

## Union Calendar No. 73

112th Congress, 1st Session - - - - - House Report 112-123

FIRST SEMIANNUAL REPORT  
ON THE ACTIVITIES  
OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
FOR THE  
ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS



JUNE 24, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on  
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

99-006

WASHINGTON : 2011

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS

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

ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland  
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas  
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina  
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri  
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia  
JEFF MILLER, Florida  
JOE WILSON, South Carolina  
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey  
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio  
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota  
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama  
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona  
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania  
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas  
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado  
ROB WITTMAN, Virginia  
DUNCAN HUNTER, California  
JOHN C. FLEMING, M.D., Louisiana  
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado  
TOM ROONEY, Florida  
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania  
SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia  
CHRIS GIBSON, New York  
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri  
JOE HECK, Nevada  
BOBBY SCHILLING, Illinois  
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey  
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia  
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas  
STEVEN PALAZZO, Mississippi  
ALLEN B. WEST, Florida  
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama  
MO BROOKS, Alabama  
TODD YOUNG, Indiana

ADAM SMITH, Washington  
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas  
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California  
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina  
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania  
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey  
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California  
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island  
RICK LARSEN, Washington  
JIM COOPER, Tennessee  
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam  
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut  
DAVE LOEBSACK, Iowa  
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona  
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts  
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine  
LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina  
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico  
BILL OWENS, New York  
JOHN R. GARAMENDI, California  
MARK S. CRITZ, Pennsylvania  
TIM RYAN, Ohio  
C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland  
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia  
KATHY CASTOR, Florida  
BETTY SUTTON, Ohio  
COLLEEN HANABUSA, Hawaii

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

**LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL**

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC, June 24, 2011.*

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

DEAR MS. HAAS: Pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I present herewith the first semi-annual report on the activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 112th Congress.

Sincerely,

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



# CONTENTS

---

	Page
Powers and Duties .....	1
Background .....	1
Constitutional Powers and Duties .....	2
House Rules on Jurisdiction .....	3
Investigative Authority and Legislative Oversight .....	3
Committee Rules .....	5
Composition of the Committee on Armed Services .....	17
Subcommittees of the Committee on Armed Services .....	18
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities .....	18
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	19
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	20
Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces .....	21
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	22
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces .....	23
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	24
Committee Staff .....	25
Committee Meetings .....	27
Legislative Activities .....	28
Legislation Passed in the House of Representatives .....	28
Legislation Reported by the Committee on Armed Services .....	31
Legislation Not Reported but Managed by the Committee on Armed Services on the Floor of the House of Representatives .....	32
Budget Activity .....	33
Oversight Activities .....	35
Summary of Oversight Plan .....	35
Policy Issues .....	36
Fiscal Responsibility and Efficiency .....	43
Other Policy Issues .....	47
Readiness .....	48
Energy and Environment .....	51
Military Construction and Infrastructure .....	52
Total Force, Personnel, and Health Care Issues .....	54
Modernization and Investment Issues .....	58
Emerging Threats and Capabilities .....	71
Additional Oversight Activities of the Full Committee .....	73
Additional Oversight Activities of the Subcommittees .....	76
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities .....	76
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	77
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	78
Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces .....	79
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	79
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces .....	80
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	80
Publications .....	82
Committee Prints .....	82
Published Proceedings .....	82
House Reports .....	85
Press Releases .....	86
First Session .....	86



## Union Calendar No. 73

112TH CONGRESS }  
*1st Session* } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
112-123

---

---

### FIRST SEMIANNUAL REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 112TH CONGRESS

---

JUNE 24, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of  
the Union and ordered to be printed

---

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

### R E P O R T

#### POWERS AND DUTIES

##### BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES

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

- Raise and support armies;
- Provide and maintain a navy;
- Make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;
- Provide for calling forth the militia;
- Provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States;



Exercise exclusive legislation . . . over all places purchased . . . for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings; and

Make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

#### HOUSE RULES ON JURISDICTION

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

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

(2) Common defense generally.

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

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

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

(6) Merchant Marine Academy and State Maritime Academies.

(7) Military applications of nuclear energy.

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

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

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

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

(12) Selective service.

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

(14) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

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

(16) Cemeteries administered by the Department of Defense.

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

#### INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY AND LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

H. Res. 988 of the 93rd Congress, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, amended clause 1(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to provide general authority for each committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction. That

amendment established a permanent investigative authority and relieved the committee of the former requirement of obtaining a renewal of the investigative authority by a House resolution at the beginning of each Congress. H. Res. 988 also amended rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives by requiring, as previously indicated, that standing committees are to conduct legislative oversight in the area of their respective jurisdiction, and by establishing specific oversight functions for the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 147 was approved by the House on March 17, 2011, and provided funds for, among other things, committee oversight responsibilities to be conducted in the 112th Congress. The committee derives its authority to conduct oversight from, among other things, clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to general oversight responsibilities), clause 3(b) of rule X (relating to special oversight functions), and clause 1(b) of rule XI (relating to investigations and studies).

## COMMITTEE RULES

The committee held its organizational meeting on January 20, 2011, and adopted the following rules governing rules and procedure for oversight hearings conducted by the full committee and its subcommittees.

(H.A.S.C. 112–1; Committee Print No. 1)

### RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

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

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

### RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

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

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

### RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

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

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

#### *(a) Jurisdiction*

(1) The Committee retains jurisdiction of all subjects listed in clause 1(c) and clause 3(b) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives and retains exclusive jurisdiction for: defense pol-

icy generally, ongoing military operations, the organization and reform of the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, counter-drug programs, security and humanitarian assistance (except special operations-related activities) of the Department of Defense, acquisition and industrial base policy, technology transfer and export controls, joint interoperability, the Cooperative Threat Reduction program, Department of Energy nonproliferation programs, detainee affairs and policy, intelligence policy, force protection policy and inter-agency reform as it pertains to the Department of Defense and the nuclear weapons programs of the Department of Energy. While subcommittees are provided jurisdictional responsibilities in subparagraph (2), the Committee retains the right to exercise oversight and legislative jurisdiction over all subjects within its purview under rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

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

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

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

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

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

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic weapons (except deep strike bombers and related systems), space programs, ballistic missile defense, national intelligence programs, and Department of Energy national security programs (except non-proliferation programs).

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities: Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism pro-

grams and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations.

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

*(b) Membership of the Subcommittees*

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

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

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

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

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS AND TASK FORCES

*(a) Committee Panels*

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

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

(3) Consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, all Majority members of the panels shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Committee, and all Minority members shall be appointed by the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee shall choose one of the Majority mem-

bers so appointed who does not currently chair another subcommittee of the Committee to serve as Chairman of the panel. The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall similarly choose the Ranking Minority Member of the panel.

(4) No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

*(b) Committee and Subcommittee Task Forces*

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

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

(3) No task force shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

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

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

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

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

(e) The Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall establish criteria for recommending legislation and other matters to be considered by the House of Representatives, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XV of the Rules of the House of Representatives. Such criteria shall not conflict with the Rules of the House of Representatives and other applicable rules.

RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

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

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

RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

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

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

RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee, or any subcommittee, panel, or task force, to the extent that the respective body is authorized to conduct markups, shall be open to the public except when the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force may vote to close a hearing or meet-

ing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee, subcommittee, panel, or task force being present.

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

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

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.



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

#### RULE 10. QUORUM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(3) The Chairman of the Committee or a subcommittee, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may depart with the regular order for questioning which is specified in

paragraphs (a) and (b) of this rule provided that such a decision is announced prior to the hearing or prior to the opening statements of the witnesses and that any such departure applies equally to the Majority and the Minority.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of Secret or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee as soon as practicable but not less than 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present. In cases where a witness does not submit a statement by the time required under this rule, the

Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, with the concurrence of the respective Ranking Minority Member, may elect to exclude the witness from the hearing.

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

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

#### RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

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

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

#### RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

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

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

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

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

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee, subcommittee, or panel will be published officially in substantially verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. The transcripts of markups conducted by the Committee or any subcommittee may be published officially in verbatim form. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Any transcript published under this rule shall include the results of record votes conducted in the session covered by the transcript and shall also include ma-

materials that have been submitted for the record and are covered under rule 19. The handling and safekeeping of these materials shall fully satisfy the requirements of rule 20. No transcript of an executive session conducted under rule 9 shall be published under this rule.

#### RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

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

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

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

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

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

#### RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

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

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

## RULE 19. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

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

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

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

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

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

## RULE 21. COMMITTEE STAFFING

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

## RULE 22. COMMITTEE RECORDS

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

presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

RULE 23. HEARING PROCEDURES

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

RULE 24. COMMITTEE ACTIVITY REPORTS

Not later than the 30th day after June 1 and December 1, the Committee shall submit to the House a semiannual report on its activities, pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

## COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Pursuant to H. Res. 6, election of the Chairman (adopted January 5, 2011), H. Res. 7, election of the Ranking Member (adopted January 5, 2011), H. Res. 33, election of majority members (adopted January 12, 2011), and H. Res. 39, election of minority members (adopted January 19, 2011), the following members serve on the Committee on Armed Services in the 112th Congress:

HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California, <i>Chairman</i>	
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland	ADAM SMITH, Washington, <i>Ranking Member</i>
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas	SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina	LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri	MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia	ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
JEFF MILLER, Florida	ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
JOE WILSON, South Carolina	SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey	JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio	RICK LARSEN, Washington
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota	JIM COOPER, Tennessee
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania	DAVE LOEBSACK, Iowa
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas	GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona
DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado	NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts
ROB WITTMAN, Virginia	CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
DUNCAN HUNTER, California	LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina
JOHN C. FLEMING, M.D., Louisiana	MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico
MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado	BILL OWENS, New York
TOM ROONEY, Florida	JOHN R. GARAMENDI, California
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania	MARK S. CRITZ, Pennsylvania
SCOTT RIGELL, Virginia	TIM RYAN, Ohio
CHRIS GIBSON, New York	C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	HANK JOHNSON, Georgia
JOE HECK, Nevada	KATHY CASTOR, Florida
BOBBY SCHILLING, Illinois	BETTY SUTTON, Ohio
JON RUNYAN, New Jersey	COLLEEN HANABUSA, Hawaii
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	
TIM GRIFFIN, Arkansas	
STEVEN PALAZZO, Mississippi	
ALLEN B. WEST, Florida	
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama	
MO BROOKS, Alabama	
TODD YOUNG, Indiana	

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following subcommittees were established at the committee's organizational meeting on January 20, 2011.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

*Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4*—Defense-wide and joint enabling activities and programs to include: Special Operations Forces; counter-proliferation and counter-terrorism programs and initiatives; science and technology policy and programs; information technology programs; homeland defense and Department of Defense related consequence management programs; related intelligence support; and other enabling programs and activities to include cyber operations, strategic communications, and information operations.

Mr. THORNBERRY, *Chairman*

Mr. MILLER  
Mr. KLINE  
Mr. SHUSTER  
Mr. CONAWAY  
Mr. GIBSON  
Mr. SCHILLING  
Mr. WEST  
Mr. FRANKS  
Mr. HUNTER

Mr. LANGEVIN, *Ranking Member*  
Ms. SANCHEZ  
Mr. ANDREWS  
Mrs. DAVIS  
Mr. RYAN  
Mr. RUPPERSBERGER  
Mr. JOHNSON  
Mrs. CASTOR



SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

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

Mr. WILSON, *Chairman*

Mr. JONES  
Mr. COFFMAN  
Mr. ROONEY  
Dr. HECK  
Mr. WEST  
Mr. SCOTT  
Mrs. HARTZLER

Mrs. DAVIS, *Ranking Member*  
Mr. BRADY  
Ms. BORDALLO  
Mr. LOEBSACK  
Ms. TSONGAS  
Ms. PINGREE

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

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

Mr. FORBES, *Chairman*

Mr. ROGERS  
Dr. HECK  
Mr. SCOTT  
Mr. LoBIONDO  
Mr. GIBSON  
Mrs. HARTZLER  
Mr. SCHILLING  
Mr. RUNYAN  
Mr. GRIFFIN  
Mr. PALAZZO  
Mrs. ROBY

Ms. BORDALLO, *Ranking Member*  
Mr. REYES  
Mr. COURTNEY  
Mr. LOEBSACK  
Ms. GIFFORDS  
Mr. KISSELL  
Mr. OWENS  
Mr. RYAN  
Mrs. HANABUSA

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

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

Mr. AKIN, *Chairman*

Mr. HUNTER  
Mr. COFFMAN  
Mr. RIGELL  
Mr. GRIFFIN  
Mr. PALAZZO  
Mr. YOUNG  
Mr. BARTLETT  
Mr. FORBES  
Mr. WITTMAN  
Mr. PLATTS

Mr. MCINTYRE, *Ranking Member*  
Mrs. DAVIS  
Mr. LANGEVIN  
Mr. LARSEN  
Mr. COURTNEY  
Ms. PINGREE  
Mr. CRITZ  
Mr. JOHNSON  
Ms. SUTTON

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

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

Mr. TURNER, *Chairman*

Mr. FRANKS  
Mr. LAMBORN  
Mr. BROOKS  
Mr. THORNBERRY  
Mr. ROGERS  
DR. FLEMING  
Mr. RIGELL  
Mr. SCOTT

Ms. SANCHEZ, *Ranking Member*  
Mr. LANGEVIN  
Mr. LARSEN  
Mr. HEINRICH  
Mr. GARAMENDI  
Mr. RUPPERSBERGER  
Ms. SUTTON

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR AND LAND FORCES

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

Mr. BARTLETT, *Chairman*

Mr. LoBIONDO  
 Dr. FLEMING  
 Mr. ROONEY  
 Mr. PLATTS  
 Mrs. HARTZLER  
 Mr. RUNYAN  
 Mrs. ROBY  
 Mr. JONES  
 Mr. AKIN  
 Mr. WILSON  
 Mr. TURNER  
 Mr. SHUSTER  
 Mr. LAMBORN

Mr. REYES, *Ranking Member*  
 Mr. McINTYRE  
 Mr. COOPER  
 Ms. GIFFORDS  
 Ms. TSONGAS  
 Mr. KISSELL  
 Mr. HEINRICH  
 Mr. OWENS  
 Mr. GARAMENDI  
 Mr. CRITZ  
 Mrs. CASTOR

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

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

Mr. WITTMAN, *Chairman*

Mr. CONAWAY  
Mr. BROOKS  
Mr. YOUNG  
Mr. ROONEY  
Mr. COFFMAN

Mr. COOPER, *Ranking Member*  
Mr. ANDREWS  
Ms. SANCHEZ  
Mrs. HANABUSA

## COMMITTEE STAFF

By committee resolution adopted at the organizational meeting on January 20, 2011, or by authority of the chairman, the following persons have been appointed to the staff of the committee during the 112th Congress:

Bob Simmons, *Staff Director*  
Roger Zakheim, *Deputy Staff Director/General Counsel*  
Betty B. Gray, *Executive Assistant*  
Michael R. Higgins, *Professional Staff Member*  
John D. Chapla, *Professional Staff Member*  
John F. Sullivan, *Professional Staff Member*  
Nancy M. Warner, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jesse D. Tolleson, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*  
Debra S. Wada, *Professional Staff Member*  
Douglas C. Roach, *Professional Staff Member*  
Mark R. Lewis, *Professional Staff Member*  
Paul Arcangeli, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jeanette S. James, *Professional Staff Member*  
Rebecca A. Ross, *Professional Staff Member*  
Andrew Hunter, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned February 26, 2011)  
Heath R. Bope, *Professional Staff Member*  
Lynn M. Williams, *Professional Staff Member*  
Joshua C. Holly, *Director of Communications* (resigned June 12, 2011)  
John Wason, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jeness Simler, *Professional Staff Member*  
Alex Kugajevsky, *Professional Staff Member*  
Kari Bingen, *Professional Staff Member*  
Cyndi Howard, *Security Manager*  
Douglas Bush, *Professional Staff Member*  
Lara Battles, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned March 25, 2011)  
Cathy Garman, *Professional Staff Member*  
Vickie Plunkett, *Professional Staff Member*  
Timothy McClees, *Professional Staff Member*  
Kevin Gates, *Professional Staff Member*  
Michael Casey, *Professional Staff Member*  
David Sienicki, *Professional Staff Member*  
Zach Steacy, *Director, Legislative Operations*  
Everett Coleman, *Professional Staff Member*  
Mary Kate Cunningham, *Staff Assistant*  
Craig Greene, *Professional Staff Member*  
Phil MacNaughton, *Professional Staff Member*  
Jack Schuler, *Professional Staff Member*  
Scott Bousum, *Staff Assistant*  
Ryan Crumpler, *Professional Staff Member*  
John N. Johnson, *Staff Assistant*  
William S. Johnson, *Counsel*  
Jaime Cheshire, *Professional Staff Member and Senior Advisor to the Chairman*  
Jim Weiss, *Staff Assistant*  
Alejandra Villarreal, *Staff Assistant*  
Megan Howard, *Staff Assistant*  
Christine Wagner, *Staff Assistant*  
Peter Villano, *Professional Staff Member*  
Paul Lewis, *Counsel*  
Jeff Cullen, *Staff Assistant*  
Leonor Tomero, *Counsel*  
Jamie R. Lynch, *Professional Staff Member*

