242	0	656,242
	<b>COMMON SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b> .....				
65	AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT SUPPORT EQUIP .....	0	33,716	0	33,716

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT (In Thousands of Dollars)							
Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
<b>POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT</b>							
67	B-2A .....	0	38,837			0	38,837
68	B-52 .....	0	5,911			0	5,911
69	C-17A .....	0	30,108			0	30,108
70	CV-22 POST PRODUCTION SUPPORT .....	0	3,353			0	3,353
71	C-135 .....	0	4,490			0	4,490
72	F-15 .....	0	3,225			0	3,225
73	F-16 .....	0	14,969			0	14,969
74	F-22A .....	0	971			0	971
76	MQ-9 .....	0	5,000			0	5,000
<b>INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS</b>							
77	INDUSTRIAL RESPONSIVENESS .....	0	18,802			0	18,802
<b>WAR CONSUMABLES</b>							
78	WAR CONSUMABLES .....	0	156,465			0	156,465
<b>OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES</b>							
79	OTHER PRODUCTION CHARGES .....	0	1,052,814		59,086	0	1,111,900
	Transfer from RDT&E for NATO AWACS .....				[59,086]		
<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>							
79A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	42,503			0	42,503
<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....</b>		<b>193</b>	<b>15,657,769</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>814,944</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>16,472,713</b>
<b>MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>							
<b>MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQUIPMENT—BALLISTIC</b>							
1	MISSILE REPLACEMENT EQ-BALLISTIC .....	0	94,040			0	94,040
<b>TACTICAL</b>							

3	JOINT AIR-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE .....	360	440,578	360	440,578
4	SIDEWINDER (AIM-9X) .....	506	200,777	506	200,777
5	AMRAAM .....	262	390,112	262	390,112
6	PREDATOR HELLFIRE MISSILE .....	3,756	423,016	3,756	423,016
7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB .....	1,942	133,697	1,942	133,697
	<b>INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES</b>				
8	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNS/POL PREVENTION .....	0	397	0	397
	<b>CLASS IV</b>				
9	MM III MODIFICATIONS .....	0	50,517	0	50,517
10	AGM-65D MAVERICK .....	0	9,639	0	9,639
11	AGM-88A HARM .....	0	197	0	197
12	AIR LAUNCH CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) .....	0	25,019	0	25,019
	<b>MISSILE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>				
14	INITIAL SPARES/REPAIR PARTS .....	0	48,523	0	48,523
	<b>SPECIAL PROGRAMS</b>				
28	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAMS .....	0	276,562	0	276,562
	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>				
28A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	893,971	0	893,971
	<b>TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>6,826</b>	<b>2,987,045</b>	<b>6,826</b>	<b>2,987,045</b>
	<b>SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>				
	<b>SPACE PROGRAMS</b>				
1	ADVANCED EHF .....	0	333,366	0	333,366
2	WIDEBAND GAPPILLER SATELLITES(SPACE) .....	0	53,476	0	53,476
3	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT .....	1	199,218	-1	-199,218
	GPS III SV10 early to need .....			-1	[-199,218]
4	SPACEBORNE EQUIP (COMSEC) .....	0	18,362	0	18,362
5	GLOBAL POSITIONING (SPACE) .....	0	66,135	0	66,135
6	DEF METEOROLOGICAL SAT PROG(SPACE) .....	0	89,351	0	89,351
	Cut DMSP #20 .....				[-89,351]
7	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH CAPABILITY .....	0	571,276	0	571,276

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
8	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEH(SPACE) .....	5	800,201			5	800,201
9	SBIR HIGH (SPACE) .....	0	452,676			0	452,676
	<b>TOTAL SPACE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2,584,061</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>-288,569</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2,295,492</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</b>						
	<b>ROCKETS</b>						
1	ROCKETS .....	0	23,788			0	23,788
	<b>CARTRIDGES</b>						
2	CARTRIDGES .....	0	131,102		38,500	0	169,602
	Increase to match size of A-10 fleet .....				[38,500]		
	<b>BOMBS</b>						
3	PRACTICE BOMBS .....	0	89,759			0	89,759
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS .....	0	637,181			0	637,181
5	MASSIVE ORDNANCE PENETRATOR (MOP) .....	0	39,690			0	39,690
6	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION .....	6,341	374,688			6,341	374,688
	<b>OTHER ITEMS</b>						
7	CAD/PAD .....	0	58,266			0	58,266
8	EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DISPOSAL (EOD) .....	0	5,612			0	5,612
9	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....	0	103			0	103
10	MODIFICATIONS .....	0	1,102			0	1,102
11	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	3,044			0	3,044
	<b>FLARES</b>						
12	FLARES .....	0	120,935			0	120,935
	<b>FUZES</b>						
13	FUZES .....	0	213,476			0	213,476

14	<b>SMALL ARMS</b>								
	SMALL ARMS .....	0	60,097	0	60,097				
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</b> .....	<b>6,341</b>	<b>1,758,843</b>	<b>6,341</b>	<b>1,797,343</b>	<b>38,500</b>			
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>								
	<b>PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES</b>								
1	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES .....	0	8,834	0	8,834				
	<b>CARGO AND UTILITY VEHICLES</b>								
2	MEDIUM TACTICAL VEHICLE .....	0	58,160	0	58,160				
3	CAP VEHICLES .....	0	977	0	977				
4	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	12,483	0	12,483				
	<b>SPECIAL PURPOSE VEHICLES</b>								
5	SECURITY AND TACTICAL VEHICLES .....	0	4,728	0	4,728				
6	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	4,662	0	4,662				
	<b>FIRE FIGHTING EQUIPMENT</b>								
7	FIRE FIGHTING/CRASH RESCUE VEHICLES .....	0	10,419	0	10,419				
	<b>MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT</b>								
8	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	23,320	0	23,320				
	<b>BASE MAINTENANCE SUPPORT</b>								
9	RUNWAY SNOW REMOV & CLEANING EQUIP .....	0	6,215	0	6,215				
10	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	87,781	0	87,781				
	<b>COMM SECURITY EQUIPMENT(COMSEC)</b>								
11	COMSEC EQUIPMENT .....	0	136,998	0	139,244	2,246			
	Transfer for Link 16 upgrades .....					[2,246]			
12	MODIFICATIONS (COMSEC) .....	0	677	0	677				
	<b>INTELLIGENCE PROGRAMS</b>								
13	INTELLIGENCE TRAINING EQUIPMENT .....	0	4,041	0	4,041				
14	INTELLIGENCE COMM EQUIPMENT .....	0	22,573	0	22,573				
15	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS .....	0	14,456	0	14,456				
	<b>ELECTRONICS PROGRAMS</b>								
16	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL & LANDING SYS .....	0	31,823	0	31,823				

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
17	NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM .....	0	5,833			0	5,833
18	BATTLE CONTROL SYSTEM—FIXED .....	0	1,687			0	1,687
19	THEATER AIR CONTROL SYS IMPROVEMENTS .....	0	22,710			0	22,710
20	WEATHER OBSERVATION FORECAST .....	0	21,561			0	21,561
21	STRATEGIC COMMAND AND CONTROL .....	0	286,980			0	286,980
22	CHEYENNE MOUNTAIN COMPLEX .....	0	36,186			0	36,186
24	INTEGRATED STRAT PLAN & ANALY NETWORK (ISPAN) .....	0	9,597			0	9,597
	<b>SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS</b>						
25	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY .....	0	27,403			0	27,403
26	AF GLOBAL COMMAND & CONTROL SYS .....	0	7,212			0	7,212
27	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL .....	0	11,062		19,900	0	30,962
	Additional battlefield air operations kits to meet need .....				[19,900]		
28	AIR FORCE PHYSICAL SECURITY SYSTEM .....	0	131,269			0	131,269
29	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES .....	0	33,606			0	33,606
30	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMM N .....	0	5,232			0	5,232
31	C3 COUNTERMEASURES .....	0	7,453			0	7,453
32	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM .....	0	3,976			0	3,976
33	GCSS-AF FOS .....	0	25,515			0	25,515
34	DEFENSE ENTERPRISE ACCOUNTING AND MGMT SYSTEM .....	0	9,255			0	9,255
35	THEATER BATTLE MGT C2 SYSTEM .....	0	7,523			0	7,523
36	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CTR-WPN SYS .....	0	12,043			0	12,043
37	AIR OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) 10.2 .....	0	24,246			0	24,246
	<b>AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS</b>						
38	INFORMATION TRANSPORT SYSTEMS .....	0	74,621			0	74,621
39	AFNET .....	0	103,748		-17,000	0	86,748
	Restructure program .....				[-17,000]		

41	JOINT COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT ELEMENT (JCSE)	0	5,199	0	5,199
42	USCENTCOM	0	15,780	0	15,780
	<b>SPACE PROGRAMS</b>				
43	FAMILY OF BEYOND LINE-OF-SIGHT TERMINALS	0	79,592	0	79,592
44	SPACE BASED IR SENSOR PGM SPACE	0	90,190	0	90,190
45	NAVSTAR GPS SPACE	0	2,029	0	2,029
46	NUDET DETECTION SYS SPACE	0	5,095	0	5,095
47	AF SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK SPACE	0	76,673	0	76,673
48	SPACE/LIFT RANGE SYSTEM SPACE	0	113,275	0	113,275
49	MILSATCOM SPACE	0	35,495	0	35,495
50	SPACE MODS SPACE	0	23,435	0	23,435
51	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEM	0	43,065	0	43,065
	<b>ORGANIZATION AND BASE</b>				
52	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT	0	77,538	0	113,538
	Increase JTAC training and rehearsal simulators per AF unfunded priority list			36,000	[36,000]
54	RADIO EQUIPMENT	0	8,400	0	8,400
55	CCTV/AUDIOVISUAL EQUIPMENT	0	6,144	0	6,144
56	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE	0	77,010	0	77,010
	<b>MODIFICATIONS</b>				
57	COMM ELECT MODS	0	71,800	0	71,800
	<b>PERSONAL SAFETY &amp; RESCUE EQUIP</b>				
58	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES	0	2,370	0	2,370
59	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	0	79,623	0	79,623
	<b>DEPOT PLANT+MTRLS HANDLING EQ</b>				
60	MECHANIZED MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIP	0	7,249	0	7,249
	<b>BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>				
61	BASE PROCURED EQUIPMENT	0	9,095	0	9,095
62	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT	0	17,866	0	17,866
64	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT	0	61,850	0	61,850
65	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION	0	30,477	0	30,477
	<b>SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS</b>				
67	DARPA RC135	0	25,072	0	25,072

**SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
68	DCGS-AF .....	0	183,021			0	183,021
70	SPECIAL UPDATE PROGRAM .....	0	629,371			0	629,371
71	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG. ....	0	100,663			0	100,663
	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>						
71A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	15,038,333			0	15,038,333
	<b>SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS</b>						
73	SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS .....	0	59,863			0	59,863
	<b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18,272,438</b>		<b>41,146</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>18,313,584</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>						
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCAA</b>						
1	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	1,488			0	1,488
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DCMA</b>						
2	MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....	0	2,494			0	2,494
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DHRA</b>						
3	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION .....	0	9,341			0	9,341
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA</b>						
7	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY .....	0	8,080		10,000	0	18,080
	Sharkseer increase .....				[10,000]		
8	TELEPORT PROGRAM .....	0	62,789			0	62,789
9	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	9,399			0	9,399
10	NET CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) .....	0	1,819			0	1,819
11	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEM NETWORK .....	0	141,298			0	141,298
12	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE .....	0	12,732			0	12,732
13	WHITE HOUSE COMMUNICATION AGENCY .....	0	64,098			0	64,098



14	SENIOR LEADERSHIP ENTERPRISE .....	0	617,910	0	617,910	0	617,910
15	JOINT INFORMATION ENVIRONMENT .....	0	84,400	0	84,400	0	84,400
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DLA</b>						
16	MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....	0	5,644	0	5,644	0	5,644
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DDMAC</b>						
17	MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....	4	11,208	4	11,208	4	11,208
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DODEA</b>						
18	AUTOMATION/EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT & LOGISTICS .....	0	1,298	0	1,298	0	1,298
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DSS</b>						
20	MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....	0	1,048	0	1,048	0	1,048
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY</b>						
21	VEHICLES .....	0	100	0	100	0	100
22	OTHER MAJOR EQUIPMENT .....	0	5,474	0	5,474	0	5,474
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY</b>						
23	THAAD .....	30	464,067	30	464,067	30	464,067
24	AEGIS BMD .....	40	558,916	49	706,681	49	706,681
	Increase SM-3 Block IB purchase .....			9	147,765	9	147,765
	Increase SM-3 Block IB canisters .....			9	[117,880]	9	[117,880]
	Undifferentiated Block IB test and evaluation costs .....			9	[2,565]	9	[2,565]
25	AEGIS BMD (AP) .....	0	147,765	0	147,765	0	147,765
	Early to need .....						
26	BMDs AN/TPY-2 RADARS .....	0	78,634	0	78,634	0	78,634
27	AEGIS ASHORE PHASE III .....	0	30,587	0	30,587	0	30,587
28	IRON DOME .....	1	55,000	1	41,100	1	41,100
	Request excess of requirement .....						
XX	DAVIDS SLING .....	0	0	0	150,000	0	150,000
	Increase for David's Sling co-production .....				[150,000]		[150,000]
XXX	ARROW 3 .....	0	0	0	15,000	0	15,000
	Increase for Arrow 3 co-production .....				[15,000]		[15,000]
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, NSA</b>						
35	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM (ISSP) .....	0	37,177	0	37,177	0	37,177
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD</b>						

33  
33

SEC. 4101. PROCUREMENT  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
36	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, OSD .....	17	46,939			17	46,939
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS</b>						
38	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TJS .....	0	13,027			0	13,027
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS</b>						
40	MAJOR EQUIPMENT, WHS .....	0	27,859			0	27,859
	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>						
40A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	617,757			0	617,757
	<b>AVIATION PROGRAMS</b>						
41	MC-12 .....	0	63,170		-63,170	0	0
	SOCOM requested realignment .....				[-63,170]		
42	ROTARY WING UPGRADES AND SUSTAINMENT .....	0	135,985			0	135,985
44	NON-STANDARD AVIATION .....	0	61,275			0	61,275
45	U-28 .....	0	0		63,170	0	63,170
	SOCOM requested realignment .....				[63,170]		
47	RQ-11 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE .....	0	20,087			0	20,087
48	CV-22 MODIFICATION .....	0	18,832			0	18,832
49	MQ-1 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE .....	0	1,934			0	1,934
50	MQ-9 UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE .....	0	11,726		10,000	0	21,726
	MQ-9 capability enhancements .....				[10,000]		
51	STUASLO .....	0	1,514			0	1,514
52	PRECISION STRIKE PACKAGE .....	0	204,105			0	204,105
53	AC/MC-130J .....	0	61,368			0	61,368
54	C-130 MODIFICATIONS .....	0	66,861		-35,449	0	31,412
	C-130 TF/TA adjustments .....				[-35,449]		
	<b>SHIPBUILDING</b>						
55	UNDERWATER SYSTEMS .....	0	32,521			0	32,521

	<b>AMMUNITION PROGRAMS</b>						
56	ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M .....	0	174,734	0	174,734	0	174,734
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS</b>						
57	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS .....	0	93,009	0	93,009	0	93,009
58	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....	0	14,964	0	14,964	0	14,964
59	OTHER ITEMS <\$5M .....	0	79,149	0	79,149	0	79,149
60	COMBATANT CRAFT SYSTEMS .....	0	33,362	0	33,362	0	33,362
61	SPECIAL PROGRAMS .....	0	143,533	0	143,533	0	143,533
62	TACTICAL VEHICLES .....	0	73,520	0	73,520	0	73,520
63	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M .....	0	186,009	0	186,009	0	186,009
64	COMBAT MISSION REQUIREMENTS .....	0	19,693	0	19,693	0	19,693
65	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES .....	0	3,967	0	3,967	0	3,967
66	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE .....	0	19,225	0	19,225	0	19,225
68	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS .....	0	213,252	0	213,252	0	213,252
	<b>CBDP</b>						
74	CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL SITUATIONAL AWARENESS .....	0	141,223	0	141,223	0	141,223
75	CB PROTECTION & HAZARD MITIGATION .....	0	137,487	0	137,487	0	137,487
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>						
XX	USCC CYBER CAPABILITIES .....	0	0	0	75,000	0	75,000
	Cyber capabilities .....				[75,000]		
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE</b> .....	<b>92</b>	<b>5,130,853</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>210,651</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>5,341,504</b>
	<b>JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND</b>						
	<b>JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND</b>						
1	JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND .....	0	99,701	0	99,701	0	99,701
	<b>TOTAL JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL NEEDS FUND</b> .....	<b>0</b>	<b>99,701</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>99,701</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>99,701</b>
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT</b> .....	<b>22,785</b>	<b>106,967,393</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4,880,184</b>	<b>22,885</b>	<b>111,847,577</b>

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>						
	<b>FIXED WING</b>						
3	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR (ACS) (MIP) .....	5	99,500			5	99,500
4	MQ-1 UAV .....	2	16,537			2	16,537
	<b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>						
16	MQ-1 PAYLOAD (MIP) .....	0	8,700			0	8,700
23	ARL SEMA MODS (MIP) .....	0	32,000			0	32,000
31	RQ-7 UAV MODS .....	0	8,250			0	8,250
	<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, ARMY .....</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>164,987</b>			<b>7</b>	<b>164,987</b>
	<b>MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>						
	<b>AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILE SYSTEM</b>						
3	HELLFIRE SYS SUMMARY .....	270	37,260			270	37,260
	<b>TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, ARMY .....</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>37,260</b>			<b>270</b>	<b>37,260</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY</b>						
	<b>WEAPONS &amp; OTHER COMBAT VEHICLES</b>						
16	MORTAR SYSTEMS .....	0	7,030			0	7,030
21	COMMON REMOTELY OPERATED WEAPONS STATION .....	0	19,000			0	19,000
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF W&amp;TCV, ARMY .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26,030</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>26,030</b>

<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY</b>			
<b>SMALL/MEDIUM CAL AMMUNITION</b>			
4	CTG, .50 CAL, ALL TYPES .....	0	4,000
<b>MORTAR AMMUNITION</b>			
8	60MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....	0	11,700
9	81MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....	0	4,000
10	120MM MORTAR, ALL TYPES .....	0	7,000
<b>ARTILLERY AMMUNITION</b>			
12	ARTILLERY CARTRIDGES, 75MM & 105MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	5,000
13	ARTILLERY PROJECTILE, 155MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	10,000
15	ARTILLERY PROPELLANTS, FUZES AND PRIMERS, ALL .....	0	2,000
<b>ROCKETS</b>			
17	ROCKET, HYDRA 70, ALL TYPES .....	0	136,340
<b>OTHER AMMUNITION</b>			
19	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES .....	0	4,000
21	SIGNALS, ALL TYPES .....	0	8,000
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, ARMY .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>192,040</b>
<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b>			
<b>TACTICAL VEHICLES</b>			
5	FAMILY OF MEDIUM TACTICAL VEH (FMTV) .....	1,191	243,998
9	HVY EXPANDED MOBILE TACTICAL TRUCK EXT SERV .....	0	223,276
11	MODIFICATION OF IN SVC EQUIP .....	0	130,000
12	MINE-RESISTANT AMBUSH-PROTECTED (MRAP) MODS .....	0	393,100
<b>COMM—SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS</b>			
21	TRANSPORTABLE TACTICAL COMMAND COMMUNICATIONS .....	0	5,724
<b>COMM—BASE COMMUNICATIONS</b>			
51	INSTALLATION INFO INFRASTRUCTURE MOD PROGRAM .....	0	29,500
<b>ELECT EQUIP—TACT INT REL ACT (TIARA)</b>			
57	DCGS-A (MIP) .....	0	54,140
59	TROJAN (MIP) .....	0	6,542

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
61	CI HUMINT AUTO REPRING AND COLL(CHARCS) .....	0	3,860			0	3,860
	<b>ELECT EQUIP—ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW)</b>						
68	FAMILY OF PERSISTENT SURVEILLANCE CAPABILITY .....	0	14,847			0	14,847
69	COUNTERINTELLIGENCE/SECURITY COUNTERMEASURES .....	0	19,535			0	19,535
	<b>ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL SURV. (TAC SURV)</b>						
84	COMPUTER BALLISTICS: LHMCB XM32 .....	0	2,601			0	2,601
	<b>ELECT EQUIP—TACTICAL C2 SYSTEMS</b>						
87	FIRE SUPPORT C2 FAMILY .....	0	48			0	48
94	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM (MCS) .....	0	252			0	252
	<b>ELECT EQUIP—AUTOMATION</b>						
101	AUTOMATED DATA PROCESSING EQUIP .....	0	652			0	652
	<b>CHEMICAL DEFENSIVE EQUIPMENT</b>						
111	BASE DEFENSE SYSTEMS (BDS) .....	0	4,035			0	4,035
	<b>COMBAT SERVICE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
131	FORCE PROVIDER .....	12	53,800			12	53,800
133	CARGO AERIAL DEL & PERSONNEL PARACHUTE SYSTEM .....	0	700			0	700
	<b>MATERIAL HANDLING EQUIPMENT</b>						
159	FAMILY OF FORKLIFTS .....	0	10,486			0	10,486
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
169	RAPID EQUIPPING SOLDIER SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	0	8,500			0	8,500
	<b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY</b> .....	<b>1,203</b>	<b>1,205,596</b>			<b>1,203</b>	<b>1,205,596</b>
	<b>JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND</b>						
	<b>FORCE TRAINING</b>						
3	TRAIN THE FORCE .....	0	7,850			0	7,850

	<b>JIEDDO DEVICE DEFEAT</b>				
2	DEFEAT THE DEVICE .....	0	77,600	0	77,600
	<b>NETWORK ATTACK</b>				
1	ATTACK THE NETWORK .....	0	219,550	0	215,086
	Adjustment due to low execution in prior years .....			-4,464	
	STAFF AND INFRASTRUCTURE			[-4,464]	
4	OPERATIONS .....	0	188,271	0	144,464
	Maintain prior year funding level .....			-43,807	
				[-43,807]	
	<b>TOTAL JOINT IMPR EXPLOSIVE DEV DEFEAT FUND</b> .....	<b>0</b>	<b>493,271</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>445,000</b>
	<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>				
	<b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>				
26	STUASLO UAV .....	3	55,000	3	55,000
	<b>MODIFICATION OF AIRCRAFT</b>				
30	AV-8 SERIES .....	0	41,365	0	41,365
32	F-18 SERIES .....	0	8,000	0	8,000
37	EP-3 SERIES .....	0	6,300	0	6,300
47	SPECIAL PROJECT AIRCRAFT .....	0	14,198	0	14,198
51	COMMON ECM EQUIPMENT .....	0	72,700	0	72,700
52	COMMON AVIONICS CHANGES .....	0	13,988	0	13,988
59	V-22 (TILT/ROTOR ACFT) OSPREY .....	0	4,900	0	4,900
	<b>AIRCRAFT SUPPORT EQUIP &amp; FACILITIES</b>				
65	AIRCRAFT INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES .....	0	943	0	943
	<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b> .....	<b>3</b>	<b>217,394</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>217,394</b>
	<b>WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>				
	<b>TACTICAL MISSILES</b>				
10	LASER MAVERICK .....	0	3,344	0	3,344
	<b>TOTAL WEAPONS PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b> .....	<b>0</b>	<b>3,344</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,344</b>

SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY &amp; MC</b>						
	<b>NAVY AMMUNITION</b>						
1	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS .....	0	9,715			0	9,715
2	AIRBORNE ROCKETS, ALL TYPES .....	0	11,108			0	11,108
3	MACHINE GUN AMMUNITION .....	0	3,603			0	3,603
6	AIR EXPENDABLE COUNTERMEASURES .....	0	11,982			0	11,982
11	OTHER SHIP GUN AMMUNITION .....	0	4,674			0	4,674
12	SMALL ARMS & LANDING PARTY AMMO .....	0	3,456			0	3,456
13	PYROTECHNIC AND DEMOLITION .....	0	1,989			0	1,989
14	AMMUNITION LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	4,674			0	4,674
	<b>MARINE CORPS AMMUNITION</b>						
20	120MM, ALL TYPES .....	0	10,719			0	10,719
23	ROCKETS, ALL TYPES .....	0	3,993			0	3,993
24	ARTILLERY, ALL TYPES .....	0	67,200			0	67,200
26	FUZE, ALL TYPES .....	0	3,299			0	3,299
25	DEMOLITION MUNITIONS, ALL TYPES .....	0	518			0	518
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMO, NAVY &amp; MC .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>136,930</b>			<b>0</b>	<b>136,930</b>
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY</b>						
	<b>CIVIL ENGINEERING SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>						
135	PASSENGER CARRYING VEHICLES .....	0	186			0	186
	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>						
160A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	12,000			0	12,000



	<b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, NAVY .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,186</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12,186</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS</b>				
	<b>GUIDED MISSILES</b>				
10	JAVELIN .....	0	7,679	0	7,679
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT</b>				
13	MODIFICATION KITS .....	0	10,311	0	10,311
	<b>COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEMS</b>				
14	UNIT OPERATIONS CENTER .....	0	8,221	0	8,221
	<b>OTHER SUPPORT (TEL)</b>				
18	MODIFICATION KITS .....	0	3,600	0	3,600
	<b>COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (NON-TEL)</b>				
19	ITEMS UNDER \$5 MILLION (COMM & ELEC) .....	0	8,693	0	8,693
	<b>INTELL/COMM EQUIPMENT (NON-TEL)</b>				
27	RQ-11 UAV .....	0	3,430	0	3,430
	<b>MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT</b>				
52	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT .....	0	7,000	0	7,000
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT, MARINE CORPS .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48,934</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>48,934</b>
	<b>AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>				
	<b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>				
15	MQ-9 .....	0	13,500	0	13,500
	<b>OTHER AIRCRAFT</b>				
44	C-130 .....	0	1,410	0	1,410
56	H-60 .....	0	39,300	0	39,300
58	HC/MC-130 MODIFICATIONS .....	0	5,690	0	5,690
61	MQ-9 MODS .....	0	69,000	0	69,000
	<b>TOTAL AIRCRAFT PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>128,900</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>128,900</b>
	<b>MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>				

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	<b>TACTICAL</b>						
6	PREDATOR HELIFIRE MISSILE .....	1,811	280,902			1,811	280,902
7	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB .....	63	2,520			63	2,520
	<b>CLASS IV</b>						
10	AGM-65D MAVERICK .....	0	5,720			0	5,720
	<b>TOTAL MISSILE PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>1,874</b>	<b>289,142</b>			<b>1,874</b>	<b>289,142</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE</b>						
	<b>CARTRIDGES</b>						
2	CARTRIDGES .....	0	8,371			0	8,371
	<b>BOMBS</b>						
4	GENERAL PURPOSE BOMBS .....	0	17,031			0	17,031
6	JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITION .....	5,953	184,412			5,953	184,412
	<b>FLARES</b>						
12	FLARES .....	0	11,064			0	11,064
	<b>FUZES</b>						
13	FUZES .....	0	7,996			0	7,996
	<b>TOTAL PROCUREMENT OF AMMUNITION, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>5,953</b>	<b>228,874</b>			<b>5,953</b>	<b>228,874</b>
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE</b>						
	<b>SPCL COMM-ELECTRONICS PROJECTS</b>						
25	GENERAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY .....	0	3,953			0	3,953
27	MOBILITY COMMAND AND CONTROL .....	0	2,000			0	2,000
	<b>AIR FORCE COMMUNICATIONS</b>						

42	USCENTCOM .....	0	10,000	0	10,000
	<b>ORGANIZATION AND BASE</b>				
52	TACTICAL C-E EQUIPMENT .....	0	4,065	0	4,065
56	BASE COMM INFRASTRUCTURE .....	0	15,400	0	15,400
	<b>PERSONAL SAFETY &amp; RESCUE EQUIP</b>				
58	NIGHT VISION GOGGLES .....	0	3,580	0	3,580
59	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	3,407	0	3,407
	<b>BASE SUPPORT EQUIPMENT</b>				
62	ENGINEERING AND EOD EQUIPMENT .....	0	46,790	0	46,790
64	MOBILITY EQUIPMENT .....	0	400	0	400
65	ITEMS LESS THAN \$5 MILLION .....	0	9,800	0	9,800
	<b>SPECIAL SUPPORT PROJECTS</b>				
71	DEFENSE SPACE RECONNAISSANCE PROG. ....	0	28,070	0	28,070
	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>				
71A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	3,732,499	0	3,732,499
	<b>TOTAL OTHER PROCUREMENT, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,859,964</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,859,964</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>				
	<b>MAJOR EQUIPMENT, DISA</b>				
8	TELEPORT PROGRAM .....	0	1,940	0	1,940
	<b>CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS</b>				
40A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	0	35,482	0	35,482
	<b>AVIATION PROGRAMS</b>				
41	MC-12 .....	0	5,000	0	5,000
	<b>AMMUNITION PROGRAMS</b>				
56	ORDNANCE ITEMS <\$5M .....	746,066	35,299	746,066	35,299
	<b>OTHER PROCUREMENT PROGRAMS</b>				
61	SPECIAL PROGRAMS .....	1	15,160	1	15,160
63	WARRIOR SYSTEMS <\$5M .....	50	15,000	50	15,000
68	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS .....	3	104,537	3	104,537