Michele Pearce, *Counsel*  
Famid Sinha, *Staff Assistant* (resigned May 9, 2011)  
Katie Sendak, *Executive Assistant*  
Ben Runkle, *Professional Staff Member*  
Melissa Tuttle, *Staff Assistant*  
Catherine A. McElroy, *Counsel*  
Michael Amato, *Professional Staff Member*  
Robert J. McAlister, *Communications Assistant*  
Anna Hagler, *Intern* (appointed January 3, 2011, resigned May 5, 2011)  
Jonathan Shepard, *Intern* (appointed January 4, 2011, resigned February 18, 2011)  
Dustin Walker, *Staff Assistant* (appointed February 7, 2011)  
Thomas MacKenzie, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed March 7, 2011)  
Lauren Hauhn, *Research Assistant* (appointed March 8, 2011)  
John Noonan, *Deputy Communications Director* (appointed March 21, 2011)  
Brian Garrett, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed April 1, 2011)  
Arthur Milikh, *Intern* (appointed April 1, 2011)  
Elizabeth Nathan, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed April 8, 2011)  
Elizabeth McWhorter, *Staff Assistant* (appointed April 18, 2011)  
Nicholas Rodman, *Staff Assistant* (appointed May 2, 2011)  
Stephen Bosco, *Intern* (appointed May 17, 2011)  
Aaron Applbaum, *Intern* (appointed May 23, 2011)  
Kelly McRaven, *Intern* (appointed June 1, 2011)  
Andrew T. Walter, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed June 2, 2011)  
Ken Orvick, *Intern* (appointed June 16, 2011)



## COMMITTEE MEETINGS

A total of 54 meetings and markups have been held by the Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees during the 112th Congress. A breakdown of the meetings follows:

Full Committee .....	17
Subcommittees:	
Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities .....	6
Subcommittee on Military Personnel .....	7
Subcommittee on Readiness .....	7
Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces .....	3
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces .....	5
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces .....	6
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations .....	3

## LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITIES

### LEGISLATION PASSED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H.R. 1540—TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012 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

On April 14, 2011, H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, was introduced by Chairman McKeon and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On May 11, 2011, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider H.R. 1540. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered reported H.R. 1540, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a vote of 60–1. The bill passed the House, as amended, on May 26, 2011, by a recorded vote of 322–96 (Roll no. 375). On June 6, 2011, the bill was received in the Senate, read twice and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. No further action has been taken on H.R. 1540.

H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011, would: (1) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for procurement and for research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E); (2) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and for working capital funds; (3) Authorize for fiscal year 2012: (a) the personnel strength for each active duty component of the military departments; (b) the personnel strength for the Selected Reserve for each Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; (c) the military training student loads for each of the active and Reserve Components of the military departments; (4) Modify various elements of compensation for military personnel and impose certain requirements and limitations on personnel actions in the defense establishment; (5) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military construction and family housing; (6) Authorize appropriations for Overseas Contingency Operations; (7) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Energy national security programs; (8) Modify provisions related to the National Defense Stockpile; and (9) Authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for the Maritime Administration.

H.R. 1540 is a key mechanism through which Congress fulfills one of its primary responsibilities as mandated in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States, which grants Congress the power to raise and support an Army; to provide and maintain a Navy; and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives provides jurisdiction over the Department of Defense generally, and over the military application of nuclear energy, to the Committee on Armed Services. The committee bill includes the

large majority of the findings and recommendations resulting from its oversight activities in the current year, as informed by the experience gained over the previous decades of the committee's existence.

H.R. 1540, as passed by the House, would authorize \$689.7 billion for national defense discretionary programs and includes \$552.7 billion for the base budget of the Department of Defense, \$118.9 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations, and \$18.1 billion for national security programs in the Department of Energy.

#### *Division A*

Division A of H.R. 1540, as passed by the House, would authorize funds for fiscal year 2012 for the Department of Defense.

Subtitle A of title I would authorize \$111,331,833,000 for procurement for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and Defense-wide activities. Subtitles B and C of title I would establish additional program requirements, restrictions, and limitations for specified programs for the Armed Forces.

Subtitle A of title II would authorize \$75,558,979,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces and the defense agencies, including amounts for basic research and development-related matters. Subtitle B of title II would establish certain program requirements, restrictions, and limitations on separate research and development-related matters. Subtitles C through E of title II addresses missile defense programs, reports and miscellaneous matters.

Subtitle A of title III would authorize \$171,137,669,000 for operation and maintenance. Subtitles B through F of title III addresses energy and environmental issues, logistics and sustainment issues, studies and reports relating to military readiness, limitations and extensions of authority, and other miscellaneous matters.

Title IV would provide military personnel authorizations for the active and reserve forces for fiscal year 2012 and would authorize appropriations of \$142,174,158,000 for military personnel for fiscal year 2012.

The end strengths for active duty personnel for fiscal year 2012 would be as follows:

- (1) The Army, 562,000.
- (2) The Navy, 325,739.
- (3) The Marine Corps, 202,100.
- (4) The Air Force, 332,800.

The Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2012 would be as follows:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 358,200.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 205,000.
- (3) The Navy Reserve, 66,200.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 39,600.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 106,700.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 71,400.
- (7) The Coast Guard Reserve, 10,000.

The end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the Reserve Components for fiscal year 2012 would be as follows:

- (1) The Army National Guard of the United States, 32,060.
- (2) The Army Reserve, 16,261.

- (3) The Navy Reserve, 10,337.
- (4) The Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261.
- (5) The Air National Guard of the United States, 14,833.
- (6) The Air Force Reserve, 2,662.

Title V would establish military personnel policy, including provisions addressing officer personnel policy; Reserve Component management; general service authorities; military justice and legal matters; education and training; Army National Military Cemeteries; Armed Forces Retirement Home; military families; improved sexual assault prevention and response in the Armed Forces; and other miscellaneous matters.

Title VI would address compensation and other personnel benefits, including pay and allowances; bonuses and special and incentive pays; travel and transportation allowances; consolidation and reform of travel and transportation authorities; commissary and nonappropriated fund instrumentality benefits and operations; disability, retired pay and survivor benefits; and other matters.

Title VII contains military health care provisions, such as improvements to military health benefits; health care administration; and other matters.

Title VIII addresses acquisition policy, acquisition management and related matters, including amendments to general contracting authorities, procedures, and limitations; provisions relating to contracts in support of contingency operations in Iraq or Afghanistan; defense industrial base matters; and other matters.

Title IX contains Department of Defense organization and management provisions, including space activities; intelligence-related matters; total force management; quadrennial roles and missions and related matters; and other miscellaneous matters.

Title X addresses general provisions relating to financial matters; counter-drug activities and counter transnational criminal activities; naval vessels and shipyards; counterterrorism; nuclear forces; financial management; studies and reports; miscellaneous authorities and limitations; and other matters.

Title XI addresses Department of Defense civilian personnel matters.

Title XII concerns matters relating to foreign nations, including assistance and training; matters relating to Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan; and reports and other matters.

Title XIII addresses Cooperative Threat Reduction.

Title XIV would authorize miscellaneous authorizations totaling \$37,692,377,000 and also includes provisions addressing the National Defense stockpile, Chemical Demilitarization Matters; and other matters.

Title XV includes authorization of \$118,939,693,000 for Overseas Contingency Operations.

Title XVI contains provisions regarding additional budget items.

#### *Division B*

Division B would authorize appropriations in the amount of \$14,766,026,000 for military construction and military family housing in support of the active forces, the Reserve Components, and the NATO security investment program for fiscal year 2012. In addition, Division B contains military construction and family hous-

ing program changes; real property and facilities administration; provisions related to Guam realignment; provisions concerning land conveyances; energy security; and other matters.

*Division C*

Division C would authorize appropriations in the amount of \$18,075,850,000 for Department of Energy national security programs for fiscal year 2012. Division C also includes authorization for and addresses the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; Naval Petroleum Reserves; and the Maritime Administration.

*Division D*

Division D would provide for the allocation of funds among programs, projects, and activities in accordance with the tables in division D, subject to reprogramming guidance in accordance with established procedures, and would also require that a decision by an Agency Head to commit, obligate, or expend funds to a specific entity on the basis of such funding tables be based on merit-based selection procedures in accordance with the requirements of section 2304(k) and 2374 of title 10, United States Code, and other applicable provisions of law.

(H. Rept. 112–78, Parts I & II)

LEGISLATION REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

H. RES. 208—RESOLUTION DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO TRANSMIT TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COPIES OF ANY OFFICIAL DOCUMENT, RECORD, MEMO, CORRESPONDENCE, OR OTHER COMMUNICATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IN THE POSSESSION OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THAT REFERS OR RELATES TO ANY CONSULTATION WITH CONGRESS REGARDING OPERATION ODYSSEY DAWN OR NATO OPERATION UNIFIED PROTECTOR

House Resolution 208 was introduced by Representative Tom Cole on April 7, 2011, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The resolution, as introduced, would direct the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of Defense, or any portion of such communication, that refers or relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or military actions in or against Libya.

On May 11, 2011, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider House Resolution 208, as introduced. The committee, a quorum being present, ordered to be reported House Resolution 208, as amended, to the House with a favorable recommendation by a voice vote. House Resolution 208 was amended to direct the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of such resolution, copies of any official document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communication of the Department of Defense in the possession of the Secretary of Defense that was created on or after February 15, 2011, and refers or relates to any of the following: (1) consultation or communication with Congress regarding the employment or deployment of the United States

Armed Forces for Operation Odyssey Dawn or North Atlantic Treaty Organization Operation Unified Protector; and (2) the War Powers Resolution and Operation Odyssey Dawn or Operation Unified Protector. Additionally, the title of House Resolution 208 was amended.

On May 12, 2011, House Resolution 208 was placed on the House Calendar, Calendar No. 38. No further action has been taken.

(H. Rept. 112–77)

LEGISLATION NOT REPORTED BUT MANAGED BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

H.R. 1246—TO REDUCE THE AMOUNTS OTHERWISE AUTHORIZED TO BE APPROPRIATED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR PRINTING AND REPRODUCTION

H.R. 1246, “To reduce the amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for printing and reproduction” was introduced on March 29, 2011, by Representative Allen B. West and was referred to the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness. Chairman Forbes of the Subcommittee on Readiness waived subcommittee consideration of H.R. 1246, and Chairman McKeon waived full committee consideration of the bill. On April 4, 2011, Mr. West moved to consider H.R. 1246, as introduced, under suspension of the rules of the House, and the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to by the yeas and nays, 393–0 (Roll no. 225). On April 5, 2011, H.R. 1246 was received in the Senate and read twice and referred to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. No further action has been taken.

H. RES. 292—DECLARING THAT THE PRESIDENT SHALL NOT DEPLOY, ESTABLISH, OR MAINTAIN THE PRESENCE OF UNITS AND MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES ON THE GROUND IN LIBYA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

House Resolution 292, “Declaring that the President shall not deploy, establish, or maintain the presence of units and members of the United States Armed Forces on the ground in Libya, and for other purposes” was introduced on June 2, 2011, by Speaker John Boehner, and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 294, House Resolution 292 was considered under a closed rule by the House on June 3, 2011. House Resolution 294 waived all points of order against consideration of House Resolution 292, and provided one hour of debate, with 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. On June 3, 2011, House Resolution 292 was agreed to in the House by the yeas and nays, 268–145–1 (Roll no. 441).

## BUDGET ACTIVITY

On March 18, 2011, the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services forwarded his views and estimates regarding the budget request for National Defense Budget Function (050) for fiscal year 2012 to the Committee on the Budget.

The committee noted that the President's fiscal year 2012 budget request totaled \$578.2 billion in discretionary budget authority for national defense. Of this total, \$553.1 billion was for the Department of Defense, \$18.1 billion was for the Department of Energy's defense activities, and \$7.0 billion was for other defense-related activities. The President's budget also included \$6.8 billion in mandatory budget authority.

In addition to the base budget request, the committee noted that as required by section 1008 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the President's budget for fiscal year 2012 included a separate request of \$117.8 billion for war-related expenditures in support of ongoing military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and the Republic of Iraq, presented as Overseas Contingency Operations.

Given the spectrum of threats to our national security, the diverse missions performed by our military, and the funding required for reset from current contingency operations, the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services considered the budget request to be below the minimum level necessary to support our national security requirements, and recommended an increase in funding for national defense by \$7 billion for fiscal year 2012 and \$44 billion across fiscal years 2012-16 above the budget request. The Chairman believed that an increase would ensure a smooth transition from one fiscal year to the next, move toward resolution of certain programmatic and economic concerns, ease the Department of Defense's concerns on pricing fluctuations such as fuel, and provide service members with a larger funding stream.

In review of the budget request, the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services highlighted several concerns to the Committee on the Budget. First, with respect to proposed reductions by the Department of Defense, they were not performed from a strategic perspective. The reduction of \$13 billion in fiscal year 2012 was directed by the Office of Management and Budget. Second, the Chairman noted that the reductions in Army and Marine Corps manpower, totaling 47,000 persons as programmed in the Future Year's Defense Program, were premature, both from a national security strategy standpoint and for the potential impact on the time between deployments, dwell time, experienced by members of the Armed Forces. Third, the Chairman suggested that high-profile programs such as the Air Force's new bomber program and the Navy's *Ohio* class ballistic missile submarine replacement may not be realized within currently planned cost and schedule constraints.

Finally, the Chairman argued that the President's budget request may have adverse implications on the readiness of the Armed Forces due to funding shortfalls and inaccurate economic assumptions.

The Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services did not join the Chairman in making these assertions, nor did he join the Chairman in recommending budgetary increases over the President's budget request. Instead, the Ranking Member expressed to the Committee on the Budget his support for the President's budget request as a balanced platform for military effectiveness from which justifiable savings may be realized.



## OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

### SUMMARY OF OVERSIGHT PLAN

On January 20, 2011, the committee held its organizational meeting and adopted its oversight plan for the 112th Congress. The following is a summary of the committee's oversight agenda printed in the oversight plan.

The oversight plan for the 112th Congress states the committee will continue its oversight and assessment of threats to U.S. national security as it considers the fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 defense budget requests. This effort will involve appropriate oversight hearings with the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the individual service secretaries and chiefs of staff, combatant commanders, other officials of the Department of Defense and the military departments, officials from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Central Intelligence Agency and other defense-related intelligence agencies, and the Secretary of Energy, the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security and other officials of the Department of Energy. In addition, the committee will invite the views and perspectives of outside experts in academia, industry, associations and advocacy organizations, and those in private life on these matters. Finally, the committee will continue its aggressive outreach program to seek the views and perspectives of service members and their families to include Active Duty, National Guard, and Reserve members across the United States and at deployed locations overseas.

The oversight plan explains that the committee carries out its oversight of the Department of Defense and its subordinate departments and agencies as well as portions of the Department of Energy through activities involving the full committee and its standing subcommittees. Each subcommittee conducts oversight of the programs within its jurisdiction as specified in the committee's rules, with the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations pursuing coordinated and constructive oversight that will identify best practices, areas of potential savings, as well as those areas in need of correction and reform within the Department of Defense.

The oversight agenda is designed to support the consideration by the committee and, ultimately, the House of Representatives of the annual defense authorization bill, as well as the committee's broader oversight responsibilities. The issues identified will be ongoing areas of oversight activity throughout the 112th Congress. In addition, the committee will continue to pay particular attention to the mandates placed on executive departments and agencies by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-62). The committee will examine closely the progress of the Department of Defense, the military departments, and the Department of Energy in implementing Public Law 103-62 to include the

use of performance-based budgeting techniques and five-year strategic planning documents, for programs within its jurisdiction. In this context, pursuant to clause 2(d)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the committee will place renewed emphasis on examining relevant rules, regulations, statutes, and court decisions affecting the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy for their effects on efficiency and good management practices.

The committee has a long tradition of translating oversight activities into prescriptive legislative action as reflected in past comprehensive efforts such as: providing for concurrent receipt of retirement and disability benefits for veterans with qualifying combat-related disabilities; reforming the military retirement system; the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-433); the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act of 1991 (Public Law 101-510); the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-355); the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-106); the establishment of the National Nuclear Security Administration and related reform of the management of the national security programs of the Department of Energy; reform of the military health care system; and the Military Commissions Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-366). More recently, in the 110th Congress, the committee played a lead role in the passage of the Wounded Warrior Assistance Act of 2007 and the Acquisition Improvement and Accountability Act of 2007 as included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), the Reconstruction and Stabilization Civilian Management Act of 2008, the Clean Contracting Act of 2008 as included in the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417). In the 111th Congress, the committee played a lead role in the passage of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-23) and H.R. 5013, Implementing Management for Performance and Related Reforms to Obtain Value in Every Acquisition Act of 2010 (IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010), as included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383), and will continue to oversee these legislative provisions in the 112th Congress. In general, the committee will continue to maintain a strong linkage between formal oversight efforts and legislative initiatives.

Pursuant to clause 1(d) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, described below are actions taken and recommendations made with respect to specific areas and subjects that were identified in the oversight plan for special attention during the 112th Congress, as well as additional oversight activities not explicitly enumerated by the oversight plan.

#### POLICY ISSUES

##### NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY, NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY, AND RELATED DEFENSE POLICY ISSUES

During the 112th Congress, the committee has continued its traditional interest in the broad spectrum of national security challenges facing the United States and how the Nation might best pre-

pare itself to face such challenges in the near- and long-term. The committee particularly focused on conducting oversight of issues pertaining to the wars in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, military operations in Libya, and the popular uprisings throughout the Middle East calling for political reforms. Throughout the first half of the first session of the 112th Congress, the committee received numerous briefings from representatives of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the military services, the joint staff, academics, and other experts.

The committee also explored certain strategic issues that are becoming a prominent part of recent discussions of defense strategy, such as Department of Defense efficiencies initiatives and potential effects of the U.S. debt crisis on the defense budget. The committee convened a hearing on proposed Department of Defense budget reductions and efficiencies initiatives in order to gain a better understanding of the Department's efforts to create real growth within force structure and modernization accounts, without commensurate increases to the defense budget top-line. The committee continues to believe that in its efforts to seek efficiencies, the Department would be well served to conduct comprehensive review of the roles and missions of the Armed Forces every 4 years. Although such a review is required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110-181), the Department's first such review, and the associated report which was delivered in January 2009, failed to comply with congressional intent. Therefore, the committee urged the Secretary of Defense to take a more comprehensive approach to the 2011 Quarterly Roles and Missions Review (QRMR) and also took action in H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as passed by the House of Representatives on May 26, 2011, to strengthen the requirements in the QRMR and to clarify congressional intent regarding such a review. The committee also included a provision in H.R. 1540 that would reinforce the strong belief that the Quadrennial Defense Review is a critical strategic document and should be based upon a process unconstrained by budgetary influences so that such influences do not limit or otherwise determine the outcome of the review.

In H.R. 1540, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011, the committee included several provisions relating to defense policy, such as improving interagency coordination in matters of national security, additional reporting on the military capabilities of certain potential aggressors, such as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and assessing the national security risk posed by U.S. Federal debt. The committee also added provisions related to the Department of Defense efficiencies initiatives, including a required assessment from the Comptroller General of the Department of Defense's implementation of the initiative and an assessment of the extent to which business case analyses informed such decisions.

Much of the committee's oversight on overarching defense policy resulted from numerous posture and budget hearings which were held in reaction to the President's budget request for fiscal year 2012. The detailed list of these hearings is included elsewhere in this report.

## THE WAR IN AFGHANISTAN

The committee held several full committee briefings and hearings on the war in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan during the first session of the 112th Congress. On February 10, 2011, the committee held an operations and intelligence briefing on Afghanistan and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Witnesses included Michele Flournoy, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; Lieutenant General Charles Jacoby, Director for Strategic Plans and Policy, Joint Staff J5; Brigadier General (P) Frederick “Ben” Hodges, Director of the Pakistan Afghanistan Coordination Cell, Joint Staff; and Rear Admiral Paul Becker, Vice Director for Intelligence, Joint Staff, J2. On March 3, 2011, the committee received testimony on Afghanistan and Pakistan from General James Mattis, Commander of U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), during the CENTCOM posture hearing. Two weeks later, the committee held a hearing on developments in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Witnesses included Under Secretary Flournoy and General David Petraeus, Commander, International Security Assistance Force and U.S. Forces-Afghanistan. Committee members and professional staff also participated in numerous delegations to Afghanistan to meet with U.S. diplomats, U.S. military officers, and Afghan government officials in order to gain a better understanding of military operations and policy issues related to Afghanistan.

The committee included a number of legislative provisions as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011, that would extend the Afghanistan Infrastructure Fund established under section 1217 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111–383), and recommended increasing the amount authorized under this provision to \$475.0 million. H.R. 1540 also extended the Commanders’ Emergency Response Program (CERP), and extended section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), authorizing the Secretary of Defense to reimburse any key cooperating nation for logistical, military, and other support provided by that nation to or in connection with U.S. military operations in Afghanistan. H.R. 1540 also extended the “Report on Progress Toward Stability and Security in Afghanistan,” as required by section 1230(a) of Public Law 110–181, thereby continuing its oversight role in the war in Afghanistan.

## PAKISTAN

The committee held numerous full committee briefings and hearings on the effort to combat against Al Qaeda and other militant extremists in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, as noted above. Committee members and professional staff also participated in numerous delegations to Pakistan to meet with U.S. diplomats, U.S. military officers, and Pakistani government officials in order to gain a better understanding of Pakistan-related policy issues.

The committee included several legislative provisions as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011. H.R. 1540 would extend section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for

Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), authorizing the Secretary of Defense to reimburse Pakistan for logistical support provided in connection with U.S. military operations in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan and for logistical and military support provided to confront the threat posed by Al Qaeda and other militant extremists in Pakistan. The committee extended the Pakistan Counterinsurgency Fund (PCF) to provide assistance to Pakistan’s security forces to build and maintain their counterinsurgency capability. However, acknowledging concerns regarding Pakistan’s political will to combat militant extremists, this provision would withhold authority to obligate more than 25 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated for PCF until the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the strategy to utilize the fund, a discussion of the terrorist or extremist groups that the United States encourages Pakistan to combat, the gaps in capabilities of Pakistani security units, how assistance provided utilizing the fund will address these capability gaps, and metrics of progress. This provision also would direct that future updates of the report be submitted concurrently with the President’s budget request, and would require quarterly reporting on progress in achieving U.S. strategic objectives in Pakistan and progress made by programs supported by PCF. Thus, the committee has continued a critical program for training and equipping the Pakistani security forces to be able to conduct counterinsurgency operations in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas of Pakistan, while strengthening its oversight of these programs.

#### THE WAR IN IRAQ

In the 112th Congress, the committee has continued its vigorous oversight of the war in the Republic of Iraq. The committee held several hearings regarding the war, including an operations and intelligence briefing on Iraq on February 11, 2011. Witnesses included Dr. Colin Kahl, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense for the Middle East; Brigadier General John W. Charlton, Deputy Director, Middle East, Joint Staff J5; and Mr. Amir Asmar, Defense Intelligence Agency officer for Middle East and North Africa. The committee also received testimony on Iraq from General James Mattis, Commander of U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) during the CENTCOM posture hearing on March 3, 2011. Committee members and professional staff also participated in numerous delegations to Iraq to meet with U.S. diplomats, U.S. military officers, and Iraqi government officials in order to gain a better understanding of the U.S. military’s role in Iraq and related policy issues.

In addition to these hearings, the committee included several provisions and reporting requirements relating to Iraq as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011. H.R. 1540 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to utilize funds available for operations and maintenance by the Air Force to support operations and activities of the Office of Security Cooperation in Iraq (OSCI). The House version of the NDAA also included a section that would require the Secretary of Defense to provide the congressional

defense committees with formal notification if the U.S. Government and the Government of the Iraq complete an agreement permitting the United States to maintain a force presence in Iraq above that envisioned for the OSC-I. The provision would require that in the absence of such an agreement in place by December 31, 2011, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report outlining how Department of Defense participation in OSC-I programs will address capability gaps of the Iraqi Security Forces, should the Government of Iraq request such assistance. The committee also urged the Department of Defense to consider methods to strengthen the U.S. military-to-military relationship with Iraq, including the value of conducting joint exercises with the Iraqi military similar to the Bright Star exercises carried out with the Arab Republic of Egypt. These provisions would establish committee oversight over the OSC-I, and support our vital interest in maintaining Iraqi stability and security.

#### FORCE PROTECTION

The committee continued to emphasize force protection as a high priority issue for special oversight, focusing on areas having direct impact on the safety of military personnel engaged in operations in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The objective of committee activity was to expedite the promulgation of policies and the fielding of technology and equipment to prevent and/or reduce combat casualties. In Iraq and Afghanistan, focus areas included but were not limited to: effective requirements generation and test and evaluation procedures; mine resistant ambush protected (MRAP) vehicle production and fielding; adequate, effective, and properly resourced quantities of body and vehicle armor; effective counter improvised explosive device (IED) equipment throughout the force; persistent surveillance in support of ground operations, particularly prevention of IED emplacement; solutions to counter the IED threat to dismounted forces; capabilities to counter indirect fires; and personal equipment that mitigates traumatic brain injury.

The committee continued to have concerns regarding the Department's ability to effectively combat and counter the IED threat, specifically in Afghanistan. During the 112th Congress, the committee has focused on activities and solutions being developed, procured, and fielded to address the IED threat in dismounted operations. In the committee report (H. Rept. 112-78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, the committee indicated that the number of dismounted operations conducted by U.S. and coalition forces continue to rise in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. The committee noted that although overall enemy IED efficacy has decreased since October 2010, primarily due to early detection from dismounted forces, the severity of casualties increased when a dismounted IED effective attack occurred. The committee stated that efforts to mitigate the IED threat to dismounted forces should be a top priority for the Department of Defense.

The committee, through formal activity, to include open hearings and classified briefings has also continued to maintain close oversight of the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO), the Depart-

ment of Defense's focal point for the battle against IEDs, during the 112th Congress. To date, Congress has provided approximately \$21.0 billion to JIEDDO to address the IED threat through JIEDDO's three lines of operation: attacking the network, defeating the device, and training the force. The nearly 3,100-person strong JIEDDO obligates and executes approximately \$3.0 billion annually and JIEDDO reports significant progress in the Counter-IED (C-IED) fight. The committee continued to examine and provide oversight on JIEDDO's current roles and missions, operational functions, organizational and force structure requirements, and current metrics for measuring success against countering the IED threat. The committee paid particular attention to whether JIEDDO has rectified previously identified deficiencies to include a lack of rigor in internal management and reporting, questions surrounding their reporting structure to the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and JIEDDO's overall effectiveness in transferring counter-IED technologies to the military services, and why JIEDDO is not actively leading all DOD C-IED efforts.

The committee also continued its intensive oversight of individual body armor and personnel protection programs through hearings and other formal activities. The committee continued to maintain strong interest in: significant ergonomic and ballistic improvements in body armor; advances in light-weight and flexible solutions; and improvements in non-ballistic, blast and blunt-impact protection against traumatic brain injury. The committee continued to encourage fidelity and transparency in body armor test and evaluation procedures; monitored the development and validation of operationally realistic performance specification requirements; and provide oversight on current body armor policy for Operation New Dawn and Operation Enduring Freedom. The committee continued to direct the Department of Defense to adequately plan, program, and budget for body armor and personnel protection programs.

#### GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND EMERGING THREATS

The committee conducted extensive oversight, often in classified form, over terrorism issues and emerging threats, with particular attention given to special operations capabilities, the changing nature of Al Qaeda's organization and operations, and efforts to build partner nation counter-terrorism capability. At the full committee level, members received testimony on special operations forces and emerging threats from Admiral Eric Olson, Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command (SOCOM) during the SOCOM posture hearing on March 3, 2011.

Committee members and staff made numerous trips to countries impacted by terrorism, to include areas where U.S. forces are engaged in combat operations to understand the resources leveraged against terrorism and other emerging threats, the authorities applied in these efforts, and the Department of Defense's interaction with its interagency and international partners. Additionally, the committee received a classified briefing on the Osama Bin Laden raid on May 4, 2011.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011, contained several provisions related to terrorism, emerging threats, and building

partnership capabilities, to include: a provision to modify and extend authority provided under section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) to build the capacity of foreign military forces; a provision to extend authority provided under section 1232 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181) to reimburse certain coalition nations for support provided to U.S. military operations; and several provisions directing reports on military capabilities of nations such as the People’s Republic of China and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and on the national security risk posed by U.S. federal debt held by China. Additionally, recognizing terrorist use of cyberspace to conduct terrorist operations against U.S. forces, the committee included a provision that would affirm the authority for the Secretary of Defense to conduct military activities in cyberspace.

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted detailed oversight of specific issues related to special operations capabilities, counter-proliferation efforts, and counter-insurgency and unconventional warfare operations. Further details on these subcommittee activities are provided in the “Additional Oversight Activities of the Subcommittees” section.

(H.A.S.C. 112–14)

#### DETAINEE POLICY, MILITARY COMMISSIONS, AND RELATED MATTERS

The committee conducted extensive oversight over detainee policy, military commissions, and related matters. On March 17, 2011, the committee held a full committee hearing to discuss “Law of War Detention and the President’s Executive Order Establishing Periodic Review Boards for Guantanamo Detainees”. Deputy Secretary of Defense William Lynn and Department of Defense General Counsel Jeh Johnson testified at the hearing. In addition to the full committee hearing, the committee conducted numerous member and staff level briefings.

While much of the committee’s oversight of detainee issues was conducted in classified form and cannot be addressed in this report, committee members and staff generally focused on issues relating to the legal authorities under which detention operations are undertaken, policies regarding future captures, recidivism amongst former detainees, administrative review procedures for current detainees, detainee-related intelligence gathering, the Department’s role in the High Value Interrogation Group, resources devoted to the Office of Military Commissions, and transfers and releases of third country national detainees from facilities in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

Committee members and staff also made several trips to U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan during which detention operations were carefully evaluated. Committee staff also traveled to Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom specifically to further study counterterrorism and issues relating to detention as well.

There were numerous legislative provisions relating to detainee policy in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011. Specifically, H.R. 1540 includes provisions that would clarify the right to



plead guilty in a trial of a capital offense by military commission; affirm the ongoing armed conflict with Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and associated forces; require national security protocols regarding detainee communications; establish a comprehensive administrative review procedure for detainees held at Guantanamo Bay; prohibit the use of funds to construct or modify facilities in the United States to house Guantanamo detainees; prohibit family visits to Guantanamo detainees; prohibit transfers or releases of Guantanamo and certain other detainees to the United States; and prohibit certain transfers or releases of Guantanamo detainees elsewhere overseas.

#### IRAN

The committee has received three briefings on the status of the threat the Islamic Republic of Iran poses to the national security of the United States and its allies, including an operations and intelligence briefing on February 11, 2011. Briefers included Dr. Colin Kahl, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense for the Middle East; Brigadier General John W. Charlton, Deputy Director, Middle East, Joint Staff J-5; and Mr. Amir Asmar, Defense Intelligence Agency officer for Middle East and North Africa. The committee also received testimony on Iran from General James Mattis, Commander of U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) during the CENTCOM posture hearing on March 3, 2011. Finally, the committee received a second operations and intelligence report on the Middle East that included discussion of Iran on June 15, 2011. Briefers included Dr. Colin Kahl, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, OSD-Policy; Mr. James Q. Roberts, Principal Director, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Combating Terrorism, OSD-Policy; Rear Admiral Scott Moore, Deputy Director for Special Operations, Counterterrorism, J3; Brigadier General John Charlton, Deputy Director for Politico-Military Affairs-Middle East, J5; and Mr. Alan Pino, National Intelligence Officer for Near East.

#### FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND EFFICIENCY

As previously discussed, the committee has taken seriously its role in ensuring that the Department of Defense is a good steward of the taxpayer's dollars. It is essential, particularly in the current economic environment that the Department brings fiscal discipline to the management of its financial resources and that priorities be set to fund much needed modernization and operations. To that end, the committee scrutinized defense programs to ensure we are concentrating our limited resources on the highest priority programs. The committee supported initiatives focused on reducing waste, streamlining operations, and eliminating redundancies across all enterprises.