**SEC. 4102. PROCUREMENT FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request		Senate Change		Senate Authorized	
		Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost	Qty	Cost
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	746,120	212,418			746,120	212,418
	TOTAL PROCUREMENT .....	755,430	7,257,270		-48,271	755,430	7,208,999

**TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST,  
AND EVALUATION**

# TITLE XLII—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

## SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION.

### SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION (In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, ARMY</b>					
<b>BASIC RESEARCH</b>					
1	0601101A	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH .....	13,018		13,018
2	0601102A	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES .....	239,118	40,000	279,118
		Basic research program increase .....		[40,000]	
3	0601103A	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES .....	72,603		72,603
4	0601104A	UNIVERSITY AND INDUSTRY RESEARCH CENTERS .....	100,340		100,340
		<b>SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH</b> .....	<b>425,079</b>	<b>40,000</b>	<b>465,079</b>
<b>APPLIED RESEARCH</b>					
5	0602105A	MATERIALS TECHNOLOGY .....	28,314		28,314
6	0602120A	SENSORS AND ELECTRONIC SURVIVABILITY .....	38,374		38,374
7	0602122A	TRACTOR HIP .....	6,879		6,879
8	0602211A	AVIATION TECHNOLOGY .....	56,884		56,884
9	0602270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY .....	19,243		19,243
10	0602303A	MISSILE TECHNOLOGY .....	45,053		45,053
11	0602307A	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY .....	29,428		29,428
12	0602308A	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND SIMULATION .....	27,862		27,862
13	0602601A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE TECHNOLOGY .....	68,839		68,839

14	0602618A	BALLISTIAG TECHNOLOGY .....	92,801	92,801
15	0602622A	CHEMICAL, SMOKE AND EQUIPMENT DEFEATING TECHNOLOGY .....	3,866	3,866
16	0602623A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM .....	5,487	5,487
17	0602624A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY .....	48,340	48,340
18	0602705A	ELECTRONIAG AND ELECTRONIC DEVICES .....	55,301	55,301
19	0602709A	NIGHT VISION TECHNOLOGY .....	33,807	33,807
20	0602712A	COUNTERMINE SYSTEMS .....	25,068	25,068
21	0602716A	HUMAN FACTORS ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY .....	23,681	23,681
22	0602720A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY .....	20,850	20,850
23	0602782A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY .....	36,160	36,160
24	0602783A	COMPUTER AND SOFTWARE TECHNOLOGY .....	12,656	12,656
25	0602784A	MILITARY ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY .....	63,409	63,409
26	0602785A	MANPOWER/PERSONNEL/TRAINING TECHNOLOGY .....	24,735	24,735
27	0602786A	WARFIGHTER TECHNOLOGY .....	35,795	35,795
28	0602787A	MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY .....	76,853	76,853
		<b>SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>879,685</b>	<b>879,685</b>
<b>ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</b>				
29	0603001A	WARFIGHTER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	46,973	46,973
30	0603002A	MEDICAL ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	69,584	69,584
31	0603003A	AVIATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	89,736	89,736
32	0603004A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	57,663	57,663
33	0603005A	COMBAT VEHICLE AND AUTOMOTIVE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	113,071	113,071
34	0603006A	SPACE APPLICATION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	5,554	5,554
35	0603007A	MANPOWER, PERSONNEL AND TRAINING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	12,636	12,636
37	0603009A	TRACTOR HIKE .....	7,502	7,502
38	0603015A	NEXT GENERATION TRAINING & SIMULATION SYSTEMS .....	17,425	17,425
39	0603020A	TRACTOR ROSE .....	11,912	11,912
40	0603125A	COMBATING TERRORISM—TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	27,520	27,520
41	0603130A	TRACTOR MAIL .....	2,381	2,381
42	0603131A	TRACTOR EGGS .....	2,431	2,431
43	0603270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY .....	26,874	26,874

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
44	0603313A	MISSILE AND ROCKET ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	49,449		49,449
45	0603322A	TRACTOR CAGE .....	10,999		10,999
46	0603461A	HIGH PERFORMANCE COMPUTING MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....	177,159	-10,000	167,159
		Encourage use of commercial technology .....		[-10,000]	
47	0603606A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	13,993		13,993
48	0603607A	JOINT SERVICE SMALL ARMS PROGRAM .....	5,105		5,105
49	0603710A	NIGHT VISION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	40,929		40,929
50	0603728A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS .....	10,727		10,727
51	0603734A	MILITARY ENGINEERING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	20,145		20,145
52	0603772A	ADVANCED TACTICAL COMPUTER SCIENCE AND SENSOR TECHNOLOGY .....	38,163		38,163
53	0603794A	C3 ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	37,816		37,816
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>895,747</b>	<b>-10,000</b>	<b>885,747</b>
<b>ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES</b>					
54	0603305A	ARMY MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION .....	10,347		10,347
55	0603308A	ARMY SPACE SYSTEMS INTEGRATION .....	25,061		25,061
56	0603619A	LANDMINE WARFARE AND BARRIER—ADV DEV .....	49,636		49,636
57	0603627A	SMOKE, OBSCURANT AND TARGET DEFEATING SYS-ADV DEV .....	13,426		13,426
58	0603639A	TANK AND MEDIUM CALIBER AMMUNITION .....	46,749		46,749
60	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY .....	6,258		6,258
61	0603766A	TACTICAL ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM—ADV DEV .....	13,472		13,472
62	0603774A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....	7,292		7,292
63	0603779A	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY—DEM/VAL .....	8,813		8,813
65	0603790A	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....	6,075		6,075
67	0603804A	LOGSTIAG AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ADV DEV .....	21,233		21,233
68	0603807A	MEDICAL SYSTEMS—ADV DEV .....	31,962		31,962
69	0603827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....	22,194		22,194



71	0604100A	ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES .....	9,805	9,805
72	0604115A	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES .....	40,917	40,917
73	0604120A	ASSURED POSITIONING, NAVIGATION AND TIMING (PNT) .....	30,058	30,058
74	0604319A	INDIRECT FIRE PROTECTION CAPABILITY INCREMENT 2—INTERCEPT (IFPC2) .....	155,361	155,361
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES .....</b>	<b>498,659</b>	<b>498,659</b>

**SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT & DEMONSTRATION**

76	0604201A	AIRCRAFT AVIONIAG .....	12,939	12,939
78	0604270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....	18,843	18,843
79	0604280A	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO .....	9,861	9,861
80	0604290A	MID-TIER NETWORKING VEHICULAR RADIO (MNVVR) .....	8,763	8,763
81	0604321A	ALL SOURCE ANALYSIS SYSTEM .....	4,309	4,309
82	0604328A	TRACTOR CAGE .....	15,138	15,138
83	0604601A	INFANTRY SUPPORT WEAPONS .....	74,128	76,628

Transfer from WTCV

85	0604611A	JAVELIN .....	3,945	3,945
87	0604633A	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL .....	10,076	10,076
88	0604641A	TACTICAL UNMANNED GROUND VEHICLE (TUGV) .....	40,374	40,374
89	0604710A	NIGHT VISION SYSTEMS—ENG DEV .....	67,582	67,582
90	0604713A	COMBAT FEEDING, CLOTHING, AND EQUIPMENT .....	1,763	1,763
91	0604715A	NON-SYSTEM TRAINING DEVICES—ENG DEV .....	27,155	27,155
92	0604741A	AIR DEFENSE COMMAND, CONTROL AND INTELLIGENCE—ENG DEV .....	24,569	24,569
93	0604742A	CONSTRUCTIVE SIMULATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	23,364	23,364
94	0604746A	AUTOMATIC TEST EQUIPMENT DEVELOPMENT .....	8,960	8,960
95	0604760A	DISTRIBUTIVE INTERACTIVE SIMULATIONS (DIS)—ENG DEV .....	9,138	9,138
96	0604780A	COMBINED ARMS TACTICAL TRAINER (CATT) CORE .....	21,622	21,622
97	0604798A	BRIGADE ANALYSIS, INTEGRATION AND EVALUATION .....	99,242	99,242
98	0604802A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS—ENG DEV .....	21,379	21,379
99	0604804A	LOGISTIAG AND ENGINEER EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV .....	48,339	48,339
100	0604805A	COMMAND, CONTROL, COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS—ENG DEV .....	2,726	2,726
101	0604807A	MEDICAL MATERIEL/MEDICAL BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE EQUIPMENT—ENG DEV .....	45,412	45,412
102	0604808A	LANDMINE WARFARE/BARRIER—ENG DEV .....	55,215	55,215

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
104	0604818A	ARMY TACTICAL COMMAND & CONTROL HARDWARE & SOFTWARE .....	163,643		163,643
105	0604820A	RADAR DEVELOPMENT .....	12,309		12,309
106	0604822A	GENERAL FUND ENTERPRISE BUSINESS SYSTEM (GFEBS) .....	15,700		15,700
107	0604823A	FIREFINDER .....	6,243		6,243
108	0604827A	SOLDIER SYSTEMS—WARRIOR DEMVAL .....	18,776		18,776
109	0604854A	ARTILLERY SYSTEMS—EMD .....	1,953		1,953
110	0605013A	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	67,358		67,358
111	0605018A	INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM-ARMY (PPS-A) .....	136,011	-50,000	86,011
		Restructure program .....		[-50,000]	
112	0605028A	ARMORED MULTI-PURPOSE VEHICLE (AMPV) .....	230,210		230,210
113	0605030A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK CENTER (JTC) .....	13,357		13,357
114	0605031A	JOINT TACTICAL NETWORK (JTN) .....	18,055		18,055
115	0605032A	TRACTOR TIRE .....	5,677		5,677
116	0605035A	COMMON INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (CIRCW) .....	77,570	24,000	101,570
		Army UPL for AH-64 ASE development .....		[24,000]	
117	0605051A	AIRCRAFT SURVIVABILITY DEVELOPMENT .....	18,112	60,000	78,112
		Army UPL for AH-64 ASE development .....		[60,000]	
118	0605350A	WIN-T INCREMENT 3—FULL NETWORKING .....	39,700		39,700
119	0605380A	AMF JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM (JTRS) .....	12,987	-6,832	6,155
		Only for SALT program .....		[-6,832]	
120	0605450A	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) .....	88,866		88,866
121	0605456A	PAC-3/MSE MISSILE .....	2,272		2,272
122	0605457A	ARMY INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AIAMD) .....	214,099		214,099
123	0605625A	MANNED GROUND VEHICLE .....	49,247		49,247
124	0605626A	AERIAL COMMON SENSOR .....	2		2
125	0605766A	NATIONAL CAPABILITIES INTEGRATION (MIP) .....	10,599		10,599
126	0605812A	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (JLV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH ..	32,486		32,486

127	0605830A	AVIATION GROUND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT .....	8,880	8,880
128	0210609A	PALADIN INTEGRATED MANAGEMENT (PIM) .....	152,288	152,288
129	0303032A	TROJAN—RH12 .....	5,022	5,022
130	0304270A	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....	12,686	12,686
		<b>SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION .....</b>	<b>2,068,950</b>	<b>29,668</b>
<b>RD&amp;E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>				
131	0604256A	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT .....	20,035	20,035
132	0604258A	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	16,684	16,684
133	0604759A	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT .....	62,580	62,580
134	0605103A	RAND ARROYO CENTER .....	20,853	20,853
135	0605301A	ARMY KWAJALEIN ATOLL .....	205,145	205,145
136	0605326A	CONCEPTS EXPERIMENTATION PROGRAM .....	19,430	19,430
138	0605601A	ARMY TEST RANGES AND FACILITIES .....	277,646	277,646
139	0605602A	ARMY TECHNICAL TEST INSTRUMENTATION AND TARGETS .....	51,550	51,550
140	0605604A	SURVIVABILITY/LETHALITY ANALYSIS .....	33,246	33,246
141	0605606A	AIRCRAFT CERTIFICATION .....	4,760	4,760
142	0605702A	METEOROLOGICAL SUPPORT TO RD&E ACTIVITIES .....	8,303	8,303
143	0605706A	MATERIEL SYSTEMS ANALYSIS .....	20,403	20,403
144	0605709A	EXPLOITATION OF FOREIGN ITEMS .....	10,396	10,396
145	0605712A	SUPPORT OF OPERATIONAL TESTING .....	49,337	49,337
146	0605716A	ARMY EVALUATION CENTER .....	52,694	52,694
147	0605718A	ARMY MODELING & SIM X-CMD COLLABORATION & INTEG .....	938	938
148	0605801A	PROGRAMWIDE ACTIVITIES .....	60,319	60,319
149	0605803A	TECHNICAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES .....	28,478	28,478
150	0605805A	MUNITIONS STANDARDIZATION, EFFECTIVENESS AND SAFETY .....	32,604	24,604
		Under execution of prior year funds .....		-8,000
		ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TECHNOLOGY MGMT SUPPORT .....		[-8,000]
151	0605857A	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D .....	3,186	3,186
152	0605898A	<b>SUBTOTAL, RD&amp;E MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>	<b>1,027,542</b>	<b>-8,000</b>
<b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT</b>				

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
154	0603778A	MLRS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	18,397		18,397
155	0603813A	TRACTOR PULL .....	9,461		9,461
156	0607131A	WEAPONS AND MUNITIONS PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS .....	4,945		4,945
157	0607133A	TRACTOR SMOKE .....	7,569		7,569
158	0607135A	APACHE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	69,862		69,862
159	0607136A	BLACKHAWK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	66,653		66,653
160	0607137A	CHINOOK PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	37,407		37,407
161	0607138A	FIXED WING PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	1,151		1,151
162	0607139A	IMPROVED TURBINE ENGINE PROGRAM .....	51,164		51,164
163	0607140A	EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES FROM NIE .....	2,481		2,481
164	0607141A	LOGSTIAG AUTOMATION .....	1,673		1,673
166	0607665A	FAMILY OF BIOMETRIAG .....	13,237		13,237
167	0607865A	PATRIOT PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT .....	105,816		105,816
169	0202429A	AEROSTAT JOINT PROJECT—COCOM EXERCISE .....	40,565		40,565
171	0203728A	JOINT AUTOMATED DEEP OPERATION COORDINATION SYSTEM (JADOAG) .....	35,719		35,719
172	0203735A	COMBAT VEHICLE IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS .....	257,167	40,000	297,167
		Stryker modification and improvement .....		[40,000]	
173	0203740A	MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM .....	15,445		15,445
175	0203752A	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	364		364
176	0203758A	DIGITIZATION .....	4,361		4,361
177	0203801A	MISSILE/AIR DEFENSE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	3,154		3,154
178	0203802A	OTHER MISSILE PRODUCT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS .....	35,951		35,951
179	0203808A	TRACTOR CARD .....	34,686		34,686
180	0205402A	INTEGRATED BASE DEFENSE—OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEV .....	10,750		10,750
181	0205410A	MATERIALS HANDLING EQUIPMENT .....	402		402
183	0205456A	LOWER TIER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE (AMD) SYSTEM .....	64,159		64,159
184	0205778A	GUIDED MULTIPLE-LAUNCH ROCKET SYSTEM (GMLRS) .....	17,527		17,527

185	0208053A	JOINT TACTICAL GROUND SYSTEM .....	20,515	20,515
187	0303028A	SECURITY AND INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES .....	12,368	12,368
188	0303140A	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....	31,154	31,154
189	0303141A	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM .....	12,274	12,274
190	0303142A	SATCOM GROUND ENVIRONMENT (SPACE) .....	9,355	9,355
191	0303150A	WMMCAG/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM .....	7,053	7,053
193	0305179A	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS) .....	750	750
194	0305204A	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES .....	13,225	13,225
195	0305206A	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS .....	22,870	22,870
196	0305208A	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....	25,592	25,592
199	0305233A	RQ-7 UAV .....	7,297	7,297
201	0310349A	WIN-T INCREMENT 2—INITIAL NETWORKING .....	3,800	3,800
202	0708045A	END ITEM INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS ACTIVITIES .....	48,442	48,442
	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	4,536	4,536
		<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>1,129,297</b>	<b>1,169,297</b>
			<b>40,000</b>	<b>40,000</b>

**TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, ARMY .....**  
**6,924,959**

1	0601103N	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES .....	116,196	116,196
2	0601152N	IN-HOUSE LABORATORY INDEPENDENT RESEARCH .....	19,126	19,126
3	0601153N	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES .....	451,606	506,606
		Basic research program increase .....	55,000	[55,000]
		<b>SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>586,928</b>	<b>641,928</b>

4	0602114N	POWER PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH .....	68,723	68,723
5	0602123N	FORCE PROTECTION APPLIED RESEARCH .....	154,963	154,963
6	0602131M	MARINE CORPS LANDING FORCE TECHNOLOGY .....	49,001	49,001
7	0602235N	COMMON PICTURE APPLIED RESEARCH .....	42,551	42,551
8	0602236N	WARFIGHTER SUSTAINMENT APPLIED RESEARCH .....	45,056	45,056

**TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, NAVY .....**  
**91,668**

**TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST & EVAL, AIR FORCE .....**  
**7,016,627**

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
9	0602271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS APPLIED RESEARCH .....	115,051		115,051
10	0602435N	OCEAN WARFIGHTING ENVIRONMENT APPLIED RESEARCH .....	42,252		42,252
11	0602651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS APPLIED RESEARCH .....	6,119		6,119
12	0602747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH .....	123,750	18,600	142,350
		Accelerate undersea warfare research .....		[18,600]	
13	0602750N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES APPLIED RESEARCH .....	179,686		179,686
14	0602782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE APPLIED RESEARCH .....	37,418		37,418
		<b>SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>864,570</b>	<b>18,600</b>	<b>883,170</b>
<b>ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</b>					
15	0603114N	POWER PROJECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	37,093		37,093
16	0603123N	FORCE PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	38,044		38,044
17	0603271N	ELECTROMAGNETIC SYSTEMS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	34,899		34,899
18	0603640M	USMC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATION (ATD) .....	137,562		137,562
19	0603651M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	12,745		12,745
20	0603673N	FUTURE NAVAL CAPABILITIES ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	258,860	-10,000	248,860
		Capable manpower, enablers, and sea basing .....		[-10,000]	
21	0603680N	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM .....	57,074		57,074
22	0603729N	WARFIGHTER PROTECTION ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	4,807		4,807
23	0603747N	UNDERSEA WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	13,748		13,748
24	0603758N	NAVY WARFIGHTING EXPERIMENTS AND DEMONSTRATIONS .....	66,041		66,041
25	0603782N	MINE AND EXPEDITIONARY WARFARE ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	1,991		1,991
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>662,864</b>	<b>-10,000</b>	<b>652,864</b>
<b>ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES</b>					
26	0603207N	AIR/OCEAN TACTICAL APPLICATIONS .....	41,832		41,832
27	0603216N	AVIATION SURVIVABILITY .....	5,404		5,404

28	0603237N	DEPLOYABLE JOINT COMMAND AND CONTROL .....	3,086	3,086
29	0603251N	AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS .....	11,643	11,643
30	0603254N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	5,555	5,555
31	0603261N	TACTICAL AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE .....	3,087	3,087
32	0603382N	ADVANCED COMBAT SYSTEMS TECHNOLOGY .....	1,636	1,636
33	0603502N	SURFACE AND SHALLOW WATER MINE COUNTERMEASURES .....	118,588	118,588
34	0603506N	SURFACE SHIP TORPEDO DEFENSE .....	77,385	77,385
35	0603512N	CARRIER SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	8,348	8,348
36	0603525N	PILOT FISH .....	123,246	123,246
37	0603527N	RETRACT LARCH .....	28,819	28,819
38	0603536N	RETRACT JUNIPER .....	112,678	112,678
39	0603542N	RADIOLOGICAL CONTROL .....	710	710
40	0603553N	SURFACE ASW .....	1,096	1,096
41	0603561N	ADVANCED SUBMARINE SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT .....	87,160	87,160
		Accelerate unmanned underwater vehicle development .....		
42	0603562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEMS .....	10,371	10,371
43	0603563N	SHIP CONCEPT ADVANCED DESIGN .....	11,888	11,888
44	0603564N	SHIP PRELIMINARY DESIGN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES .....	4,332	4,332
45	0603570N	ADVANCED NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS .....	482,040	482,040
46	0603573N	ADVANCED SURFACE MACHINERY SYSTEMS .....	25,904	25,904
47	0603576N	CHALK EAGLE .....	511,802	511,802
48	0603581N	LITTORAL COMBAT SHIP (LAG) .....	118,416	118,416
49	0603582N	COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION .....	35,901	35,901
50	0603595N	OHIO REPLACEMENT .....	971,393	971,393
51	0603596N	LAG MISSION MODULES .....	206,149	206,149
52	0603597N	AUTOMATED TEST AND RE-TEST (ATRT) .....	8,000	8,000
53	0603609N	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS .....	7,678	7,678
54	0603611M	MARINE CORPS ASSAULT VEHICLES .....	219,082	219,082
55	0603635M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORT SYSTEM .....	623	623
56	0603654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT .....	18,260	18,260
57	0603658N	COOPERATIVE ENGAGEMENT .....	76,247	76,247
58	0603713N	OCEAN ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	4,520	4,520
			11,000	11,000
			[11,000]	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
59	0603721N	ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION .....	20,711		20,711
60	0603724N	NAVY ENERGY PROGRAM .....	47,761		47,761
61	0603725N	FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT .....	5,226		5,226
62	0603734N	CHALK CORAL .....	182,771		182,771
63	0603739N	NAVY LOGISTIC PRODUCTIVITY .....	3,866		3,866
64	0603746N	RETRACT MAPLE .....	360,065		360,065
65	0603748N	LINK PLUMERIA .....	237,416		237,416
66	0603751N	RETRACT ELM .....	37,944		37,944
67	0603764N	LINK EVERGREEN .....	47,312		47,312
68	0603787N	SPECIAL PROCESSES .....	17,408		17,408
69	0603790N	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....	9,359		9,359
70	0603795N	LAND ATTACK TECHNOLOGY .....	887		887
71	0603851M	JOINT NON-LETHAL WEAPONS TESTING .....	29,448		29,448
72	0603860N	JOINT PRECISION APPROACH AND LANDING SYSTEMS—DEMVAL .....	91,479		91,479
73	0603925N	DIRECTED ENERGY AND ELECTRIC WEAPON SYSTEMS .....	67,360		67,360
74	0604112N	GERALD R. FORD CLASS NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIER (CVN 78—80) .....	48,105	79,100	127,205
		Full ship shock trials for CVN-78 .....		[79,100]	
75	0604122N	REMOTE MINEHUNTING SYSTEM (RMS) .....	20,089		20,089
76	0604272N	TACTICAL AIR DIRECTIONAL INFRARED COUNTERMEASURES (TADIRCM) .....	18,969		18,969
77	0604279N	ASE SELF-PROTECTION OPTIMIZATION .....	7,874		7,874
78	0604292N	MH-XX .....	5,298		5,298
79	0604454N	LX (R) .....	46,486	29,000	75,486
		Accelerate LX (R) .....		[29,000]	
80	0604653N	JOINT COUNTER RADIO CONTROLLED IED ELECTRONIC WARFARE (JCREW) .....	3,817		3,817
81	0604659N	PRECISION STRIKE WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM .....	9,595		9,595
82	0604707N	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) ARCHITECTURE/ENGINEERING SUPPORT .....	29,581		29,581
83	0604786N	OFFENSIVE ANTI-SURFACE WARFARE WEAPON DEVELOPMENT .....	285,849		285,849



84	0605812M	JOINT LIGHT TACTICAL VEHICLE (LTV) ENGINEERING AND MANUFACTURING DEVELOPMENT PH ..	36,656	21,708	36,656
85	0303354N	ASW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT—MIP .....	9,835	11,101	9,835
86	0304270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT—MIP .....	580	39,878	580
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES .....</b>	<b>5,024,626</b>	<b>119,100</b>	<b>5,143,726</b>
<b>SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION</b>					
87	0603208N	TRAINING SYSTEM AIRCRAFT .....	21,708	21,708	21,708
88	0604212N	OTHER HELO DEVELOPMENT .....	11,101	11,101	11,101
89	0604214N	AV—8B AIRCRAFT—ENG DEV .....	39,878	39,878	39,878
90	0604215N	STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT .....	53,059	53,059	53,059
91	0604216N	MULTI-MISSION HELICOPTER UPGRADE DEVELOPMENT .....	21,358	21,358	21,358
92	0604218N	AIR/OCEAN EQUIPMENT ENGINEERING .....	4,515	4,515	4,515
93	0604221N	P-3 MODERNIZATION PROGRAM .....	1,514	1,514	1,514
94	0604230N	WARFARE SUPPORT SYSTEM .....	5,875	5,875	5,875
95	0604231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM .....	81,553	81,553	81,553
96	0604234N	ADVANCED HAWKEYE .....	272,149	272,149	272,149
97	0604245N	H-1 UPGRADES .....	27,235	27,235	27,235
98	0604261N	ACOUSTIC SEARCH SENSORS .....	35,763	35,763	35,763
99	0604262N	V-22A .....	87,918	87,918	87,918
100	0604264N	AIR CREW SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	12,679	12,679	12,679
101	0604269N	EA-18 .....	56,921	56,921	56,921
102	0604270N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....	23,685	23,685	23,685
103	0604273N	EXECUTIVE HELO DEVELOPMENT .....	507,093	507,093	507,093
104	0604274N	NEXT GENERATION JAMMER (NGJ) .....	411,767	411,767	411,767
105	0604280N	JOINT TACTICAL RADIO SYSTEM—NAVY (JTRS-NAVY) .....	25,071	25,071	25,071
106	0604307N	SURFACE COMBATANT COMBAT SYSTEM ENGINEERING .....	443,433	443,433	443,433
107	0604311N	LPD-17 CLASS SYSTEMS INTEGRATION .....	747	747	747
108	0604329N	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB) .....	97,002	97,002	97,002
109	0604366N	STANDARD MISSILE IMPROVEMENTS .....	129,649	129,649	129,649
110	0604373N	AIRBORNE MCM .....	11,647	11,647	11,647
111	0604376M	MARINE AIR GROUND TASK FORCE (MAGTF) ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) FOR AVIATION .....	2,778	2,778	2,778
112	0604378N	NAVAL INTEGRATED FIRE CONTROL—COUNTER AIR SYSTEMS ENGINEERING .....	23,695	23,695	23,695

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
113	0604404N	UNMANNED CARRIER LAUNCHED AIRBORNE SURVEILLANCE AND STRIKE (UCLASS) SYSTEM .....	134,708	-134,708	0
		Excess FY15 funds buy down FY16 requirements .....		[-134,708]	
114	0604501N	ADVANCED ABOVE WATER SENSORS .....	43,914		43,914
115	0604503N	SSN-688 AND TRIDENT MODERNIZATION .....	109,908		109,908
116	0604504N	AIR CONTROL .....	57,928		57,928
117	0604512N	SHIPBOARD AVIATION SYSTEMS .....	120,217		120,217
118	0604522N	AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE RADAR (AMDR) SYSTEM .....	241,754		241,754
119	0604558N	NEW DESIGN SSN .....	122,556		122,556
120	0604562N	SUBMARINE TACTICAL WARFARE SYSTEM .....	48,213	12,000	60,213
		Accelerate submarine combat and weapon system modernization .....		[12,000]	
121	0604567N	SHIP CONTRACT DESIGN/ LIVE FIRE T&E .....	49,712		49,712
122	0604574N	NAVY TACTICAL COMPUTER RESOURCES .....	4,096		4,096
123	0604580N	VIRGINIA PAYLOAD MODULE (VPM) .....	167,719		167,719
124	0604601N	MINE DEVELOPMENT .....	15,122		15,122
125	0604610N	LIGHTWEIGHT TORPEDO DEVELOPMENT .....	33,738		33,738
126	0604654N	JOINT SERVICE EXPLOSIVE ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT .....	8,123		8,123
127	0604703N	PERSONNEL TRAINING, SIMULATION, AND HUMAN FACTORS .....	7,686		7,686
128	0604727N	JOINT STANDOFF WEAPON SYSTEMS .....	405		405
129	0604755N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (DETECT & CONTROL) .....	153,836		153,836
130	0604756N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: HARD KILL) .....	99,619		99,619
131	0604757N	SHIP SELF DEFENSE (ENGAGE: SOFT KILL/EW) .....	116,798		116,798
132	0604761N	INTELLIGENCE ENGINEERING .....	4,353		4,353
133	0604771N	MEDICAL DEVELOPMENT .....	9,443		9,443
134	0604777N	NAVIGATION/ID SYSTEM .....	32,469		32,469
135	0604800M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD .....	537,901	-12,500	525,401
		F-35B Block 4 development early to need .....		[-12,500]	
136	0604800N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER (JSF)—EMD .....	504,736	-12,500	492,236

137	0604810M	F-35C Block 4 development early to need .....	59,265	59,265
138	0604810N	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—MARINE CORPS .....	47,579	47,579
139	0605013M	JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER FOLLOW ON DEVELOPMENT—NAVY .....	5,914	5,914
140	0605013N	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	89,711	89,711
141	0605212N	CH-53K RDTE .....	632,092	632,092
142	0605220N	SHIP TO SHORE CONNECTOR (SSC) .....	7,778	7,778
143	0605450N	JOINT AIR-TO-GROUND MISSILE (JAGM) .....	25,898	25,898
144	0605500N	MULTI-MISSION MARITIME AIRCRAFT (MMA) .....	247,929	247,929
145	0204202N	DDG-1000 .....	103,199	103,199
146	0304231N	TACTICAL COMMAND SYSTEM—MIP .....	998	998
147	0304785N	TACTICAL CRYPTOLOGIC SYSTEMS .....	17,785	17,785
148	0305124N	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS PROGRAM .....	35,905	35,905
		<b>SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION .....</b>	<b>6,308,800</b>	<b>6,161,092</b>

[-12,500]

-147,708

149	0604256N	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT .....	30,769	30,769
150	0604258N	TARGET SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	112,606	112,606
151	0604759N	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT .....	61,234	61,234
152	0605126N	JOINT THEATER AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION .....	6,995	6,995
153	0605152N	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—NAVY .....	4,011	4,011
154	0605154N	CENTER FOR NAVAL ANALYSES .....	48,563	48,563
155	0605285N	NEXT GENERATION FIGHTER .....	5,000	5,000
157	0605804N	TECHNICAL INFORMATION SERVICES .....	925	925
158	0605853N	MANAGEMENT, TECHNICAL & INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT .....	78,143	78,143
159	0605856N	STRATEGIC TECHNICAL SUPPORT .....	3,258	3,258
160	0605861N	RDT&E SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT .....	76,948	76,948
161	0605863N	RDT&E SHIP AND AIRCRAFT SUPPORT .....	132,122	132,122
162	0605864N	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT .....	351,912	351,912
163	0605865N	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION CAPABILITY .....	17,985	17,985
164	0605866N	NAVY SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE (SEW) SUPPORT .....	5,316	5,316
165	0605867N	SEW SURVEILLANCE/RECONNAISSANCE SUPPORT .....	6,519	6,519

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
166	0605873M	MARINE CORPS PROGRAM WIDE SUPPORT .....	13,649		13,649
		<b>SUBTOTAL, MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>	<b>955,955</b>		<b>955,955</b>
		<b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT</b>			
174	0101221N	STRATEGIC SUB & WEAPONS SYSTEM SUPPORT .....	107,039		107,039
175	0101224N	SSBN SECURITY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM .....	46,506		46,506
176	0101226N	SUBMARINE ACOUSTIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT .....	3,900	800	4,700
		Accelerate combat rapid attack weapon .....		[800]	
177	0101402N	NAVY STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS .....	16,569		16,569
178	0203761N	RAPID TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION (RTT) .....	18,632		18,632
179	0204136N	F/A-18 SQUADRONS .....	133,265		133,265
181	0204163N	FLEET TELECOMMUNICATIONS (TACTICAL) .....	62,867		62,867
182	0204228N	SURFACE SUPPORT .....	36,045		36,045
183	0204229N	TOMAHAWK AND TOMAHAWK MISSION PLANNING CENTER (TMPC) .....	25,228		25,228
184	0204311N	INTEGRATED SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM .....	54,218		54,218
185	0204413N	AMPHIBIOUS TACTICAL SUPPORT UNITS (DISPLACEMENT CRAFT) .....	11,335		11,335
186	0204460M	GROUND/AIR TASK ORIENTED RADAR (G/ATOR) .....	80,129		80,129
187	0204571N	CONSOLIDATED TRAINING SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	39,087		39,087
188	0204574N	CRYPTOLOGIC DIRECT SUPPORT .....	1,915		1,915
189	0204575N	ELECTRONIC WARFARE (EW) READINESS SUPPORT .....	46,609		46,609
190	0205601N	HARM IMPROVEMENT .....	52,708		52,708
191	0205604N	TACTICAL DATA LINKS .....	149,997		149,997
192	0205620N	SURFACE ASW COMBAT SYSTEM INTEGRATION .....	24,460		24,460
193	0205632N	MK-48 ADCAP .....	42,206	5,500	47,706
		Accelerate torpedo upgrades .....		[5,500]	
194	0205633N	AVIATION IMPROVEMENTS .....	117,759		117,759
195	0205675N	OPERATIONAL NUCLEAR POWER SYSTEMS .....	101,323		101,323

196	0206313M	MARINE CORPS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS .....	67,763
197	0206335M	COMMON AVIATION COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM (CAC2S) .....	13,431
198	0206623M	MARINE CORPS GROUND COMBAT/SUPPORTING ARMS SYSTEMS .....	56,769
199	0206624M	MARINE CORPS COMBAT SERVICES SUPPORT .....	20,729
200	0206625M	USMC INTELLIGENCE/ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS (MIP) .....	13,152
201	0206629M	AMPHIBIOUS ASSAULT VEHICLE .....	48,535
202	0207161N	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES .....	76,016
203	0207163N	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) .....	32,172
208	0303109N	SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS (SPACE) .....	53,239
209	0303138N	CONSOLIDATED Afloat NETWORK ENTERPRISE SERVICES (CANES) .....	21,677
210	0303140N	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....	28,102
211	0303150M	WMCAG/GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM .....	294
213	0305160N	NAVY METEOROLOGICAL AND OCEAN SENSORS-SPACE (METOC) .....	599
214	0305192N	MILITARY INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM (MIP) ACTIVITIES .....	6,207
215	0305204N	TACTICAL UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES .....	8,550
216	0305205N	UAS INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY .....	41,831
217	0305208M	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....	1,105
218	0305208N	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....	33,149
219	0305220N	RQ-4 UAV .....	227,188
220	0305231N	MQ-8 UAV .....	52,770
221	0305232M	RQ-11 UAV .....	635
222	0305233N	RQ-7 UAV .....	688
223	0305234N	SMALL (LEVEL 0) TACTICAL UAS (STUASLO) .....	4,647
224	0305239M	RQ-21A .....	6,435
225	0305241N	MULTI-INTELLIGENCE SENSOR DEVELOPMENT .....	49,145
226	0305242M	UNMANNED AERIAL SYSTEMS (UAS) PAYLOADS (MIP) .....	9,246
227	0305421N	RQ-4 MODERNIZATION .....	150,854
228	0308601N	MODELING AND SIMULATION SUPPORT .....	4,757
229	0702207N	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) .....	24,185
231	0708730N	MARITIME TECHNOLOGY (MARTECH) .....	4,321
231A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	1,252,185
		<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>3,482,173</b>
			<b>6,300</b>
			<b>3,488,473</b>

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		<b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, NAVY</b>	<b>17,885,916</b>	<b>41,292</b>	<b>17,927,208</b>
		<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, AF</b>			
		<b>BASIC RESEARCH</b>			
		DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	329,721	45,000	374,721
		Basic research program increase		[45,000]	
1	0601102F				
2	0601103F	UNIVERSITY RESEARCH INITIATIVES	141,754		141,754
3	0601108F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH INITIATIVES	13,778		13,778
		<b>SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH</b>	<b>485,253</b>	<b>45,000</b>	<b>530,253</b>
		<b>APPLIED RESEARCH</b>			
		MATERIALS	125,234	-10,000	115,234
		Nanostructured and biological materials		[-10,000]	
4	0602102F				
5	0602201F	AEROSPACE VEHICLE TECHNOLOGIES	123,438		123,438
6	0602202F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS APPLIED RESEARCH	100,530		100,530
7	0602203F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION	182,326		182,326
8	0602204F	AEROSPACE SENSORS	147,291		147,291
9	0602601F	SPACE TECHNOLOGY	116,122		116,122
10	0602602F	CONVENTIONAL MUNITIONS	99,851		99,851
11	0602605F	DIRECTED ENERGY TECHNOLOGY	115,604		115,604
12	0602788F	DOMINANT INFORMATION SCIENCES AND METHODS	164,909		164,909
13	0602890F	HIGH ENERGY LASER RESEARCH	42,037		42,037
		<b>SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH</b>	<b>1,217,342</b>	<b>-10,000</b>	<b>1,207,342</b>
		<b>ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT</b>			
14	0603112F	ADVANCED MATERIALS FOR WEAPON SYSTEMS	37,665		37,665

15	0603199F	SUSTAINMENT SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T) .....	18,378	18,378
16	0603203F	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SENSORS .....	42,183	42,183
17	0603211F	AEROSPACE TECHNOLOGY DEV/DEMO .....	100,733	100,733
18	0603216F	AEROSPACE PROPULSION AND POWER TECHNOLOGY .....	168,821	168,821
19	0603270F	ELECTRONIC COMBAT TECHNOLOGY .....	47,032	47,032
20	0603401F	ADVANCED SPACECRAFT TECHNOLOGY .....	54,897	54,897
21	0603444F	MAUI SPACE SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (MSS) .....	12,853	12,853
22	0603456F	HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	25,448	25,448
23	0603601F	CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY .....	48,536	48,536
24	0603605F	ADVANCED WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY .....	30,195	30,195
25	0603680F	MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM .....	42,630	42,630
26	0603788F	BATTLESPACE KNOWLEDGE DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION .....	46,414	46,414
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>675,785</b>	<b>675,785</b>

**ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT & PROTOTYPES**

27	0603260F	INTELLIGENCE ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....	5,032	5,032
29	0603438F	SPACE CONTROL TECHNOLOGY .....	4,070	4,070
30	0603742F	COMBAT IDENTIFICATION TECHNOLOGY .....	21,790	21,790
31	0603790F	NATO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....	4,736	4,736
33	0603830F	SPACE SECURITY AND DEFENSE PROGRAM .....	30,771	30,771
34	0603851F	INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE—DEW/VAL .....	39,765	39,765
36	0604015F	LONG RANGE STRIKE .....	1,246,228	786,228
		Delayed EMD contract award .....		-460,000
		TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER .....		[-460,000]
37	0604317F	HARD AND DEEPLY BURIED TARGET DEFEAT SYSTEM (HDBTDS) PROGRAM .....	3,512	3,512
38	0604327F	WEATHER SYSTEM FOLLOW-ON .....	54,637	54,637
40	0604422F	OPERATIONALLY RESPONSIVE SPACE .....	76,108	76,108
44	0604857F	Increase to match previous year funding level .....	6,457	13,500
		TECH TRANSITION PROGRAM .....		[-13,500]
45	0604858F	GROUND BASED STRATEGIC DETERRENT .....	246,514	246,514
46	0605230F	NEXT GENERATION AIR DOMINANCE .....	75,166	75,166
49	0207110F	THREE DIMENSIONAL LONG-RANGE RADAR (3DELRR) .....	8,830	8,830
50	0207455F		14,939	14,939

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
51	0305164F	NAVSTAR GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM (USER EQUIPMENT) (SPACE)	142,288		142,288
52	0306250F	CYBER OPERATIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	81,732	15,000	96,732
		Increase USCC Cyber Operations Technology Development		[15,000]	
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES</b>	<b>2,062,575</b>	<b>-431,500</b>	<b>1,631,075</b>
<b>SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION</b>					
55	0604270F	ELECTRONIC WARFARE DEVELOPMENT	929		929
56	0604281F	TACTICAL DATA NETWORKS ENTERPRISE	60,256		60,256
57	0604287F	PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT	5,973		5,973
58	0604329F	SMALL DIAMETER BOMB (SDB)—EMD	32,624		32,624
59	0604421F	COUNTERSPACE SYSTEMS	24,208		24,208
60	0604425F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS SYSTEMS	32,374		32,374
61	0604426F	SPACE FENCE	243,909		243,909
62	0604429F	AIRBORNE ELECTRONIC ATTACK	8,358		8,358
63	0604441F	SPACE BASED INFRARED SYSTEM (SBIRS) HIGH EMD	292,235		292,235
64	0604602F	ARMAMENT/ORDNANCE DEVELOPMENT	40,154		40,154
65	0604604F	SUBMUNITIONS	2,506		2,506
66	0604617F	AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT	57,678		57,678
67	0604706F	LIFE SUPPORT SYSTEMS	8,187		8,187
68	0604735F	COMBAT TRAINING RANGES	15,795		15,795
69	0604800F	F-35—EMD	589,441	-25,000	564,441
		F-35A Block 4 development early to need		[-25,000]	
71	0604853F	EVOLVED EXPENDABLE LAUNCH VEHICLE PROGRAM (SPACE)—EMD	84,438		84,438
72	0604932F	LONG RANGE STANDOFF WEAPON	36,643		36,643
73	0604933F	ICBM FUZE MODERNIZATION	142,551		142,551
74	0605213F	F-22 MODERNIZATION INCREMENT 3.2B	140,640		140,640
75	0605214F	GROUND ATTACK WEAPONS FUZE DEVELOPMENT	3,598		3,598



76	0605221F	KC-46	402,364	-200,000	602,364	
		Schedule delay and availability of unobligated prior year funds		[-200,000]		
77	0605223F	ADVANCED PILOT TRAINING	11,395		11,395	
78	0605229F	AGAR HH-60 RECAPITALIZATION	156,085		156,085	
80	0605431F	ADVANCED EHF MILSATCOM (SPACE)	228,230		228,230	
81	0605432F	POLAR MILSATCOM (SPACE)	72,084		72,084	
82	0605433F	WIDEBAND GLOBAL SATCOM (SPACE)	56,343		56,343	
83	0605458F	AIR & SPACE OPS CENTER 10.2 RDT&E	47,629		47,629	
84	0605931F	B-2 DEFENSIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM	271,961		271,961	
85	0101125F	NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION	212,121		212,121	
86	0207171F	F-15 EPAWSS	186,481	29,500	215,981	
		NRE for ADCPIL upgrade		[28,000]		
		Flight test support		[1,500]		
87	0207701F	FULL COMBAT MISSION TRAINING	18,082		18,082	
88	0305176F	COMBAT SURVIVOR EVADER LOCATOR	993		993	
89	0307581F	NEXTGEN JSTARS	44,343		44,343	
91	0401319F	PRESIDENTIAL AIRCRAFT REPLACEMENT (PAR)	102,620		102,620	
92	0701212F	AUTOMATED TEST SYSTEMS	14,563		14,563	
		<b>SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION</b>	<b>3,847,791</b>	<b>-195,500</b>	<b>3,652,291</b>	
		<b>MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>				
93	0604256F	THREAT SIMULATOR DEVELOPMENT	23,844		23,844	
94	0604759F	MAJOR T&E INVESTMENT	68,302		68,302	
95	0605101F	RAND PROJECT AIR FORCE	34,918		34,918	
97	0605712F	INITIAL OPERATIONAL TEST & EVALUATION	10,476		10,476	
98	0605807F	TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	673,908		673,908	
99	0605860F	ROCKET SYSTEMS LAUNCH PROGRAM (SPACE)	21,858		21,858	
100	0605864F	SPACE TEST PROGRAM (STP)	28,228		28,228	
101	0605976F	FACILITIES RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	40,518		40,518	
102	0605978F	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT—TEST AND EVALUATION SUPPORT	27,895		27,895	
103	0606017F	REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS AND MATURATION	16,507		16,507	
104	0606116F	SPACE TEST AND TRAINING RANGE DEVELOPMENT	18,997		18,997	

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
106	0606392F	SPACE AND MISSILE CENTER (SMC) CIVILIAN WORKFORCE .....	185,305		185,305
107	0308602F	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION SERVICES (EIS) .....	4,841		4,841
108	0702806F	ACQUISITION AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....	15,357		15,357
109	0804731F	GENERAL SKILL TRAINING .....	1,315		1,315
111	1001004F	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES .....	2,315		2,315
		<b>SUBTOTAL, MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>	<b>1,174,584</b>		<b>1,174,584</b>
<b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT</b>					
112	0603423F	GLOBAL POSITIONING SYSTEM III—OPERATIONAL CONTROL SEGMENT .....	350,232		350,232
113	0604233F	SPECIALIZED UNDERGRADUATE FLIGHT TRAINING .....	10,465		10,465
114	0604445F	WIDE AREA SURVEILLANCE .....	24,577		24,577
117	0605018F	AF INTEGRATED PERSONNEL AND PAY SYSTEM (AF-IPPS) .....	69,694	-45,400	24,294
		Restructure program .....		[-45,400]	
118	0605024F	ANTI-TAMPER TECHNOLOGY EXECUTIVE AGENCY .....	26,718		26,718
119	0605278F	HC/MC-130 RECAP RDT&E .....	10,807		10,807
121	0101113F	B-52 SQUADRONS .....	74,520		74,520
122	0101122F	AIR-LAUNCHED CRUISE MISSILE (ALCM) .....	451		451
123	0101126F	B-1B SQUADRONS .....	2,245		2,245
124	0101127F	B-2 SQUADRONS .....	108,183		108,183
125	0101213F	MINUTEMAN SQUADRONS .....	178,929		178,929
126	0101313F	STRAT WAR PLANNING SYSTEM—USSTRATCOM .....	28,481		28,481
127	0101314F	NIGHT FIST—USSTRATCOM .....	87		87
128	0101316F	WORLDWIDE JOINT STRATEGIC COMMUNICATIONS .....	5,315		5,315
131	0105921F	SERVICE SUPPORT TO STRATCOM—SPACE ACTIVITIES .....	8,090		8,090
132	0205219F	MQ-9 UAV .....	123,439		123,439
134	0207131F	A-10 SQUADRONS .....	0	16,200	16,200
		Sustain avionics software development .....		[16,200]	

135	0207133F	F-16 SQUADRONS .....	148,297	148,297
136	0207134F	F-15E SQUADRONS .....	179,283	192,079
		Transfer from procurement .....		12,796
				[12,796]
137	0207136F	MANNED DESTRUCTIVE SUPPRESSION .....	14,860	14,860
138	0207138F	F-22A SQUADRONS .....	262,552	262,552
139	0207142F	F-35 SQUADRONS .....	115,395	115,395
140	0207161F	TACTICAL AIM MISSILES .....	43,360	43,360
141	0207163F	ADVANCED MEDIUM RANGE AIR-TO-AIR MISSILE (AMRAAM) .....	46,160	46,160
143	0207224F	COMBAT RESCUE AND RECOVERY .....	412	412
144	0207227F	COMBAT RESCUE—PARARESCUE .....	657	657
145	0207247F	AF TENCAP .....	31,428	31,428
146	0207249F	PRECISION ATTACK SYSTEMS PROCUREMENT .....	1,105	1,105
147	0207253F	COMPASS CALL .....	14,249	14,249
148	0207268F	AIRCRAFT ENGINE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM .....	103,942	103,942
149	0207325F	JOINT AIR-TO-SURFACE STANDOFF MISSILE (JASSM) .....	12,793	12,793
150	0207410F	AIR & SPACE OPERATIONS CENTER (AOC) .....	21,193	21,193
151	0207412F	CONTROL AND REPORTING CENTER (CRC) .....	559	559
152	0207417F	AIRBORNE WARNING AND CONTROL SYSTEM (AWAAG) .....	161,812	161,812
153	0207418F	TACTICAL AIRBORNE CONTROL SYSTEMS .....	6,001	6,001
155	0207431F	COMBAT AIR INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM ACTIVITIES .....	7,793	7,793
156	0207444F	TACTICAL AIR CONTROL PARTY-MOD .....	12,465	12,465
157	0207448F	C2ISR TACTICAL DATA LINK .....	1,681	1,681
159	0207452F	DCAPES .....	16,796	16,796
161	0207590F	SEEK EAGLE .....	21,564	21,564
162	0207601F	USAF MODELING AND SIMULATION .....	24,994	24,994
163	0207605F	WARGAMING AND SIMULATION CENTERS .....	6,035	6,035
164	0207697F	DISTRIBUTED TRAINING AND EXERCISES .....	4,358	4,358
165	0208006F	MISSION PLANNING SYSTEMS .....	55,835	55,835
167	0208087F	AF OFFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS .....	12,874	12,874
168	0208088F	AF DEFENSIVE CYBERSPACE OPERATIONS .....	7,681	7,681
171	0301017F	GLOBAL SENSOR INTEGRATED ON NETWORK (GSIN) .....	5,974	5,974
177	0301400F	SPACE SUPERIORITY INTELLIGENCE .....	13,815	13,815

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
178	0302015F	E-4B NATIONAL AIRBORNE OPERATIONS CENTER (NAOC)	80,360		80,360
179	0303001F	FAMILY OF ADVANCED BLOS TERMINALS (FAB-T)	3,907		3,907
180	0303131F	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN)	75,062		75,062
181	0303140F	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM	46,599		46,599
183	0303142F	GLOBAL FORCE MANAGEMENT—DATA INITIATIVE	2,470		2,470
186	0304260F	AIRBORNE SIGINT ENTERPRISE	112,775		112,775
189	0305099F	GLOBAL AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT (GATM)	4,235		4,235
192	030510F	SATELLITE CONTROL NETWORK (SPACE)	7,879		7,879
193	0305111F	WEATHER SERVICE	29,955		29,955
194	0305114F	AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL, APPROACH, AND LANDING SYSTEM (ATCAL)	21,485		21,485
195	0305116F	AERIAL TARGETS	2,515		2,515
198	0305128F	SECURITY AND INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES	472		472
199	0305145F	ARMS CONTROL IMPLEMENTATION	12,137		12,137
200	0305146F	DEFENSE JOINT COUNTERINTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES	361		361
203	0305173F	SPACE AND MISSILE TEST AND EVALUATION CENTER	3,162		3,162
204	0305174F	SPACE INNOVATION, INTEGRATION AND RAPID TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT	1,543		1,543
205	0305179F	INTEGRATED BROADCAST SERVICE (IBS)	7,860		7,860
206	0305182F	SPACELIFT RANGE SYSTEM (SPACE)	6,902		6,902
207	0305202F	DRAGON U-2	34,471		34,471
209	0305206F	AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	50,154		50,154
210	0305207F	MANNED RECONNAISSANCE SYSTEMS	13,245		13,245
211	0305208F	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS	22,784		22,784
212	0305219F	MQ-1 PREDATOR A UAV	716		716
213	0305220F	RQ-4 UAV	208,053		208,053
214	0305221F	NETWORK-CENTRIC COLLABORATIVE TARGETING	21,587		21,587
215	0305236F	COMMON DATA LINK EXECUTIVE AGENT (COL EA)	43,986		43,986
216	0305238F	NATO AGS	197,486	-59,086	138,400

217	0305240F	Transfer from procurement for NATO AWACS .....	28,434	[ -59,086]	28,434
218	0305265F	SUPPORT TO DCGS ENTERPRISE .....	180,902		180,902
220	0305614F	GPS III SPACE SEGMENT .....	81,911		81,911
221	0305881F	JSPOC MISSION SYSTEM .....	3,149		3,149
222	0305913F	RAPID CYBER ACQUISITION .....	14,447		14,447
223	0305940F	MUDET DETECTION SYSTEM (SPACE) .....	20,077		20,077
225	0308699F	SPACE SITUATION AWARENESS OPERATIONS .....	853		853
226	0401115F	SHARED EARLY WARNING (SEW) .....	33,962		33,962
227	0401119F	C-130 AIRLIFT SQUADRON .....	42,864		42,864
228	0401130F	C-5 AIRLIFT SQUADRONS (IF) .....	54,807		54,807
229	0401132F	C-17 AIRCRAFT (IF) .....	31,010		31,010
230	0401134F	C-130J PROGRAM .....	6,802		6,802
231	0401219F	LARGE AIRCRAFT IR COUNTERMEASURES (LAIRCMI) .....	1,799		1,799
232	0401314F	KC-10S .....	48,453		48,453
233	0401318F	OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT .....	36,576		36,576
235	0408011F	CV-22 .....	7,963		7,963
236	0702207F	SPECIAL TACTIAG / COMBAT CONTROL .....	1,525		1,525
237	0708610F	DEPOT MAINTENANCE (NON-IF) .....	112,676	-31,000	81,676
		LOGISTIAG INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (LOGIT) .....		[ -31,000]	
		Program growth .....			
238	0708611F	SUPPORT SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	12,657		12,657
239	0804743F	OTHER FLIGHT TRAINING .....	1,836		1,836
240	0808716F	OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES .....	121		121
241	0901202F	JOINT PERSONNEL RECOVERY AGENCY .....	5,911		5,911
242	0901218F	CIVILIAN COMPENSATION PROGRAM .....	3,604		3,604
243	0901220F	PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION .....	4,598		4,598
244	0901226F	AIR FORCE STUDIES AND ANALYSIS AGENCY .....	1,103		1,103
246	0901538F	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	101,840		101,840
246A	99999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	12,780,142	165,000	12,945,142
		Three program increases .....		[165,000]	
		<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>17,010,339</b>	<b>58,510</b>	<b>17,068,849</b>

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		<b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, AF</b>	<b>26,473,669</b>	<b>- 533,490</b>	<b>25,940,179</b>
		<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, DW</b>			
		<b>BASIC RESEARCH</b>			
1	0601000BR	DTRA BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVE	38,436		38,436
2	0601101E	DEFENSE RESEARCH SCIENCES	333,119		333,119
3	0601110D8Z	BASIC RESEARCH INITIATIVES	42,022		42,022
4	0601117E	BASIC OPERATIONAL MEDICAL RESEARCH SCIENCE	56,544		56,544
5	0601120D8Z	NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION PROGRAM	49,453		49,453
6	0601228D8Z	HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES/MINORITY INSTITUTIONS	25,834		25,834
7	0601384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	46,261		46,261
		<b>SUBTOTAL, BASIC RESEARCH</b>	<b>591,669</b>		<b>591,669</b>
		<b>APPLIED RESEARCH</b>			
8	0602000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY	19,352		19,352
9	0602115E	BIOMEDICAL TECHNOLOGY	114,262		114,262
10	0602234D8Z	LINCOLN LABORATORY RESEARCH PROGRAM	51,026		51,026
11	0602251D8Z	APPLIED RESEARCH FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF S&T PRIORITIES	48,226	-15,000	33,226
		General program decrease		[-15,000]	
12	0602303E	INFORMATION & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY	356,358		356,358
14	0602383E	BIOLOGICAL WARFARE DEFENSE	29,265		29,265
15	0602384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM	208,111		208,111
16	0602668D8Z	CYBER SECURITY RESEARCH	13,727		13,727
18	0602702E	TACTICAL TECHNOLOGY	314,582	-5,000	309,582
		Multi-azimuth defense fast intercept round engagement system		[-5,000]	
19	0602715E	MATERIALS AND BIOLOGICAL TECHNOLOGY	220,115	-10,000	210,115
		Decrease in program growth		[-10,000]	

20	0602716E	ELECTRONIAG TECHNOLOGY .....	174,798	174,798
21	0602718BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT TECHNOLOGIES .....	155,415	155,415
22	0602751D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE (SEI) APPLIED RESEARCH .....	8,824	8,824
23	1160401BB	SOF TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	37,517	37,517
		<b>SUBTOTAL, APPLIED RESEARCH .....</b>	<b>1,751,578</b>	<b>1,721,578</b>
			<b>-30,000</b>	

**ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT**

24	0603000D8Z	JOINT MUNITIONS ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	25,915	25,915
26	0603122D8Z	COMBATING TERRORISM TECHNOLOGY SUPPORT .....	71,171	71,171
27	0603133D8Z	FOREIGN COMPARATIVE TESTING .....	21,782	21,782
28	0603160BR	COUNTERPROLIFERATION INITIATIVES—PROLIFERATION PREVENTION AND DEFEAT .....	290,654	290,654
30	0603176C	ADVANCED CONCEPTS AND PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT .....	12,139	12,139
31	0603177C	DISCRIMINATION SENSOR TECHNOLOGY .....	28,200	28,200
32	0603178C	WEAPONS TECHNOLOGY .....	45,389	75,389
		Fiber laser prototype development .....	30,000	
		Divert attitude control tech to support MOKV .....	[20,000]	
			[10,000]	

33	0603179C	ADVANCED CAISR .....	9,876	9,876
34	0603180C	ADVANCED RESEARCH .....	17,364	17,364
35	060325D8Z	JOINT DOD-DOE MUNITIONS TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	18,802	18,802
36	0603264S	AGILE TRANSPORTATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (AT21)—THEATER CAPABILITY .....	2,679	2,679
37	0603274C	SPECIAL PROGRAM—MDA TECHNOLOGY .....	64,708	64,708
38	0603286E	ADVANCED AEROSPACE SYSTEMS .....	185,043	185,043
39	0603287E	SPACE PROGRAMS AND TECHNOLOGY .....	126,692	126,692
40	0603288D8Z	ANALYTIC ASSESSMENTS .....	14,645	9,645
		General program decrease .....	[-5,000]	
41	0603289D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE ANALYSIS AND CONCEPTS .....	59,830	59,830
42	0603294C	COMMON KILL VEHICLE TECHNOLOGY .....	46,753	66,753
		Increase for Multiple Object Kill Vehicle .....	20,000	
			[20,000]	
43	0603384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....	140,094	140,094
44	0603527D8Z	RETRACT LARCH .....	118,666	118,666
45	0603618D8Z	JOINT ELECTRONIC ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY .....	43,966	43,966
46	0603648D8Z	JOINT CAPABILITY TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS .....	141,540	131,540

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		General program decrease .....		[-10,000]	
47	0603662D8Z	NETWORKED COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITIES .....	6,980		6,980
50	0603680D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE MANUFACTURING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM .....	157,056		157,056
51	0603699D8Z	EMERGING CAPABILITIES TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	33,515		33,515
52	0603712S	GENERIC LOGISTIAG R&D TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS .....	16,543		16,543
53	0603713S	DEPLOYMENT AND DISTRIBUTION ENTERPRISE TECHNOLOGY .....	29,888		29,888
54	0603716D8Z	STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH PROGRAM .....	65,836		65,836
55	0603720S	MICROELECTRONIAG TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT .....	79,037		79,037
56	0603727D8Z	JOINT WARFIGHTING PROGRAM .....	9,626		9,626
57	0603739E	ADVANCED ELECTRONIAG TECHNOLOGIES .....	79,021		79,021
58	0603760E	COMMAND, CONTROL AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS .....	201,335		201,335
59	0603766E	NETWORK-CENTRIC WARFARE TECHNOLOGY .....	452,861	-20,000	432,861
		Decrease to reduce inefficiency .....		[-20,000]	
60	0603767E	SENSOR TECHNOLOGY .....	257,127		257,127
61	0603769SE	DISTRIBUTED LEARNING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	10,771		10,771
62	0603781D8Z	SOFTWARE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE .....	15,202		15,202
63	0603826D8Z	QUICK REACTION SPECIAL PROJECTS .....	90,500	-20,000	70,500
		Program decrease .....		[-20,000]	
66	0603833D8Z	ENGINEERING SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY .....	18,377		18,377
67	0603941D8Z	TEST & EVALUATION SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY .....	82,589		82,589
68	0604055D8Z	OPERATIONAL ENERGY CAPABILITY IMPROVEMENT .....	37,420		37,420
69	0303310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS .....	42,488		42,488
70	11604028B	SOF ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	57,741		57,741
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>3,229,821</b>	<b>-5,000</b>	<b>3,224,821</b>
		<b>ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT AND PROTOTYPES</b>			
71	0603161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RDT&E ADC&P .....	31,710		31,710



73	0603600D8Z	WALKOFF .....	90,567		90,567
74	0603714D8Z	ADVANCED SENSORS APPLICATION PROGRAM .....	15,900	4,000	19,900
		Increase to match previous year funding level .....		[4,000]	
75	0603851D8Z	ENVIRONMENTAL SECURITY TECHNICAL CERTIFICATION PROGRAM .....	52,758		52,758
76	0603881C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT .....	228,021		228,021
77	0603882C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE DEFENSE SEGMENT .....	1,284,891		1,284,891
78	0603884BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DEM/VAL .....	172,754		172,754
79	0603884C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSORS .....	233,588		233,588
80	0603890C	BMD ENABLING PROGRAMS .....	409,088		409,088
81	0603891C	SPECIAL PROGRAMS—MDA .....	400,387		400,387
82	0603892C	AEGIS BMD .....	843,355		843,355
83	0603893C	SPACE TRACKING & SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM .....	31,632		31,632
84	0603895C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM SPACE PROGRAMS .....	23,289		23,289
85	0603896C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE COMMAND AND CONTROL, BATTLE MANAGEMENT AND COMMUNICATI.....	450,085		450,085
86	0603898C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE JOINT WARFIGHTER SUPPORT .....	49,570		49,570
87	0603904C	MISSILE DEFENSE INTEGRATION & OPERATIONS CENTER (MDIOC) .....	49,211		49,211
88	0603906C	REGARDING TRENCH .....	9,583		9,583
89	0603907C	SEA BASED X-BAND RADAR (SBX) .....	72,866		72,866
90	0603913C	ISRAELI COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS .....	102,795	166,000	268,795
		Increase for Arrow/David's Sling .....		[166,000]	
91	0603914C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TEST .....	274,323		274,323
92	0603915C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TARGETS .....	513,256		513,256
93	0603920D8Z	HUMANITARIAN DEMINING .....	10,129		10,129
94	0603923D8Z	COALITION WARFARE .....	10,350		10,350
95	0604016D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CORROSION PROGRAM .....	1,518	10,000	11,518
		Program Increase .....		[10,000]	
96	0604115C	TECHNOLOGY MATURATION INITIATIVES .....	96,300		96,300
97	0604250D8Z	ADVANCED INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES .....	469,798		469,798
98	0604400D8Z	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE (DOD) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM (UAS) COMMON DEVELOPMENT .....	3,129		3,129
103	0604826J	JOINT C5 CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT, INTEGRATION AND INTEROPERABILITY ASSESSMENTS .....	25,200		25,200
105	0604873C	LONG RANGE DISCRIMINATION RADAR (LRDR) .....	137,564		137,564

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
106	0604874C	IMPROVED HOMELAND DEFENSE INTERCEPTORS .....	278,944	20,000	298,944
		Redesigned kill vehicle development .....		[20,000]	
107	0604876C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINAL DEFENSE SEGMENT TEST .....	26,225		26,225
108	0604878C	AEGIS BMD TEST .....	55,148		55,148
109	0604879C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE SENSOR TEST .....	86,764		86,764
110	0604880C	LAND-BASED SM-3 (LBSM3) .....	34,970		34,970
111	0604881C	AEGIS SM-3 BLOCK IIA CO-DEVELOPMENT .....	172,645		172,645
112	0604887C	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE MIDCOURSE SEGMENT TEST .....	64,618		64,618
114	0303191D8Z	JOINT ELECTROMAGNETIC TECHNOLOGY (JET) PROGRAM .....	2,660		2,660
115	0305103C	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE .....	963		963
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES .....</b>	<b>6,816,554</b>	<b>200,000</b>	<b>7,016,554</b>
<b>SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION</b>					
116	0604161D8Z	NUCLEAR AND CONVENTIONAL PHYSICAL SECURITY EQUIPMENT RD&E SDD .....	8,800		8,800
117	0604165D8Z	PROMPT GLOBAL STRIKE CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT .....	78,817	10,000	88,817
		CPGS development and flight test .....		[10,000]	
118	0604384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EMD .....	303,647		303,647
119	0604764K	ADVANCED IT SERVICES JOINT PROGRAM OFFICE (AITS-JPO) .....	23,424		23,424
120	0604771D8Z	JOINT TACTICAL INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (JTIDS) .....	14,285		14,285
121	0605000BR	WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFEAT CAPABILITIES .....	7,156		7,156
122	0605013BL	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT .....	12,542		12,542
123	0605021SE	HOMELAND PERSONNEL SECURITY INITIATIVE .....	191		191
124	0605022D8Z	DEFENSE EXPORTABILITY PROGRAM .....	3,273		3,273
125	0605027D8Z	OUSDC/CI DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES .....	5,962		5,962
126	0605070S	DOD ENTERPRISE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT AND DEMONSTRATION .....	13,412		13,412
127	0605075D8Z	DCMO POLICY AND INTEGRATION .....	2,223		2,223
128	0605080S	DEFENSE AGENCY INITIATIVES (DAI)—FINANCIAL SYSTEM .....	31,660		31,660

129	0605090S	DEFENSE RETIRED AND ANNUITANT PAY SYSTEM (DRAS) .....	13,085	13,085
130	0605210D8Z	DEFENSE-WIDE ELECTRONIC PROCUREMENT CAPABILITIES .....	7,209	7,209
131	0303141K	GLOBAL COMBAT SUPPORT SYSTEM .....	15,158	5,158
		Early to need .....	-10,000	
132	0305304D8Z	DOD ENTERPRISE ENERGY INFORMATION MANAGEMENT (EIM) .....	4,414	4,414
		<b>SUBTOTAL, SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT &amp; DEMONSTRATION .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>545,258</b>
<b>MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>				
133	0604774D8Z	DEFENSE READINESS REPORTING SYSTEM (DRRS) .....	5,581	5,581
134	0604875D8Z	JOINT SYSTEMS ARCHITECTURE DEVELOPMENT .....	3,081	3,081
135	0604940D8Z	CENTRAL TEST AND EVALUATION INVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT (CTEIP) .....	229,125	229,125
136	0604942D8Z	ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATIONS .....	28,674	28,674
138	0605100D8Z	JOINT MISSION ENVIRONMENT TEST CAPABILITY (JMETC) .....	45,235	45,235
139	0605104D8Z	TECHNICAL STUDIES, SUPPORT AND ANALYSIS .....	24,936	24,936
141	0605126J	JOINT INTEGRATED AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE ORGANIZATION (JIAMDO) .....	35,471	35,471
144	0605142D8Z	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING .....	37,655	32,655
		Reducing reporting and inefficiencies .....	-5,000	
145	0605151D8Z	STUDIES AND ANALYSIS SUPPORT—OSD .....	3,015	3,015
146	0605161D8Z	NUCLEAR MATTERS-PHYSICAL SECURITY .....	5,287	5,287
147	0605170D8Z	SUPPORT TO NETWORKS AND INFORMATION INTEGRATION .....	5,289	5,289
148	0605200D8Z	GENERAL SUPPORT TO USD (INTELLIGENCE) .....	2,120	2,120
149	0605384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE PROGRAM .....	102,264	102,264
158	0605790D8Z	SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH (SBIR)/ SMALL BUSINESS TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER .....	2,169	2,169
159	0605798D8Z	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY ANALYSIS .....	13,960	13,960
160	0605801KA	DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER (DTIC) .....	51,775	51,775
161	0605803SE	R&D IN SUPPORT OF DOD ENLISTMENT, TESTING AND EVALUATION .....	9,533	9,533
162	0605804D8Z	DEVELOPMENT TEST AND EVALUATION .....	17,371	17,371
163	0605898E	MANAGEMENT HQ—R&D .....	71,571	71,571
164	0606100D8Z	BUDGET AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS .....	4,123	4,123
165	0203345D8Z	DEFENSE OPERATIONS SECURITY INITIATIVE (DOSI) .....	1,946	1,946
166	0204571J	JOINT STAFF ANALYTICAL SUPPORT .....	7,673	7,673
169	0303166J	SUPPORT TO INFORMATION OPERATIONS (IO) CAPABILITIES .....	10,413	10,413

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
170	0303260D8Z	DEFENSE MILITARY DECEPTION PROGRAM OFFICE (DMDPO) .....	971		971
171	0305193D8Z	CYBER INTELLIGENCE .....	6,579		6,579
173	0804767D8Z	COCOM EXERCISE ENGAGEMENT AND TRAINING TRANSFORMATION (GE2T2)—MHA .....	43,811		43,811
174	0901598C	MANAGEMENT HQ—MDA .....	35,871		35,871
176	0903230D8W	WHS—MISSION OPERATIONS SUPPORT - IT .....	1,072		1,072
176A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	49,500		49,500
		<b>SUBTOTAL, MANAGEMENT SUPPORT .....</b>	<b>856,071</b>	<b>-5,000</b>	<b>851,071</b>
<b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT</b>					
178	0604130V	ENTERPRISE SECURITY SYSTEM (ESS) .....	7,929		7,929
179	0605127T	REGIONAL INTERNATIONAL OUTREACH (RIO) AND PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE INFORMATION MANA .....	1,750		1,750
180	0605147T	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE SHARED INFORMATION SYSTEM (OHASIS) .....	294		294
181	0607210D8Z	INDUSTRIAL BASE ANALYSIS AND SUSTAINMENT SUPPORT .....	22,576		22,576
182	0607310D8Z	CWMD SYSTEMS: OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	1,901		1,901
183	0607327T	GLOBAL THEATER SECURITY COOPERATION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS (G-TSCMIS) ..	8,474		8,474
184	0607384BP	CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL DEFENSE (OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT) .....	33,561		33,561
186	0208043J	PLANNING AND DECISION AID SYSTEM (PDAS) .....	3,061		3,061
187	0208045K	C4I INTEROPERABILITY .....	64,921		64,921
189	0301144K	JOINT/ALLIED COALITION INFORMATION SHARING .....	3,645		3,645
193	0302016K	NATIONAL MILITARY COMMAND SYSTEM-WIDE SUPPORT .....	963		963
194	0302019K	DEFENSE INFO INFRASTRUCTURE ENGINEERING AND INTEGRATION .....	10,186		10,186
195	0303126K	LONG-HAUL COMMUNICATIONS—DAG .....	36,883		36,883
196	0303131K	MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) .....	13,735		13,735
197	0303135G	PUBLIC KEY INFRASTRUCTURE (PKI) .....	6,101		6,101
198	0303136G	KEY MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE (KMI) .....	43,867		43,867
199	0303140D8Z	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....	8,957		8,957
200	0303140G	INFORMATION SYSTEMS SECURITY PROGRAM .....	146,890		146,890

201	0303150K	GLOBAL COMMAND AND CONTROL SYSTEM .....	21,503		21,503
202	0303153K	DEFENSE SPECTRUM ORGANIZATION .....	20,342		20,342
203	0303170K	NET-CENTRIC ENTERPRISE SERVICES (NCES) .....	444		444
205	0303610K	TELEPORT PROGRAM .....	1,736		1,736
206	0304210BB	SPECIAL APPLICATIONS FOR CONTINGENCIES .....	65,060		65,060
210	0305103K	CYBER SECURITY INITIATIVE .....	2,976		2,976
215	0305186D8Z	POLICY R&D PROGRAMS .....	4,182		4,182
216	0305199D8Z	NET CENTRICITY .....	18,130		18,130
218	0305208BB	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....	5,302		5,302
221	0305208K	DISTRIBUTED COMMON GROUND/SURFACE SYSTEMS .....	3,239		3,239
225	0305327V	INSIDER THREAT .....	11,733		11,733
226	0305387D8Z	HOMELAND DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER PROGRAM .....	2,119		2,119
234	0708011S	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS .....	24,605		24,605
235	0708012S	LOGISTAG SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....	1,770		1,770
236	0902298J	MANAGEMENT HQ—OJAG .....	2,978		2,978
237	1105219BB	MQ-9 UAV .....	18,151		23,151
		MQ-9 capability enhancements .....		5,000	5,000
				[5,000]	
238	1105232BB	RQ-11 UAV .....	758		758
240	1160403BB	AVIATION SYSTEMS .....	173,934		191,141
		ISR payload technology improvements .....		17,207	17,207
				[2,000]	
				[15,207]	
241	1160405BB	C-130 TF/TA Program Adjustment .....	6,866		6,866
242	1160408BB	INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....	63,008		63,008
243	1160431BB	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS .....	25,342		25,342
244	1160432BB	WARRIOR SYSTEMS .....	3,401		3,401
245	1160480BB	SPECIAL PROGRAMS .....	3,212		3,212
246	1160483BB	SOF TACTICAL VEHICLES .....	63,597		63,597
247	1160489BB	MARITIME SYSTEMS .....	3,933		3,933
248	1160490BB	GLOBAL VIDEO SURVEILLANCE ACTIVITIES .....	10,623		10,623
248A	9999999999	OPERATIONAL ENHANCEMENTS INTELLIGENCE .....	3,564,272		3,564,272
		CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....			
		<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>		<b>22,207</b>	<b>4,561,117</b>

SEC. 4201. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xx	xxxx	DEFENSE WIDE CYBER VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT .....	0	200,000	200,000
		Assess all major weapon systems for cyber vulnerability .....		[200,000]	
xxx	xxxxxx	UCAS-D DEVELOPMENT AND FOLLOW ON PROTOTYPING .....	0	725,000	725,000
		Supports continued efforts on UCAS-D and follow on prototyping .....		[725,000]	
x	xxxxx	TECHNOLOGY OFFSET INITIATIVE .....	0	400,000	400,000
		Supports innovative technology development .....		[400,000]	
		<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....	<b>0</b>	<b>1,325,000</b>	<b>1,325,000</b>
		<b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, DW</b> .....	<b>18,329,861</b>	<b>1,507,207</b>	<b>19,837,068</b>
		<b>OPERATIONAL TEST &amp; EVAL, DEFENSE</b>			
		<b>MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b>			
1	06051180TE	OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION .....	76,838		76,838
2	06051310TE	LIVE FIRE TEST AND EVALUATION .....	46,882		46,882
3	06058140TE	OPERATIONAL TEST ACTIVITIES AND ANALYSES .....	46,838		46,838
		<b>SUBTOTAL, MANAGEMENT SUPPORT</b> .....	<b>170,558</b>		<b>170,558</b>
		<b>TOTAL OPERATIONAL TEST &amp; EVAL, DEFENSE</b> .....	<b>170,558</b>		<b>170,558</b>
		<b>TOTAL RDT&amp;E</b> .....	<b>69,784,963</b>	<b>1,106,677</b>	<b>70,891,640</b>

**SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

**SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
		<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, ARMY</b>			
		<b>ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES</b>			
60	0603747A	SOLDIER SUPPORT AND SURVIVABILITY .....	1,500		1,500
		<b>SUBTOTAL, ADVANCED COMPONENT DEVELOPMENT &amp; PROTOTYPES .....</b>	<b>1,500</b>		<b>1,500</b>
		<b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, ARMY .....</b>	<b>1,500</b>		<b>1,500</b>
		<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, NAVY</b>			
		<b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT</b>			
231A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	35,747		35,747
		<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>35,747</b>		<b>35,747</b>
		<b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, NAVY .....</b>	<b>35,747</b>		<b>35,747</b>
		<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, AF</b>			
		<b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT</b>			
133	0205671F	JOINT COUNTER RCIED ELECTRONIC WARFARE .....	300		300
246A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	16,800		16,800
		<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>17,100</b>		<b>17,100</b>
		<b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, AF .....</b>	<b>17,100</b>		<b>17,100</b>
		<b>RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, DW</b>			
		<b>OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT</b>			

**SEC. 4202. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Program Element	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
248A	9999999999	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	137,087		137,087
		<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATIONAL SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>137,087</b>		<b>137,087</b>
		<b>TOTAL RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST &amp; EVAL, DW .....</b>	<b>137,087</b>		<b>137,087</b>
		<b>TOTAL RDT&amp;E .....</b>	<b>191,434</b>		<b>191,434</b>



**TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**

# TITLE XLIII—OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

## SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE.

### SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE (In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY</b>				
<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>				
010	MANEUVER UNITS .....	1,094,429	-1,094,429	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-1,094,429]	
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES .....	68,873		68,873
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE .....	508,008		508,008
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS .....	763,300	-763,300	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-763,300]	
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	1,054,322	-1,054,322	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-1,054,322]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS .....	1,546,129	-1,546,129	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-1,546,129]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	3,158,606	-3,158,606	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-3,158,606]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS .....	438,909		438,909
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	1,214,116	77,200	1,291,316
	Readiness funding increase .....		[77,200]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	7,616,008	10,500	7,626,508
	Readiness funding increase .....		[10,500]	
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....	2,617,169	34,000	2,651,169
	Kwajalein facilities restoration .....		[34,000]	

120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS .....	421,269	421,269	
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS .....	164,743	164,743	
170	COMBATANT COMMANDS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT .....	448,633	448,633	
	Streamlining of Army Combatant Commands Direct Mission Support .....		-12,357	
			[-12,357]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>21,114,514</b>	<b>-7,507,443</b>	<b>13,607,071</b>
	<b>MOBILIZATION</b>			
180	STRATEGIC MOBILITY .....	401,638	401,638	
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS .....	261,683	261,683	
200	INDUSTRIAL PREPAREDNESS .....	6,532	6,532	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION .....</b>	<b>669,853</b>		<b>669,853</b>
	<b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
210	OFFICER ACQUISITION .....	131,536	131,536	
220	RECRUIT TRAINING .....	47,843	47,843	
230	ONE STATION UNIT TRAINING .....	42,565	42,565	
240	SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS .....	490,378	490,378	
250	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....	981,000	981,000	
	Readiness funding increase .....		33,200	
			[33,200]	
260	FLIGHT TRAINING .....	940,872	940,872	
270	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION .....	230,324	230,324	
280	TRAINING SUPPORT .....	603,519	603,519	
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....	491,922	491,922	
300	EXAMINING .....	194,079	194,079	
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION .....	227,951	227,951	
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....	161,048	161,048	
330	JUNIOR RESERVE OFFICER TRAINING CORPS .....	170,118	170,118	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>	<b>4,713,155</b>	<b>33,200</b>	<b>4,746,355</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....	485,778	485,778	
360	CENTRAL SUPPLY ACTIVITIES .....	813,881	813,881	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
370	LOGISTIC SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....	714,781		714,781
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT .....	322,127		322,127
390	ADMINISTRATION .....	384,813		384,813
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....	1,781,350		1,781,350
410	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT .....	292,532		292,532
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT .....	375,122		375,122
430	OTHER SERVICE SUPPORT .....	1,119,848	-4,500	1,115,348
	Army outreach reduction .....		[-4,500]	
440	ARMY CLAIMS ACTIVITIES .....	225,358		225,358
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT .....	239,755		239,755
460	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND AUDIT READINESS .....	223,319		223,319
470	INTERNATIONAL MILITARY HEADQUARTERS .....	469,865		469,865
480	MISC. SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS .....	40,521		40,521
480A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	1,120,974	25,500	1,146,474
	Additional SOUTHCOM ISR and intel support .....		[20,000]	
	Readiness increase .....		[5,500]	
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-238,451	-238,451
	Streamlining of Army Management Headquarters .....		[-238,451]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>8,610,024</b>	<b>-217,451</b>	<b>8,392,573</b>
<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>				
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT .....	0	-281,500	-281,500
	Foreign currency adjustment .....		[-281,500]	
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-260,100	-260,100
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-260,100]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-541,600</b>	<b>-541,600</b>

	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY</b>	<b>35,107,546</b>	<b>-8,233,294</b>	<b>26,874,252</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	16,612		16,612
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	486,531		486,531
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	105,446		105,446
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	516,791		516,791
060	AVIATION ASSETS	87,587		87,587
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	348,601		348,601
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	81,350		81,350
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	59,574	32,400	91,974
	Readiness funding increase		[32,400]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	570,852		570,852
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	245,686		245,686
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	40,962		40,962
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>2,559,992</b>	<b>32,400</b>	<b>2,592,392</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	10,665		10,665
140	ADMINISTRATION	18,390		18,390
150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS	14,976		14,976
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT	8,841		8,841
170	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING	52,928		52,928
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED	0	-6,011	-6,011
	Streamlining of Army Reserve Management Headquarters		[-6,011]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>105,800</b>	<b>-6,011</b>	<b>99,790</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS	0	-7,600	-7,600
	Bulk fuel savings		[-7,600]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-7,600</b>	<b>-7,600</b>

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES</b>	<b>2,665,792</b>	<b>18,789</b>	<b>2,684,581</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARNG</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	MANEUVER UNITS	709,433		709,433
020	MODULAR SUPPORT BRIGADES	167,324		167,324
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE	741,327		741,327
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS	88,775	7,700	96,475
	ARNG border security enhancement		[7,700]	
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT	32,130		32,130
060	AVIATION ASSETS	943,609	52,600	996,209
	Readiness funding increase		[39,600]	
	ARNG border security enhancement		[13,000]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT	703,137		703,137
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS	84,066		84,066
090	LAND FORCES DEPOT MAINTENANCE	166,848	22,500	189,348
	Readiness funding increase		[22,500]	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT	1,022,970		1,022,970
110	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	673,680		673,680
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS	954,574		954,574
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>6,287,873</b>	<b>82,800</b>	<b>6,370,673</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWWD ACTIVITIES</b>			
130	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	6,570		6,570
140	ADMINISTRATION	59,629	-250	59,379
	Reduction to National Guard Heritage Paintings		[-250]	

150	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....	68,452		68,452
160	MANPOWER MANAGEMENT .....	8,841		8,841
170	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT .....	283,670	-11,500	272,170
	Reduction to Army Marketing Program .....		[-11,500]	
180	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT .....	2,942		2,942
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-26,631	-26,631
	Streamlining of Army National Guard Management Headquarters .....		[-26,631]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>430,104</b>	<b>-38,381</b>	<b>391,723</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-25,300	-25,300
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-25,300]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-25,300</b>	<b>-25,300</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARNG .....</b>	<b>6,717,977</b>	<b>19,119</b>	<b>6,737,096</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS .....	4,940,365	-4,940,365	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-4,940,365]	
020	FLEET AIR TRAINING .....	1,830,611		1,830,611
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES .....	37,225		37,225
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT .....	103,456		103,456
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT .....	376,844	13,900	390,744
	Readiness funding increase .....		[13,900]	
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	897,536	-897,536	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-897,536]	
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	33,201		33,201
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS .....	544,056	5,300	549,356
	Readiness funding increase .....		[5,300]	
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS .....	4,287,658	-4,287,658	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-4,287,658]	

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING .....	787,446		787,446
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	5,960,951	-5,960,951	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-5,960,951]	
120	SHIP DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	1,554,863		1,554,863
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS .....	704,415		704,415
140	ELECTRONIC WARFARE .....	96,916		96,916
150	SPACE SYSTEMS AND SURVEILLANCE .....	192,198		192,198
160	WARFARE TACTICS .....	453,942		453,942
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY .....	351,871		351,871
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES .....	1,186,847		1,186,847
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE .....	123,948		123,948
200	DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	2,443		2,443
210	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS .....	98,914		98,914
220	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT .....	73,110	-5,483	67,628
	Streamlining of Navy Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support .....		[-5,483]	
230	CRUISE MISSILE .....	110,734		110,734
240	FLEET BALLISTIC MISSILE .....	1,206,736		1,206,736
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT .....	141,664		141,664
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE .....	523,122		523,122
270	OTHER WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT .....	371,872		371,872
280	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION .....	896,061		896,061
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION .....	2,220,423		2,220,423
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....	4,472,468	14,000	4,486,468
	Funding increase for Behavioral Counseling .....		[14,000]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>34,581,896</b>	<b>- 16,058,793</b>	<b>18,523,103</b>

**MOBILIZATION**



310	SHIP PREPOSITIONING AND SURGE .....	422,846		422,846
320	AIRCRAFT ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS .....	6,464	500	6,964
	Readiness funding increase .....		[500]	
330	SHIP ACTIVATIONS/INACTIVATIONS .....	361,764		361,764
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS .....	69,530		69,530
350	INDUSTRIAL READINESS .....	2,237		2,237
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT .....	21,823		21,823
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION .....</b>	<b>884,664</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>885,164</b>
<b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>				
370	OFFICER ACQUISITION .....	149,375		149,375
380	RECRUIT TRAINING .....	9,035		9,035
390	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS .....	156,290		156,290
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....	653,728		653,728
410	FLIGHT TRAINING .....	8,171		8,171
420	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION .....	168,471		168,471
430	TRAINING SUPPORT .....	196,048		196,048
440	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....	234,233		234,233
450	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION .....	137,855		137,855
460	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....	77,257		77,257
470	JUNIOR ROTC .....	47,653		47,653
	<b>SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>	<b>1,838,116</b>		<b>1,838,116</b>
<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWD ACTIVITIES</b>				
480	ADMINISTRATION .....	923,771		923,771
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS .....	13,967		13,967
500	CIVILIAN MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT .....	120,812		120,812
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT .....	350,983		350,983
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT .....	265,948		265,948
530	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....	335,482		335,482
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....	197,724		197,724
570	PLANNING, ENGINEERING AND DESIGN .....	274,936		274,936