However, the committee notes that it is essential that efficiencies initiatives are grounded by sound analysis and will not leave our military less capable and less ready to fight. The committee will continue to evaluate the impacts of the proposed \$78 billion reduction from the Department's funding top line during fiscal years 2012–16, particularly in light of proposals to trim an additional

\$400 billion from the Department of Defense through fiscal year 2023.

#### ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The committee undertook an extensive review of the organization and management of the Department of Defense in order to ensure that it is properly postured to meet the complex and evolving security threats of the 21st century. Specifically, the committee was concerned that the Department of Defense's recent focus on efficiencies without a thorough business case analysis and risk assessment potentially undermines the Department's ability to appropriately plan and budget for its total manpower requirements. The committee believes that the Department of Defense should aggressively undertake a more holistic look at its manpower requirements in order to achieve the appropriate balance in its total workforce, rather than managing simply to an arbitrary civilian authorization level. The committee notes that total force management would improve manpower requirements determination and planning to facilitate decisions on which sector is most appropriate to perform the requirement with consideration of the distinct value of each component, whether military, civilian, or contractor personnel. To achieve that end, the committee included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a total force management plan that would provide the means to establish the appropriate mix of manpower (military, civilian, and contractor personnel) to perform the mission of the Department of Defense. The committee also included provisions that would make changes to requirements for manpower reporting and civilian strategic human capital plans.

#### FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The Comptroller General of the United States has consistently identified the Department of Defense's financial management as a high-risk area since 1995. The Department's inability to track and account for billions of dollars annually in funding and tangible assets continues to undermine its management approach. It also creates a lack of transparency that significantly limits congressional oversight. Any attempt by the Department to reform defense acquisition or to find efficiencies within the Department lack credibility if it is unable to produce auditable financial statements. Without these objective tools, neither the Department nor Congress can verify that greater value is being created. As a result, the committee continues to monitor the Department's efforts to implement the Financial Improvement and Audit Readiness (FIAR) plan to correct the weaknesses in its financial statements and monitor closely the interdependencies between FIAR and the hundreds of millions of dollars being spent on business systems modernization programs that the Department has proposed to address its financial management problems. Subtitle F of title X of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011, contains several provisions that would strengthen the Department's financial management, improve the reliability of defense financial statements, increase the com-

petency of the financial management workforce, and add additional requirements to the FIAR plan. As previously discussed, the committee also directed the Comptroller General to assess the extent to which the Department is tracking and realizing savings proposed pursuant the Secretary of Defense's efficiencies initiatives through fiscal year 2016.

#### ACQUISITION ISSUES

##### *The acquisition system and acquisition policy*

The committee continued its long-standing work on Department of Defense acquisition policy. The committee conducted oversight of the implementation of the Weapon System Acquisition Reform Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-181) and the IMPROVE Acquisition Act of 2010, as included in the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383), and specifically examined the impact of these reforms on individual acquisition programs such as the Joint Strike Fighter, the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle, and the Common Vertical Lift Support Program. The committee continued its oversight of the Department's process for reviewing and certifying requirements for major defense acquisition programs, development of the acquisition workforce, protection of strategic materials, and management of services contracting.

In conjunction with its review of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2012, the committee examined the military requirements determination processes. The committee continues to believe that validation of a military requirement is foundational to any acquisition effort. However, the Department's processes for requirements determination continue to produce outcomes which do not reflect the jointness that the military has achieved at the operating level. For this reason, the committee included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, which prohibited funding for procurement or fielding of light attack armed reconnaissance aircraft until such time as the Joint Requirements Oversight Council validates the requirement for such capability.

The committee recognizes that a fundamental component in addressing most of the problems in the acquisition process is improving the composition and quality of the acquisition workforce. The committee continued its oversight of efforts to enhance career paths for military personnel working in acquisition, implementation of the Department of Defense Acquisition Workforce Development Fund, and other efforts by the Department to expand and improve the acquisition workforce and the financial management community.

The committee maintains that competition reduces costs, increases quality, and improves vendor performance. For this reason, the committee included several provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, to foster competition in defense acquisitions and weapon systems sustainment. Department of Defense acquisition officials often find that they are locked into sole-source acquisition strategies because the government does not own sufficient technical data rights to enable competition. The committee exam-

ined the findings and recommendations of the May 2011 review by the Government Accountability Office of the Department's acquisition and procurement policies regarding technical data rights and will continue oversight of this matter.

Service contracting represents an increasingly large proportion of the acquisition expenditures of the Department. The committee continued to work with the Department's Panel on Contracting Integrity to eliminate contracting vulnerabilities and monitored the Department's phase out of the use of contractors to perform inherently governmental functions.

While the committee has done a significant amount of work to improve the ability of the workforce to contract in a contingency environment, the committee took additional steps to ensure that contingency contracting can be used as an effective tool of counter-insurgency operations. The committee reviewed the findings and recommendations of the Commission on Wartime Contracting. Based on the commission's findings, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, contained several provisions aimed at addressing shortfalls in Operational Contract Support, increasing competition in contingency contracting, and enhancing contract management. Furthermore, the committee continued to monitor the progress of the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the United States Agency for International Development in implementing the memorandum of understanding among those agencies on oversight of contracting in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan.

#### *Defense industrial base and technology transfers*

The committee continued its close examination of the health of the defense industrial base. The industrial base for complex major weapons systems has shrunk dramatically in the last decade, limiting the ability of the Department of Defense (DOD) to control costs and encourage innovation through the use of competition. Industry also has struggled in many cases to make the long-term investments that are vital to the health of the defense industrial base, notably in the shipbuilding industry. The committee examined the policies and funding tools available to the Department to ensure the health of the defense industrial base and, as a result, included provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, for enhancing DOD's ability to monitor and manage supplier risk, and to address supplier-base vulnerabilities.

Section 1248 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111-84) required the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to carry out an assessment of the national security risks of removing satellites and related components from the U.S. Munitions List. The committee received an interim risk assessment report in May 2011 and awaits delivery of the final report. The committee plans to hold an oversight hearing in the latter half of 2011 to review space export control policy. The consolidation of the defense industry and its increasingly global nature will increasingly challenge the capabilities of current systems for industrial security.

*Rapid acquisition authority and joint urgent operational needs process*

The conflicts in the Republic of Iraq and the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and particularly the evolution of the improvised explosive device (IED) as a highly effective weapon of strategic influence, have illustrated the ability of an enemy to adapt within a normal defense acquisition cycle. The committee continued its oversight of the joint urgent operational needs (JUONS) process and urged the Secretary of Defense to leverage previous efforts of the committee to take advantage of the rapid acquisition authority provided to the Department of Defense as part of section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), wherever necessary, in order to guarantee that military personnel receive required equipment in a timely manner.

*Information technology*

The committee continued its oversight of information technology acquisition issues, to include implementation of section 804 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84). The committee scrutinized the Department of Defense’s plan for budget reductions and efficiencies initiatives, and the impacts those changes would have on information technology programs. As the military services are the primary acquirers of information technology systems, particular attention was given to service information technology programs during the service posture hearings and during other committee oversight activities.

The committee remains concerned about the projected dissolution of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Networks & Information Integration) and other information technology-related realignment within the Department, and will continue to monitor Department of Defense efforts to achieve efficiencies and leverage information technology.

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities conducted detailed oversight of specific programmatic issues related to information technology. Further details on these subcommittee activities are provided in the “Additional Oversight Activities of the Subcommittees” section of this report.

## OTHER POLICY ISSUES

### INTELLIGENCE

The committee focused on several areas of oversight related to intelligence activities of the Department of Defense. The committee held numerous classified briefings to discuss intelligence activities, with a particular emphasis on activities in support of ongoing hostilities and the division of responsibilities and authorities between the military and other components of the intelligence community. Committee members and staff also made several trips to areas of ongoing hostilities during which intelligence activities were carefully evaluated. The committee continued its efforts to ensure that the Department of Defense has the resources and legal authorities needed to provide effective and efficient intelligence support to military operations.

While much of the committee's oversight of intelligence issues was conducted in classified form and cannot be addressed in this report, the committee specifically evaluated the Department of Defense's security practices, audit capabilities, and information-sharing policies following recent extensive unauthorized disclosures of classified information. These efforts resulted in a legislative provision that would require a comprehensive insider threat detection program being included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011.

#### NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVES

The committee continued its efforts to review the requirements for full time support of the Reserve Component. Oversight visits were made to National Guard state headquarters to discuss the military technicians program. The committee is committed to working with the Administration to ensure the proper structure is resourced to support an operational reserve force.

#### READINESS

The Subcommittee on Readiness provided oversight of Department of Defense military readiness, training, logistics, maintenance, military construction, installations, family housing, and the base realignment and closure process. The subcommittee also provided oversight on civilian personnel, energy security, and environmental issues that affect the Department of Defense. The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 4, 2011, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011.

#### FORCE READINESS

The committee held several hearings focused on the challenges facing the military services to provide trained and ready forces for ongoing operations while maintaining the capability to meet other commitments and to posture the force for long-term required readiness to respond to future real-world contingencies. The committee found that while deployed Army forces have, in most cases, the equipment, personnel, and training they require for their missions, this deployed readiness has come at the continued expense of non-deployed Army units. The committee remains concerned about the number of non-deployed units reporting that they are not ready for combat operations, or would need additional time, personnel, and equipment to prepare for deployment, and intends to hold additional hearings to conduct further oversight on force readiness levels. In addition, the committee found that these personnel challenges are especially acute in key personnel categories such as warrant officers and certain enlisted specialties which have experienced shortages as the number of medically non-deployable personnel has increased. Therefore, the committee tasked the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to conduct a review of Army personnel readiness.

Restoring equipment readiness also is a key element of the Army reset process. The fiscal year 2012 budget request moves an in-

creasing share of the enduring depot maintenance requirements back to the base budget, providing funds for the restoration of equipment, damaged or worn out through nearly 10 years of constant operations. The committee also tasked the Secretary of Defense to annually certify prepositioned stocks as meeting operation plans requirements and report in greater detail on the condition, composition, and status of such stocks in an effort to increase materiel readiness.

The Army also has increased funding for home-station full spectrum training, reflecting anticipated increases in training tempo as the Army commits fewer units to combat operations. Because of concerns that full-spectrum training may not adequately measure training tempo, the committee directed GAO to review the Army's transition to full-spectrum training as a readiness metric. In addition, the committee remains concerned that while the Army has made targeted investments in the Reserve's critical combat service support capabilities, the Guard and Reserve may not have the level of access to training resources necessary for a return to full spectrum operations training. The committee also requested GAO to conduct a review of the Department's mix of live versus simulated training for all the military services, including the Reserve Components.

The committee found that the Air Force continues to experience a high operations tempo, which has resulted in detrimental effects on equipment such as engine and structural fatigue, deterioration, corrosion, and increased rates of component failures. The increased tempo also delays routine maintenance. As a result, the committee intends to continue its review of the significant shortfalls experienced by the Air Force in depot maintenance, particularly in its baseline program for Active and Reserve forces which the Air Force has made up only through Overseas Contingency Operations funding.

Despite the drawdown in the Republic of Iraq, naval operations tempo is expected to remain high, as demand for the Navy's services is up, including anti-piracy and ballistic missile defense operations as well as operations in support of U.S. Africa Command and U.S. Pacific Command. Because of concerns over the impact on the Navy's non-nuclear surface fleet material readiness as a result of its increased operations tempo, the committee requested GAO to review the Navy's initiatives to improve amphibious and surface combatant ship material readiness. Additionally, in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, the committee included additional funds for ship and aircraft depot maintenance to address the backlog of requirements and to prevent further degradation to the fleet. Furthermore, the Marine Corps recently concluded a Force Posture Review that emphasized "rebalancing" the Marine Corps to better "focus on future contingencies." As such, the fiscal year 2012 budget request reflects some initial investments in special skill sets needed to move the Marine Corps toward a force more fully attuned to the lessons learned during nine years of combat. Despite this positive trend, the Marine Corps faces significant challenges in migrating its core maintenance and logistical requirements into the base budget.

(H.A.S.C. 112–13; H.A.S.C. 112–17; H.A.S.C. 112–21; H.A.S.C. 112–33; H.A.S.C. 112–40)

#### LIFE-CYCLE SUSTAINMENT

Without appropriate and timely input from the logistics community, decisions made during weapon systems design can create unnecessary sustainment problems that increase depot-level maintenance once the system is fielded. To address this, the committee amended the Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–23) to include subsystems and components of a major weapon system in the requirement for consideration of competition throughout the operation and sustainment of major weapon systems. The committee also directed improved sustainment planning using predictive modeling tools to assure that the proper source of repair is being considered.

Despite a 38-to-1 return on investment from corrosion mitigation and control projects, the Department of Defense consistently underfunds corrosion efforts. Specifically, the Government Accountability Office determined that the Department of Defense requested \$11.1 million of its total projected funding requirements of \$43.2 million. Therefore, the committee included several provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, that address corrosion. Specifically, the committee increased funding for corrosion mitigation by an additional \$33 million, directed the Department of Defense to take corrective action regarding the F–22 Raptor and F–35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft, and directed the Department of Defense to evaluate corrosion for facilities and infrastructure and report the findings.

#### DEPOT AND ARSENAL CAPABILITY

A critical piece of equipment sustainment is the capability provided by the nation’s organic arsenals and depots, including air logistics centers and shipyards. In February, the committee received a study on the future capability of the Department of Defense maintenance depots directed by section 322 of the Duncan Hunter Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110–417). The study assessed organic depot maintenance capabilities and made several recommendations to address the challenges facing the organic depots. The committee included several of the study’s recommendations in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, including revising the statutory definitional framework for depot maintenance, strengthening the core determination process, expanding the designation for Centers of Industrial and Technical Excellence, and improving depot maintenance reporting.

#### CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

The Department of Defense has long relied on the Federal civilian workforce to support its missions around the world, often requiring civilians to serve in active combat zones, and it is clear that the Department’s civilian workforce plays a critical role in the readiness of U.S. military forces. The committee included provi-



sions in the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, to extend authorities for premium pay and to expand death gratuity benefits for deployed civilians.

The committee also included provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, that would require the Secretary of Defense to develop a total force management plan that would provide the means to establish the appropriate mix of manpower, military, civilian, and contractor personnel, to perform the mission of the Department of Defense, and to make changes to requirements for manpower reporting and civilian strategic human capital plans.

In addition, the committee continued its oversight of the Department's transition from the National Security Personnel System (NSPS) and implementation of the authorities provided to the Department for performance management and hiring flexibilities which would apply across the Department's civilian workforce, within the context of the existing General Schedule system. The committee is aware that the NSPS transition office has been moving forward in its efforts to develop the new authorities, starting with a "New Beginnings" conference and establishing design teams to begin the development of a plan for implementing the performance management and hiring flexibilities. Recognizing that additional legislative authorities may be necessary as the process moves forward, the committee included provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, to further facilitate the Department's ability to implement a fair and transparent performance management system. The committee also specifically focused on the Department's process for recruiting, selecting and hiring qualified individuals.

## ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

### ENERGY SECURITY

The committee conducted vigorous oversight of the Department's energy activities and closely examined the strategies and policies for both installations energy and operational energy to reduce consumption and dependence on foreign oil. The committee believes that Department of Defense installations provide significant opportunity for advancing renewable energy technologies, pursuing energy security, and reducing overall demand through demonstrated return on investment. The Subcommittee on Readiness took action in this area in the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, and increased funding for the Installation Energy Test Bed, Navy metering of piers, as well as other activities that will help advance energy efficient technologies and reduce overall demand for energy. There were several legislative provisions that sought to enhance installation energy security, to include a requirement to establish a core curriculum and certification for Department of Defense energy managers, metering of navy piers, and consideration for energy security when contracting for renewable energy projects through third-party financing.

The Subcommittee on Readiness continued its oversight and emphasis of reducing demand for operational energy at forward-deployed locations to relieve the significant logistical burden and force protection requirements, and decrease operational vulnerabilities. Specifically, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, increased funding for operational energy capability improvement and the U.S. Marine Corps' Experimental Forward Operating Base. In addition to this, there were several legislative provisions that sought to advance operational energy security by streamlining alternative fuels investments through the designation of an executive agent, requiring the Department of Defense to give favorable consideration to energy efficient technologies in logistics support contracts for contingency operations, and requiring the Department of Defense to report on the distribution and use of bottled water in contingency operations.

On April 13, 2011, the Subcommittee on Readiness received testimony from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and each of the military services regarding military construction and installation energy. Each of the witnesses highlighted the importance of energy efficiency and the impact of a vulnerable electric power grid and the potential to jeopardize the security of military installations and mission capabilities. The witnesses also highlighted the importance of innovative, cost-effective solutions as critical to their success, operationally necessary, fiscally prudent, and mission essential.

(H.A.S.C. 112-43)

#### ENVIRONMENT

The committee conducted oversight of environmental issues resulting from Department of Defense activities on military installations, training ranges, and operational activities to include the military services' environmental restoration program and adherence to federal, state and local cleanup, compliance, and pollution prevention requirements. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, the committee had several environmental provisions including one which codified Navy requirements for discharge of waste at sea to ensure minimum impact on the environment, preserving Navy operational readiness, and averting \$2.0 billion of expenses for Navy fleet modifications. The committee also included provisions that would limit the use of property in airfield clear zone areas to mitigate encroachment on military installations. Additionally, the committee directed reports regarding Department of Defense unexploded ordnance cleanup activities and a Comptroller General assessment of the Department of Defense's report on the Arctic.

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

##### BASING

The Department of Defense is undergoing a significant change in force structure both in the United States and overseas as a result of the 2005 BRAC decisions and the Global Defense Posture Review. These rebasing movements affect not only U.S. global pres-

ence, but they also have significant repercussions for readiness, surge capability, military construction, and quality of life for military members and their families.

After concluding a hearing on Long-Term Readiness Challenges in the Pacific on March 15, 2011, the Subcommittee on Readiness supported the proposed realignment of 8,000 Marines from Okinawa, Japan, to Guam and supported the budget request for \$155 million for the fiscal year 2012 effort. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, also included a legislative subsection that would support the realignment of Marine Corps assets to Guam that includes the following provisions: use of operations and maintenance funding to support community adjustment; requirements to support H2B visa workers that support the construction effort; and, modifications to utility conveyance authority. The Subcommittee on Readiness also supported the requisite BRAC funding to continue required environmental remediation at impacted installations.

(H.A.S.C. 112–21)

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMMING

The Department of Defense programs construction projects at 25–40 percent above market pricing to account for several programmatic initiatives to include Federal contracting requirements (including Davis-Bacon wages, Federal subcontracting and small business goals, and bonding requirements), Federal design requirements (including Anti-Terrorism, Force Protection standards) and energy efficiency objectives. The committee included a provision in the committee report (H. Rept. 112–78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, that would require the Secretary of Defense to submit a report that assesses these program increases and provides a plan to reduce these costs.

As an additional issue for construction programming, the committee continued its efforts to provide combatant commanders limited authority to rapidly implement contingency construction to address emerging construction requirements. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, contained a provision that authorized the use of Operations and Maintenance funds for contingency construction.

#### REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION, MAINTENANCE, AND DISPOSAL

The real property management process requires extensive oversight to maintain more than \$810.0 billion in infrastructure at an annual cost of almost \$50.0 billion, or nearly 11 percent, of the Department of Defense's budget. The Subcommittee on Readiness in the 112th Congress reviewed issues pertaining to military construction, family housing, and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) activities of the Department of Defense. The Readiness Subcommittee held a hearing on April 13, 2011, to examine the fiscal year 2012 budget request to review military construction, family housing, BRAC activities, and facility operations and maintenance.

As a result of this oversight, additional BRAC authorities were included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, to extend the completion date of up to seven BRAC 2005 recommendations to September 15, 2012. This extension would provide additional latitude to the Secretary of Defense to ensure continuity of mission and services for those activities impacted by BRAC 2005. The committee also included requirements for the Department of Defense to include transportation impact assessments at local communities significantly impacted by Department of Defense realignment actions.

The committee also reviewed the Department of Defense facility sustainment accounts and the Army Base Operating Services account and found that significant shortfalls needed to be addressed to manage basic services. The committee proposed increased funding to these accounts in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, to address critical shortfalls in facility maintenance and operations. (H.A.S.C. 112-43)

#### MILITARY INFRASTRUCTURE PRIVATIZATION

The Department of Defense has made extensive use of privatization of military assets including family housing, bachelor quarters, and utility-related infrastructure. The Department has leveraged available capital in Department of Defense infrastructure and entered into long-term contracts with private property managers. The Subcommittee on Readiness in the 112th Congress reviewed this privatization initiative and included a provision in the committee report (H. Rept. 112-78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, that would encourage the Department of Defense to more aggressively and effectively implement utilities privatization as part of an asset management strategy to allow each military service to focus on core defense missions and functions.

#### TOTAL FORCE, PERSONNEL, AND HEALTH CARE ISSUES

##### MANPOWER SUFFICIENT IN QUANTITY AND QUALITY TO MEET GLOBAL COMMITMENTS

The committee continued its support for the end strengths of the services by including the Department of Defense request in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011. The committee has concerns about the future size of the force and whether proposed reductions in end strength will provide the services with sufficient manpower to meet global commitments. The committee is equally concerned with dwell time of service members and the impact this will have on readiness. Both of these issues were addressed in full committee and subcommittee hearings. The committee will continue close oversight of these issues during the remainder of the 1st session of the 112th Congress.

The committee continued to closely monitor compensation programs during the 112th Congress to ensure an adequate quality of

life for service members and their families and to ensure that pay and benefits met the needs of the wartime military and kept pace with private sector standards. The committee's active oversight of these issues resulted in legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, that authorized a 1.6 percent raise in basic pay during fiscal year 2012. This military pay raise matches the rate of compensation increases in the private sector as measured by the Employment Cost Index and thus ensures that military pay increases are keeping pace with private sector contemporaries. The committee extended the authorities to pay bonuses and special pays during fiscal year 2012 and monitored the value of those bonuses and special pays to ensure they were sufficient to achieve the recruiting and retention objectives for which they were developed. The committee also included legislation that reforms, consolidates, and simplifies travel and transportation authorities to enhance the utility, flexibility, efficiency, and relevancy of the law in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011.

(H.A.S.C. 112-28)

SUSTAINING COST EFFICIENT OPERATION OF MORALE, WELFARE AND RECREATION PROGRAMS, MILITARY RESALE PROGRAMS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE SCHOOL SYSTEM

During the 112th Congress, the committee acted to improve the effectiveness and quality of military exchanges and commissaries and morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) programs and to protect these critical programs for future generations of service members. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel conducted two hearings during the 1st session of the 112th Congress that explored policy issues and the fiscal status of the commissary and military exchange stores and the service-operated MWR programs. The Department of Defense consulted the committee on a wide range of management proposals regarding new construction or facility renovation, store expansions or closures, public-private ventures, business practices, and new business opportunities and models. In each case, the committee provided guidance and decisions, as requested. The committee included legislative initiatives in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, to address the concerns that had been brought to the attention of the committee and to improve the policies and processes used to manage military resale and MWR programs. These issues included: expansion of the authority for non-appropriated fund activities to employ a uniform funding concept to include permanent change of station and temporary duty billeting facilities; clarification of the multi-year contracting authority by nonappropriated funding activities; authorization for the Secretary of the Navy to select categories of merchandise to sell in ship stores; authorization for military retail stores to borrow funding for business operations from the Federal Financing Bank; and authorization for the Defense Commissary Service to conduct a pilot program to test the cost effectiveness of enhanced commissary stores.

(H.A.S.C. 112-3; H.A.S.C. 112-4)

## MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The committee continued its efforts to ensure that service members and their families have access to quality mental health services. Some members of the Armed Forces, particularly in the Reserve Components, continue to struggle with mental health issues that ultimately result in suicide. Members of the Reserve Components are often in rural communities and may not have sufficient access to mental health care, as there is a nationwide shortage of qualified mental health professionals. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, included legislation to expand the capacity of the military health system to provide mental health care to members of the Reserve Components at the location of the unit during scheduled unit training and provided training on suicide prevention and response. In addition, the Department is required to undertake several projects that would further advance the knowledge and understanding of traumatic brain injury and combat related mental health issues to enhance the care provided to members of the Armed Forces.

(H.A.S.C. 112-19; H.A.S.C. 112-23)

## SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

The committee remained vigilant on ensuring that the efforts to prevent sexual assault and sexual harassment in the military continue as a priority for the Department of Defense (DOD). The committee was concerned that the Department of Defense and the military service sexual assault and prevention programs were not consistent or coordinated resulting in unnecessary confusion for military service members. To address these concerns legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, improved sexual assault prevention and response in the Armed Forces by requiring standardized training for sexual assault response coordinators and victim advocates and requiring at least one full time sexual assault response coordinator and victim advocate be assigned to each brigade equivalent military unit. Privileged communications for the victim was expanded to include access to legal assistance for sexual assault victims.

## MILITARY HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

Since the start of the 112th Congress, the committee exercised vigorous oversight on the military health system. The committee focused substantial attention on the cost of military health care to the Department of Defense (DOD) and to military beneficiaries and the long term viability of the military health system for future generations of military beneficiaries. The committee is aware of the rising cost of providing health care to military beneficiaries and the potential negative impact of health care costs on other critical readiness programs. The committee received detailed input from DOD health affairs and comptroller personnel on the five cost saving initiatives proposed by the department. One Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing was devoted to understanding the views of various beneficiary organizations impacted by the Department of De-

fense proposed changes. The committee also heard the views of health care organizations and retail drug store chains impacted by the proposals. The Congressional Budget Office assisted the committee to fully understand estimates of costs and savings inherent in the DOD proposals. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011, included a provision that caps TRICARE Prime enrollment fee increases, beginning in fiscal year 2013, to the percentage of a COLA increase in military retired pay. Additional health care legislation required beneficiaries who are enrolled in the U.S. Family Health Plans to transition to TRICARE for Life when they reach age 65.

(H.A.S.C. 112–19; H.A.S.C. 112–23)

#### WOUNDED WARRIOR CARE (WOUNDED AND DISABLED SERVICE MEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILIES)

The committee continued to provide oversight of the disability evaluation system to ensure that service members receive disability rating that accurately and fairly reflect their illnesses and injuries. These activities included monitoring of the implementation of the integrated disability evaluation system (IDES) and the deployment of IDES to locations throughout the world by September 2011.

(H.A.S.C. 112–28)

#### MILITARY VOTING

The committee continued oversight of the military and overseas voting program to ensure all members of the Armed Forces and their families have the opportunity to exercise their right to vote in each election. In February 2012, the committee provided assistance to the House Administration Committee in preparation for a hearing they conducted on the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment Act. The hearing explored the implementation of the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment (“MOVE”) Act during this past election cycle. Chairman Wilson and Ranking Member Davis were invited and attended the hearing.

#### PRISONER OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

The committee continued its efforts to monitor efforts by the Department of Defense to meet the mandate in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84) requiring the Secretary of Defense to institute a plan to increase the number of identifications to a rate of 200 per year by 2015. The committee solicited the views of Mr. Peter Verga, Chief of Staff for the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy regarding the status of key decisions pending in the Secretariat on command and control and integration of functions in the POW/MIA accounting community. Although decisions have not been formally made, the resources to increase manpower and to create a satellite laboratory for identifications were requested in the fiscal year 2012 President’s budget request. The committee also received an update from the Commander of Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command (JPAC) on the organization’s plans to meet the 2010 mandate. The committee also received information from the Defense Prisoner of War

and Missing Office (DPMO) to receive updates on potential changes to staff requirements for the Joint U.S.-Russia Joint Commission on POW/MIA. The committee will continue its efforts on both of these topics during the remainder of the first session of the 112th Congress.

#### MODERNIZATION AND INVESTMENT ISSUES

During the 112th Congress, particular attention has been given by the committee to examination of military equipment modernization with respect to military capability. The committee is concerned with the future of the size, health, age, and supporting industrial base of the air, sea, and land force structure available to U.S. forces to support the National Military Strategy.

Major weapons system development and acquisition programs continue to experience cost growth and schedule delays. The committee assessed the need for legislative action by examining causes of these problems including: late determination of requirements, requirements growth, and failure to properly control requirements changes; inadequate analyses of alternatives, military services proceeding prematurely with development with immature technology; poor cost estimating; improper funding profiles; over estimating potential production rates; and program instability.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, included the following legislative provisions to, in part, address the committee's concern with the force structure and supporting industrial base available to U.S. forces to support the National Military Strategy: a report, including a fleet viability assessment, on intra-theater airlift that incorporates a comprehensive review of intra-theater airlift requirements for both title 10, United States Code, and title 32, United States Code, operations; a limitation of up to 6 B-1 bomber aircraft that could be retired; the authorization of an additional \$272.0 million for sustainment of the Abrams Tank industrial base; and the authorization of an additional \$153.0 million for Bradley Infantry Fighting Vehicle industrial base.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, also included the following legislative provisions to, in part, address acquisition-related cost, schedule, and performance issues with programs: multiyear procurement authority for airframes, mission avionics, and common cockpits for Army UH-60M/HH-60M helicopters and Navy MH-60R/MH-60S helicopters; an additional third year of multiyear procurement authority to fully fund LHA-7; multiyear procurement authority for the Navy for *Arleigh-Burke* class destroyers; a requirement for a life-cycle cost-benefit analysis comparing alternate maintenance and sustainability plans for the Littoral Combat Ship program; authority for the Air Force to enter into a fixed price contract to procure Advanced Extremely High Frequency satellites to reduce costs and improve the stability of the satellite industrial base; a limitation on obligation of funds for the Ground Combat Vehicle program until the Army provides an update analysis of alternatives; a requirement for submission of an analysis of alternatives for the individual carbine program; a limitation on the obligation of funds for the *Ohio* class ballistic missile



submarine replacement program until submission of a report summarizing the analysis that supported the decision to reduce the planned number of missile tubes per submarine to 16; a limitation on the obligation of funds for amphibious programs in the Department of the Navy until submission of a report and an analysis of alternatives; a limitation on the obligation of funds for performance improvements to the F-35 aircraft propulsion system unless the Secretary of Defense ensures the competitive development and production of such a propulsion system; a limitation on the obligation of funds for the Joint Replacement Fuze program until submission of a report on the feasibility of such a program; a limitation on the obligation of funds for release one of the Joint Space Operations Center management system until provision of an acquisition strategy for such a management system; a limitation on the obligation of funds for the wireless innovation fund program until 30 days after the submission of a report on the program; authority for the establishment of a program for flight research and development of advanced rotorcraft technology; a requirement for the establishment of the main propulsion system of the next-generation long-range strike bomber as a major subprogram and development of an acquisition strategy for such propulsion system; a requirement for the establishment of the electromagnetic aircraft launch system as a major subprogram of the CVN-78 *Ford*-class aircraft carrier program; and a limitation on the obligation of funds for the future unmanned carrier-based strike system until 60 days after specified certification and a report is provided on the program.

#### ARMY ARMORED VEHICLE MODERNIZATION

The committee focused closely on the Army's plans for upgrading current combat vehicles and starting new replacement programs. With regard to existing armored vehicles, the committee sought to protect and strengthen vehicle upgrade programs, for which the Army showed varying levels of support. The committee placed continued upgrades to the M1 Abrams tank, M2 Bradley Fighting Vehicles, Stryker Vehicles, and Paladin Artillery Vehicles on a firm footing for the future by ensuring the Army carried through with upgrade plans and used authorized funds as directed. In particular, the committee took necessary initial actions to prevent a production break of the Abrams tank and Bradley fighting vehicle programs. These oversight efforts included hearings, site visits, close coordination with Army leadership, and careful scrutiny of reprogramming requests.

#### ARMY TACTICAL NETWORK PROGRAMS

Due to a significant increase in Army funding for tactical communications equipment, the committee pursued aggressive oversight efforts to shape the Army's plans for future battlefield networking equipment. These efforts stemmed from the committee's concern that the Army was procuring an incompatible combination of commercial and military communications equipment based on redundant programs, unclear requirements, and uncoordinated acquisition plans. In response, the committee pursued a combination of legislative restrictions, funding adjustments to select programs, hearings, reprogramming decisions, and outside expert reports to

help guide the Army to a more suitable and affordable path forward. The committee included a legislative provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, that would restrict procurement funds for the Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS) until the Secretary of the Army submits written certification that the acquisition strategy for full rate production includes full and open competition.

#### ARMY AVIATION PROGRAMS

The Army sustained limited operations in the Republic of Iraq in the first half of 2011 and continued the drawdown of forces while Army operations maintained at surge levels in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan. Large numbers of legacy rotorcraft deployed to the Central Command area of operations continued to be operated at high tempos. Aircraft deployed included the CH-47, UH-60, AH-64, and OH-58. The committee fully supported funding requirements for these aircraft, including research and development and procurement of significant aircraft survivability equipment upgrades to provide warning and protection against the insurgent surface-to-air missile threat. Further, due to committee concerns that the Army may not be fully utilizing the UH-72A Lakota helicopter in all operational situations, the committee requested in the report (H. Rept. 112-78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, that the Army define “permissive” versus “non-permissive” environments. In addition, the committee requested additional information on what the associated survivability modifications would be required and if such modifications would be feasible given, size, weight, and power limitations, if the mission envelope of the UH-72A was expanded beyond “permissive” environments.