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....	1,122,178		1,122,178
590	HULL, MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SUPPORT .....	48,587		48,587
600	COMBAT/WEAPONS SYSTEMS .....	25,599		25,599
610	SPACE AND ELECTRONIC WARFARE SYSTEMS .....	72,768		72,768
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE .....	577,803		577,803
680	INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS AND AGENCIES .....	4,768		4,768
680A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	560,754		560,754
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-209,823	-209,823
	Streamlining of Navy Management Headquarters .....		[-209,823]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRVWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>4,896,080</b>	<b>-209,823</b>	<b>4,686,257</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT .....	0	-59,900	-59,900
	Foreign currency adjustment .....		[-59,900]	
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-482,300	-482,300
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-482,300]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRICTED .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-542,200</b>	<b>-542,200</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY .....</b>	<b>42,200,756</b>	<b>-16,810,316</b>	<b>25,390,440</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES .....	931,079	-931,079	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-931,079]	
020	FIELD LOGISTICS .....	931,757	-931,757	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-931,757]	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	227,583		227,583

040	MARITIME PREPOSITIONING .....	86,259	86,259
050	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....	746,237	746,237
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....	2,057,362	2,058,562
	Readiness funding increase for Criminal Investigative Equipment .....	1,200	1,200
	Readiness funding increase for Criminal Investigative Equipment .....	(1,200)	(1,200)
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>4,980,277</b>	<b>3,118,641</b>
	<b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>		
070	RECRUIT TRAINING .....	16,460	16,460
080	OFFICER ACQUISITION .....	977	977
090	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....	97,325	97,325
100	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION .....	40,786	40,786
110	TRAINING SUPPORT .....	347,476	347,476
120	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....	164,806	164,806
130	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION .....	39,963	39,963
140	JUNIOR ROTC .....	23,397	23,397
	<b>SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>	<b>731,190</b>	<b>731,190</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWD ACTIVITIES</b>		
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....	37,386	37,386
160	ADMINISTRATION .....	358,395	358,395
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....	76,105	76,105
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	45,429	45,429
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-32,588
	Streamlining of Marine Corps Management Headquarters .....		(-32,588)
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRWD ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>517,315</b>	<b>484,727</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>		
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT .....	0	-19,800
	Foreign currency adjustment .....		(-19,800)
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-17,000
	Bulk fuel savings .....		(-17,000)
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-36,800</b>

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS</b> .....	<b>6,228,782</b>	<b>-1,931,024</b>	<b>4,297,758</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS .....	563,722		563,722
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE .....	6,218		6,218
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	82,712		82,712
040	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	326		326
050	AVIATION LOGISTICS .....	13,436		13,436
070	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING .....	557		557
090	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS .....	14,499		14,499
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES .....	117,601		117,601
120	ENTERPRISE INFORMATION .....	29,382		29,382
130	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION .....	48,513		48,513
140	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....	102,858		102,858
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b> .....	<b>979,824</b>		<b>979,824</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWVD ACTIVITIES</b>			
150	ADMINISTRATION .....	1,505		1,505
160	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT .....	13,782		13,782
170	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....	3,437		3,437
180	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT .....	3,210		3,210
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0		0
	Streamlining of Navy Reserve Management Headquarters .....		-1,386	-1,386
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRWVD ACTIVITIES</b> .....	<b>21,934</b>	<b>[-1,386]</b>	<b>20,548</b>

xxx	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-39,700	-39,700
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-39,700]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....	<b>0</b>	<b>-39,700</b>	<b>-39,700</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES</b> .....	<b>1,001,758</b>	<b>-41,086</b>	<b>960,672</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	OPERATING FORCES .....	97,631		97,631
020	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	18,254		18,254
030	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION .....	28,653		28,653
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....	111,923		111,923
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b> .....	<b>256,461</b>		<b>256,461</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>			
050	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....	924		924
060	ADMINISTRATION .....	10,866		10,866
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....	8,785		8,785
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-1,473	-1,473
	Streamlining of Marine Corps Reserve Management Headquarters .....		[-1,473]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b> .....	<b>20,575</b>	<b>-1,473</b>	<b>19,102</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-1,000	-1,000
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-1,000]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED</b> .....	<b>0</b>	<b>-1,000</b>	<b>-1,000</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE</b> .....	<b>277,036</b>	<b>-2,473</b>	<b>274,563</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES .....	3,336,868	-3,336,868	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-3,336,868]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES .....	1,897,315	-1,897,315	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-1,897,315]	
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS) .....	1,797,549	-40,300	1,757,249
	Cancel transition of A-10 to F-15E Training .....		[-78,000]	
	Readiness increase .....		[37,700]	
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	6,537,127	-6,537,127	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-6,537,127]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....	1,997,712		1,997,712
060	BASE SUPPORT .....	2,841,948		2,841,948
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING .....	930,341		930,341
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS .....	924,845		924,845
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES .....	271,177		271,177
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS .....	382,824		382,824
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT .....	900,965	-15,380	885,586
	Streamlining of Air Force Combatant Commanders Direct Mission Support .....		[-15,380]	
130	COMBATANT COMMANDERS CORE OPERATIONS .....	205,078	-41,000	164,078
	Cutting Joint Enabling Capabilities Command .....		[-41,000]	
xxx	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	907,496	16,800	924,296
	Increase One Program .....		[20,000]	
	Unjustified increase .....		[-3,200]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>22,931,245</b>	<b>-11,851,190</b>	<b>11,080,055</b>
	<b>MOBILIZATION</b>			
140	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS .....	2,229,196		2,229,196
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS .....	148,318		148,318

160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	1,617,571	-1,617,571	0
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[-1,617,571]	
170	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....	259,956		259,956
180	BASE SUPPORT .....	708,799		708,799
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION .....</b>	<b>4,963,840</b>	<b>-1,617,571</b>	<b>3,346,269</b>
	<b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION .....	92,191		92,191
200	RECRUIT TRAINING .....	21,871		21,871
210	RESERVE OFFICERS TRAINING CORPS (ROTC) .....	77,527		77,527
220	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....	228,500		228,500
230	BASE SUPPORT .....	772,870		772,870
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....	359,304	43,100	402,404
	Readiness increase for RPA training .....		[43,100]	
250	FLIGHT TRAINING .....	710,553		710,553
260	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION .....	228,252		228,252
270	TRAINING SUPPORT .....	76,464		76,464
280	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	375,513		375,513
290	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....	79,690		79,690
300	EXAMINING .....	3,803		3,803
310	OFF-DUTY AND VOLUNTARY EDUCATION .....	180,807		180,807
320	CIVILIAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....	167,478		167,478
330	JUNIOR ROTC .....	59,263		59,263
	<b>SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>	<b>3,434,086</b>	<b>43,100</b>	<b>3,477,186</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWD ACTIVITIES</b>			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS .....	1,141,491		1,141,491
350	TECHNICAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....	862,022	-10,000	852,022
	Acquisition Management Adjustment .....		[-10,000]	
360	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	61,745		61,745
370	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....	298,759		298,759
380	BASE SUPPORT .....	1,108,220	-12,000	1,096,220

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
390	Reduce IT procurement .....		[-12,000]	
	ADMINISTRATION .....	689,797	-20,700	669,097
	DEAMS reduction-Funding ahead of need .....		[-20,700]	
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....	498,053		498,053
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES .....	900,253		900,253
420	CIVIL AIR PATROL .....	25,411		25,411
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT .....	89,148		89,148
450A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	1,187,859	-4,900	1,182,959
	Unjustified increase .....		[-4,900]	
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-276,203	-276,203
	Streamlining of Air Force Management Headquarters .....		[-276,203]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>6,862,758</b>	<b>-323,803</b>	<b>6,538,955</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xx	Restore EC-130 Compass Call .....	0	27,300	27,300
	Costs associated with preventing divestiture of EC-130 .....		[27,300]	
x	Restore A-10 .....	0	235,300	235,300
	Costs associated with preventing divestiture of A-10 fleet .....		[235,300]	
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-618,300	-618,300
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-618,300]	
	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT .....	0	-137,800	-137,800
	Foreign currency adjustment .....		[-137,800]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-493,500</b>	<b>-493,500</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>38,191,929</b>	<b>-14,242,964</b>	<b>23,948,965</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE</b>			



	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES .....	1,779,378		1,779,378
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS .....	226,243		226,243
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	487,036		487,036
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....	109,342		109,342
050	BASE SUPPORT .....	373,707		373,707
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>2,975,706</b>		<b>2,975,706</b>
	<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
060	ADMINISTRATION .....	53,921		53,921
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....	14,359		14,359
080	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERS MGMT (ARPC) .....	13,665		13,665
090	OTHER PERS SUPPORT (DISABILITY COMP) .....	6,606		6,606
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-2,116	-2,116
	Costs associated with preventing divestiture of A-10 fleet .....		[2,500]	
	Streamlining of Air Force Reserve Management Headquarters .....		[-4,616]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>88,551</b>	<b>-2,116</b>	<b>86,435</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xxxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-101,100	-101,100
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-101,100]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-101,100</b>	<b>-101,100</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE .....</b>	<b>3,064,257</b>	<b>-103,216</b>	<b>2,961,041</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ANG</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	AIRCRAFT OPERATIONS .....	3,526,471		3,526,471
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS .....	740,779	2,600	743,379
	ARNG border security enhancement .....		[2,600]	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	1,763,859		1,763,859
040	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION .....	288,786		288,786

**SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
050	BASE SUPPORT .....	582,037		582,037
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b> .....	<b>6,901,932</b>	<b>2,600</b>	<b>6,904,532</b>
	<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
060	ADMINISTRATION .....	23,626		23,626
070	RECRUITING AND ADVERTISING .....	30,652		30,652
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-3,015	-3,015
	Streamlining of Air National Guard Management Headquarters .....		[-3,015]	
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	42,200	42,200
	Costs associated with preventing divestiture of A-10 fleet .....		[42,200]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES</b> .....	<b>54,278</b>	<b>39,185</b>	<b>93,463</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xxxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-162,600	-162,600
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-162,600]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRICTED</b> .....	<b>0</b>	<b>-162,600</b>	<b>-162,600</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ANG</b> .....	<b>6,956,210</b>	<b>-120,815</b>	<b>6,835,395</b>
	<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF .....	485,888	20,000	505,888
	Middle East Assurance Initiative .....		[20,000]	
020	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE .....	534,795	-4,000	530,795
	DOD Rewards reduction-funding ahead of need .....		[-4,000]	
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES .....	4,862,368		4,862,368
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b> .....	<b>5,883,051</b>	<b>16,000</b>	<b>5,899,051</b>

<b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
040	DEFENSE ACQUISITION UNIVERSITY .....	142,659	142,659
050	NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY .....	78,416	78,416
060	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....	354,372	354,372
	<b>SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b> .....	<b>575,447</b>	<b>575,447</b>
<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
070	CIVIL MILITARY PROGRAMS .....	160,320	160,320
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY .....	570,177	570,177
100	DEFENSE CONTRACT MANAGEMENT AGENCY .....	1,374,536	1,374,536
110	DEFENSE HUMAN RESOURCES ACTIVITY .....	642,551	642,551
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY .....	1,292,755	1,292,755
	Sharkseer increase .....	10,000	10,000
		[110,000]	[110,000]
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY .....	26,073	26,073
150	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY .....	366,429	366,429
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY .....	192,625	192,625
180	DEFENSE PERSONNEL ACCOUNTING AGENCY .....	115,372	115,372
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY .....	524,723	524,723
	Reduction to Combating Terrorism Fellowship .....	-7,000	-7,000
		[-7,000]	[-7,000]
200	DEFENSE SECURITY SERVICE .....	508,396	508,396
230	DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY SECURITY ADMINISTRATION .....	33,577	33,577
240	DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY .....	415,696	415,696
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY .....	2,753,771	2,784,021
	Impact Aid .....	30,250	30,250
		[30,000]	[30,000]
	School lunches for territories .....	[250]	[250]
270	MISSILE DEFENSE AGENCY .....	432,068	432,068
290	OFFICE OF ECONOMIC ADJUSTMENT .....	110,612	110,612
	Guam outside the fence infrastructure .....	-53,100	-53,100
	Defense industry adjustment .....	[-20,000]	[-20,000]
		[-33,100]	[-33,100]
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE .....	1,388,285	1,378,785
	BRAC 2017 Planning and Support .....	-9,500	-9,500
		[-10,500]	[-10,500]

SEC. 4301. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	OSD fleet architecture study .....		[1,000]	
310	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/ADMIN & SVC-WIDE ACTIVITIES .....	83,263		83,263
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES .....	621,688		621,688
320A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	14,379,428		14,379,428
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED .....	0	-897,552	-897,552
	Streamlining of Department of Defense Management Headquarters .....		[-897,552]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICE-WIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>25,982,345</b>	<b>- 926,902</b>	<b>25,055,443</b>
	<b>UNDISTRIBUTED</b>			
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT .....	0	-51,900	-51,900
	Foreign currency adjustment .....		[-51,900]	
xxx	UNDISTRIBUTED BULK FUEL SAVINGS .....	0	-36,000	-36,000
	Bulk fuel savings .....		[-36,000]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UNDISTRIBUTED .....</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-87,900</b>	<b>-87,900</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE .....</b>	<b>32,440,843</b>	<b>- 998,802</b>	<b>31,442,041</b>
	<b>MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS</b>			
010	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR ARMED FORCES, DEF .....	14,078		14,078
	US COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES, DEFENSE .....	14,078		14,078
	<b>SUBTOTAL, US COURT OF APPEALS FOR ARMED FORCES, DEF .....</b>	<b>28,156</b>		<b>28,156</b>
010	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID .....	100,266		100,266
	OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER AND CIVIC AID .....	100,266		100,266
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID .....</b>	<b>200,532</b>		<b>200,532</b>
	<b>COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT</b>			

010	FORMER SOVIET UNION (FSU) THREAT REDUCTION .....	358,496	358,496
	<b>SUBTOTAL, COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION ACCOUNT .....</b>	<b>358,496</b>	<b>358,496</b>
	<b>DOD ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND</b>		
010	ACQ WORKFORCE DEV FD .....	84,140	84,140
	<b>SUBTOTAL, DOD ACQUISITION WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT FUND .....</b>	<b>84,140</b>	<b>84,140</b>
	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY</b>		
040	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY .....	234,829	234,829
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, ARMY .....</b>	<b>234,829</b>	<b>234,829</b>
	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY</b>		
050	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY .....	292,453	292,453
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, NAVY .....</b>	<b>292,453</b>	<b>292,453</b>
	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE</b>		
060	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE .....	368,131	368,131
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>368,131</b>	<b>368,131</b>
	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE</b>		
070	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE .....	8,232	8,232
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION, DEFENSE .....</b>	<b>8,232</b>	<b>8,232</b>
	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES</b>		
080	ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES .....	203,717	203,717
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION FORMERLY USED SITES .....</b>	<b>203,717</b>	<b>203,717</b>
	<b>TOTAL MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS .....</b>	<b>1,664,342</b>	<b>1,664,342</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....</b>	<b>176,517,228</b>	<b>134,071,146</b>
		<b>-42,446,082</b>	

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY</b>				
<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>				
010	MANEUVER UNITS .....	257,900	1,094,429	1,352,329
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[1,094,429]	
040	THEATER LEVEL ASSETS .....	1,110,836	763,300	1,874,136
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[763,300]	
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	261,943	1,054,322	1,316,265
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[1,054,322]	
060	AVIATION ASSETS .....	22,160	1,546,129	1,568,289
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[1,546,129]	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	1,119,201	3,158,606	4,277,807
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[3,158,606]	
080	LAND FORCES SYSTEMS READINESS .....	117,881		117,881
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	50,000		50,000
140	ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES .....	4,500,666		4,500,666
150	COMMANDERS EMERGENCY RESPONSE PROGRAM .....	10,000		10,000
160	RESET .....	1,834,777		1,834,777
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b> .....	<b>9,285,364</b>	<b>7,616,786</b>	<b>16,902,150</b>
<b>MOBILIZATION</b>				
190	ARMY PREPOSITIONED STOCKS .....	40,000		40,000
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION</b> .....	<b>40,000</b>		<b>40,000</b>
<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>				

350	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....	529,891	529,891
380	AMMUNITION MANAGEMENT .....	5,033	5,033
420	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT .....	100,480	100,480
450	REAL ESTATE MANAGEMENT .....	154,350	154,350
480A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	1,267,632	1,267,632
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>2,057,386</b>	<b>2,057,386</b>

	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY .....</b>	<b>11,382,750</b>	<b>7,616,786</b>	<b>18,999,536</b>
--	--	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE .....	2,442	2,442	
050	LAND FORCES OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	813	813	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	779	779	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	20,525	20,525	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>24,559</b>	<b>24,559</b>	<b>453</b>

	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARMY RES .....</b>	<b>24,559</b>	<b>24,559</b>	
--	--	---------------	---------------	--

	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARNG</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	MANEUVER UNITS .....	1,984	1,984	
030	ECHELONS ABOVE BRIGADE .....	4,671	4,671	
060	AVIATION ASSETS .....	15,980	15,980	
070	FORCE READINESS OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	12,867	12,867	
100	BASE OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	23,134	23,134	
120	MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONAL HEADQUARTERS .....	1,426	1,426	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>60,062</b>	<b>60,062</b>	

	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWID ACTIVITIES</b>			
	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....	783	783	
150	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>783</b>	<b>783</b>	

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ARNG</b> .....	<b>60,845</b>		<b>60,845</b>
	<b>AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND</b>			
	<b>MINISTRY OF DEFENSE</b>			
010	SUSTAINMENT .....	2,214,899		2,214,899
030	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION .....	182,751		182,751
040	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS .....	281,555		281,555
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MINISTRY OF DEFENSE</b> .....	<b>2,679,205</b>		<b>2,679,205</b>
	<b>MINISTRY OF INTERIOR</b>			
060	SUSTAINMENT .....	901,137		901,137
080	EQUIPMENT AND TRANSPORTATION .....	116,573		116,573
090	TRAINING AND OPERATIONS .....	65,342		65,342
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MINISTRY OF INTERIOR</b> .....	<b>1,083,052</b>		<b>1,083,052</b>
	<b>TOTAL AFGHANISTAN SECURITY FORCES FUND</b> .....	<b>3,762,257</b>		<b>3,762,257</b>
	<b>IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND</b>			
	<b>IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND</b>			
010	IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND .....	715,000		715,000
	<b>SUBTOTAL, IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND</b> .....	<b>715,000</b>		<b>715,000</b>
	<b>TOTAL IRAQ TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND</b> .....	<b>715,000</b>		<b>715,000</b>
	<b>SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND</b>			
	<b>SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND</b>			



010	SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND .....			600,000	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND .....</b>			<b>600,000</b>	
	<b>TOTAL SYRIA TRAIN AND EQUIP FUND .....</b>			<b>600,000</b>	
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY</b>				
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>				
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS .....	358,417	4,943,665	5,302,082	
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[4,940,365]		
	Readiness funding increase .....		[3,300]		
030	AVIATION TECHNICAL DATA & ENGINEERING SERVICES .....	110		110	
040	AIR OPERATIONS AND SAFETY SUPPORT .....	4,513		4,513	
050	AIR SYSTEMS SUPPORT .....	126,501		126,501	
060	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	75,897	914,536	990,433	
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[897,536]		
	Readiness funding increase .....		[17,000]		
070	AIRCRAFT DEPOT OPERATIONS SUPPORT .....	2,770		2,770	
080	AVIATION LOGISTICS .....	34,101		34,101	
090	MISSION AND OTHER SHIP OPERATIONS .....	1,184,878	4,287,658	5,472,536	
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[4,287,658]		
100	SHIP OPERATIONS SUPPORT & TRAINING .....	16,663	5,960,951	16,663	
110	SHIP DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	1,922,829		7,883,780	
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[5,960,951]		
130	COMBAT COMMUNICATIONS .....	33,577		33,577	
160	WARFARE TACTICS .....	26,454		26,454	
170	OPERATIONAL METEOROLOGY AND OCEANOGRAPHY .....	22,305		22,305	
180	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES .....	513,969		513,969	
190	EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE .....	10,007		10,007	
250	IN-SERVICE WEAPONS SYSTEMS SUPPORT .....	60,865		60,865	
260	WEAPONS MAINTENANCE .....	275,231		275,231	
290	SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION AND MODERNIZATION .....	7,819		7,819	
300	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....	61,422		61,422	

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>4,738,328</b>	<b>16,106,810</b>	<b>20,845,138</b>
	<b>MOBILIZATION</b>			
340	EXPEDITIONARY HEALTH SERVICES SYSTEMS	5,307		5,307
360	COAST GUARD SUPPORT	160,002		160,002
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION</b>	<b>165,309</b>		<b>165,309</b>
	<b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
400	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING	44,845		44,845
	<b>SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>	<b>44,845</b>		<b>44,845</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>			
480	ADMINISTRATION	2,513		2,513
490	EXTERNAL RELATIONS	500		500
510	MILITARY MANPOWER AND PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT	5,309		5,309
520	OTHER PERSONNEL SUPPORT	1,469		1,469
550	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION	156,671		156,671
580	ACQUISITION AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	8,834		8,834
620	NAVAL INVESTIGATIVE SERVICE	1,490		1,490
680A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	6,320		6,320
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>183,106</b>		<b>183,106</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY</b>	<b>5,131,588</b>	<b>16,106,810</b>	<b>21,238,398</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	OPERATIONAL FORCES	353,133	931,079	1,284,212

020	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[931,079]	
	FIELD LOGISTICS .....	259,676	931,757	1,191,433
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[931,757]	
030	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	240,000		240,000
060	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....	16,026		16,026
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>888,835</b>	<b>1,862,836</b>	<b>2,731,671</b>
	<b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
110	TRAINING SUPPORT .....	37,862		37,862
	<b>SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING .....</b>	<b>37,862</b>		<b>37,862</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRWD ACTIVITIES</b>			
150	SERVICEWIDE TRANSPORTATION .....	43,767		43,767
180A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	2,070		2,070
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRWIDE ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>45,837</b>		<b>45,837</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS .....</b>	<b>952,534</b>	<b>1,862,836</b>	<b>2,815,370</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	MISSION AND OTHER FLIGHT OPERATIONS .....	4,033		4,033
020	INTERMEDIATE MAINTENANCE .....	60		60
030	AIRCRAFT DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	20,300		20,300
100	COMBAT SUPPORT FORCES .....	7,250		7,250
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES .....</b>	<b>31,643</b>		<b>31,643</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, NAVY RES .....</b>	<b>31,643</b>		<b>31,643</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	OPERATING FORCES .....	2,500		2,500
040	BASE OPERATING SUPPORT .....	955		955

**SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>3,455</b>		<b>3,455</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, MC RESERVE</b>	<b>3,455</b>		<b>3,455</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	PRIMARY COMBAT FORCES	1,505,738	3,333,368	4,839,106
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[3,336,868]	
	Retain Current A-10 Fleet		[-1,400]	
	Unjustified Increase		[-2,100]	
020	COMBAT ENHANCEMENT FORCES	914,973	1,887,615	2,802,588
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[1,897,315]	
	Unjustified Increase		[-14,000]	
	Readiness funding increase		[4,300]	
030	AIR OPERATIONS TRAINING (OJT, MAINTAIN SKILLS)	31,978		31,978
040	DEPOT MAINTENANCE	1,192,765	6,537,127	7,729,892
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA		[6,537,127]	
050	FACILITIES SUSTAINMENT, RESTORATION & MODERNIZATION	85,625		85,625
060	BASE SUPPORT	917,269		917,269
070	GLOBAL C3I AND EARLY WARNING	30,219		30,219
080	OTHER COMBAT OPS SPT PROGRAMS	174,734		174,734
100	LAUNCH FACILITIES	869		869
110	SPACE CONTROL SYSTEMS	5,008		5,008
120	COMBATANT COMMANDERS DIRECT MISSION SUPPORT	100,190		100,190
xxx	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS	22,893		22,893
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b>	<b>4,982,261</b>	<b>11,758,110</b>	<b>16,740,371</b>

140	<b>MOBILIZATION</b>			
	AIRLIFT OPERATIONS .....	2,995,703		2,995,703
150	MOBILIZATION PREPAREDNESS .....	108,163		108,163
160	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	511,059	1,617,571	2,128,630
	Transfer base requirement to OCO due to BCA .....		[1,617,571]	
180	BASE SUPPORT .....	4,642		4,642
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOBILIZATION</b> .....	<b>3,619,567</b>	<b>1,617,571</b>	<b>5,237,138</b>
	<b>TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b>			
190	OFFICER ACQUISITION .....	92		92
240	SPECIALIZED SKILL TRAINING .....	11,986		11,986
	<b>SUBTOTAL, TRAINING AND RECRUITING</b> .....	<b>12,078</b>		<b>12,078</b>
	<b>ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b>			
340	LOGISTICS OPERATIONS .....	86,716		86,716
380	BASE SUPPORT .....	3,836		3,836
400	SERVICEWIDE COMMUNICATIONS .....	165,348		165,348
410	OTHER SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES .....	204,683	-63,000	141,683
	Reduction to the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq .....		[-63,000]	
450	INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT .....	61		61
450A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	15,463		15,463
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMIN &amp; SRVWD ACTIVITIES</b> .....	<b>476,107</b>	<b>-63,000</b>	<b>413,107</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE</b> .....	<b>9,090,013</b>	<b>13,312,681</b>	<b>22,402,694</b>
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE</b>			
030	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
	DEPOT MAINTENANCE .....	51,086		51,086
050	BASE SUPPORT .....	7,020		7,020
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b> .....	<b>58,106</b>		<b>58,106</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, AF RESERVE</b> .....	<b>58,106</b>		<b>58,106</b>

SEC. 4302. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ANG</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
020	MISSION SUPPORT OPERATIONS .....	19,900		19,900
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b> .....	<b>19,900</b>		<b>19,900</b>
	<b>TOTAL OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE, ANG</b> .....	<b>19,900</b>		<b>19,900</b>
	<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>			
	<b>OPERATING FORCES</b>			
010	JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF .....	9,900		9,900
030	SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND/OPERATING FORCES .....	2,345,835		2,345,835
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATING FORCES</b> .....	<b>2,355,735</b>		<b>2,355,735</b>
	<b>ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b>			
090	DEFENSE CONTRACT AUDIT AGENCY .....	18,474		18,474
120	DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY .....	29,579		29,579
140	DEFENSE LEGAL SERVICES AGENCY .....	110,000		110,000
160	DEFENSE MEDIA ACTIVITY .....	5,960		5,960
190	DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY .....	1,677,000	-100,000	1,577,000
	Reduction from Coalition Support Funds .....		[-100,000]	
260	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EDUCATION ACTIVITY .....	73,000		73,000
300	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE .....	106,709		106,709
320	WASHINGTON HEADQUARTERS SERVICES .....	2,102		2,102
320A	CLASSIFIED PROGRAMS .....	1,427,074		1,427,074
	<b>SUBTOTAL, ADMINISTRATION AND SERVICEWIDE ACTIVITIES</b> .....	<b>3,449,898</b>	<b>-100,000</b>	<b>3,349,898</b>

TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE .....	5,805,633	-100,000	5,705,633
TOTAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....	37,638,283	38,799,113	76,437,396





**TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL**

# TITLE XLIV—MILITARY PERSONNEL

## SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL.

### SEC. 4401. MILITARY PERSONNEL (In Thousands of Dollars)

Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>			
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS</b>			
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS .....	130,491,227		129,236,727
Military Personnel Underexecution .....		-1,254,500	
Additional support for the National Guard's Operation Phalanx .....		[-987,200]	
Reduction for anticipated cost of TRICARE consolidation .....		[21,700]	
TRICARE program improvement initiatives .....		[-85,000]	
Financial literacy improvement .....		[15,000]	
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Army .....		[85,000]	
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Navy .....		[-65,200]	
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Marine Corps .....		[-81,400]	
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Air Force .....		[-27,000]	
Reduction from Foreign Currency Gains, Air Force .....		[-130,400]	
<b>SUBTOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS</b> .....	<b>130,491,227</b>	<b>-1,254,500</b>	<b>129,236,727</b>
<b>MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS</b>			
MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS .....	6,243,449		6,243,449
<b>SUBTOTAL, MEDICARE-ELIGIBLE RETIREE HEALTH FUND CONTRIBUTIONS</b> .....	<b>6,243,449</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,243,449</b>
<b>TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL</b> .....	<b>136,734,676</b>	<b>-1,254,500</b>	<b>135,480,176</b>

**SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

SEC. 4402. MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS (In Thousands of Dollars)				
Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized	
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL</b>				
<b>MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS</b>				
MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS .....	3,204,758	0	3,204,758	
<b>SUBTOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS</b> .....	<b>3,204,758</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,204,758</b>	
<b>TOTAL, MILITARY PERSONNEL</b> .....	<b>3,204,758</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,204,758</b>	



**TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS**

# TITLE XLV—OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS

## SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.

### SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS (In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	<b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND</b>			
	<b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY</b>			
020	SUPPLY MANAGEMENT—ARMY .....	50,432		50,432
	<b>SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, ARMY .....</b>	<b>50,432</b>		<b>50,432</b>
	<b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE</b>			
010	SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS .....	62,898		62,898
	<b>SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>62,898</b>		<b>62,898</b>
	<b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>			
030	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA) .....	45,084		45,084
	<b>SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE .....</b>	<b>45,084</b>		<b>45,084</b>
	<b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA</b>			
020	WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA .....	1,154,154		1,154,154
	<b>SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DECA .....</b>	<b>1,154,154</b>		<b>1,154,154</b>
	<b>TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND .....</b>	<b>1,312,568</b>		<b>1,312,568</b>
	<b>NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND</b>			
040	POST DELIVERY AND OUTFITTING .....	15,456		15,456

060	LG MED SPD RO/RO MAINTENANCE .....	124,493	124,493
070	DOD MOBILIZATION ALTERATIONS .....	8,243	8,243
080	TAH MAINTENANCE .....	27,784	27,784
090	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT .....	25,197	25,197
100	READY RESERVE FORCE .....	272,991	272,991
	<b>SUBTOTAL, NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND .....</b>	<b>474,164</b>	<b>474,164</b>
	<b>TOTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE SEALIFT FUND .....</b>	<b>474,164</b>	<b>474,164</b>
	<b>CHEM AGENTS &amp; MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION</b>		
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</b>		
01	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—O&M .....	139,098	139,098
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE .....</b>	<b>139,098</b>	<b>139,098</b>
	<b>RD&amp;E</b>		
02	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—RD&E .....	579,342	579,342
	<b>SUBTOTAL, RD&amp;E .....</b>	<b>579,342</b>	<b>579,342</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT</b>		
03	CHEM DEMILITARIZATION—PROC .....	2,281	2,281
	<b>SUBTOTAL, PROCUREMENT .....</b>	<b>2,281</b>	<b>2,281</b>
	<b>TOTAL CHEM AGENTS &amp; MUNITIONS DESTRUCTION .....</b>	<b>720,721</b>	<b>720,721</b>
	<b>DRUG INTERDICTION &amp; CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF</b>		
	<b>DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES</b>		
010	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE .....	739,009	739,009
	SOUTHCOM Operational support .....	22,000	22,000
	Transfer to Demand Reduction Program .....	[30,000]	[30,000]
	<b>SUBTOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>761,009</b>	<b>761,009</b>
	<b>DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM</b>		
		<b>22,000</b>	<b>[—8,000]</b>
			<b>22,000</b>

SEC. 4501. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
020	DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM	111,589	8,000	119,589
	Expanded drug testing		[8,000]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, DRUG DEMAND REDUCTION PROGRAM</b>	<b>111,589</b>	<b>8,000</b>	<b>119,589</b>
	<b>TOTAL DRUG INTERDICTION &amp; CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF</b>	<b>850,598</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>880,598</b>
010	<b>OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>	310,459		310,459
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	310,459		310,459
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>	<b>310,459</b>		<b>310,459</b>
020	<b>RD&amp;E</b>	4,700	-2,600	2,100
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	4,700	-2,600	2,100
	Funding ahead of need		[-2,600]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, RD&amp;E</b>	<b>4,700</b>	<b>-2,600</b>	<b>2,100</b>
030	<b>PROCUREMENT</b>	1,000	-1,000	0
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	1,000	-1,000	0
	Funding ahead of need		[-1,000]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, PROCUREMENT</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>-1,000</b>	<b>0</b>
	<b>TOTAL OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL</b>	<b>316,159</b>	<b>-3,600</b>	<b>312,559</b>
010	<b>DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</b>	9,082,298		9,082,298
020	IN-HOUSE CARE	9,082,298		9,082,298
	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE	14,892,683		14,892,683



030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT .....	2,415,658	-10,290	2,405,368
	Reduction of funds related to Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria (CARB) project .....		[-10,290]	
040	INFORMATION MANAGEMENT .....	1,677,827		1,677,827
050	MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES .....	327,967		327,967
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....	750,614		750,614
070	BASE OPERATIONS/COMMUNICATIONS .....	1,742,893		1,742,893
xx	UNDISTRIBUTED FOREIGN CURRENCY ADJUSTMENT .....	0		
	Foreign currency adjustment .....		-36,400	-36,400
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE .....</b>	<b>30,889,940</b>	<b>[-36,400]</b>	<b>30,843,250</b>
	<b>RD&amp;E</b>			
090	R&D RESEARCH .....	10,996		10,996
100	R&D EXPLORATORY DEVELOPMENT .....	59,473		56,323
	Reduction of funds related to Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria (CARB) project .....		-3,150	
110	R&D ADVANCED DEVELOPMENT .....	231,356		228,256
	Reduction of funds related to Combating Antibiotic Resistant Bacteria (CARB) project .....		[-3,100]	
120	R&D DEMONSTRATION/VALIDATION .....	103,443		103,443
130	R&D ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT .....	515,910		515,910
140	R&D MANAGEMENT AND SUPPORT .....	41,567		41,567
150	R&D CAPABILITIES ENHANCEMENT .....	17,356		17,356
	<b>SUBTOTAL, RD&amp;E .....</b>	<b>980,101</b>	<b>-6,250</b>	<b>973,851</b>
	<b>PROCUREMENT</b>			
160	PROC INITIAL OUTFITTING .....	33,392		33,392
170	PROC REPLACEMENT & MODERNIZATION .....	330,504		330,504
180	PROC THEATER MEDICAL INFORMATION PROGRAM .....	1,494		1,494
190	PROC IEHR .....	7,897		7,897
	<b>SUBTOTAL, PROCUREMENT .....</b>	<b>373,287</b>		<b>373,287</b>
	<b>TOTAL DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>32,243,328</b>	<b>-52,940</b>	<b>32,190,388</b>
	<b>TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS .....</b>	<b>35,917,538</b>	<b>-26,540</b>	<b>35,890,998</b>

**SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

**SEC. 4502. OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Line	Item	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
	<b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND</b>			
	<b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE</b>			
020	TRANSPORTATION OF FALLEN HEROES .....	2,500		2,500
	<b>SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, AIR FORCE .....</b>	<b>2,500</b>		<b>2,500</b>
	<b>WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE</b>			
030	DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY (DLA) .....	86,350		86,350
	<b>SUBTOTAL, WORKING CAPITAL FUND, DEFENSE-WIDE .....</b>	<b>86,350</b>		<b>86,350</b>
	<b>TOTAL WORKING CAPITAL FUND .....</b>	<b>88,850</b>		<b>88,850</b>
	<b>DRUG INTERDICTION &amp; CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF</b>			
	<b>DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES</b>			
010	DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEFENSE .....	186,000		186,000
	<b>SUBTOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION AND COUNTER DRUG ACTIVITIES .....</b>	<b>186,000</b>		<b>186,000</b>
	<b>TOTAL, DRUG INTERDICTION &amp; CTR-DRUG ACTIVITIES, DEF .....</b>	<b>186,000</b>		<b>186,000</b>
	<b>OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL</b>			
	<b>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE</b>			
010	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL .....	10,262		10,262
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE .....</b>	<b>10,262</b>		<b>10,262</b>
	<b>TOTAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL .....</b>	<b>10,262</b>		<b>10,262</b>

	<b>DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM</b>				
	<b>OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE</b>				
010	IN-HOUSE CARE .....	65,149			65,149
020	PRIVATE SECTOR CARE .....	192,210			192,210
030	CONSOLIDATED HEALTH SUPPORT .....	9,460			9,460
060	EDUCATION AND TRAINING .....	5,885			5,885
	<b>SUBTOTAL, OPERATION &amp; MAINTENANCE .....</b>	<b>272,704</b>			<b>272,704</b>
	<b>TOTAL, DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM .....</b>	<b>272,704</b>			<b>272,704</b>
	<b>COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND</b>				
	<b>COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND</b>				
090	COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND .....	2,100,000		-1,100,000	1,000,000
	Request excess to need .....			[-1,100,000]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND .....</b>	<b>2,100,000</b>		<b>-1,100,000</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>
	<b>TOTAL, COUNTERTERRORISM PARTNERSHIPS FUND .....</b>	<b>2,100,000</b>		<b>-1,100,000</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>
	<b>UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE</b>				
	<b>UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE</b>				
xxx	UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE .....	0		300,000	300,000
	Provides assistance to Ukraine .....			[300,000]	
	<b>SUBTOTAL, UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE .....</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>300,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>
	<b>TOTAL, UKRAINE SECURITY ASSISTANCE INITIATIVE .....</b>	<b>0</b>		<b>300,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>
	<b>TOTAL OTHER AUTHORIZATION .....</b>	<b>2,657,816</b>		<b>-800,000</b>	<b>1,857,816</b>



**TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**

# TITLE XLVI—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

## SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION.

### SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>MILITARY CONSTRUCTION</b>						
MILCON, ARMY	ALASKA	Fort Greely	Physical Readiness Training Facility	7,800		7,800
MILCON, ARMY	CALIFORNIA	Concord	Pier	98,000		98,000
MILCON, ARMY	COLORADO	Fort Carson, Colorado	Rotary Wing Taxiway	5,800		5,800
MILCON, ARMY	GEORGIA	Fort Gordon	Command and Control Facility	90,000		90,000
MILCON, ARMY	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	Vehicle Maintenance Shop	51,000		51,000
MILCON, ARMY	GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA	Guantanamo Bay	Unaccompanied Personnel Housing	0	76,000	76,000
MILCON, ARMY	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	Access Control Point-Reece Road	0	19,500	19,500
MILCON, ARMY	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	Access Control Point-Mapes Road	0	15,000	15,000
MILCON, ARMY	NEW YORK	Fort Drum, New York	NCO Academy Complex	19,000		19,000
MILCON, ARMY	NEW YORK	U.S. Military Academy	Waste Water Treatment Plant	70,000		70,000
MILCON, ARMY	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	Reception Barracks Complex Ph2	56,000		56,000
MILCON, ARMY	OKLAHOMA	Fort Sill	Training Support Facility	13,400		13,400
MILCON, ARMY	TEXAS	Corpus Christi	Powertrain Facility (Infrastructure/Metal)	85,000		85,000
MILCON, ARMY	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Homeland Defense Operations Center	43,000	-43,000	0
MILCON, ARMY	VIRGINIA	Fort Lee	Training Support Facility	33,000		33,000
MILCON, ARMY	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Myer-Henderson	Instruction Building	37,000	-37,000	0
MILCON, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Host Nation Support	36,000		36,000
MILCON, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Minor Construction	25,000		25,000

MILCON, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design	73,245	73,245
MILCON, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Unobligated Amounts	0	-52,000
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MILCON, ARMY</b>			<b>743,245</b>	<b>-21,500</b>
<b>MIL CON, NAVY</b>					
MIL CON, NAVY	ARIZONA	Yuma	Aircraft Maint. Facilities & Apron (So. CALA)	50,635	50,635
MIL CON, NAVY	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	Mina Salman Pier Replacement	37,700	37,700
MIL CON, NAVY	BAHRAIN ISLAND	SW Asia	Ship Maintenance Support Facility	52,091	52,091
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton, California	Raw Water Pipeline Pendleton to Fallbrook	44,540	0
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton, California	Pendleton Ops Center	0	25,000
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	Coastal Campus Utilities	4,856	4,856
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	F-35C Hangar Modernization and Addition	56,497	56,497
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	F-35C Training Facilities	8,187	8,187
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Lemoore	RTO and Mission Debrief Facility	7,146	7,146
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Miramar	KC-130J Enlisted Air Crew Trainer	0	11,200
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Point Mugu	E-2C/D Hangar Additions and Renovations	19,453	19,453
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Point Mugu	Triton Avionics and Fuel Systems Trainer	2,974	2,974
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	San Diego	LCS Support Facility	37,366	37,366
MIL CON, NAVY	CALIFORNIA	Twentynine Palms, California	Microgrid Expansion	9,160	9,160
MIL CON, NAVY	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	Fleet Support Facility Addition	8,455	8,455
MIL CON, NAVY	FLORIDA	Jacksonville	Triton Mission Control Facility	8,296	8,296
MIL CON, NAVY	FLORIDA	Mayport	LCS Mission Module Readiness Center	16,159	16,159
MIL CON, NAVY	FLORIDA	Pensacola	A-School Unaccompanied Housing (Gorry Station)	18,347	18,347
MIL CON, NAVY	FLORIDA	Whiting Field	T-6B JPATS Training Operations Facility	10,421	10,421
MIL CON, NAVY	GEORGIA	Albany	Ground Source Heat Pumps	7,851	7,851
MIL CON, NAVY	GEORGIA	Kings Bay	Industrial Control System Infrastructure	8,099	8,099
MIL CON, NAVY	GEORGIA	Townsend	Townsend Bombing Range Expansion Phase 2	48,279	-5,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MIL CON, NAVY	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Live-Fire Training Range Complex (NW Field) .....	125,677		125,677
MIL CON, NAVY	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Closure .....	10,777		10,777
MIL CON, NAVY	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	Sanitary Sewer System Recapitalization .....	45,314		45,314
MIL CON, NAVY	HAWAII	Barking Sands	PMRF Power Grid Consolidation .....	30,623		30,623
MIL CON, NAVY	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor- Hickam	UEM Interconnect Sta C to Hickam .....	6,335		6,335
MIL CON, NAVY	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor- Hickam	Welding School Shop Consolidation .....	8,546		8,546
MIL CON, NAVY	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Airfield Lighting Modernization .....	26,097		26,097
MIL CON, NAVY	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Bachelor Enlisted Quarters .....	68,092		68,092
MIL CON, NAVY	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	P-8A Detachment Support Facilities .....	12,429		12,429
MIL CON, NAVY	HAWAII	MCB Hawaii	LHD Pad Conversions MW22 Landing Pads .....	0	12,800	12,800
MIL CON, NAVY	ITALY	Sigonella	P-8A Hangar and Fleet Support Facility .....	62,302		62,302
MIL CON, NAVY	ITALY	Sigonella	Triton Hangar and Operation Facility .....	40,641		40,641
MIL CON, NAVY	JAPAN	Camp Butler	Military Working Dog Facilities (Camp Hansen) .....	11,697		11,697
MIL CON, NAVY	JAPAN	Iwakuni	E-2D Operational Trainer Complex .....	8,716		8,716
MIL CON, NAVY	JAPAN	Iwakuni	Security Modifications—CWW5/MAG12 HQ .....	9,207		9,207
MIL CON, NAVY	JAPAN	Kadena AB	Aircraft Maint. Shelters & Apron .....	23,310		23,310
MIL CON, NAVY	JAPAN	Yokosuka	Child Development Center .....	13,846		13,846
MIL CON, NAVY	MARYLAND	Patuxent River	Unaccompanied Housing .....	40,935		40,935
MIL CON, NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune	Range Safety Improvements .....	0	19,400	19,400
MIL CON, NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	Simulator Integration/Range Control Facility .....	54,849		54,849
MIL CON, NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Air Field Security Improvements .....	0	23,300	23,300
MIL CON, NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	KC130J Enlisted Air Crew Trainer Facility .....	4,769		4,769



MIL CON, NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station	Unmanned Aircraft System Facilities .....	29,657	29,657
MIL CON, NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	Operational Trainer Facility .....	3,312	3,312
MIL CON, NAVY	NORTH CAROLINA	New River	Radar Air Traffic Control Facility Addition .....	4,918	4,918
MIL CON, NAVY	POLAND	Redzikowo Base	AEGIS Ashore Missile Defense Complex .....	51,270	51,270
MIL CON, NAVY	SOUTH CAROLINA	Parris Island	Range Safety Improvements & Modernization .....	27,075	27,075
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	Maritime Surveillance System Facility .....	23,066	23,066
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	Communications Center .....	75,289	75,289
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	Electrical Repairs to Piers 2,6,7, and 11 .....	44,254	44,254
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Norfolk	MH60 Helicopter Training Facility .....	7,134	7,134
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Portsmouth	Waterfront Utilities .....	45,513	45,513
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Quantico	ATFP Gate .....	5,840	5,840
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Electrical Distribution Upgrade .....	8,418	8,418
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Quantico	Embassy Security Guard BEQ & Ops Facility .....	43,941	43,941
MIL CON, NAVY	VIRGINIA	Quantico	TBS Fire Station Replacement .....	0	17,200
MIL CON, NAVY	WASHINGTON	Bangor	WRA Land/Water Interface .....	34,177	34,177
MIL CON, NAVY	WASHINGTON	Bremerton	Dry Dock 6 Modernization & Utility Improve. ....	22,680	22,680
MIL CON, NAVY	WASHINGTON	Indian Island	Shore Power to Ammunition Pier .....	4,472	4,472
MIL CON, NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	MCON Design Funds .....	91,649	91,649
MIL CON, NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction .....	22,590	22,590
<b>SUBTOTAL, MIL CON, NAVY .....</b>				<b>55,360</b>	<b>1,665,289</b>
<b>MILCON, AIR FORCE</b>					
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	F-35A Flight Sim/Alter Squad Ops/AMU Facility .....	37,000	37,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ALASKA	Eielson AFB	Rpr Central Heat & Power Plant Boiler Ph3 .....	34,400	34,400
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC-130J AGE Covered Storage .....	4,700	4,700

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ARIZONA	Davis-Monthan AFB	HC-130J Wash Rack .....	12,200		12,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	Communications Facility .....	0	21,000	21,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F-35A ADAL Fuel Offload Facility .....	5,000		5,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F-35A Aircraft Maintenance Hangar/Sq 3 .....	13,200		13,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F-35A Bomb Build-Up Facility .....	5,500		5,500
MILCON, AIR FORCE	ARIZONA	Luke AFB	F-35A Sq Ops/AMU/Hangar/Sq 4 .....	33,000		33,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	COLORADO	U.S. Air Force Academy	Front Gates Force Protection Enhancements .....	10,000		10,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	FLORIDA	Cape Canaveral Afs	Range Communications Facility .....	21,000		21,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	FLORIDA	Eglin AFB	F-35A Consolidated HQ Facility .....	8,700		8,700
MILCON, AIR FORCE	FLORIDA	Hurlburt Field	ADAL 39 Information Operations Squad Facility .....	14,200		14,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	GREENLAND	Thule AB	Thule Consolidation Ph 1 .....	41,965		41,965
MILCON, AIR FORCE	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	APR—Dispersed Maint Spares & SE Storage Fac .....	19,000		19,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	APR—Installation Control Center .....	22,200		22,200

MILCON, AIR FORCE	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	APR—South Ramp Utilities Phase 2 .....	7,100		7,100
MILCON, AIR FORCE	GUAM	Joint Region Marianas	PRTC Roads .....	2,500		2,500
MILCON, AIR FORCE	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	F-22 Fighter Alert Facility .....	46,000		46,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	JAPAN	Yokota AB	C-130J Flight Simulator Facility .....	8,461		8,461
MILCON, AIR FORCE	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower .....	0	11,200	11,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	KANSAS	McConnell AFB	KC-46A ADAL Deicing Pads .....	4,300		4,300
MILCON, AIR FORCE	LOUISIANA	Barksdale AFB	Consolidated Communications Facility .....	0	20,000	20,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	CYBERCOM Joint Operations Center, Increment 3 .....	86,000		86,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	MISSOURI	Whiteman AFB	Consolidated Stealth Ops & Nuclear Alert Fac .....	29,500		29,500
MILCON, AIR FORCE	MONTANA	Malmstrom AFB	Tactical Response Force Alert Facility .....	19,700		19,700
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEBRASKA	Offutt AFB	Dormitory (144 RM) .....	21,000		21,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F-35A Airfield Pavements .....	31,000		31,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F-35A Live Ordnance Loading Area .....	34,500		34,500
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	F-35A Munitions Maintenance Facilities .....	3,450		3,450
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	Construct AT/FP Gate—Portales .....	7,800		7,800
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	Marshalling Area ARM/DE-ARM Pad D .....	3,000		3,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEW MEXICO	Holloman AFB	Fixed Ground Control .....	0	3,200	3,200
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEW MEXICO	Kirtland AFB	Space Vehicles Component Development Lab .....	12,800		12,800
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NEW YORK	Fort Drum, New York	ASOS Expansion .....	0	6,000	6,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NIGER	Agadez	Construct Airfield and Base Camp .....	50,000		50,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	NORTH CAROLINA	Seymour Johnson AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower/Base Ops Facility .....	17,100		17,100
MILCON, AIR FORCE	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	Dormitory (120 RM) .....	18,000		18,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	OKLAHOMA	Altus AFB	KC-46A FTU ADAL Fuel Cell Maint Hangar .....	10,400		10,400
MILCON, AIR FORCE	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	Air Traffic Control Tower .....	12,900		12,900
MILCON, AIR FORCE	OKLAHOMA	Tinker AFB	KC-46A Depot Maintenance Dock .....	37,000		37,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	OMAN	Al Musannah AB	Airlift Apron .....	25,000		25,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	SOUTH DAKOTA	Ellsworth AFB	Dormitory (168 RM) .....	23,000		23,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT Classrooms/Dining Facility 3 .....	35,000		35,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	BMT Recruit Dormitory 5 .....	71,000		71,000

MILCON, AIR FORCE	UNITED KINGDOM	Croughton RAF	Consolidated SATCOM/Tech Control Facility .....	36,424	36,424
MILCON, AIR FORCE	UNITED KINGDOM	Croughton RAF	JAC Consolidation—Ph 2 .....	94,191	94,191
MILCON, AIR FORCE	UTAH	Hill AFB	F-35A Flight Simulator Addition Phase 2 .....	5,900	5,900
MILCON, AIR FORCE	UTAH	Hill AFB	F-35A Hangar 40/42 Additions and AMU .....	21,000	21,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	UTAH	Hill AFB	Hayman Igloos .....	11,500	11,500
MILCON, AIR FORCE	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	Long Range Strike Bomber .....	77,130	77,130
MILCON, AIR FORCE	WORLDWIDE CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	Munitions Storage .....	3,000	3,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior Year Unobligated Amounts .....	0	-50,000
MILCON, AIR FORCE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design .....	89,164	89,164
MILCON, AIR FORCE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Military Construction .....	22,900	22,900
MILCON, AIR FORCE	WYOMING	F. E. Warren AFB	Weapon Storage Facility .....	95,000	95,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, MILCON, AIR FORCE .....</b>				<b>1,354,785</b>	<b>1,366,185</b>
<b>MILCON, DEF-WIDE</b>					
MILCON, DEF-WIDE	ALABAMA	Fort Rucker	Fort Rucker ES/PS Consolidation/Replacement .....	46,787	46,787
MILCON, DEF-WIDE	ALABAMA	Maxwell AFB	Maxwell ES/MS Replacement/Renovation .....	32,968	32,968
MILCON, DEF-WIDE	ARIZONA	Fort Huachuca	JTC Buildings 52101/52111 Renovations .....	3,884	3,884

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton, Cali- fornia	SOF Combat Service Support Facility .....	10,181		10,181
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	CALIFORNIA	Camp Pendleton, Cali- fornia	SOF Performance Resiliency Center-West .....	10,371		10,371
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	CALIFORNIA	Coronado	SOF Logistics Support Unit One Ops Fac. #2 .....	47,218		47,218
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	CALIFORNIA	Fresno Yosemite IAP ANG	Replace Fuel Storage and Distrib. Facilities .....	10,700		10,700
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	COLORADO	Fort Carson, Colorado	SOF Language Training Facility .....	8,243		8,243
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	CONUS CLASSIFIED	Classified Location	Operations Support Facility .....	20,065		20,065
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	DELAWARE	Dover AFB	Construct Hydrant Fuel System .....	21,600		21,600
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	DJIBOUTI	Camp Lemonier, Djibouti	Construct Fuel Storage & Distrib. Facilities .....	43,700		43,700
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	FLORIDA	Hurlburt Field	SOF Fuel Cell Maintenance Hangar .....	17,989		17,989
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	FLORIDA	MacDill AFB	SOF Operational Support Facility .....	39,142		39,142
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	GEORGIA	Moody AFB	Replace Pumphouse and Truck Fillstands .....	10,900		10,900
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	GERMANY	Garmisch	Garmisch E/MS-Addition/Modernization .....	14,676		14,676
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	GERMANY	Grafenwoehr	Grafenwoehr Elementary School Replacement .....	38,138		38,138

MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	GERMANY	Rhine Ordnance Barracks	Medical Center Replacement Incr 5 .....	85,034	85,034
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	Construct Fuel Pipeline .....	5,500	5,500
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	GERMANY	Spangdahlem AB	Medical/Dental Clinic Addition .....	34,071	34,071
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	GERMANY	Stuttgart-Patch Barracks	Patch Elementary School Replacement .....	49,413	49,413
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	HAWAII	Kaneohe Bay	Medical/Dental Clinic Replacement .....	122,071	122,071
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	HAWAII	Schofield Barracks	Behavioral Health/Dental Clinic Addition .....	123,838	123,838
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	JAPAN	Kadena AB	Airfield Pavements .....	37,485	37,485
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	KENTUCKY	Fort Campbell, Kentucky	SOF Company HQ/Classrooms .....	12,553	12,553
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	KENTUCKY	Fort Knox	Fort Knox HS Renovation/MS Addition .....	23,279	23,279
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW Campus Feeders Phase 2 .....	33,745	33,745
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	MARYLAND	Fort Meade	NSAW Recapitalize Building #2 Incr 1 .....	34,897	34,897
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NEVADA	Nellis AFB	Replace Hydrant Fuel System .....	39,900	39,900
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	Construct Pumphouse and Fuel Storage .....	20,400	20,400
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF Squadron Operations Facility .....	11,565	11,565
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NEW MEXICO	Cannon AFB	SOF ST Operational Training Facilities .....	13,146	13,146
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NEW YORK	West Point	West Point Elementary School Replacement .....	55,778	55,778

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	SOF Combat Service Support Facility .....	14,036		14,036
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NORTH CAROLINA	Camp Lejeune, North Carolina	SOF Marine Battalion Company/Team Facilities .....	54,970		54,970
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	Butner Elementary School Replacement .....	32,944		32,944
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF 21 STS Operations Facility .....	16,863		16,863
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Battalion Operations Facility .....	38,549		38,549
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Indoor Range .....	8,303		8,303
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Intelligence Training Center .....	28,265		28,265
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	NORTH CAROLINA	Fort Bragg	SOF Special Tactics Facility (PH 2) .....	43,887		43,887
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	OHIO	Wright-Patterson AFB	Satellite Pharmacy Replacement .....	6,623		6,623
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	OREGON	Klamath Falls IAP	Replace Fuel Facilities .....	2,500		2,500
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	PENNSYLVANIA	Philadelphia	Replace Headquarters .....	49,700	-49,700	0
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	POLAND	Redzikowo Base	Aegis Ashore Missile Defense System Complex .....	169,153		169,153
MIL CON, DEF- WIDE	SOUTH CAROLINA	Fort Jackson	Pierce Terrace Elementary School Replacement .....	26,157		26,157



MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	SPAIN	Rota	Rota ES and HS Additions .....	13,737	13,737
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	TEXAS	Fort Bliss	Hospital Replacement Incr 7 .....	239,884	239,884
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Ambulatory Care Center Phase 4 .....	61,776	61,776
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	Construct Visitor Control Center .....	5,000	5,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	VIRGINIA	Fort Belvoir	Replace Ground Vehicle Fueling Facility .....	4,500	4,500
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	VIRGINIA	Joint Base Langley-Eustis	Replace Fuel Pier and Distribution Facility .....	28,000	28,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	VIRGINIA	Joint Expeditionary Base Little Creek—Story	SOF Applied Instruction Facility .....	23,916	23,916
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Contingency Construction .....	10,000	10,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	ECIP Design .....	10,000	10,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Energy Conservation Investment Program .....	150,000	150,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Exercise Related Minor Construction .....	8,687	8,687
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design .....	118,632	118,632
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction .....	23,676	23,676
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Prior year savings, including rescoped medical facility at Fort Knox.	0	-120,000
MIL CON, DEF-WIDE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning & Design .....	31,772	31,772
<b>SUBTOTAL, MIL CON, DEF-WIDE .....</b>				<b>2,300,767</b>	<b>-169,700</b>
					<b>2,131,067</b>

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>MILCON, ARNG</b>						
MILCON, ARNG	ALABAMA	Camp Foley	Vehicle Maintenance Shop .....	0	4,500	4,500
MILCON, ARNG	CONNECTICUT	Camp Hartell	Ready Building (CST-WMD) .....	11,000		11,000
MILCON, ARNG	DELAWARE	Dagsboro	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop .....	10,800		10,800
MILCON, ARNG	FLORIDA	Palm Coast	National Guard Readiness Center .....	18,000		18,000
MILCON, ARNG	GEORGIA	Fort Stewart	Tactical Aerial Unmanned Systems .....	0	6,800	6,800
MILCON, ARNG	ILLINOIS	Sparta	Basic 10M-25M Firing Range (Zero) .....	1,900		1,900
MILCON, ARNG	KANSAS	Salina	Automated Combat Pistol/MP Firearms Qual Cour .....	2,400		2,400
MILCON, ARNG	KANSAS	Salina	Modified Record Fire Range .....	4,300		4,300
MILCON, ARNG	MARYLAND	Easton	National Guard Readiness Center .....	13,800		13,800
MILCON, ARNG	MISSISSIPPI	Gulfport	Aviation Classification and Repair .....	0	40,000	40,000
MILCON, ARNG	NEVADA	Reno	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop Add/A .....	8,000		8,000
MILCON, ARNG	OHIO	Camp Ravenna	Modified Record Fire Range .....	3,300		3,300
MILCON, ARNG	OREGON	Salem	National Guard/Reserve Center Bldg Add/Alt (J) .....	16,500		16,500
MILCON, ARNG	PENNSYLVANIA	Fort Indiantown Gap	Training Aids Center .....	16,000		16,000
MILCON, ARNG	VERMONT	North Hyde Park	National Guard Vehicle Maintenance Shop Addit .....	7,900		7,900
MILCON, ARNG	VIRGINIA	Richmond	National Guard/Reserve Center Building (JFHQ) .....	29,000		29,000
MILCON, ARNG	WASHINGTON	Yakima	Enlisted Barracks, Transient Training .....	19,000		19,000
MILCON, ARNG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Planning and Design .....	20,337		20,337
MILCON, ARNG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Unspecified Minor Construction .....	15,000		15,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, MILCON, ARNG</b>				<b>197,237</b>	<b>51,300</b>	<b>248,537</b>
<b>MILCON, ANG</b>						
MILCON, ANG	ALABAMA	Dannelly Field	TFI—Replace Squadron Operations Facility .....	7,600		7,600
MILCON, ANG	CALIFORNIA	Moffett Field	Replace Vehicle Maintenance Facility .....	6,500		6,500

48  
88

MILCON, ANG	COLORADO	Buckley Air Force Base	ASE Maintenance and Storage Facility .....	5,100		5,100
MILCON, ANG	CONNECTICUT	Bradley	Ops and Deployment Facility .....	0	6,300	6,300
MILCON, ANG	FLORIDA	Cape Canaveral Afs	Space Control Facility .....	0	6,100	6,100
MILCON, ANG	GEORGIA	Savannah/Hilton Head IAP	C-130 Squadron Operations Facility .....	9,000		9,000
MILCON, ANG	HAWAII	Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam	F-22 Composite Repair Facility .....	0	9,700	9,700
MILCON, ANG	IOWA	Des Moines Map	Air Operations Grp/CYBER Beddown-Reno Bldg 430 .....	6,700		6,700
MILCON, ANG	KANSAS	Smokey Hill ANG Range	Range Training Support Facilities .....	2,900		2,900
MILCON, ANG	LOUISIANA	New Orleans	Replace Squadron Operations Facility .....	10,000		10,000
MILCON, ANG	MAINE	Bangor IAP	Add to and Alter Fire Crash/Rescue Station .....	7,200		7,200
MILCON, ANG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	Bldg Mo KC-46 Fuselage Trainer .....	0	1,500	1,500
MILCON, ANG	NEW HAMPSHIRE	Pease International Trade Port	KC-46A ADAL Flight Simulator Bldg 156 .....	2,800		2,800
MILCON, ANG	NEW JERSEY	Atlantic City IAP	Fuel Cell and Corrosion Control Hangar .....	10,200		10,200
MILCON, ANG	NEW YORK	Niagara Falls IAP	Remotely Piloted Aircraft Beddown Bldg 912 .....	7,700		7,700
MILCON, ANG	NORTH CAROLINA	Charlotte/Douglas IAP	Replace C-130 Squadron Operations Facility .....	9,000		9,000
MILCON, ANG	NORTH DAKOTA	Hector IAP	Intel Targeting Facilities .....	7,300		7,300
MILCON, ANG	OKLAHOMA	Will Rogers World Airport	Medium Altitude Manned ISR Beddown .....	7,600		7,600
MILCON, ANG	OREGON	Klamath Falls IAP	Replace Fire Crash/Rescue Station .....	7,200		7,200
MILCON, ANG	WEST VIRGINIA	Yeager Airport	Force Protection—Relocate Coonskin Road .....	3,900		3,900
MILCON, ANG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design .....	5,104		5,104
MILCON, ANG	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Construction .....	7,734		7,734
<b>SUBTOTAL, MILCON, ANG</b> .....				<b>123,538</b>	<b>23,600</b>	<b>147,138</b>
<b>MILCON, ARMY R</b>						
MILCON, ARMY R	CALIFORNIA	Miramar	Army Reserve Center .....	24,000		24,000
MILCON, ARMY R	FLORIDA	MacDill AFB	AR Center/AS Facility .....	55,000		55,000

SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
MILCON, ARMY R	MISSISSIPPI	Starkville	Army Reserve Center .....	9,300		9,300
MILCON, ARMY R	NEW YORK	Orangeburg	Organizational Maintenance Shop .....	4,200		4,200
MILCON, ARMY R	PENNSYLVANIA	Conneaut Lake	DAR Highway Improvement .....	5,000		5,000
MILCON, ARMY R	PUERTO RICO	Fort Buchanan	Access Control Point .....	0	10,200	10,200
MILCON, ARMY R	VIRGINIA	Fort AP Hill	Equipment Concentration .....	0	24,000	24,000
MILCON, ARMY R	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Planning and Design .....	9,318		9,318
MILCON, ARMY R	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Unspecified Minor Construction .....	6,777		6,777
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MILCON, ARMY R</b>			<b>113,595</b>	<b>34,200</b>	<b>147,795</b>
<b>MIL CON, NAVY RES</b>						
MIL CON, NAVY RES	NEVADA	Fallon	NAVOPSTCEN Fallon .....	11,480		11,480
MIL CON, NAVY RES	NEW YORK	Brooklyn	Reserve Center Storage Facility .....	2,479		2,479
MIL CON, NAVY RES	VIRGINIA	Dam Neck	Reserve Training Center Complex .....	18,443		18,443
MIL CON, NAVY RES	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	MCNR Planning & Design .....	2,208		2,208
MIL CON, NAVY RES	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	MCNR Unspecified Minor Construction .....	1,468		1,468

<b>SUBTOTAL, MIL CON, NAVY RES</b> .....			<b>36,078</b>				<b>36,078</b>
<b>MILCON, AF RES</b>							
MILCON, AF RES	CALIFORNIA	March AFB	Satellite Fire Station .....	4,600			4,600
MILCON, AF RES	FLORIDA	Patrick AFB	Aircrew Life Support Facility .....	3,400			3,400
MILCON, AF RES	GEORGIA	Dobbins	Fire Station/Security Complex .....	0	10,400		10,400
MILCON, AF RES	OHIO	Youngstown	Indoor Firing Range .....	9,400			9,400
MILCON, AF RES	TEXAS	Joint Base San Antonio	Consolidate 433 Medical Facility .....	9,900			9,900
MILCON, AF RES	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Planning and Design .....	13,400			13,400
MILCON, AF RES	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Various Worldwide Locations	Unspecified Minor Military Construction .....	6,121			6,121
<b>SUBTOTAL, MILCON, AF RES</b> .....				<b>46,821</b>	<b>10,400</b>		<b>57,221</b>
<b>NATO SEC INV PRGM</b>							
NATO SEC INV PRGM	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	NATO Security Investment Program	NATO Security Investment Program .....	120,000			120,000
<b>SUBTOTAL, NATO SEC INV PRGM</b> .....				<b>120,000</b>			<b>120,000</b>
<b>TOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION</b> .....				<b>6,641,995</b>	<b>-940</b>		<b>6,641,055</b>
<b>FAMILY HOUSING</b>							
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	FLORIDA	Camp Rudder	Family Housing Replacement Construction .....	8,000			8,000
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	GERMANY	Wiesbaden Army Airfield	Family Housing Improvements .....	3,500			3,500

SEC. 4601, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION (In Thousands of Dollars)						
Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	ILLINOIS	Rock Island	Family Housing Replacement Construction .....	20,000		20,000
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	KOREA	Camp Walker	Family Housing New Construction .....	61,000		61,000
FAM HSG CON, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Family Housing P & D .....	7,195		7,195
<b>SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG CON, ARMY</b>				<b>99,695</b>		<b>99,695</b>
<b>FAM HSG O&amp;M, ARMY</b>						
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Furnishings .....	25,552		25,552
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Leased Housing .....	144,879		144,879
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Maintenance of Real Property Facilities .....	75,197		75,197
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Management Account .....	48,515		48,515
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Military Housing Privatization Initiative .....	22,000		22,000
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Miscellaneous .....	840		840
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Services .....	10,928		10,928
FAM HSG O&M, ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Utilities .....	65,600		65,600
<b>SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG O&amp;M, ARMY</b>				<b>393,511</b>		<b>393,511</b>

<b>FAM HSG CON, N/MC</b>						
FAM HSG CON, N/MC	VIRGINIA	Wallops Island	Construct Housing Welcome Center	438	438	
FAM HSG CON, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Design	4,588	4,588	
FAM HSG CON, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Improvements	11,515	11,515	
<b>SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG CON, N/MC</b>				<b>16,541</b>	<b>16,541</b>	
<b>FAM HSG O&amp;M, N/MC</b>						
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Furnishings Account	17,534	17,534	
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Leasing	64,108	64,108	
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Maintenance of Real Property	99,323	99,323	493
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Management Account	56,189	56,189	
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Miscellaneous Account	373	373	
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Privatization Support Costs	28,668	28,668	
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Services Account	19,149	19,149	
FAM HSG O&M, N/MC	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Utilities Account	67,692	67,692	
<b>SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG O&amp;M, N/MC</b>				<b>353,036</b>	<b>353,036</b>	
<b>FAM HSG CON, AF</b>						
FAM HSG CON, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Locations	Improvements	150,649	150,649	

**SEC. 4601. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
FAM HSG CON, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Planning and Design .....	9,849		9,849
<b>SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG CON, AF</b>				<b>160,498</b>		<b>160,498</b>
<b>FAM HSG O&amp;M, AF</b>						
FAM HSG O&M, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Furnishings Account .....	38,746		38,746
FAM HSG O&M, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Housing Privatization .....	41,554		41,554
FAM HSG O&M, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Leasing .....	28,867		28,867
FAM HSG O&M, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Maintenance .....	114,129		114,129
FAM HSG O&M, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Management Account .....	52,153		52,153
FAM HSG O&M, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Miscellaneous Account .....	2,032		2,032
FAM HSG O&M, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Services Account .....	12,940		12,940
FAM HSG O&M, AF	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Utilities Account .....	40,811		40,811
<b>SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG O&amp;M, AF</b>				<b>331,232</b>		<b>331,232</b>
<b>FAM HSG O&amp;M, DW</b>						
FAM HSG O&M, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Furnishings Account .....	4,203		4,203



FAM HSG O&M, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Leasing	51,952	51,952
FAM HSG O&M, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Maintenance of Real Property	1,448	1,448
FAM HSG O&M, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Management Account	388	388
FAM HSG O&M, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Services Account	31	31
FAM HSG O&M, DW	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	Utilities Account	646	646
	<b>SUBTOTAL, FAM HSG O&amp;M, DW</b>			<b>58,668</b>	<b>58,668</b>
	<b>TOTAL FAMILY HOUSING</b>			<b>1,413,181</b>	<b>1,413,181</b>
<b>DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE</b>					
<b>DOD BRAC—ARMY</b>					<b>495</b>
DOD BRAC— ARMY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Clo- sure, Army	Base Realignment and Closure	29,691	29,691
	<b>SUBTOTAL, DOD BRAC—ARMY</b>			<b>29,691</b>	<b>29,691</b>
<b>DOD BRAC—NAVY</b>					
DOD BRAC— NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Base Realignment & Clo- sure, Navy	Base Realignment & Closure	118,906	118,906
DOD BRAC— NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	DON-100: Planning, Design and Management	7,787	7,787
DOD BRAC— NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	DON-101: Various Locations	20,871	20,871
DOD BRAC— NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	DON-138: NAS Brunswick, ME	803	803
DOD BRAC— NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	DON-157: MCSA Kansas City, MO	41	41

**SEC. 4601, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Account	State/ Country	Installation	Project Title	Budget Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
DOD BRAC— NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	DON-172: NWS Seal Beach, Concord, CA .....	4,872		4,872
DOD BRAC— NAVY	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	DON-84: JRB Willow Grove & Cambria Reg AP .....	3,808		3,808
	<b>SUBTOTAL, DOD BRAC—NAVY</b> .....			<b>157,088</b>		<b>157,088</b>
<b>DOD BRAC—AIR FORCE</b>						
DOD BRAC— AIR FORCE	WORLDWIDE UNSPECIFIED	Unspecified Worldwide Lo- cations	DoD BRAC Activities—Air Force .....	64,555		64,555
	<b>SUBTOTAL, DOD BRAC—AIR FORCE</b> .....			<b>64,555</b>		<b>64,555</b>
	<b>TOTAL DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE</b> .....			<b>251,334</b>		<b>251,334</b>
	<b>TOTAL MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, FAMILY HOUSING, AND BRAC</b> .....			<b>8,306,510</b>	<b>-940</b>	<b>8,305,570</b>

**TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY  
NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**

# TITLE XLVII—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

## SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS.

### SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS (In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>Discretionary Summary By Appropriation</b>			
<b>Energy And Water Development, And Related Agencies</b>			
<b>Appropriation Summary:</b>			
<b>Energy Programs</b>			
Nuclear Energy .....	135,161		135,161
<b>Atomic Energy Defense Activities</b>			
<b>National nuclear security administration:</b>			
Weapons activities .....	8,846,948	180,000	9,026,948
Defense nuclear nonproliferation .....	1,940,302	5,000	1,945,302
Naval reactors .....	1,375,496	0	1,375,496
Federal salaries and expenses .....	402,654	0	402,654
<b>Total, National nuclear security administration .....</b>	<b>12,565,400</b>	<b>185,000</b>	<b>12,750,400</b>
<b>Environmental and other defense activities:</b>			
Defense environmental cleanup .....	5,527,347	-451,797	5,075,550
Other defense activities .....	774,425	0	774,425
<b>Total, Environmental &amp; other defense activities .....</b>	<b>6,301,772</b>	<b>-451,797</b>	<b>5,849,975</b>
<b>Total, Atomic Energy Defense Activities .....</b>	<b>18,867,172</b>	<b>-266,797</b>	<b>18,600,375</b>

<b>Total, Discretionary Funding</b> .....	<b>19,002,333</b>	<b>-266,797</b>	<b>18,735,536</b>
<b>Nuclear Energy</b>			
Idaho sitewide safeguards and security .....	126,161		126,161
Used nuclear fuel disposition .....	9,000		9,000
<b>Total, Nuclear Energy</b> .....	<b>135,161</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>135,161</b>
<b>Weapons Activities</b>			
<b>Directed stockpile work</b>			
<b>Life extension programs</b>			
B61 Life extension program .....	643,300		643,300
W76 Life extension program .....	244,019		244,019
W88 Alt 370 .....	220,176		220,176
W80-4 Life extension program .....	195,037		195,037
<b>Total, Life extension programs</b> .....	<b>1,302,532</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,302,532</b>
<b>Stockpile systems</b>			
B61 Stockpile systems .....	52,247		52,247
W76 Stockpile systems .....	50,921		50,921
W78 Stockpile systems .....	64,092		64,092
W80 Stockpile systems .....	68,005		68,005
B83 Stockpile systems .....	42,177		42,177
W87 Stockpile systems .....	89,299		89,299
W88 Stockpile systems .....	115,685		115,685
<b>Total, Stockpile systems</b> .....	<b>482,426</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>482,426</b>
<b>Weapons dismantlement and disposition</b>			
Operations and maintenance .....	48,049		48,049
<b>Stockpile services</b>			
Production support .....	447,527		447,527

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Research and development support .....	34,159		34,159
R&D certification and safety .....	192,613		192,613
Management, technology, and production .....	264,994		264,994
<b>Total, Stockpile services .....</b>	<b>939,293</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>939,293</b>
<b>Nuclear material commodities</b>			
Uranium sustainment .....	32,916		32,916
Plutonium sustainment .....	174,698		174,698
Tritium sustainment .....	107,345		107,345
Domestic uranium enrichment .....	100,000		100,000
<b>Total, Nuclear material commodities .....</b>	<b>414,959</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>414,959</b>
<b>Total, Directed stockpile work .....</b>	<b>3,187,259</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,187,259</b>
<b>Research, development, test and evaluation (RD&amp;E)</b>			
<b>Science</b>			
Advanced certification .....	50,714		50,714
Primary assessment technologies .....	98,500		98,500
Dynamic materials properties .....	109,000		109,000
Advanced radiography .....	47,000		47,000
Secondary assessment technologies .....	84,400		84,400
<b>Total, Science .....</b>	<b>389,614</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>389,614</b>
<b>Engineering</b>			
Enhanced surety .....	50,821		50,821
Weapon systems engineering assessment technology .....	17,371		17,371
Nuclear survivability .....	24,461		24,461
Enhanced surveillance .....	38,724	10,000	48,724

Program increase .....			
<b>Total, Engineering</b> .....	131,377	[10,000] 10,000	141,377
<b>Inertial confinement fusion ignition and high yield</b>			
Ignition .....	73,334		73,334
Support of other stockpile programs .....	22,843		22,843
Diagnostics, cryogenics and experimental support .....	58,587		58,587
Pulsed power inertial confinement fusion .....	4,963		4,963
Joint program in high energy density laboratory plasmas .....	8,900		8,900
Facility operations and target production .....	333,823		333,823
Undistributed .....	0		0
<b>Total, Inertial confinement fusion and high yield</b> .....	<b>502,450</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>502,450</b>
Advanced simulation and computing .....	623,006		623,006
Response Capabilities Program .....	0	20,000	20,000
Supports flexible design capability for national labs .....		[20,000]	
Nonnuclear Readiness Campaign .....	0		0
<b>Advanced manufacturing</b>			
Additive manufacturing .....	0		0
Component manufacturing development .....	112,256		112,256
Processing technology development .....	17,800		17,800
<b>Total, Advanced manufacturing</b> .....	<b>130,056</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>130,056</b>
<b>Total, RDT&amp;E</b> .....	<b>1,776,503</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>1,806,503</b>
<b>Readiness in technical base and facilities (RTBF)</b>			
<b>Operating</b>			
Program readiness .....	75,185		75,185
Material recycle and recovery .....	173,859		173,859
Containers .....	0		0

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Storage .....	40,920		40,920
Maintenance and repair of facilities .....	0		0
Recapitalization .....	104,327		104,327
<b>Total, Operating .....</b>	<b>394,291</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>394,291</b>
<b>Construction:</b>			
Albuquerque Complex upgrades project .....	0		0
15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12 .....	0		0
15-D-612 Emergency Operations Center, LLNL .....	0		0
15-D-611 Emergency Operations Center, SNL .....	0		0
15-D-301 HE Science & Engineering Facility, PX .....	0		0
15-D-302, TA-55 Reinvestment project, Phase 3, LANL .....	18,195		18,195
12-D-301 TRU waste facilities, LANL .....	0		0
11-D-801 TA-55 Reinvestment project Phase 2, LANL .....	3,903		3,903
07-D-220 Radioactive liquid waste treatment facility upgrade project, LANL .....	11,533		11,533
07-D-220-04 Transuranic liquid waste facility, LANL .....	40,949		40,949
06-D-141 PED/Construction, Uranium Capabilities Replacement Project Y-12 .....	430,000		430,000
04-D-125 Chemistry and metallurgy replacement project, LANL .....	155,610		155,610
<b>Total, Construction .....</b>	<b>660,190</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>660,190</b>
<b>Total, Readiness in technical base and facilities .....</b>	<b>1,054,481</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,054,481</b>
<b>Secure transportation asset</b>			
Operations and equipment .....	146,272		146,272
Program direction .....	105,338		105,338
<b>Total, Secure transportation asset .....</b>	<b>251,610</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>251,610</b>
Nuclear counterterrorism incident response .....	0		0



Counterterrorism and Counterproliferation Programs .....	0	0
<b>Infrastructure and safety</b>		
<b>Operations of facilities</b>		
Kansas City Plant .....	100,250	100,250
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory .....	70,671	70,671
Los Alamos National Laboratory .....	196,460	196,460
Nevada National Security Site .....	89,000	89,000
Pantex .....	58,021	58,021
Sandia National Laboratory .....	115,300	115,300
Savannah River Site .....	80,463	80,463
Y-12 National security complex .....	120,625	120,625
<b>Total, Operations of facilities</b> .....	<b>830,790</b>	<b>830,790</b>
Safety operations .....	107,701	107,701
Maintenance .....	227,000	227,000
Recapitalization .....	257,724	407,724
Increase to support deferred maintenance .....	150,000	150,000
[150,000]		
<b>Construction:</b>		
16-D-621 Substation replacement at TA-3, LANL .....	25,000	25,000
15-D-613 Emergency Operations Center, Y-12 .....	17,919	17,919
<b>Total, Construction</b> .....	<b>42,919</b>	<b>42,919</b>
<b>Total, Infrastructure and safety</b> .....	<b>1,466,134</b>	<b>1,616,134</b>
<b>Site stewardship</b>		
Environmental projects and operations .....	0	0
Nuclear materials integration .....	17,510	17,510
Minority serving institution partnerships program .....	19,085	19,085
<b>Total, Site stewardship</b> .....	<b>36,595</b>	<b>36,595</b>
<b>Defense nuclear security</b>		

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Operations and maintenance .....	619,891		619,891
<b>Construction:</b>			
14-D-710 Device assembly facility argus installation project, NW .....	13,000		13,000
<b>Total, Defense nuclear security .....</b>	<b>632,891</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>632,891</b>
Information technology and cybersecurity .....	157,588		157,588
Legacy contractor pensions .....	283,887		283,887
Domestic uranium enrichment .....	0		0
<b>Total, Weapons Activities .....</b>	<b>8,846,948</b>	<b>180,000</b>	<b>9,026,948</b>
<b>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b>			
<b>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs</b>			
Global threat reduction initiative .....	0		0
<b>Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&amp;D</b>			
Global material security .....	426,751		426,751
Material management and minimization .....	311,584		311,584
Nonproliferation and arms control .....	126,703		126,703
Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation R&D .....	419,333		419,333
<b>Nonproliferation Construction:</b>			
99-D-143 Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility, SRS .....	345,000		345,000
Analysis of Alternatives .....	0	5,000	5,000
Assess alternatives to MOX .....		[5,000]	

<b>Total, Nonproliferation construction</b> .....	<b>345,000</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>350,000</b>
<b>Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Programs</b> .....	<b>1,629,371</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>1,634,371</b>
Legacy contractor pensions .....	94,617		94,617
Nuclear counterterrorism and incident response program .....	234,390		234,390
Use of prior-year balances .....	-18,076		-18,076
<b>Subtotal, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b> .....	<b>1,940,302</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>1,945,302</b>
Rescission .....	0		0
<b>Total, Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation</b> .....	<b>1,940,302</b>	<b>5,000</b>	<b>1,945,302</b>
<b>Naval Reactors</b>			
Naval reactors operations and infrastructure .....	445,196		445,196
Naval reactors development .....	444,400		444,400
Ohio replacement reactor systems development .....	186,800		186,800
S8G Prototype refueling .....	133,000		133,000
Program direction .....	45,000		45,000
<b>Construction:</b>			
15-D-904 NRF Overpack Storage Expansion 3 .....	900		900
15-D-903 KL Fire System Upgrade .....	600		600
15-D-902 KS Engineer room team trainer facility .....	3,100		3,100
14-D-902 KL Materials characterization laboratory expansion, KAPL .....	30,000		30,000
14-D-901 Spent fuel handling recapitalization project, NRF .....	86,000		86,000
10-D-903, Security upgrades, KAPL .....	500		500
<b>Total, Construction</b> .....	<b>121,100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>121,100</b>
<b>Total, Naval Reactors</b> .....	<b>1,375,496</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,375,496</b>

**Federal Salaries And Expenses**

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Program direction .....	402,654		402,654
<b>Total, Office Of The Administrator .....</b>	<b>402,654</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>402,654</b>
<b>Defense Environmental Cleanup</b>			
<b>Closure sites:</b>			
Closure sites administration .....	4,889		4,889
<b>Hanford site:</b>			
<b>River corridor and other cleanup operations:</b>			
River corridor and other cleanup operations .....	196,957		196,957
<b>Central plateau remediation:</b>			
Central plateau remediation .....	555,163		555,163
Richland community and regulatory support .....	14,701		14,701
<b>Construction:</b>			
15-D-401 Containerized sludge removal annex, RL .....	77,016		77,016
<b>Total, Hanford site .....</b>	<b>843,837</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>843,837</b>
<b>Idaho National Laboratory:</b>			
Idaho cleanup and waste disposition .....	357,783		357,783
Idaho community and regulatory support .....	3,000		3,000
<b>Total, Idaho National Laboratory .....</b>	<b>360,783</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>360,783</b>
<b>MNSA sites</b>			
Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory .....	1,366		1,366
Nevada .....	62,385		62,385

Sandia National Laboratories .....	2,500		2,500
Los Alamos National Laboratory .....	188,625	20,000	208,625
Accelerate cleanup of transuranic waste .....		[20,000]	
<b>Construction:</b>			
15-D-406 Hexavalent chromium D & D (VI-LanI-0030) .....	0		
<b>Total, NNSA sites and Nevada off-sites .....</b>	<b>254,876</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>274,876</b>
<b>Oak Ridge Reservation:</b>			
<b>OR Nuclear facility D &amp; D</b>			
OR Nuclear facility D & D .....	75,958		75,958
<b>Construction:</b>			
14-D-403 Outfall 200 Mercury Treatment Facility .....	6,800		6,800
<b>Total, OR Nuclear facility D &amp; D .....</b>	<b>82,758</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>82,758</b>
U233 Disposition Program .....	26,895		26,895
<b>OR cleanup and disposition:</b>			
OR cleanup and disposition .....	60,500		60,500
<b>Construction:</b>			
15-D-405—Sludge Buildout .....	0		0
<b>Total, OR cleanup and disposition .....</b>	<b>60,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>60,500</b>
OR reservation community and regulatory support .....	4,400		4,400
<b>Solid waste stabilization and disposition</b>			
Oak Ridge technology development .....	2,800		2,800
<b>Total, Oak Ridge Reservation .....</b>	<b>177,353</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>177,353</b>
<b>Office of River Protection:</b>			
<b>Waste treatment and immobilization plant</b>			
01-D-416 A-D/ORP-0060 / Major construction .....	595,000		595,000
01-D-16E Pretreatment facility .....	95,000		95,000
<b>Total, Waste treatment and immobilization plant .....</b>	<b>690,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>690,000</b>

**SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS**  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
<b>Tank farm activities</b>			
Rad liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition .....	649,000		649,000
<b>Construction:</b>			
15-D-409 Low Activity Waste Pretreatment System, Hanford .....	75,000		75,000
<b>Total, Tank farm activities</b> .....	<b>724,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>724,000</b>
<b>Total, Office of River protection</b> .....	<b>1,414,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,414,000</b>
<b>Savannah River sites:</b>			
Savannah River risk management operations .....	386,652		386,652
SR community and regulatory support .....	11,249		11,249
<b>Radioactive liquid tank waste:</b>			
Radioactive liquid tank waste stabilization and disposition .....	581,878		581,878
<b>Construction:</b>			
15-D-402—Saltstone Disposal Unit #6 .....	34,642		34,642
05-D-405 Salt waste processing facility, Savannah River .....	194,000		194,000
<b>Total, Construction</b> .....	<b>228,642</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>228,642</b>
<b>Total, Radioactive liquid tank waste</b> .....	<b>810,520</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>810,520</b>
<b>Total, Savannah River site</b> .....	<b>1,208,421</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,208,421</b>
<b>Waste Isolation Pilot Plant</b>			
Waste isolation pilot plant .....	212,600		212,600
<b>Construction:</b>			
15-D-411 Safety significant confinement ventilation system, WIPP .....	23,218		23,218
15-D-412 Exhaust shaft, WIPP .....	7,500		7,500
<b>Total, Construction</b> .....	<b>30,718</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30,718</b>

<b>Total, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant</b> .....	<b>243,318</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>243,318</b>
Program direction .....	281,951		281,951
Program support .....	14,979		14,979
<b>Safeguards and Security:</b>			
Oak Ridge Reservation .....	17,228		17,228
Paducah .....	8,216		8,216
Portsmouth .....	8,492		8,492
Richland/Hanford Site .....	67,601		67,601
Savannah River Site .....	128,345		128,345
Waste Isolation Pilot Project .....	4,860		4,860
West Valley .....	1,891		1,891
Technology development .....	14,510		14,510
Use of prior-year balances .....	0		0
<b>Subtotal, Defense environmental cleanup</b> .....	<b>5,055,550</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>5,075,550</b>
Uranium enrichment D&D fund contribution .....	471,797	-471,797	0
Requires industry match authorization that will not be forthcoming .....		[-471,797]	
<b>Total, Defense Environmental Cleanup</b> .....	<b>5,527,347</b>	<b>-451,797</b>	<b>5,075,550</b>
<b>Other Defense Activities</b>			
Specialized security activities .....	221,855		221,855
<b>Environment, health, safety and security</b>			
Environment, health, safety and security .....	120,693		120,693
Program direction .....	63,105		63,105
<b>Total, Environment, Health, safety and security</b> .....	<b>183,798</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>183,798</b>
<b>Enterprise assessments</b>			

SEC. 4701. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS  
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Program	FY 2016 Request	Senate Change	Senate Authorized
Enterprise assessments .....	24,068		24,068
Program direction .....	49,466		49,466
<b>Total, Enterprise assessments .....</b>	<b>73,534</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>73,534</b>
<b>Office of Legacy Management</b>			
Legacy management .....	154,080		154,080
Program direction .....	13,100		13,100
<b>Total, Office of Legacy Management .....</b>	<b>167,180</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>167,180</b>
<b>Defense-related activities</b>			
<b>Defense related administrative support</b>			
Chief financial officer .....	35,758		35,758
Chief information officer .....	83,800		83,800
Management .....	3,000		3,000
<b>Total, Defense related administrative support .....</b>	<b>122,558</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>122,558</b>
Office of hearings and appeals .....	5,500		5,500
<b>Subtotal, Other defense activities .....</b>	<b>774,425</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>774,425</b>
<b>Total, Other Defense Activities .....</b>	<b>774,425</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>774,425</b>



**Department of Energy national security programs (sec. 4701)**

**LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

**Departmental Recommendations**

On April 28, 2015, Senator McCain, with concurrence by Senator Reed, introduced by request the Administration's proposed National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. This bill—S.1118—was introduced for the purpose of placing the Administration's proposals before Congress and the public without expressing the views of Senators McCain or Reed on the substance of those proposals. In accordance with past practice, the committee reported an original bill rather than acting on S.1118.