#### COMBAT SEARCH AND RESCUE PROGRAMS

The committee continues to remain concerned about the Air Force combat search and rescue (CSAR) programs since the Combat Search and Rescue-X (CSAR-X) program was canceled by the Department of Defense in 2009. Currently, the Air Force has 99 HH-60G CSAR helicopters which is 13 short of its program of record requirement for 112 HH-60Gs, and over 50 percent of the HH-60G fleet has major structural cracks. At a hearing on March 15, 2011 before the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, the Air Force witnesses testified that on-going HH-60G modification programs are attempting to keep the HH-60G as a viable asset until the Air Force’s replacement programs are complete. The Air Force is procuring replacement rotary wing aircraft based upon currently fielded CSAR capabilities with the HH-60 Operational Loss Replacement (OLR) program and the HH-60 recapitalization program. The OLR program is designed to bring the fleet back to the program of record of 112 helicopters and is procuring UH-60M aircraft that will be modified with CSAR equipment to create an airframe comparable to the HH-60G, and will be designated the HH-60M. The HH-60G recapitalization program is designed to recapitalize the entire CSAR fleet and the Air Force is currently ex-

aming acquisition strategies to determine how to ensure the warfighter receives the best product, on schedule and within budget. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, authorized \$34.8 million for one HH-60M which was two fewer than the budget request since those two helicopters were provided for in the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10). The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, also authorized the Overseas Contingency Operations request for \$39.3 million for two additional HH-60M helicopters, and the \$34.3 million budget request for H-60 modifications.

#### F-22 AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

During the 112th Congress, the committee has continued oversight of the Air Force F-22 aircraft procurement program. Fiscal Year 2009 was the final year of a 3 year, 60-aircraft F-22 aircraft multiyear procurement program that will result in a force structure of 187 F-22 aircraft, including the 4 additional F-22s appropriated in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-32). The final F-22 aircraft will be delivered in 2012. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, authorized the F-22 modification budget request for \$232.0 million and the F-22 research, development, test, and evaluation budget request for \$718.4 million.

#### F-35 FIGHTER AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

During the 112th Congress, the committee has continued oversight of the F-35 program, particularly the competitive propulsion system, the F136 alternate engine, program. The F-35 competitive propulsion system program is developing the F136 engine, which is intended to eventually provide F-35 equipped forces a competitive choice between the primary F135 engine and the F136 engine. Congress and the Department of Defense had originally supported the competitive engine initiative beginning in 1996, but the Department of Defense has not included funding for the competitive propulsion system program in its budget requests since 2006. At the Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on March 15, 2011, the Air Force Acquisition Executive and the F-35 Program Executive Officer testified that the Department of Defense believes that maintaining a single engine supplier provides the best balance of cost and risk. The Department of Defense terminated the F136 development program on April 25, 2011. However, the F136 contractor offered to continue F136 development at its expense, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, included a provision that would ensure that the Secretary of Defense, at no cost to the Federal Government, provides support and allows for the use of F136 property by the contractor under a contract to conduct research, development, test, and evaluation of the F136 engine, if such activities are self-funded by the contractor. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, also included a provision that would limit the obligation or expenditure of funds for performance improvements to

the F-35 Lightning II propulsion system unless the Secretary of Defense ensures the competitive development and production of such propulsion system.

#### FIGHTER AIRCRAFT FORCE STRUCTURE ADEQUACY

During the 112th Congress, the committee investigated the adequacy of fighter force structure in both the Navy and the Air Force. The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on March 15, 2011. The Navy witness testified that F/A-18A/B/C/D aircraft are reaching their projected service-life and will require replacement or modifications to further extend their service-life to eventual deployment of the F-35 aircraft, and noted that the Department of the Navy's strike fighter shortfall would reach a manageable level of 65 aircraft in 2018. The committee later learned that Department of the Navy's estimated strike fighter shortfall is further, projected to be reduced to 52 aircraft in 2018 with the increase of nine additional F/A-18E/F aircraft for fiscal year 2011. Also at the hearing on March 15, 2011, the Air Force witness testified to an a Air Force requirement for 2,000 fighter aircraft, and noted that a comprehensive review of current and projected force structure revealed a shortfall of approximately 3 to 5 percent in the future years defense program. The Air Force officials also noted that shortfall mitigation will include executing funded sustainment and fleet management actions for older F-16 Block 25, 30 and 32 aircraft, newer block 40 and 50 service life extension, and targeted modernization and examination of the overall force structure to ensure viable warfighting capabilities are maintained. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, authorized the budget request for 40 F/A-18E/F and EA-18G aircraft for the Navy, other Navy and Air Force requests for the modification of existing fighter aircraft, and the budget request for 32 F-35s for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

#### GROUND COMBAT VEHICLE PROGRAM

The committee devoted considerable oversight efforts to the Ground Combat Vehicle (GCV) program. The committee included a legislative provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, that restricts the use of funds until the Secretary of the Army provides and updated analysis of alternatives to the congressional defense committees that includes a quantitative comparison of upgraded existing systems against the revised GCV design concept. In addition, the committee encouraged the Army to establish another red team prior to the milestone B review to assess the cost, schedule, and technical risks of the GCV acquisition strategy.

#### INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE PROGRAMS

The Department of Defense employs a large inventory of manned and unmanned vehicles to perform tactical, non-space-based, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR). For fiscal year 2012, the budget request included over \$3.6 billion for new tactical ISR aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV) for the Army,

Navy, Marines, and Air Force. Nearly 20 different ISR acquisition programs were requested by the Army, Air Force, and Department of the Navy. The committee has consistently sought to avoid the unnecessary proliferation and duplication of ISR capabilities among the services. The committee has also acted to facilitate the operation in U.S. air space of UAVs in support of training and operational requirements and to provide support to civil emergencies. In the 112th Congress, the committee continued to provide close oversight over myriad ISR projects and programs operated throughout the Department of Defense. The committee report (H. Rept. 112-78) included specific mention of the Enhanced Medium Altitude Reconnaissance and Surveillance System program, airborne reconnaissance low, and Global Hawk unmanned aerial vehicle programs.

RAPID ACQUISITION AUTHORITY AND JOINT URGENT OPERATIONAL  
NEEDS PROCESS

The conflicts in the Republic of Iraq and Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and particularly the evolution of the improvised explosive device (IED) as a highly effective weapon of strategic influence, have illustrated the ability of an adaptive enemy to work to advantage inside a normal defense acquisition cycle. The committee continued its oversight of the urgent operational needs (UONS) process across the Department of Defense and the military services and continued to leverage and evaluate recommendations put forth by the congressionally mandated Defense Science Board commission report required by the Duncan Hunter National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009 (Public Law 110-417), as well as recent reports issued by the Government Accountability Office in April 2010 and March 2011. These reports noted there were significant shortcomings in existing Department of Defense processes for meeting urgent operational needs for the warfighter in a timely, expeditious manner.

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces fully engaged the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military services with formal requests for information regarding the processes used to address urgent operational needs through official correspondence, classified briefings, and open hearings. Further, in the committee report (H. Rept. 112-78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, the committee noted the Department of Defense lacks complete visibility to readily identify the total cost of its urgent operational needs and lacks the internal controls necessary to manage these efforts. For instance, the Department has no comprehensive database for which to track, monitor, and evaluate urgent operational requests and no set of universal metrics used to effectively evaluate their performance once the system is fielded. The committee highlighted that the Secretary of Defense has not issued a Department-wide policy guidance that provided for a unified approach for managing quick reaction programs and urgent need efforts to include managing funding requirements. Given the escalating budgetary challenges, the committee believed that it was and continues to be critical for the Department to reevaluate the current processes of how it fulfills its urgent needs and wheth-

er there is potential to reduce duplication, fragmentation, and overlap to achieve increased efficiencies or cost savings, or both. The committee will continue to work with the Department and the military services to improve upon the rapid acquisition process used to address urgent operational need requests from the warfighter. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, authorized \$50.0 million, for a joint urgent operational needs fund, a reduction of \$150.0 million from the President's request because of the concerns noted by the committee in the current process.

The committee also continued to urge the Secretary of Defense to leverage previous efforts of the committee to take advantage of the rapid acquisition authority provided to the Department of Defense as part of Section 806(c) of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314), as amended by Section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) and section 803 of the Ike Skelton National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011 (Public Law 111-383) wherever necessary, in order to guarantee that military personnel receive required equipment in a timely manner. This authority provided the Secretary of Defense with \$200.0 million in authority, per fiscal year, to waive any necessary statutes for quick response to immediate warfighter capability requirements in response to combat fatalities.

#### TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLES

From 2003 to 2011, Congress has provided \$43.0 billion towards the procurement and recapitalization of tactical wheeled vehicles (TWVs), averaging approximately \$6.0 billion per year. The Army's TWV fleet alone currently consists of 260,000 light, medium and heavy vehicles and represents an investment of over \$70.0 billion; the sheer magnitude of the TWV fleet will present many challenges and warrants intensive oversight and management by the committee. The committee continued to monitor and examine the Department's attempt to develop a comprehensive, joint tactical wheeled vehicle strategy that would limit the potential risk of unplanned overlap in capabilities throughout the military services, takes into consideration the development of realistic and affordable joint requirements, and incorporates sustainment costs. The committee continued to focus on the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV) program, the integration of the family of mine resistant ambush protected vehicles into the current fleet, and other TWV modernization efforts, most notably the Up-Armor High Mobility Multi-purpose Wheeled Vehicle (UAH) recapitalization program.

The committee devoted particular attention towards the JLTV program and the UAH Recapitalization program in the committee report (H. Rept. 112-78) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011. The committee noted that the Army and the Marine Corps both plan to competitively recapitalize their respective UAH fleets with improvements to automotive performance and survivability in order to improve overall capability and extend life cycles. The committee supported this competitive approach to improving the Army and the Marine Corps UAH fleets and noted this

strategy should be based on a best value, full and open competition among public, private, and/or public-private partnerships. The committee encouraged the Army and the Marine Corps to accelerate this program as a means to stabilize the industrial base and provide a bridge to the JLTV program.

The JLTV program is the largest new procurement of tactical wheeled vehicles planned for DOD. No firm quantities have been determined for the JLTV, but the current estimate is that the Army alone would like to have one-third of the light tactical vehicle fleet be JLTVs, approximately 50,000 vehicles. The committee expressed concerns over the JLTV program's projected costs of at least \$9.7 billion for fiscal years 2011–2015. The committee noted that initial test results indicate that the JLTV program faces many operational and technical challenges. Because of the ambitious schedule which has resulted in several delays, projected cost estimates, and lack of stable requirements, the committee recommended a reduction of \$50.0 million for the JLTV program in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011. Also, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, authorized the President's request of \$2.4 billion for tactical wheeled vehicle acquisition.

DEPARTMENT PROJECTION AVIATION (BOMBERS, MOBILITY, UAV AND TANKER) PROGRAMS

Through its oversight activities, the committee recognized the Air Force planned to retire six B–1 bomber aircraft and reduce the current combat-coded force structure from 36 B–1 bomber aircraft down to 30 in fiscal year 2012. The committee supported the Air Force's plan to retire six B–1 bomber aircraft but did not support the plan to reduce the combat-coded force structure of B–1 bomber aircraft. In the report "2007 Long-Range Strike White Paper" required by the committee report (S. Rept. 109–254) accompanying the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, the Air Force stated that 96 combat-coded bomber aircraft total (36 B–1s, 16 B–2s, and 44 B–52s) were required to meet combatant commander requirements until a next-generation long-range strike aircraft is fielded. Furthermore, the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review validated the requirement to maintain up to 96 combat-coded bomber aircraft. The committee will continue to emphasize that retirement of any bomber aircraft that reduces the combat-coded force structure below 96 total bombers is premature prior to a replacement long-range strike bomber aircraft reaching initial operational capability status.

The committee supported the decision to restart the development of a new bomber aircraft and acknowledges that the current fleet of bomber aircraft are still effective and relevant in meeting the combatant commanders' warfighting requirements, but believes that the long-range strike requirements have been sufficiently analyzed on numerous occasions over the last 18 years against forecasted threats and that a recapitalization program must begin.

The committee remained concerned with the workload being levied on the Air Force Rapid Capabilities Office (AFRCO) and will monitor the acquisition governance structure to ensure that

AFRCO is staffed with acquisition officials that represent an appropriate and sufficient cross-section of recent operational experience, major defense acquisition program management, requirements development, technology integration, and cost estimation to effectively execute the bomber program. The committee also remained concerned that the Secretary of the Air Force has not performed a comprehensive life-cycle cost analysis comparing the development of one bomber platform, integrating all long-range strike capabilities, to a “family of long-range strike systems” to determine the affordability of the Department of Defense’s long-range strike portfolio strategy.

Through its oversight activities, the subcommittee recognized that the Secretary of the Air Force requested to repeal section 8062(g) of title 10, United States Code, which provides that the Secretary of the Air Force maintain a minimum inventory of 316 strategic inter-theater airlift aircraft. The committee did not support repeal and believes that a minimum inventory of 316 airlift aircraft provides a prudent balance of operational risk, affordability and sufficient organic capabilities in meeting the ever-increasing mobility requirements in support of the National Military Strategy and combat operations. The committee’s actions stemmed from concerns regarding the questionable viability of the Civil Reserve Airlift Fleet, the reliance of transporting oversize and outsize cargo using foreign aircraft leasing arrangements, the unforeseen overutilization rates of the current fleet of inter-theater airlift aircraft, the consistent under-estimation of deploying units Time-Phased Force and Deployment Data regarding the amount of equipment to support combat operations, and the Mobility Capability and Requirements Study of 2016 did not address or characterize the operational risk in meeting combatant commander warfighting requirements or timelines.

Through its oversight activities, the committee recognized that the Department of Defense continues to struggle with sufficiently, and comprehensively, analyzing and defining intra-theater airlift mobility requirements for active and reserve components, as well as National Guard units supporting both title 10 and title 32, United States Code, airlift mobility operations. The committee recognized that a reduction in the C-130H/J inventory from 395 to 335 aircraft, a reduction in the inventory of C-27J aircraft from 78 to 38, and a wholesale inventory reduction by the Army of 42 C-23 aircraft was unjustified, premature and based on insufficient analytics, and moreover, likely executed for budgetary reasons. Furthermore, the subcommittee recognized that neither the “2006 Mobility Capability Study” or the “2010 Mobility Capability and Requirements Study” did not comprehensively analyze all aspects of intra-theater airlift requirements in the mission areas of time sensitive-direct support, homeland security, Air Force and Army National Guard domestic airlift operations in support of contingencies resulting from natural disasters, humanitarian crises, emergencies, and combatant commander warfighting requirements. The committee will continue to emphasize that without a comprehensive analysis of the aforementioned mission areas, it is impossible to justify such a decrease in intra-theater airlift capabilities.



Through its oversight activities, the committee supported the Chief of Naval Operations' stated desire to investigate the feasibility of sea-basing unmanned, low-observable aircraft on aircraft carriers to potentially provide intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and limited strike capabilities. However, the committee remained concerned with the Navy's execution strategy for developing systems in this mission area.

The committee's concerns include: the Navy plans not to accomplish a thorough future unmanned carrier-based strike system analysis of alternatives; the desired aircraft fielding date of fiscal year 2018 was randomly selected and was not derived through a threat-based analysis for the system; the current engineering and technology development strategy is considered high-risk by Navy officials to meet the fiscal year 2018 date; the Navy has been unable to articulate to the committee the required capabilities and performance characteristics of the system; and the lessons learned from the technology demonstrator known as the unmanned combat air system, which is a precursor to the future unmanned carrier-based strike system, is not sufficiently integrated into the acquisition strategy.

Through its oversight activities, the committee supported the attributes and benefits regarding the KC-46A competition and acknowledged that the source-selection process was conducted fairly amongst all competitors. The committee discovered, according to Department of Defense acquisition officials, that the competition resulted in at least a 20 percent savings for the unit cost of the aircraft and a savings of \$3.0 to \$4.0 billion as compared to the source-selection competition held for the tanker in 2008.

The committee plans to closely monitor the KC-46A engineering, manufacturing and development program to ensure that the taxpayer dollars are wisely invested and that the platform will result in a capability that enhances the warfighter's global reach capabilities. The committee requested that the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics provide the committee quarterly reviews of the Air Force's KC-46A program to maintain sufficient and effective oversight and the committee also requested that the Comptroller General of the United States provide the committee with an annual review of the development program.

#### SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMS

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

Through its oversight activities, the committee was pleased that the Navy has apparently reversed the downward spiral in battle force ship quantities, and believes the plan to achieve the floor of 313 ships is achievable. To obtain the required capability and to provide the required stability to the fragile shipbuilding industrial base, the committee focused on the major shipbuilding programs.

CVN-78 is the lead ship of the *Ford*-class of aircraft carriers. The subcommittee was critical when the Navy changed construction starts of these carriers from 4-year to 5-year centers. The committee has encouraged the Navy to keep these aircraft carriers on 5-year centers at the most, with fiscal year 2013 being the first year of detail design and construction funding for CVN-79. The committee has also expressed that it is essential to minimize changes from ship to ship in the class.

The committee was impressed with the progress of the *Virginia*-class submarine program, which has proven to be a model shipbuilding program. Cost reduction efforts and ever-decreasing span time for construction and delivery have allowed the Navy to fund two ships a year starting in fiscal year 2011, a year earlier than previously contemplated.

The committee is most concerned about how the Navy will fund and maintain the current shipbuilding plan once the Navy begins to acquire replacements for the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine fleet.

The committee, in reviewing the budget request, and knowing that the Navy has re-started the DDG-51 *Arleigh Burke*-class of destroyers, included authorization of a multi-year procurement program. These ships are vital for their traditional roles, as well as modifications that make them a key component for ballistic missile defense.

The committee received testimony that the Marine Corps' requirement for amphibious ships is 38 ships, but that the number of ships that are absolutely necessary with acceptable risk is 33. The committee encouraged the Navy to continue pursuing a minimum of 33 amphibious ships.

Through its oversight activities, the committee examined the schedule for the Littoral Combat Ship, both the sea frame and the mission modules. The committee included two provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, that would increase the transparency and allow for adequate oversight of this program.

Through its oversight activities, the committee delved into the Department's rationale for cancelling the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle program. The committee included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, that would not allow expenditure of funds on a replacement for this vital capability until adequate analyses are completed.

#### DIRECTED ENERGY PROGRAMS

The committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense's directed energy programs, to specifically include directed energy technologies with missile defense applications. During the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces' March 31, 2011, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs, subcommittee members inquired about the status of directed energy research and development efforts, testing, and resources. Concerns about the sufficiency of funds to maintain the Airborne Laser Test-bed platform and conduct further testing, continue technology development, and retain

a uniquely skilled workforce led the committee to recommend additional resources for the directed energy research programs of the Missile Defense Agency in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House.

#### NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

The committee continued its oversight of the atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy (DOE) and nuclear policies and programs of the Department of Defense (DOD) to ensure the safety, security, reliability, and credibility of the U.S. nuclear deterrent. On April 5, 2011, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the fiscal year 2012 Budget Request for Department of Energy Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Department of Defense Nuclear Forces Programs. For the first time in recent years, this annual nuclear posture and budget hearing included witnesses from the Department of Defense, who testified on the Department's nuclear programs and budgets, and linkages with the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). At the hearing, members inquired about DOE and DOD nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization plans, implementation of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), defense environmental cleanup, defense nuclear nonproliferation, safety at defense nuclear facilities, and resources.

In addition to formal hearings, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a classified briefing on March 10, 2011, on the status of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile with the NNSA Administrator and the directors of the nation's three nuclear weapons laboratories. The subcommittee also held a classified briefing on June 15, 2011 on the nuclear fuel cycle and countries of proliferation concern.

The committee included several legislative provisions and reporting requirements related to the nuclear enterprise in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House. These include reporting requirements on U.S. and Russian nuclear forces, nuclear modernization plans, New START implementation plans, NNSA construction project management, nuclear employment strategy, limitations on nuclear force reductions, security at nuclear facilities, and efficiencies at nuclear complex sites.

#### MISSILE DEFENSE

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held several missile defense sessions in support of its oversight of the Department of Defense's efforts to develop, test and field layered missile defense capabilities to protect the United States, its deployed forces, and its friends and allies against the full range of ballistic missile threats. On March 31, 2011, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces conducted a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs. Members' oversight questions addressed a range of missile defense programs and issues, including Ground-based Midcourse Defense (GMD), Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD), Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS), and directed energy research, as well as U.S. homeland missile defense capabilities, implementation of the

European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA), testing, force structure and inventory requirements, cooperative international missile defense activities, and workforce issues.

On February 5, 2011, and March 30, 2011, the subcommittee held classified briefings on the status of the GMD program after recent flight test failures and the Missile Defense Agency's plans for fixing the program. On April 6, 2011, the subcommittee received a classified briefing from the intelligence community on ballistic missile threats. Lastly, on April 14, 2011, the subcommittee received a classified briefing from the Joint Integrated Air and Missile Defense Organization on the results of the Joint Capabilities Mix-3 study, which examined the role and capabilities of U.S. missile defenses in various military engagement scenarios to identify inventory requirements and needed capabilities.

Members of the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces also participated in a congressional delegation visit to Europe, May 16–23, 2011, to see firsthand how the EPAA is being implemented. Members received missile defense briefings from experts at U.S. European Command; toured the Aegis BMD cruiser USS *Monterey*, which deployed to the European theater in March 2011 in support of the EPAA; and discussed missile defense with senior government leaders in the Republic of Poland and Romania.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House, contains several missile defense-related legislative provisions and funding recommendations, to include: reporting requirements on acquisition accountability, the Department's homeland defense hedging strategy, a plan for addressing GMD flight-test failures, and study on space-based interceptor technology. It also included a limitation on funds for the MEADS program and a limitation on providing the Russian Federation with access to sensitive U.S. missile defense technology.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE

The committee continued its oversight of the Department's national security space programs. On March 15, 2011, the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing on the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. Members' oversight questions addressed a range of topics, including: space policy; a new space acquisition approach, Evolutionary Acquisition for Space Efficiency; space launch; space industrial base; Operationally Responsive Space, space situational awareness; space intelligence analysis; and concerns about potential interference with the Global Positioning System (GPS). Additionally, on April 6, 2011, the subcommittee received a classified briefing from the intelligence community on threats to U.S. space capabilities.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House, contains several national security space-related legislative provisions, funding recommendations and reporting requirements, to include: authorization for the Air Force to use incremental funding to procure Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellites, a limitation on funds for the Joint Space Operations Center Management System until an acquisition strategy is submitted to the committee, a requirement that

the Federal Communications Commission resolve concerns of widespread harmful interference to GPS devices used by the Department of Defense prior to permitting certain commercial terrestrial communications operations, and reports on a rocket propulsion strategy and hosted payloads.

#### EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities provided oversight of Department of Defense science and technology, cyber, and counter-terrorism programs and other activities under the subcommittee's jurisdictional responsibility. The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 4, 2011, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011.

#### INVESTMENT IN FUTURE CAPABILITIES SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

The committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense's science and technology policies and programs to ensure balanced investments are made in developing capabilities to meet emerging challenges to national security. Related hearings included: March 1, 2011, Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs. In addition to formal hearings, the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a briefing on April 5, 2011, on Defense Advanced Research Project Agency's Directed Energy, Cyber and Stealth Programs.

Through its oversight activities, the committee recognized critical shortcomings in capabilities for special operations forces and accordingly authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, an additional \$60.0 million for special operations combatant craft systems and an additional \$87.8 million for special operations communications capabilities. Further, due to concerns regarding the management and performance of several procurement and research programs, the subcommittee included legislative provisions to limit the availability of funds for commercial satellite procurement and for Special Operations Command's aviation foreign internal defense program, which also received a reduction in authorized funding level by \$50 million.

(H.A.S.C. 112-9)

#### CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The committee devoted substantial attention to cyber operations and information technology to ensure the Department appropriately defends its networks and has needed capability to conduct its mission across the operational spectrum. Related hearings included: February 11, 2011, What Should the Department of Defense's Role in Cyber Be?; and March 16, 2011, Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for U.S. Cyber Command.

In addition to formal hearings, the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities held a total of four briefings which included: February 9, 2011, Classified Cyber Threat Briefing; April 15, 2011, Classified Briefing on Security of Classified Networks;

June 2, 2011, Sandia National Lab Overview and Capabilities Briefing; and June 3, 2011, Briefing on Recent Cyber Attacks on Lockheed Martin.

The committee included several legislative provisions related to cybersecurity information technology in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, to include: a provision to establish a cybersecurity fellowship program within the Department of Defense that would extend the partnership and educational opportunities between the Department of Defense and foreign militaries. Further, the committee directed an independent review and assessment of the cryptographic modernization program and an assessment of the defense industrial base pilot program.

(H.A.S.C. 112-5; H.A.S.C. 112-26)

#### STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION OPERATIONS

The committee continued its review of the Department of Defense's strategic communications and information operations programs. The subcommittee directed several reviews in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, to include: an assessment of counter adversarial narrative efforts; an assessment of countering network-based threats, and a report on Military Information Support Operations.

## ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

### FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The committee held a series of budget and posture hearings in preparation for the fiscal year 2012 budget. These hearings, combined with the committee's responsibility for assembling the annual defense authorization bill, are a central element in the discharge of the committee's oversight responsibilities.

In upholding its responsibilities to mitigate waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in federal government programs, and pursuant to House rule XI, clauses 2(n), (o), and (p), the committee met several times to conduct oversight over Department of Defense activities, as noted in this report. On January 26, 2011, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony on proposed Department of Defense budget reductions and efficiencies initiatives. Witnesses included William J. Lynn, III, Deputy Secretary of Defense, U.S. Department of Defense; General Peter W. Chiarelli, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy; General Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Marine Corps; and General Philip M. Breedlove, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

On February 16, 2011, the committee received testimony from Robert M. Gates, Secretary of Defense, and Admiral Michael G. Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to review the budget request for funding and authorities during fiscal year 2012.

In addition to these hearings, the committee held posture hearings in which it received testimony from each of the military departments. On February 17, 2011, Michael B. Donley, Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Norton A. Schwartz, appeared before the committee to discuss their service's portion of the fiscal year 2012 budget request. On March 1, 2011, the committee convened a hearing to receive testimony from Ray Mabus, Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Gary Roughead, the Chief of Naval Operations; and General James F. Amos, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who appeared before the committee to testify on the Department of the Navy's portion of the fiscal year 2012 budget request. The following day, on March 2, 2011, John McHugh, Secretary of the Army; and General George W. Casey, Jr., the Chief of Staff of the Army, testified on the budget as it related to their service.

In addition to the uniformed services, which are primarily responsible for training and equipping their respective forces, commanders of the unified combatant commands appeared before the committee to discuss the security situation in their respective areas of responsibility, as well as relevant budget requests, programs and authorities. These hearings began with testimony from General

James Mattis, Commander of U.S. Central Command and Admiral Eric Olson, Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command, on March 3, 2011. This hearing was followed by Admiral James G. Stavridis, Commander of U.S. European Command and NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe; General Douglas M. Fraser, Commander of U.S. Southern Command; and Admiral James A. Winnefeld, Jr., Commander of U.S. Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command on March 30, 2011. On April 5, 2011 the committee received testimony from General Duncan McNabb, Commander of U.S. Transportation Command and General Carter F. Ham, Commander of U.S. Africa Command, who testified on their combatant commands' fiscal year 2012 budget requests. The following day, on April 6, 2011, the committee heard testimony from Admiral Robert F. Willard, Commander of U.S. Pacific Command and General Walter L. "Skip" Sharp, Commander of U.S. Forces Korea, United Nations Command, and Republic of Korea-United States Combined Forces Command.

This year the committee also convened a hearing to receive testimony from members of Congress on their national defense priorities for the fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Act, which took place on April 14, 2011.

Additionally, the committee held a series of hearings in accordance with its legislative and oversight roles which focused on the United States' ongoing military operations and related strategies. The committee convened a hearing on March 16, 2011 in which it sought and received information on developments in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan pertaining to progress of U.S. operations. General David Petraeus, Commander of International Security Assistance Force and U.S. Forces-Afghanistan and Michèle Flournoy, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy appeared before the committee to testify on this important matter. On March 17, 2011 the committee convened a hearing to address detainee policies in response to the President's issuance of Executive Order 13567 which established a new periodic review process for detainees held at U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The committee received testimony from William J. Lynn, III, Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Department of Defense and Jeh Johnson, General Counsel of the U.S. Department of Defense. On March 31, 2011, the committee received testimony from Robert M. Gates, Secretary of Defense and Admiral Michael G. Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on Operation Odyssey Dawn and U.S. military operations in Libya.

(H.A.S.C. 112-2; H.A.S.C. 112-6; H.A.S.C. 112-7; H.A.S.C. 112-8; H.A.S.C. 112-11; H.A.S.C. 112-14; H.A.S.C. 112-24; H.A.S.C. 112-29; H.A.S.C. 112-30; H.A.S.C. 112-31; H.A.S.C. 112-37; H.A.S.C. 112-38; H.A.S.C. 112-41; H.A.S.C. 112-44)

#### LIBYA

During the 112th Congress, the committee has maintained its commitment to conduct rigorous oversight of the Executive Branch and uphold the constitutional duties of Congress in matters relating to military operations abroad. Following the Administration's decision to enter the United States into military operations with Libya, the committee convened a hearing to seek clarification on the nature of U.S. military operations in Libya, including projected



costs and concrete objectives. Prior to the expiration of the President's authority to keep U.S. forces entered into military operations without congressional authorization under the War Powers Act, the Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services wrote a letter to the President which stressed the significance of congressional oversight of Operation Odyssey Dawn and Operation Unified Protector. The committee also actively partook in member engagement on the Floor of the House of Representatives concerning several pieces of introduced legislation relating to the role of the U.S. in military operations in Libya. On June 2, 2011, the committee held a classified briefing from the Department of Defense, the Department of State, and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence on operations in Libya.

(H.A.S.C. 112-31)

## ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEES

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities continued its oversight of the Department's counter-terrorism, counter-insurgency, and counter-weapons of mass destruction proliferation activities to ensure the Department is prepared to address terrorism and other emerging threats. Related hearings included: March 11, 2011, Counterproliferation Strategy and the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and the Chemical Biological Defense Program.

The subcommittee continued to examine the Department's investment and management of information technology systems. Related hearings included: April 6, 2011, Improving Management and Acquisition of Information Technology Systems in the Department of Defense.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 4, 2011, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011. The legislative provisions covered a range of issues, to include: cybersecurity, counter terrorism, and funding for procurement and research and development programs. The subcommittee included several legislative provisions related to terrorism authorities and special operations in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, to include: a provision to extend the authority for the Secretary of Defense to make combating terrorism rewards; a provision to enhance section 1208 authority by increasing the amount authorized from \$45.0 million to \$50.0 million and extending the authority through fiscal year 2014; a provision directing quarterly briefings on counterterrorism operations; and a provision extending the authorization for the Department of Defense to develop Non-Conventional Assisted Recovery capabilities through fiscal year 2016. The subcommittee also included several legislative provisions related to information technology in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, to include: a provision revising the structure and process of the defense business systems investment review boards; and a provision to amend reporting of critical changes to Major Automated Information Systems.

In addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee hosted an introduction to U.S. Special Operations Forces display and presentation on February 11, 2011, held a classified briefing on April 1, 2011, covering U.S. Special Operations Command Fiscal Year 2012 Request and Future Challenges for U.S. Special Operations Forces, and a briefing on June 15, 2011, on counter-proliferation research

and development programs for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and U.S. Special Operations Command.

(H.A.S.C. 112–18; H.A.S.C. 112–39)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

##### *Gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals in the military*

During the 112th Congress, the Subcommittee on Military Personnel continued the process of examining the law and policy surrounding the repeal of the law limiting the military service of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals known as “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell.” The subcommittee held a hearing to determine if the Department of Defense (DOD) is prepared to implement repeal of Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell without jeopardizing morale, unit cohesion, good order, discipline, and combat readiness. Committee members had particular concerns about the effectiveness of training programs, the impact of repeal on recruiting and retention programs, and the adequacy of service policies for dealing with billeting issues, public displays of affection, and the religious freedom rights of service members with strong beliefs opposed to gay and lesbian lifestyles, to include military chaplains. During consideration of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, as passed by the House on May 26, 2011, amendments were adopted to: include the views of the service chiefs concerning readiness of the force in the formal repeal certification process; preclude the use of DOD facilities and resources and the participation of DOD personnel in same sex marriage ceremonies; and reaffirm that the provisions of the Defense of Marriage Act (1 U.S.C. 7) regarding the definition of marriage as being between a man and woman shall apply to the process for determining the meaning of any Act of Congress or any ruling, regulation, or interpretation within the Department of Defense applicable to military personnel or DOD civilian employees.