**Committee Action**

The committee vote to report the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 passed by roll call vote, 22–4, as follows: In favor: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, Cruz, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Kaine, King, and Heinrich. Opposed: Senators Reed, Nelson, Gillibrand, and Hirono.

The other 16 roll call votes on motions and amendments to the bill which were considered during the course of the full committee markup are as follows:

1. MOTION: To conduct full committee markup of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 in closed session because of classified and proprietary information expected to be discussed.

VOTE: Passed by roll call vote 17–9

In favor: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Tillis, Sullivan, Graham, Reed, Nelson, Manchin, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, and King

Opposed: Senators Ayotte, Ernst, Lee, Cruz, McCaskill, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, and Heinrich

2. MOTION: To include a provision for the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to take into account the actual number of members of the Army National Guard in each State when allocating full-time operational support duty personnel.

VOTE: Passed by roll call vote 19–7

In favor: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Tillis, Lee, Graham, Cruz, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Kaine, and King

Opposed: Senators Ernst, Sullivan, Reed, Nelson, Donnelly, Hirono, and Heinrich

3. MOTION: To include a provision that would require the Department of Defense: to provide current and evidence-based standards of care regarding contraception methods and counseling to all health care providers employed by the Department; to ensure service women have access to comprehensive contraception counseling prior to deployment and throughout their military careers; and to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a uniform, standard

curriculum to be used in family planning education programs for all members of the Armed Forces

VOTE: Passed by roll call vote 14–12

In favor: Senators Ayotte, Fischer, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, and Cruz

4. MOTION: Motion to strike a provision that would modify the waiver and exception of section 1608 of the fiscal year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act and replace with a provision that would add a special rule to section 1608 of the fiscal year 2015 National Defense Authorization Act.

VOTE: Passed by roll call vote 15–11

In Favor: Senators McCain, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, Cruz, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, and Blumenthal

Opposed: Senators Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Tillis, Reed, Nelson, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

5. MOTION: To strike the provision in the chairman's mark that would require the Secretary of Defense to certify certain matters before transferring to a foreign country detainees held at Guantanamo Bay.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote 12–14

In favor: Senators Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, and Cruz

6. MOTION: To include a provision that would prohibit the transfer of detainees held at Guantanamo Bay to countries on which the State Department has issued a threat warning.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote 13–13

In favor: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, and Cruz

Opposed: Senators Wicker, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

7. MOTION: To include a provision to prohibit the construction of domestic detention facilities or to transfer detainees held at Guantanamo to the United States until the Secretary of Defense submits a plan and Congress approves the plan.

VOTE: Passed by roll call vote 19–7

In favor: Senators McCain, Wicker, Rounds, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators Inhofe, Sessions, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Ernst, and Cruz

8. MOTION: To include a provision that would prohibit the expenditure of funds in fiscal years 2016 through 2020 to dismantle a nuclear weapon of the United States, unless that nuclear weapon was retired before September 30, 2008, or is being dismantled pursuant to a nuclear arms reduction treaty.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote 13–13

In favor: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, and Cruz  
 Opposed: Senators Tillis, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

9. MOTION: To strike a provision that would amend Section 10106 of title 10, United States Code, by specifying the Army National Guard as the primary combat reserve of the Army.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote 13–13

In favor: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, Cruz, Gillibrand, and Donnelly

Opposed: Senators Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Blumenthal, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

10. MOTION: A provision to eliminate the 4 year, 7.5% per year reduction to HQ and administrative support costs and replace with a 1 year 3.75% reduction and request for a plan for what, if anything, should be done in the out years.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote 10–16

In favor: Senators Reed, Nelson, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, Cruz, McCaskill, and Manchin

11. MOTION: To exempt certain service members from impact of changes proposed to the calculation of the basic allowance for housing.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote 9–17

In favor: Senators Ayotte, Rounds, Cruz, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Kaine, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Hirono, and King.

12. MOTION: To include a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to certify that Congress has received the written MOU between the United States and any country to which a detainee at Guantanamo is transferred and to include a provision to require the Secretary of Defense to report on previous MOUs between the United States and countries to which Guantanamo detainees have been transferred.

VOTE: Passed by roll call vote 17–9

In favor: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, Cruz, McCaskill, Gillibrand, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators Reed, Nelson, Manchin, Shaheen, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, and King.

13. MOTION: To strike a provision requiring a GAO assessment of the potential costs and benefits for privatizing the Department of Defense commissaries and a provision requiring a Department of Defense plan on privatization of the Defense Commissary System and to replace them with a modified provision that would require

a GAO assessment of the potential costs and benefits from privatizing Department of Defense commissaries.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote 11–15

In favor: Senators Inhofe, Sessions, Rounds, Sullivan, Graham, Nelson, Gillibrand, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators McCain, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Ernst, Tillis, Lee, Cruz, Reed, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Blumenthal, and King

14. MOTION: To limit the obligation of \$38 billion of overseas contingency operation funding unless the discretionary caps are increased for defense and non-defense in equal amounts, or an equal amount of emergency funding is provided to non-defense spending.

VOTE: Failed by roll call vote 12–14

In favor: Senators Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, and Cruz

15. MOTION: To transfer up to \$38 billion of overseas contingency operation funding to base budget if an act is passed that increases spending for defense and non-defense in a proportionally equal manner.

VOTE: Passed by roll call vote 23–3

In favor: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Graham, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators Sessions, Lee, and Cruz

16. MOTION: A sense of the Senate that sequestration is a harmful way to budget and that sequestration relief should increase spending for defense and non-defense in equal amounts, and that increase should be offset by changes in mandatory and discretionary spending, and revenues.

VOTE: Passed by roll call vote 16–10

In favor: Senators Ayotte, Rounds, Tillis, Graham, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich

Opposed: Senators McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Ernst, Sullivan, Lee, and Cruz

### **Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate**

It was not possible to include the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate on this legislation because it was not available at the time the report was filed. It will be included in material presented during Senate floor debate on the legislation.

### **Regulatory Impact**

Paragraph 11(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate requires that a report on the regulatory impact of the bill be included in the report on the bill. The committee finds that there is no regulatory impact in the case of the National Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 2016.

**Changes in Existing Law**

Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 12 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the changes in existing law made by certain portions of the bill have not been shown in this section of the report because, in the opinion of the committee, it is necessary to dispense with showing such changes in order to expedite the business of the Senate and reduce the expenditure of funds.

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS

---

### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. REED

This bill includes many provisions which improve our national security and provide the necessary training, equipment and support our men and women in uniform deserve. However, I was ultimately unable to vote for this bill because it continues an unsustainable approach to our national security and economic future that must be addressed.

Our national defense decisions should be based on actual needs, not on arbitrary spending caps or budget gimmicks.

The President's Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request for the defense was \$38 billion above the 2011 Budget Control Act (BCA) spending caps.

The President requested this \$38 billion be authorized and appropriated as part of the annual base budget. The requested also contained \$50.9 billion for overseas contingency operations (OCO) pursuant to the Office of Management and Budget's standards for additional funding. For some time now, the President, Secretary Carter, Secretary Hagel, Secretary Panetta, and Secretary Gates have implored Congress to end the damaging effects of the Budget Control Act's harmful sequester and spending caps.

However, the Chairman's mark, following the lead of the Senate Republican's Budget Resolution, does not clearly address the BCA's destructive impacts. Instead, it turns to a gimmick. This mark transfers \$39.3 billion from the base budget to the OCO budget, for a total of \$90.2 billion in OCO, but a base budget conveniently below BCA levels in order to avoid triggering automatic reductions through sequestration.

This transfer from base to OCO raises several concerns:

First, adding funds to OCO does not solve, and actually complicates, the Department of Defense's (DOD) budgetary problems. Defense budgeting needs to be based on our long-term military strategy, which requires DOD to focus at least five years into the future. A one year plus up to OCO does not provide DOD with the certainty and stability it needs when building its five year budget. As General Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, testified, "we need to fix the base budget . . . we won't have the certainty we need" if there is a year-by-year OCO fix. Defense Secretary Carter added that raising OCO does not allow the Defense Department to plan "efficiently or strategically." This instability undermines the morale of our troops and their families—who want to know their futures are planned for more than one year at a time—and the confidence of our defense industry partners we rely on to provide the best technologies available to our troops.

Second, the transfer does not provide additional funds for the many domestic agencies which are also critical to our national security. We cannot defend our homeland without the FBI, funded through the Department of Justice, or TSA, ICE and the Coast Guard, funded through the Department of Homeland Security. Furthermore, without adequate support for the State Department, danger to our troops increases. As retired Marine Corps General Mattis said, “If you don’t fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition.” In addition, failing to provide BCA cap relief to non-DOD departments and agencies would also short-change veterans who receive employment services, transition assistance, and housing/homeless support.

Third, moving funding from the base budget to OCO has no impact on reducing the deficit. OCO and emergency funding are outside budget caps for a reason—they provide for ongoing military operations or to respond to other unforeseen events like natural disasters. To transfer funds into these accounts to skirt the law is not fiscally responsible or honest accounting.

During the markup, I offered an amendment to address these concerns. My amendment would have fully authorized the President’s Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request, but prohibit the obligation or expenditure of the \$39.3 billion moved to OCO by the Chairman’s mark until BCA caps are raised or eliminated for all agencies, defense and non-defense, or similar emergency funding is also provided for domestic agencies. Unfortunately, my amendment failed on a 14–12 vote.

I commend the leadership of Chairman McCain for completing the markup of this bill. I stand ready to work with my colleagues to find a bipartisan solution to the BCA caps and sequestration which are risking harm to all agencies and functions of our government. Our men and women in uniform and those they protect deserve a resolution to this problem.

JACK REED.

## **ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. INHOFE**

I voted in favor of the Fiscal Year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee. This year's National Defense Authorization Act contains many provisions that will maintain our military's capabilities, restore its readiness, and support our military families. While I have long advocated for an end to sequestration to our national security, the president has not shown a willingness to come to the table with realistic plans to stop his disarming of America. The committee instead moved forward with providing necessary funding by utilizing the overseas contingency operations (OCO) account in order to meet our military's basic readiness needs. While the use of OCO in this manner does not provide a long-term solution to the ongoing defense spending shortfalls, given the growing worldwide threats, it far outweighs the damage that would have been done to our nation's security next year under current budget caps.

### **Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC)**

The committee included a provision that again prevents Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) next year. I support this provision. The United States has reduced force size and capability to unacceptable levels. Our naval fleet is at a historically low level of ships; our Air Force is the smallest in its history; and our Army may shrink to a force not seen since before World War II. We must have the infrastructure to support growing and rebuilding our military to the size and capability required to provide for this nation's security. Additionally, the defense community should not bear the near-term costs of a BRAC round in this tough economic climate for savings that will not be realized for another 20 years.

### **Commissaries**

I disagree with legislation contained in this bill that directs the Department of Defense to privatize military commissaries on a minimum of five major bases and sets into motion the potential for all commissaries to be privatized. This will be done without an assessment, and it ignores recommendations made by the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission in January. The commissary benefit is the most utilized service the military offers its members, and 95 percent of service members and their families use the commissaries for the purchase of household goods in order to achieve needed savings in their family budgets. Before making any changes to military commissaries, Congress must understand the potential impact of these changes, to include privatization, on the overall system and our military. The FY15 NDAA required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a review of the management, food, and pricing options for the commissary system utilizing an independent organization experienced in grocery retail



analysis. The committee expects to receive a report in September 2015. The statute, however, did not require an analysis to determine whether privatization would be a viable option for commissary operations. Congress should consider the information from the Department of Defense report due in September, the recommendations of the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission, the recommendations being prepared by the Department of Defense on the commission's recommendations, and the results of an analysis on privatization before making any changes to the commissary system. To do otherwise, would break faith with our service members and their families.

#### *Guantanamo Bay*

My greatest disappointment in the bill is the inclusion of language that would allow the closure of the detention center at Guantanamo Bay (GTMO), Cuba, and the eventual transfer of GTMO detainees to the United States. Members from many states have voiced concern with housing these terrorists in their states, especially now that ISIL has demonstrated the ability to call up sleeper cells to attack locations here in our country. Furthermore, I disagree with those who think that closing the detention facility at GTMO will end the propaganda campaign being waged by our enemies. The propaganda war will simply shift to whatever facility these terrorists are brought to in the U.S., allowing them to engage in a whole new propaganda campaign against 'GTMO North.' The terrorists created GTMO's image, not actions at GTMO. The attacks leading up to, including on and after 9/11, were not the result of holding detainees at GTMO. Moving these terrorists held at GTMO to the United States will not stop future terrorist attacks against our homeland. We are at war; these are war criminals and need to be handled accordingly. The President continues to want to deal with this threat through law enforcement. Law enforcement alone is not enough to protect us. Furthermore, the risk of a terrorist's release in the U.S., or elsewhere, and the security risk to those living near the location selected to house these terrorists is too great in my opinion.

#### **Military Force Structure**

Finally, I am disappointed we did not prioritize sustaining the size of our military force structure, particularly our Army. The threats we face are outpacing our ability to deter and confront them as a result of the massive cuts associated with sequestration. I believe we are sacrificing too much capability at a time when we should be maintaining our current structure and capabilities in these uncertain times. We have been wrong in the past when it comes to assumptions regarding the size of our forces and the capabilities required to protect this country. Despite the increased funding in this bill due to OCO, we are on the road to repeat the same mistakes that will take years to fix.

JAMES M. INHOFE.

## **ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MS. AYOTTE**

The Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC) voted overwhelmingly to approve its version of the fiscal year (FY) 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), building once again on its well-deserved reputation of bipartisan support for our men and women in uniform. While this bill and associated report are not perfect, they include several praiseworthy components, including provisions related to the A-10 and the service of military families. Despite these positive provisions in the bill, I remain deeply concerned about the impact of the Budget Control Act's discretionary defense spending caps on our nation's ability to defend itself and its interests.

### **A-10**

I am pleased that the SASC, the House Armed Services Committee, and the full House of Representatives have again rejected the Air Force's dangerous and misguided proposal to prematurely divest the A-10.

The bill passed by SASC on a strong and bipartisan basis would prohibit the Air Force from retiring, preparing to retire, or placing in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status any A-10 aircraft before December 31, 2016. The legislation would prohibit any significant reductions in A-10 unit manning levels before that date. The legislation would also require the Secretary of the Air Force to commission an independent assessment of the required capabilities or mission platform to eventually replace the A-10 and its uniquely effective close air support (CAS) capabilities.

Soldiers, special operators, and Joint Terminal Attack Controllers (JTACs) consistently say that the A-10 is the Air Force's best CAS aircraft and that it provides CAS capabilities that no other current aircraft can. They also say that if the Air Force were permitted to prematurely divest the A-10 before an equally capable replacement reaches full operational capability, the quality of CAS available to our ground forces will decline and Americans will be killed and injured unnecessarily. That is why I have fought, and will continue to fight, to oppose the premature divestment of the A-10.

If there were any lingering doubt about the continued lethality, survivability, effectiveness, or relevance of the A-10, one only need to look to Iraq and Syria where the A-10 is taking the fight to the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

With A-10s fighting ISIL in the Middle East, assuring allies in Europe, and deterring aggression on the Korean peninsula, now is not the time to divest the Air Force's most combat-effective and cost-efficient CAS aircraft.

If the Air Force decides to ignore the clear and consistent will of the overwhelming majority of soldiers, special operators, and

JTACs, I will continue to stand with them in opposition to the Air Force's plans to prematurely divest the A-10.

Instead of engaging in an annual battle over the future of the A-10, I welcome the opportunity to work with the Air Force to begin to identify the required capabilities and mission platform that could eventually replace the A-10. Once an equally capable platform reaches full operational capability, I will be among the first to support the retirement of the A-10.

### **Military Families Serve Too**

Americans who step forward to defend our country deserve great credit for their uniquely honorable, difficult, and important service to our country. We are safe and free because of the bravery and sacrifice of service members and veterans. However, as we honor our troops and veterans, we also must not forget that military families serve too—often making serious career and personal sacrifices on behalf of our country and their loved ones in uniform.

On March 3, 2015, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey testified that “Those who defend this Nation and the families who support them remain our most valuable national treasure and our competitive advantage.”

As General Dempsey's statement suggests, when honoring our service members, we must also not forget the family members who make their service possible.

Anyone who has served in the military, been married to a service member, or even attended a military retirement ceremony understands that a successful military career depends greatly on the support and sacrifice of military families. A career in the military often involves frequent moves and long separations that present unique and tremendous challenges for military families.

The service and sacrifice of military families not only deserve recognition and respect, but military families are also a critical component of military readiness. It is difficult for a mother, father, husband, or wife serving in the military to focus on training and their mission if they are worried about the well-being of their spouse or children.

Perhaps that is why, on March 10, 2015, the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, General Joseph Dunford, testified that “A key element in our overall readiness is family readiness. The family members of our Marines are very much a part of the Marine Corps family. Their sacrifices and support are not taken for granted.”

However, current laws and regulations fail to fully reflect the sacrifices of military families or their importance to military readiness. Under current laws and regulations, the military members who sit as juries in courts martial are sometimes confronted with the undesirable dilemma of either supporting justice or a military family—but not both.

In rare and tragic cases, a military family that has sacrificed in support of their service member suffers when the service member commits misconduct after reaching retirement eligibility. In some of these cases, the jury must choose either to impose a just sentence that will take the retirement benefits a family was counting on, or give an unjustly weak sentence to spare the innocent family.

When the jury chooses justice for the service member, the innocent family is often left with nothing.

For these reasons, I am proud that that the version of the National Defense Authorization Act passed by SASC includes the amendment I introduced, along with Senator Gillibrand, which would make transitional benefits available to innocent, retirement-eligible military family members in instances when the service member forfeits those benefits due to a court martial.

I am also pleased that the bill passed by the committee includes my Sense of Congress language that recognizes the valuable service of military families and emphasizes the view of the committee that military juries should not have to choose between a fair sentence and protecting military families.

I am pleased that the committee recognized the principle that innocent military families who serve and sacrifice alongside their service member should receive transitional benefits. That same rationale suggests that a military family that sacrifices for years alongside a service member should not be deprived of the retirement benefits they helped earn and have come to rely on.

That is why I also introduced an amendment with Senator Gillibrand that would have provided access to the portion of retirement benefits a family member would have received in a divorce settlement had the service member not forfeited them.

I look forward to working in a bipartisan manner with my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives, as well as with the Department of Defense, to ensure that our laws and military regulations fully reflect the fact that military families serve too.

### **Defense Sequestration: A Serious Threat to Our National Security**

The protection of American national security interests require that the United States maintain sufficient military strength to assure our allies, deter our adversaries, and when necessary, decisively defeat our enemies.

Sound national security strategy is based on a clear-eyed assessment of our interests, the threats to those interests, and the means required to protect those interests from the most likely and most dangerous threats.

Unfortunately, the gap is growing between the military we need and the military we have.

Any objective analysis of global events demonstrates that the world is becoming more dangerous. From ISIS's terror in Iraq and Syria, to Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability, to Putin's aggression in Ukraine, to China's bullying of its neighbors in the east and south China Seas, now is not the time to cut American military strength.

As Director of National Intelligence James Clapper testified February 26, 2015, ". . . in my 50-plus years in the intelligence business, I don't know of a time that has been more beset by challenges and crises around the world. I worry a lot about the safety and security of this country for a lot of reasons."

In light of these growing threats and with American troops in harm's way, one would expect the U.S. to be building its military

capabilities and capacities. Instead, Congress and the administration have not made the tough decisions necessary to eliminate the defense sequestration budget caps.

While there is no question that the Department of Defense must work harder to serve as a better steward of our tax dollars, Americans should have no doubt that defense sequestration represents a dangerous and irresponsible policy that will leave our troops ill-prepared, our allies in doubt, our enemies emboldened, and our citizens less safe.

As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey testified on March 3, 2015, “. . . with threats proliferating, resources declining, and sequestration just months away, our ability to assure our allies is in question and our advantages over our adversaries are shrinking.”

As someone who voted against the Budget Control Act and has worked to end defense sequestration, I will continue to work in a bipartisan manner to end defense sequestration once and for all to ensure the federal government fulfills its preeminent responsibility of protecting the American people.

KELLY AYOTTE.

## **ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. TILLIS**

Mr. Chairman and Senator Reed, I have the privilege of representing America's Global Response Force, the XVIII ABN Corps and the 82nd ABN Division. As Senator Reed knows from his long service in the Division, the 82nd is the most decorated combat unit in the armed forces—it is America's Guard of Honor. General Colin Powell famously said, "There is nothing that gets a bad guy's attention quicker than knowing the 82nd ABN is flying straight for his nose." But to put it bluntly, the Air Force wants to take the "air" out of "airborne". In 2012 the Air Force decided to de-activate the Reserve Air Wing at Pope Army Airfield at Fort Bragg and eliminate on-site daily support for training for XVIII ABN Corps, 82nd ABN and USASOC.

### **The 440th Air Wing at Pope Field consists of 8–12 C–130 Hs**

Last year this committee required the Air Force to produce a report on the C–130 fleet during which time the Air Force was required to maintain its wings at Pope and Little Rock for one year—the report came out in April, the committee expected it last December. The Congress was to be given time to respond.

Unfortunately the Air Force began dismantling the Wing at Pope long before the report was produced and in direct opposition to this Committee's instructions.

When asked about this, the Air Force said, "Congress said nothing about us taking away pilots and maintainers, we are leaving the Aircraft".

The Chairman's mark is full of behaviors like this: including Air Force refusal to heed the recommendations of the National Commission on the Air Force and the SECAF's refusal to cut the size of AF headquarters.

I have repeatedly asked the Air Force for documentation as to the impact on Airborne and Special Operations training the departure of dedicated Air Force Wings will have. The Air Force and the Army Staff have consistently produced statistics about planes needed to "deploy" Fort Bragg troops which because of the volume have to come from across the country. It has not produced figures as to the effect of the removal of the Pope planes on the day to day training of Airborne and Special Operations forces.

The USAF Reserve said that planes at Pope were a "luxury". When I asked if the commanders of XVIII ABN Corps and 82nd ABN had been consulted, I was told that the Air Force does not consult with Army three stars.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force said that the Air Force needed to maintain C–130s at Minneapolis, Youngstown and Pittsburgh for important missions. With all due respect is there any mission at Pittsburgh, Youngstown and Minneapolis that is as important as supporting Airborne and Special Operations units.

In the last three months, senior commanders at Fort Bragg have taken the extraordinary step of delivering public remarks noting that Airborne and Special Operations leadership were not consulted about the Air Force decision and that the loss of on-site planes will severely hamper their ability to train and meet requirements of emergency contingencies.

The Pope planes provide between 25–40% of all Airborne and SOF daily training missions.

Last year they dropped 50% of the 82nd ABN's chutes. The 440th AW provides 100% of 18 ASOG (Air Force) training—Air Force Special Operations Group

Even as a cost savings device the transfer of 8–12 planes out of Pope makes no sense, as planes will have to be flown in (often on a voluntarily basis if they are Reserve units) from around the country and those units will have to go on TDY orders, etc. This also does not provide for the moving to the left effects of weather grounding planes that would have to fly into Pope from as far away as Washington State. As the XVIII ABN Corps Commander said, the downstream effects will be problematic.

#### **Joint Airborne/Air Transportability Training (JA/ATT)**

From FY 2010 through FY 14 the 440th AW provided 507 JAATT's (Missions/Contract's) with 668 C-130 Tails used. Of the 507 Missions, 128 were "Add-on" missions that the 440th by virtue of being here was able to help support. We were able to fill local priority shortfalls 29 times during this time frame. The 440th on average, flies 89% of all of its JAATT's for locally assigned units on Fort Bragg. Over the five year time span, the 440th has a 95% mission effective rate due to the ability to generate spare aircraft to support the missions. The unfunded spares were utilized for local missions 146 times creating a 28.80% spare utilization rate helping allow 42,635 Paratroopers to be air dropped for locally assigned units on Fort Bragg.

#### **Air Force's Own Air Mobility Command Talking Points noted**

"The loss of 440AW does remove the 4 tails a week available for opportune training Ft Bragg has utilized outside of the JA/ATT process . . . As MAF fleets get smaller & re-balanced between the Active & Reserve, JA/ATT planning/scheduling will have to become more efficient IOT maximize effectiveness of the USAF airlift platforms made available . . . this is a fundamental change that has to occur even if the C-130s at Pope AAF were never part of the FY15 President's Budget."

The Air Force's own scheduling system can't handle the requirements at Fort Bragg if the Pope planes go away.

This amendment is simple. It stops the movement of C-130 H units from one facility of the Department of Defense for one year until certification is provided by the Secretary of the Air Force, after certification by the senior commanders of the United States Airborne and Special Operations Forces certify that the departure of such aircraft does not impact the training requirements of their units.

There are new commanders at Fort Bragg. This gives them the time to evaluate the impact of the movement of C-130s in and out of Fort Bragg.

If the actual combat commanders certify that this should happen—and I am not talking about Pentagon bureaucrats and the Army Staff—then we should all be satisfied with their judgement.

THOM TILLIS.