(H.A.S.C. 112–34)

##### *Armed Forces Retirement Home*

The Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel visited the Armed Forces Retirement Home, District of Columbia, on May 2, 2011. During the visit the chairman received an update on the facilities operations, construction and personnel issues. This oversight effort related directly to the legislation adopted by the subcommittee and included in National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011.

##### *Casualties inflicted on U.S. personnel by Afghan nationals working as contractors, police, or security forces*

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel investigated several reports of Afghan nationals serving as contract personnel, national police, and military personnel who, without warning, attacked and killed U.S. military personnel. As a result of the investigation, the committee requested that the Secretary of Defense, General Petraeus, the Commander of International Security Assistance Force & Commander of U.S. Forces Afghanistan, and the Secretary of the Army review current screening and evaluations of Afghans

hired to work closely with U.S. forces and to take disciplinary action, if merited, against the Afghan security guard contractor whose employee attacked U.S. personnel.

*Hiring of a highly qualified expert for the Defense health program*

The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness hired former Maine governor John Baldacci as a highly qualified expert to review military health care and propose reforms to it. The Chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, out of concern that such a hiring was duplicative of capabilities and personnel already available to the undersecretary and wasteful of funding and resources, sought a fuller explanation of the rationale for the hiring. In addition, the chairman sought an explanation of how the hiring and individual hired met the Department of Defense criteria for highly qualified experts. The inquiry will be continued.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

The Subcommittee on Readiness continued oversight of military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues; military construction, installations, and family housing issues; energy policy and programs of the Department of Defense; and civilian personnel and service contracting issues. The subcommittee conducted six oversight hearings and a markup of the National Defense Authorization act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011.

On March 3, 2011, the Subcommittee met for its first oversight hearing to receive testimony on the Required Readiness Posture of U.S. Forces from an independent panel. The panel explored the frameworks of resourcing decisions, including the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) Report, the 2010 Global Defense Posture (GDP) Report, the QDR Independent Panel Review, and the recent National Military Strategy.

The subcommittee met in a follow-on session on March 10, 2011, to receive testimony on the President's Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request and Global Challenges to Readiness. In this hearing, the services provided testimony on the required readiness of the U.S. forces to respond to a range of near- and far-term global threats.

On March 15, 2011, the subcommittee met to receive testimony on Long-Term Readiness Challenges in the Pacific; which addressed the readiness of U.S. forces to respond to conflicts in the Pacific region.

The subcommittee provided oversight of the ongoing challenge to jointness in a hearing on March 31, 2011 titled "the Status of and Future Plans for Military Jointness and the Impact on our Nation's Readiness." The witnesses provided testimony on the progress the military has made towards jointness and interoperability across the military department, and its impact on the readiness of our forces. The subcommittee also addressed the challenges of sustaining the force in a hearing on April 7, 2011.

The subcommittee met in open session on April 13, 2011, to receive testimony on the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Military Construction, Base Closure, Environment, Facilities Operation and Maintenance.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011.

(H.A.S.C. 112-13; H.A.S.C. 112-17; H.A.S.C. 112-21; H.A.S.C. 112-33; H.A.S.C. 112-40; H.A.S.C. 112-43)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND PROJECTION FORCES

The Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces conducted a series of hearings to review programs included in the Department of Defense (DOD) acquisition budget request for fiscal year 2012 during the 112th Congress, including; March 9, 2011, Navy Shipbuilding Acquisition Programs and Budget Requirements of the Navy's Shipbuilding and Construction Plan.

In addition to its traditional oversight responsibilities regarding DOD budget requests, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings on the following topics: March 16, 2011, Amphibious Operations.

In addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee conducted numerous briefings on the following topics: February 11, 2011, Necessary Considerations in Challenging Times for Effective Projection of Navy and Air Force Forces; March 2, 2011, OHIO-class Ballistic Missile Submarine Replacement Program (SSBN(X)); March 30, 2011, Air Force Long-Range Strike Efforts; April 7, 2011, Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 5, 2011, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House on May 26, 2011. The legislation covered a range of issues, including authorization of appropriations for procurement programs and research, development, test and evaluation programs for the Department of the Navy.

(H.A.S.C. 112-16; H.A.S.C. 112-25)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces addressed strategic forces programs (except deep strike systems), space programs, ballistic missile defense programs, intelligence policy and national programs, as well as Department of Energy national security programs (except nuclear non-proliferation programs), by conducting hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2012 budget request, including: March 15, 2011, national security space activities; March 31, 2011, missile defense programs; and April 5, 2011, Department of Energy atomic energy defense activities and Department of Defense nuclear programs.

In addition to its oversight responsibilities regarding the budget requests, the subcommittee conducted an oversight hearing on March 2, 2011, on the status of United States strategic forces.

The subcommittee also held several briefings on the following oversight topics: February 10, 2011 and March 30, 2011, status of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense program; March 10, 2011, status of the United States nuclear weapons stockpile; April 14, 2011, Joint Capability Mix-III study; and June 15, 2011, nuclear fuel cycle and countries of proliferation concern.

The committee held informal educational briefings on the following topics: February 9, 2011, missile defense policy and posture; February 15, 2011, history and evolution of nuclear policy and posture; March 1, 2011, Administration's nuclear policy and posture; March 9, 2011, space fundamentals and space policy and strategy; March 30, 2011, missile defense programs; April 6, 2011, space and ballistic missile threats; and April 13, 2011, Department of Energy environmental management programs.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 4, 2011, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012.

(H.A.S.C. 112-12; H.A.S.C. 112-22; H.A.S.C. 112-32; H.A.S.C. 112-36)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR AND LAND FORCES

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces provided oversight of all Departments of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Office of the Secretary of Defense acquisition programs providing tactical aircraft and missile; armor and ground vehicle; munitions; and associated support equipment, including Reserve and National Guard equipment programs. The subcommittee conducted five oversight hearings and a markup of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011, during its consideration of the fiscal year 2012 Department of Defense budget request. Hearings included: March 1, 2011: Equipping the Warfighter in Afghanistan; March 9, 2011: Army Modernization Programs; March 15, 2011: Air Force Tactical Aviation Programs; March 17, 2011: Soldier and Marine Equipment for Dismounted Operations; and April 1, 2011: Army and Air Force National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Posture.

In addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee received a briefing from representatives of the Department of Defense on the following: a classified briefing on provision of force protection for forces in Afghanistan and a classified briefing on special access programs included in the budget request for fiscal year 2012.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, H.R. 1540, passed by the House May 26, 2011.

(H.A.S.C. 112-10; H.A.S.C. 112-15; H.A.S.C. 112-20; H.A.S.C. 112-27; H.A.S.C. 112-35)

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

The Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations was reestablished by the 112th Congress to conduct oversight and investigation over matters directed by the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services after coordination with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. The subcommittee focused on a number of issues, including to U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, detainee transfers and release, and reengagement, and worked with other subcommittees and the full committee to conduct oversight as indicated below.

*Transfer and release of Guantanamo Bay detainees and reengagement*

In connection with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on Armed Services request of March 16, 2011, the subcommittee is significantly focused on conducting an in-depth investigation on U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, detainee transfers and releases over time. Specifically, the subcommittee was directed to review and analyze “the circumstances and mechanisms for post-transfer security measures and assurances for humane treatment for those transferred from Guantanamo Bay.” The subcommittee was also directed to provide a comprehensive written report, including evaluations of past practices and recommendations for the future, to the committee by November 30, 2011. To date, the subcommittee has:

- (1) Conducted over 100 formal and informal meetings and interviews with witnesses;
- (2) Reviewed 2,000 pages of documentary evidence;
- (3) Organized two classified member briefings;
- (4) Organized three classified staff briefings;
- (5) Organized and conducted three unclassified member briefings;
- (6) Organized and conducted one unclassified hearing;
- (7) Conducted CODELs to the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and
- (8) Conducted STAFFDELS to the United Kingdom, U.S. Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, the Kingdom of Morocco, the People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria, and the French Republic.

*Arlington National Cemetery/Department of Defense 30 Year Aviation and Shipbuilding Plans*

Other areas the subcommittee focused on include accountability and management issues at Arlington National Cemetery and the Department of Defense’s Thirty Year Aviation and Shipbuilding Plans. In connection with these matters, and in close coordination with the Military Personnel Subcommittee and the Subcommittees on Tactical Air and Land Forces and Seapower and Projection Forces, the subcommittee has:

- (1) Conducted over 20 formal and informal meetings and interviews with witnesses;
- (2) Reviewed over 500 pages of documentary evidence;
- (3) Conducted a site visit to Arlington National Cemetery;
- (4) Organized and conducted three member briefings; and
- (5) Organized and conducted two hearings.

As a result of these efforts, the subcommittee believes that additional oversight of Arlington National Cemetery and study of the thirty year plans is warranted.

(H.A.S.C. 112–42; H.A.S.C. 112–45; H.A.S.C. 112–46)

## PUBLICATIONS

### COMMITTEE PRINTS

Committee Print No. 1—Committee Rules of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, adopted January 20, 2011.

### PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS

H.A.S.C. 112-1—Full Committee hearing on Committee Organization. January 20, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-2—Full Committee hearing on Proposed Department of Defense Budget Reductions and Efficiencies Initiatives. January 26, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-3—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request on Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Programs Overview. February 9, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-4—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Resale Programs Overview. February 10, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-5—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on What Should the Department of Defense's Role in Cyber Be? February 11, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-6—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of Defense. February 16, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-7—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force. February 17, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-8—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of the Navy. March 1, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-9—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of Defense Science and Technology Programs. March 1, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-10—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Equipping the Warfighter in Afghanistan. March 1, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-11—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Department of the Army. March 1, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-12—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on The Status of United States Strategic Forces. March 2, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-13—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Are We Ready? An Independent Look at the Required Readiness Posture of the U.S. Forces. March 3, 2011.



H.A.S.C. 112-14—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests from the U.S. Central Command and U.S. Special Operations Command. March 3, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-15—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Army Modernization. March 9, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-16—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Navy Shipbuilding Acquisition Programs and Budget Requirements of the Navy's Shipbuilding and Construction Plan. March 9, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-17—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Global Challenges to Readiness and the Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Request. March 10, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-18—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Counterproliferation Strategy and the Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests for the Defense Threat Reduction Agency and Chemical Biological Defense Program. March 11, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-19—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Health System Overview and Defense Health Program Cost Efficiencies. March 15, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-20—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force Tactical Aviation Programs. March 15, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-21—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Long-term Readiness Challenges in the Pacific. March 15, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-22—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for National Security Space Activities. March 15, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-23—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Health System Overview and Defense Health Program Cost Efficiencies: A Beneficiary Perspective. March 16, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-24—Full Committee hearing on Developments in Afghanistan. March 16, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-25—Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces hearing on Amphibious Operations. March 16, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-26—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the U.S. Cyber Command.

H.A.S.C. 112-27—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Soldier and marine equipment for dismounted operations. March 17, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-28—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Military Personnel Overview. March 17, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-29—Full Committee hearing on Law of War Detention and the President's Executive Order Establishing Periodic Review Boards for Guantanamo Detainees. March 17, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-30—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests from U.S. Southern Command, U.S. Northern Command, and U.S. European Command. March 30, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-31—Full Committee hearing on Operation Odyssey Dawn and U.S. Military Operations in Libya. March 31, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-32—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Missile Defense. March 31, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-33—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Improving the Readiness of U.S. Forces through Military Jointness. March 31, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-34—Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on Implementation Plans for the Repeal of Law and Policies Governing Service by Openly Gay and Lesbian Service Members. April 1, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-35—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing on Army and Air Force National Guard and Reserve Component Equipment Posture. April 1, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-36—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Department of Energy Atomic Energy Defense Activities and Department of Defense Nuclear Forces Programs. April 5, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-37—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests from the U.S. Transportation Command and U.S. Africa Command. April 5, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-38—Full Committee hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Requests from the U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea. April 6, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-39—Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities hearing on Improving Management and Acquisition of Information Technology Systems in the Department of Defense. April 6, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-40—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Sustaining the Force: Challenges to Readiness. April 7, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-41—Full Committee hearing on Repeal of Law and Policies Governing Service by Openly Gay and Lesbian Service Members. April 7, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-42—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Guantanamo Detainee Transfer Policy and recidivism. April 13, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-43—Subcommittee on Readiness hearing on Fiscal Year 2012 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Military Construction, Base Closure, Environment, Facilities Operation and Maintenance. April 13, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-44—Full Committee hearing on Testimony from Members on their National Defense Priorities for the fiscal year 2012 National Defense Authorization Bill. April 14, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-45—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Accountability at Arlington National Cemetery. April 14, 2011.

H.A.S.C. 112-46—Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations hearing on Efficacy of the Department of Defense's Thirty Year Aviation and Shipbuilding Plans. June 1, 2011.

**HOUSE REPORTS**

Report number	Date filed	Bill number	Title
112-77	May 12, 2011	H. Res. 208	Resolution directing the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of any official document, record, memo, correspondence, or other communications of the Department of Defense in the possession of the Secretary of Defense that relates to any consultation with Congress regarding Operation Odyssey Dawn or NATO Operation Unified Protector
112-78 Part 1	May 17, 2011	H.R. 1540	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 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.
112-78 Part 2	May 23, 2011	H.R. 1540	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 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.

## PRESS RELEASES

### FIRST SESSION

January 6, 2011—McKeon: New \$78 Billion in Defense Cuts Is a Dramatic Shift for a Nation at War

January 6, 2011—McKeon Supportive of New Troop Deployment to Afghanistan

January 7, 2011—McKeon: Presidential Signing Statement Out of Touch with Public Will to Keep Terrorists off American Soil

January 8, 2011—McKeon Statement on Rep. Gabrielle Giffords

January 20, 2011—Armed Services Committee Leaders Announce Subcommittee Membership for the 112th Congress

January 25, 2011—McKeon Statement on President's State of the Union Address

February 18, 2011—New Report on Maintenance Depots Wins Bipartisan Praise

February 24, 2011—Armed Services Committee Leaders Comment on Air Force Aerial Refueling Tanker Award

March 1, 2011—McKeon Testifies before the Administration Committee on Armed Services Committee Budget for the 112th Congress

March 7, 2011—McKeon Criticizes White House Executive Fiat on Detainees

March 8, 2011—McKeon, Armed Services Members Introduce Legislation regarding America's Terrorist Prosecution and Detention Policies

March 20, 2011—McKeon Statement on Operation Odyssey Dawn

March 22, 2011—McKeon Welcomes John Noonan to the House Armed Services Committee Staff

March 24, 2011—McKeon Criticizes Pentagon Decision to Issue Stop Work Order on Joint Strike Fighter Competitive Engine Program

March 29, 2011—McKeon Statement on President's Speech on Libya Operations

April 4, 2011—McKeon Statement on Administration Decision to Try 9/11 Co-Conspirators through Military Commissions Process

April 4, 2011—McKeon Statement Applauds West YouCut Proposal

April 5, 2011—McKeon Statement Applauds Ryan Budget

April 13, 2011—McKeon Responds to White House Plan to Cut \$400 Billion from National Security Spending

April 15, 2011—McKeon Applauds Passage of Ryan Budget

April 28, 2011—McKeon on National Security Leadership Changes within the Administration; Praises Gates for His Service

May 2, 2011—McKeon Statement on Death of Osama bin Laden

May 3, 2011—Military Personnel Subcommittee Chairman Releases Details of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012

May 3, 2011—Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee Leadership Release Details of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012

May 3, 2011—Strategic Forces Subcommittee Chairman Releases Details of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012

May 3, 2011—Bartlett Releases Details of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012

May 3, 2011—Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee Chairman Releases Details of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012

May 3, 2011—Readiness Subcommittee Chairman Releases Details of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012

May 5, 2011—McKeon Praises GE, Rolls Royce for Funding Joint Strike Fighter Engine Without Taxpayer Support

May 9, 2011—McKeon Releases Details about National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012

May 12, 2011—Armed Services Committee Overwhelmingly Approves Defense Authorization Bill

May 20, 2011—Former U.S. Attorney General Lauds Affirmation of the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force

May 26, 2011—House Approves Defense Authorization Bill with Bipartisan Support

May 30, 2011—McKeon Welcomes New Senior Military Leaders; Praises Admiral Mullen for His Service

June 11, 2011—McKeon Presses Defense Department for Details on Libya Operations

June 16, 2011—McKeon Statement on White House Libya Report